

Integrated Communicative-Based English Instructional Materials for Non-English Department Students

Ribahan*¹, Muhsinin², Hery Rahmat³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram, Indonesia

*Correspondence: ✉ ribahan@uinmataram.ac.id

Abstract

This study aimed to develop integrated communicative-based English instructional materials for non-English department students at Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Mataram, employing the ADDIE instructional design model, which includes analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation. Data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, and tests. The questionnaires and interviews gathered information on student needs, validity, and practicability of the instructional materials, while tests assessed the effectiveness of the instructional materials in the classroom. Quantitative and qualitative analyses revealed that the existing English instructional materials had not been developed properly, confirming the need to create new English instructional materials aligned with the principles of an integrated communicative approach. The findings also indicated that experts, students, and lecturers found the newly developed instructional materials valid, practical, and effective in enhancing student achievement in learning English.

Article History

Received: 11-Jul-2024

Revised : 02-Aug-2024

Accepted: 16-Aug-2024

Keywords:

English instructional materials, material development, integrated communicative



© 2024 Ribahan, Muhsinin, Hery Rahmat

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

INTRODUCTION

Instructional materials are crucial in language teaching, providing learners with essential input and practice opportunities (Ajoke, 2017). They enhance instructional quality, support teachers' tasks (Damayanti et al., 2018) and provide comprehensive resources for language skills such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation (Richards, 2001). In English language teaching, these materials are vital for ensuring instructional effectiveness and meeting student needs (Çakir, 2015). Teachers can modify or create materials tailored to specific contexts to optimize their use, thus enriching students' learning experiences (Ahamat & Kabilan, 2022).

Instructional materials, encompassing a wide range of resources such as textbooks, songs, articles, and digital media, are essential for achieving learning objectives (Tomlinson, 2012; Kusuma & Apriyanto, 2018). These resources can be adapted, developed, or combined to fit specific educational needs (Brown, 2000). Effective instructional materials must align with the needs of students, teachers, and teaching contexts (Rohimajaya et al., 2021), supporting student

learning and teacher performance, particularly for novice instructors (Roblin et al., 2018). Quality materials should be relevant, practical, and valid and facilitate language acquisition (Dewi, 2016).

A preliminary study on English teaching and learning at UIN Mataram revealed significant weaknesses in the current instructional materials. These materials were poorly developed, failing to meet student needs or produce satisfactory outcomes. They contained loosely compiled content from various sources, lacking clear organization and purpose. The materials focused predominantly on reading skills, with grammar as a supplement, resulting in fragmented presentation and limited integration of language skills. Additionally, repetitive tasks lacked variety, and the scope of content was restricted. Consequently, these materials did not effectively support the intended learning goals.

This study proposed solutions to improve English teaching materials at UIN Mataram by developing resources tailored to students' needs and learning objectives. An integrated-communicative approach, which merges the integrated language learning method with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), offers a promising framework for creating materials that serve non-English majors more effectively. The integrated approach aims to immerse students in realistic language use by combining reading, writing, speaking, and listening into a cohesive learning experience. Bringing these skills together, students engage in language learning that mirrors natural communication, enhancing their practical language abilities (Kotkovets, 2014; Pardede, 2019).

CLT, which focuses on interaction, authenticity, and real-life application (Shahi, 2022) provides a complementary foundation to the integrated approach by emphasizing learner-centred instruction, meaningful goals, and task-based activities. CLT encourages students to use language for authentic communication, prioritizing language functions over strict grammar and vocabulary instruction. This approach allows students to practice appropriate language use in diverse contexts, fostering skills directly applicable to everyday communication. Research supports the impact of CLT on developing students' listening, speaking, and communicative abilities while also boosting their motivation and achievement (Efrizal, 2012; Saputra, 2015).

Together, these methodologies offer an integrated communicative approach. The integrated communicative approach integrates various language components and competencies into a unified teaching and learning process, emphasizing enhancing students' capacity to communicate proficiently in real-world contexts (Kurniawan, 2022). This approach highlights the importance of materials for instruction that facilitate classroom interaction and encourage genuine use of the target language. Several fundamental principles underlying this approach involve the integration of language skills, the promotion of authentic language use, the balance between accuracy and fluency, the implementation of task-based learning, the prioritization of learner-centred strategies, and the encouragement of collaboration. This approach is practical

for non-English department students since it creates opportunities to practice language in a real-world context, develops practical communication skills, and makes learning more meaningful and engaging through interactive activities. The studies have demonstrated that this approach effectively enhances language teaching by improving students' performance, motivation, self-confidence, communicative competence, and academic achievement in English (Aljiffri, 2010; Ostovar-Namaghi & Tajzad, 2014).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a research and development (R&D) approach to create and validate instructional materials. The primary product developed was an English coursebook designed for non-English students at UIN Mataram. The development process followed the ADDIE model, comprising five stages: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation, each applied systematically to guide the instructional material's development (Molenda, 2015). The participants of this study comprised students from diverse non-English departments at UIN Mataram, including Natural Science, Economics, Law, Arabic Language Education, Islamic Religion Education, and Elementary School Teacher Education, all enrolled in English as a General Subject. Moreover, English instructors from both non-English disciplines and the English Department at UIN Mataram were involved. Seventy-eight students and three English lecturers participated in the needs analysis phase. Two faculty members from the English Department engaged in the expert validation of the teaching materials. At the same time, 55 students from diverse non-English disciplines participated in both the small-scale and field trial stages.

The following outlines the steps in developing instructional materials using the ADDIE model, as applied in this study.

The analysis stage focused on identifying student needs, characteristics, and required competencies in knowledge, attitudes, and skills for effective English language learning through questionnaires and interviews with students and teachers. This analysis provided essential insights to guide the design of instructional materials aligned with student learning goals.

In the design stage, key activities included selecting and organizing topics, selecting relevant images, and gathering resources to support the instructional content of the instructional materials for the students. This stage also involved structuring activities, designing interactive tasks, and developing assessments aligned with instructional goals. These steps helped to establish a clear framework and plan for the instructional materials before moving on to the development stage.

In the development stage, the primary focus was developing the instructional materials using the resources designed in the previous stage. This stage involved writing content for each topic, integrating relevant images, formulating learning objectives, and developing activities or tasks for each chapter or section of the materials. After the materials were completed, experts

validated them, and revisions were made based on their feedback to ensure alignment with the learning objectives and improve effectiveness.

In the implementation stage, the instructional materials were tried out in teaching and learning contexts to assess their practicability and effectiveness. This stage aimed to gather feedback on how well the materials functioned in real-world classroom settings, providing insights into their usability and impact on student learning.

Finally, the evaluation stage focused on reviewing and revising the instructional materials based on the feedback and data gathered during the try-out phase. This stage involved a thorough analysis of how the materials performed in actual teaching and learning contexts, identifying areas for improvement.

The data collected in this study were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative analysis involved statistical techniques to examine data from various sources, including the needs analysis on student requirements for learning English, expert validation assessments, student responses and lecturer evaluations from the try-out phase, and student test results. Additionally, qualitative data analysis was conducted to provide descriptive insights and a detailed explanation of the findings. This combined approach enabled a comprehensive understanding of the instructional materials' effectiveness and relevance.

The categories presented in Table 1 (Akbar, 2013) are used to determine the instructional materials' validity. The instructional materials developed were considered "valid" if the results of expert validation obtained an average level of 'sufficient' which also means that the instructional materials do not need to be revised.

Table 1. Categories of validity level of the instructional materials

Score	Categories of Validity Level
85.01 – 100.00 %	Very Good
70.01 – 85.00 %	Good
50.01 – 70.00 %	Sufficient
01.00 – 50.00 %	Poor

Meanwhile, the categories in Table 2 (Purwanto, 2014) are used to determine the practicability of the instructional materials developed. The instructional materials developed are considered "practical" if the average student response attains a "Good" level.

Table 2. Categories of practicability level of the instructional material

Score	Categories of Practicability Level
86% - 100%	Very Good
76% - 85 %	Good
60% - 75 %	Sufficient
55% - 59 %	Poor
0% - 54 %	Very Poor

Statistical tests (t-tests) were then used to compare student scores in the experimental and control groups to determine the effectiveness of the instructional materials. A significant difference was found when the significant value was less than 0.05.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The following presents the research findings on instructional material development based on the steps of the ADDIE model, which aligns with the model used in this study.

Analysis Stage

The results of the needs analysis obtained from the questionnaire revealed that students recognized four essential language skills that need to be learned, with speaking (41%) having the highest priority, followed by reading (24%), writing (19%), and listening (16%). This finding suggests that students must master all four language skills despite their challenges in learning and practising them. Notably, 77% of students expressed the urgent need for instruction in these four skills, as many tend to engage with English passively, focusing predominantly on grammar lessons. By acquiring these skills, students are expected to become more proactive in communicating in English, as language is a primary tool for interaction, expression of ideas, and socialization. However, the data also indicated that, despite including these four skills in the curriculum, 71% of students feel their proficiency remains insufficient, highlighting the need for improvement.

Consequently, an integrated communicative approach to teaching English was developed to enhance students' language proficiency and motivate them to engage more actively in learning. Moreover, interview results revealed that the lecturers agreed that all four language skills should be integrated, particularly for first-year students, to enhance their communication abilities. They also emphasized the importance of active student engagement in the learning process and the role of lecturers as facilitators. Regarding assessment, the lecturers preferred tests that accurately measure language competency in learning outcomes and the learning process.

Design Stage

Based on the analysis phase results, integrated communicative-based English instructional materials were developed as a product. The design process commenced with the development and organization of the topics and the collection of resources to enrich the content of the instructional materials. The design result of the product developed is illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3: The Design of the Product

UNIT 1: New People A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus	UNIT 2: Family Entertainment A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus
UNIT 3: Job Application A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus	UNIT 4: Gadgets and Machines A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus
UNIT 5: Personal Experiences A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus	UNIT 6: Future Life A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus
UNIT 7: Public Celebration A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus	UNIT 8: Foreign Languages A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus
UNIT 9: General Election A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading	UNIT 10: Social Media A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading

E. Vocabulary	E. Vocabulary
F. Grammar Focus	F. Grammar Focus

Development Stage

Following the design of the instructional materials, the subsequent step was to develop an instructional material product utilizing the resources and materials that had been carefully prepared and structured during the preceding stage. This phase involved the comprehensive writing process of instructional materials, ensuring each component aligned with the earlier design. The focus was on meticulously translating the conceptual framework into a tangible product, providing the content was coherent, well-organized, and effectively addressing the learning objectives identified in the design phase. Additionally, the development of the product included integrating relevant resources, instructional strategies, and assessment methods, all by the previously established guidelines and pedagogical principles. Finally, a product in the form of English instructional materials for non-English department students was successfully developed completely. Upon completion of the instructional materials, they underwent a validation process conducted by experts to obtain feedback and approval. Experts in both content and instructional design reviewed the design to ensure the quality and effectiveness of the materials. During this phase, a questionnaire was provided to the experts for evaluation, allowing them to offer detailed comments and suggestions regarding the material's design. The feedback gathered from the questionnaire was intended to serve as a foundation for revising and refining the product, ensuring they met the necessary academic standards and addressed the intended learning outcomes effectively. The result of the product's development is provided below.

The Outcome of the Product Development

**UNIT 1
NEW PEOPLE**

In this unit, you will be able to:

- ☐ Greeting
- ☐ Introduce Yourself
- ☐ Introduce Others

INTRODUCTION

In everyday life, we sometimes meet new people in a party, in an office, in a public transportation, etc. Greeting and introducing ourselves to the people who we meet with are two ways of starting a conversation. In this case, we often share or give personal information one another.

Warming up

Look at the picture

(Source: <https://www.google.co.id/>)

Integrated - Communicative English ... 1

Discuss these questions with your classmates.

- How do you feel when you are being introduced to a new people? Why?
- Do you find it easy to introduce yourself to a new people?
- Do you remember the names of new people when you're introduced to them?
- What questions will you ask when you meet a new people?
- What things you should not do when you meet a new people?

A. LISTENING

Task 1. Listen carefully to these conversations.

Conversations 1

A: Excuse me. May I introduce myself? My name is Elroy Jetson.

B: Hello, nice to meet you.

A: Thanks and nice to meet you too. I sell computers.

B: You sell computers?

A: Yes, if you ever need a computer, please call me.

B: OK, Elroy. I do appreciate it. I will call you if I need a computer.

A: No trouble at all.

Conversations 2

A: It's nice to meet you. My name is Jack.

2 • Ribahan, 1 Nengah Martha, 1 Nengah Suandi

C. WRITING

Task 1. Go around the class and meet your classmates. Interview them and write their answers.

No	Name	City	Sex	Age	Others
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

E. VOCABULARY

Task 1: Study the vocabularies below.

COUNTRIES			
The United States	Afghanistan	Hungary	Philippines
Germany	Costa Rica	Portugal	Greece
France	Poland	Egypt	Cambodia
Spain	Finland	Japan	The United Kingdom
Russia	DanA	Korea	Puerto Rico
England	Ireland	Australia	New Zealand
Brazil	Lebanon	Ireland	Laos
Japan	Sweden	Saudi Arabia	Netherlands
Mexico	Thailand	Isak	Norway
Canada	Belgium	Italy	Portugal

Task 2. Find the appropriate nationality of the countries above. You are required to choose fifteen countries only and write them in chart below.

No	Countries	Nationalities
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		

of Ireland/Irish.

10. Lucero has got a Mexican/Mexico guitar. He is from Mexican/Mexico. He likes playing Mexican/Mexico music.

F. GRAMMAR FOCUS

PRESENT SIMPLE		
	Points	Examples
Use	We use the present simple to talk about: (1) something that is true in the present, (2) something that happens again and again in the present, (3) something that is always true, and (4) something that is fixed in the future.	I'm nineteen years old. I play football every weekend. The adult human body contains 200 bones. The school term starts next week.
Questions	With the present tense, we use do and does to make questions. We use does for the third person (she/he/it) and we use do for the others.	Do you play the piano? Does Jack play football?
Negatives	With the present tense we use do and does to make negatives. We use does not (doesn't) for the third person.	They don't work at the weekend. John doesn't live in

A set of measurement criteria was applied to assess the validity of the developed instructional materials. These criteria were categorized as follows: Very Good (85.01%–100.00 %), Good (70.01%–85.00 %), Enough (50.01%–70.00 %), and Less (0.00%–50.00%). Table 4 summarizes the results of the evaluation conducted by experts.

Table 4: The Results of Experts' Validation

4.

No	Aspects	Percentage (%)
1	Graphical elements of the instructional materials	80%
2	Appropriateness of the instructional materials	85%
3	Presentation of the instructional materials	80%
4	Content properness of the instructional materials	86%
5	Tasks or activities presented in the instructional materials	82%
6	Language skills are presented in the instructional materials.	81%
Average		82%

The evaluation results presented in Table 3, conducted by two experts, indicate that the design of the developed instructional materials was deemed "good," with an average validation score of 82%. The experts provided several constructive comments and suggestions aimed at enhancing the materials. These recommendations focused on various aspects, including the comprehensiveness of the teaching content, alignment with the intended competencies, materials' organization, clarity, relevance of the topics, reading skill exercises, vocabulary tasks, instructional guidelines, grammar components, preface, and table of contents.

Implementation Stage

Following the revision and approval of the instructional materials by the experts, the subsequent phase involved conducting a try-out to gather data regarding the practicability of the materials. This step aimed to assess various aspects of the instructional materials, including readability, attractiveness, difficulty level, relevance, and clarity, to ensure their effectiveness in real-world teaching contexts. The try-out was implemented by integrating the developed instructional materials into actual teaching and learning activities, allowing one to observe how well the materials functioned in a practical educational setting. A structured questionnaire was designed to facilitate feedback collection, allowing participants to evaluate the materials' usability, effectiveness and intended purpose. To measure the practicability of the developed instructional materials, specific categories were established for evaluation, including Very Good (86% - 100%), Good (76% - 85 %), Enough (60% - 75 %), Poor (55% - 59 %),

Very Poor (0% - 54%). The try-out consisted of minor group and field try-out. The summary of the results of the try-out is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: The Result of try-out

4			
No	Aspects	Small group try out (%)	Field try out (%)
1	Attractiveness of the instructional materials	97%	94%
2	Relevance of the instructional materials	90%	93%
3	Readability of the instructional materials	93%	96%
4	Clarity of the instructional materials	89%	95%
Average		92%	95%

Based on the results of the initial small-scale try-out presented in Table 4, the data indicated that the developed instructional materials were deemed "very good," with an average practicability score of 92%. Furthermore, the results of the field try-out, which were based on student evaluations, also confirmed that the instructional materials were rated as "very good," with an average practicability score of 95%. During both try-out phases, the feedback provided by students was limited, with few comments or suggestions for revisions or improvements. Nevertheless, the responses from the students and the lecturers' evaluations gathered through the questionnaire were instrumental in assessing the overall practicability of the developed instructional materials. These evaluations provided valuable insights into the effectiveness of the materials and contributed to confirming their suitability for use in natural educational settings.

Evaluation Stage

During the try-out phase, alongside the implementation and simulation of the developed instructional materials, the researchers also experimented to assess the effectiveness of the materials. Specifically, this experiment aimed to evaluate the impact of the developed instructional materials on students' learning achievement. A quasi-experimental method was employed, utilizing a non-equivalent control group design. In this experimental setup, two groups were involved: the experimental group, which received the treatment using the developed instructional materials, and the control group, which was taught using the existing instructional materials commonly used in English language teaching and learning activities at UIN Mataram.

To determine whether using different teaching materials resulted in varying levels of student achievement, the researchers compared the average post-test scores and the gain scores between the pretest and post-test in both groups. The instructional materials were deemed effective if the experimental group showed higher learning achievement than the control group. Before the experiment, a pretest was administered at the beginning of the lesson, followed by a post-test after the lesson.

The experimental results indicated a notable difference in the average scores between the two groups. The experimental group achieved a higher average score (71) than the control group (65). Additionally, the average gain score of the experimental group (0.20) was greater than that of the control group (0.17). These findings suggest that the experimental group demonstrated superior learning achievement, indicating that the integrated communicative English instructional materials contributed to improved student outcomes.

To further confirm the statistical significance of these differences, t-tests were conducted to assess whether there was a significant difference in learning achievement between the experimental and control groups. The results of the t-test are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6. The result of the t-test

		t-test for Equality of Means						
				Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differen ce	Std. Error Differen ce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		t	df				Lower	Upper
GSC	Equal variances assumed	3.827	118	.000	.05167	.01350	.02493	.07840

Table 6 shows that the t-test has a probability value (p) <0.05, indicating a significant difference in achievement between students taught with integrated communicative English learning materials and those taught with non-communicative English learning materials at level 5 %. Therefore, these data indicate that integrated communicative English learning can significantly improve student achievement. The result also means the integrated communicative English Instructional materials developed for UIN Mataram students meet the effectiveness criteria.

DISCUSSION

The needs analysis results revealed that students value mastering all four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—highlighting the need for a holistic approach to language learning. This finding supports the integrated language skills approach (Nan, 2018; Kurniawan, 2022) which emphasizes the simultaneous development of all skills for real-world communication. Research by Kotkovets (2014) and (Almoaiqel, 2014) further underscores how integrating skills enhances authentic language use and communicative competence. This study directly challenges the structural model, which advocated for the traditional separation of language skills (Gautam, 2019); meanwhile, students highlighted the importance of simultaneously developing listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The study's findings also highlighted the need for instructional materials to achieve learning objectives and for teachers to design materials that address students' specific needs. This finding aligns with (Robinson, 2003), who argues that aligning materials with learner needs boosts motivation and engagement. Additionally, Tomlinson (2012) highlights that personalized instructional materials improve relevance and learning retention, making them essential for student-centered teaching. This study challenges Kong's (2015) and Graves's (2000) argument that language learning materials are more effective when designed with specific, pre-determined objectives based on broad, generalized student needs rather than tailored to individual student needs.

Another study finding demonstrated that the communicative approach effectively facilitated meaningful interaction and authentic language use. This finding addresses the limitations of fragmented instruction. This finding is consistent with the theories of communicative language teaching (CLT) by Shahi (2022), in which CLT emphasizes real-world communication and interaction, helping learners develop practical language skills. Additionally, such studies by Pardede (2019) and Diana (2014) affirmed that the communicative approach enhances students' communicative competence by focusing on language use in realistic contexts. However, this finding challenges traditional methods, prioritizing grammar and vocabulary acquisition in isolation and emphasizing the importance of language structures (Azam, 2014).

Furthermore, the study found that the instructional materials developed were valid, practical, and effective. This finding aligns with a holistic communicative approach integrating language skills to reflect real-world communication. Hardini et al. (2021) indicate that a communicative approach to language teaching emphasizes using materials that foster interactive and meaningful communication. Moreover, Dewi (2016) stressed that effective instructional materials must be suitable, engaging, and responsive to learners' needs, consistent with the study's findings on the practicality and effectiveness of the materials. However, this finding challenges some traditional views prioritizing isolated skill instruction, such as those proposed by Çiftci & Özcan (2021), which emphasize teaching discrete language forms. These conventional

approaches argue that focusing on separating grammatical structures and vocabulary can be more effective in ensuring accuracy.

Finally, the findings showed that improved post-test scores among the experimental group affirmed the materials' effectiveness, indicating that the integrated communicative English instructional materials contributed to improved student outcomes. This finding is consistent with research supporting the value of task-based, communicative approaches in enhancing language learning outcomes (Nunan, 1988), who states that task-based learning is central to the communicative approach and fosters active engagement and language acquisition. Similarly, a study by Saputra (2015) indicated that instructional materials designed with a communicative focus, integrating skills, and promoting authentic language use significantly improve students' language proficiency. While the study shows positive post-test results, the challenge lies in ensuring that the communicative approach increases grammatical accuracy and other fundamental language skills, as students might prioritize fluency at the expense of precision.

CONCLUSION

The final product of this study is a set of English instructional materials designed for non-English department students at UIN Mataram, utilizing an integrated communicative approach. This approach is a foundation for developing diverse topics, content, activities, and tasks to create a more holistic and meaningful English learning experience by integrating language skills and knowledge components. The need for such materials was confirmed by the needs analysis, with 77% of students indicating a desire to learn all four language skills—speaking, reading, writing, and listening—in an integrated format. The developed materials proved practical and effective through successful implementation and enhanced student learning outcomes. Overall, the findings validate that these instructional materials meet the validity, practicality, and effectiveness criteria, providing a valuable resource to support integrated and communicative English language teaching at UIN Mataram.

REFERENCES

- Ahamat, M. I., & Kabilan, M. K. (2022). Material Adaptation Among Rural Primary School English Language Teachers. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature® The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 28, 90–102.
- Ajoke, A. R. (2017). The importance of instructional materials in teaching English as a Second Language. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 6(9), 36–44.
- Akbar, S. (2013). *Instrumen Perangkat Pembelajaran*. Bandung: PT Remaja

Rosdakarya.

- Aljiffri, I. H. (2010). Effects of the Integrated Approach to Teaching English and Social Studies on Achievement in a Saudi Private Elementary School. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Sciences*, 11(04), 11–32. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.12785/jeps/110411>.
- Almoaiqel, S. A. (2014). *Perceptions of Saudi School Teachers about Teaching Arabic Language Arts Using an Integrated Approach: an Exploratory Study*. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Azam, A. (2014). Teaching Grammar and Vocabulary. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 2(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.24297/jal.v2i1.2009>.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. USA: Pearson Education. Inc.
- Çakir, İ. (2015). Instructional materials commonly employed by foreign language teachers at elementary schools. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 8(1), 537–550.
- Çiftci, H., & Özcan, M. (2021). A Contrastive Analysis of Traditional Grammar Teaching and Communicative Language Teaching in. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 8(2), 709–729.
- Damayanti, D., Fauzi, A., & Inayati, A. M. (2018). Learning Materials: the “Nucleus” of Language Teaching. *Journal of English Education*, 3(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.31327/jee.v3i1.417>.
- Dewi, A. A. S. S. S. (2016). Teaching Learning Materials: The Reviews Coursebooks, Games, Worksheets, Audio Video Files. *Lingual: Journal of Language and Culture*, 2(2), 2–9. <https://doi.org/10.24843/ljlc.2016.v02.i02.p01>.
- Diana, S. (2014). Communicative Language Teaching and Its Misconceptions About the Practice in English Language Teaching (Elt). *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 14(1), 36–43. https://doi.org/10.17509/bs_jpbsp.v14i1.700.
- Efrizal, D. (2012). Improving Students’ Speaking through Communicative Language Teaching Method at Mts Ja-alhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(20), 127–134.

- Gautam, P. (2019). Integrated and Segregated Teaching of Language Skills: An Exploration. *Journal of NELTA Gandaki (JoNG)*, 1, 110-107.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing Language Courses: A Guide for Teachers*. Canada: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Kong, S. (2015). Designing content-language integrated learning materials for late immersion students. *TESOL Journal*, 6(2), 302-331. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.151>.
- Kotkovets, A. L. (2014). An Integrated-Skills Approach to Learning A Foreign Language through the use of the Project Method. *Advanced Education*, 2, 66-73.
- Kurniawan, A. B. (2022). Communicative Language Teaching Approach Potential for English Language Teaching. *KnE Social Sciences*, 2022, 37-44. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v7i7.10648>.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus Design*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Ostovar-Namaghi, S. A., & Tajzad, M. (2014). Exploring EFL learners' perceptions of integrated skills approach: A grounded theory. *English Language Teaching*, 7(11), 92-98. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n11p92>.
- Pardede, P. (2019). Integrated Skill Approach in EFL Classrooms: A Literature Review. *EFL Theory & Practice: Voice of EED UKI*, 147-159.
- Purwanto. (2014). *Evaluasi Hasil Belajar*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P. (2003). the Cognition Hypothesis, Task Design, and Adult Task-Based Language Learning. *Second Language Studies*, 21(2), 45-105.
- Roblin, N. P., Schunn, C., & McKenney, S. (2018). What are critical features of science curriculum materials that impact student and teacher outcomes? *Science Education*, 102(2), 260-282. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21328>.
- Rohimajaya, N. A., Sudirman, A., & Hamer, W. (2021). Developing English Materials for the Students of Information System Department at Technology and Information Faculty, Mathlaul Anwar University Banten. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 15(2), 241-248. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v15i2.26275>.

- Saputra, J. B. (2015). Communicative Language Teaching: Changing Students' Speaking Skill. *Premise Journal*, 4(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v4i1.277>.
- Shahi, N. B. (2022). CLT and Task-Based Instruction for Effective Learning. *Journal of NELTA Karnali*, 24-31. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jonk.v1i1.57225>.
- Sri Hardini, Zaini Munawir, W. (2021). An Analysis Communicative Language Teaching. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 6(2), 78-87. <https://doi.org/10.32696/jp2bs.v6i2.940>.
- Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 45(2), 143-179. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528>.

Appendix

COURSE OUTLINE

- A. Course Name : English 1
- B. Status : Compulsory
- C. Semester/Class : 1
- D. Credit : 3
- C. Target Audience : Non-English students Departments
- E. Course Description : This course is designed to develop students' English language skills, focusing on building communicative competence in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, along with vocabulary and grammar knowledge. Using integrated communicative approach, the course combines the teaching of all four language skills with vocabulary and grammar to ensure a unified and practical learning experience.
- F. Objectives : The students are expected to be able to:
- say greetings and introduce oneself to others.
 - express likes, dislikes, and preferences for something.
 - ask for and give information about something.
 - ask for, give, and follow directions/instructions on how to do something.
 - ask and retell past actions or experiences.
 - ask about and express intentions or plans in the

future, and express purposes.

- congratulate others and express wishes/hopes and express gratitude in various situations.
- ask about ability to do something, and express ability and inability to do something.
- ask about certainty and express certainty and uncertainty about something.
- express opinion about something and express agreement and disagreement about something.
- use appropriate vocabulary and grammar in communication.

G. Unit and Topics

Week	Topics	Subtopics	Methods
1	Introduction to course Learning contract	course overview, materials, activities, evaluation system	discussion, question answer
UNIT 1: New People			
2	A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greeting • Introducing Yourself • Introducing Others • Vocabulary • Grammar 	lecture, discussion, question- answer, pair work, group work, role play, simulation
UNIT 2: Family Entertainment			
3	A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressing Likes • Expressing Dislikes • Expressing Preferences • Vocabulary • Grammar 	lecture, discussion, question answer, pair work, group work, role play, simulation

UNIT 3: Job Application

4	A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking for information • Giving Information • Vocabulary • Grammar 	lecture, discussion, question, answer, pair work, group work, role play, simulation
---	--	---	---

UNIT 4: Gadgets and Machines

5	A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking for Instruction • Giving Instruction • Following instruction • Vocabulary • Grammar 	lecture, discussion, question, answer, pair work, group work, role play, simulation
---	--	--	---

UNIT 5: Personal Experiences

6-7	A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing D. Reading E. Vocabulary F. Grammar Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retelling Past Actions • Retelling Past Events • Vocabulary • Grammar 	lecture, discussion, question, answer, pair work, group work, role play, simulation
-----	--	--	---

8 Mid-term test

UNIT 6: Future Life

9-10	A. Listening B. Speaking C. Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking About Future 	lecture, discussion, question
------	---	---	-------------------------------

- D. Reading
- E. Vocabulary
- F. Grammar Focus

- Plans and Intensions
- Expressing Future Plans and Intensions
- Expressing Purposes
- Vocabulary
- Grammar

UNIT 7: Public Celebration

- 11
- A. Listening
 - B. Speaking
 - C. Writing
 - D. Reading
 - E. Vocabulary
 - F. Grammar Focus

- Expressing Congratulation
- Expressing Hopes/Wishes
- Expressing Gratitudes
- Vocabulary
- Grammar

UNIT 8: Foreign Languages

- 12
- A. Listening
 - B. Speaking
 - C. Writing
 - D. Reading
 - E. Vocabulary
 - F. Grammar Focus

- Asking about
- Expressing Abilities
- Expressing Inabilities
- Vocabulary
- Grammar

UNIT 9: General Election

- 13
- A. Listening
 - B. Speaking
 - C. Writing
 - D. Reading
 - E. Vocabulary
 - F. Grammar Focus

- Asking about Certainty
- Expressing Certainty
- Expressing uncertainty
- Vocabulary

- Grammar role play, simulation

UNIT 10 Social Media

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------|--------------|----------|
| 14- | A. Listening | • Stating | lecture, |
| 15 | B. Speaking | Opinion | discuss |
| | C. Writing | • Expressing | ion, |
| | D. Reading | Agreement | questio |
| | E. Vocabulary | • Expressing | n |
| | F. Grammar Focus | disagreeme | answer, |
| | | nt | pair |
| | | • Vocabulary | work, |
| | | • Grammar | group |
| | | | work, |
| | | | role |
| | | | play, |
| | | | simulat |
| | | | ion |

16

Final test

H. Assessment

- Weekly Quizzes
- Oral Presentations
- Written Assignments
 - Mid Test
 - Final Test

I. References

- Foley, M and Hall, D. (2003). *Advanced Learners Grammar: A Self-Study Reference and Practice Books with Answers*. England: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Redman, Stuart. (2001). *English Vocabulary in Use: Pre-Intermediate and Intermediate*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Swan, Michael. (2005). *Practical English Language Usage*. Fourth Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richard, Jack. C. (1995). *New Person to Person. Communicative Listening and Speaking*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Richard, Jack. C. (2017). *Interchange*. Fifth Edition. London: Cambridge University Press.
- <http://www.basicenglishspeaking.com/>