


# Instructional Management of English Teaching in Non-English Departments in Indonesia

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i2.2434>

\*Cahyadi, Ade Suryawirawan<sup>ab</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas YPIB Majalengka, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Sindang Kasih Majalengka, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: [cahyadi@lecturer.univypib.ac.id](mailto:cahyadi@lecturer.univypib.ac.id)

## A B S T R A C T

This study examines the instructional management of English teaching across non-English departments in Indonesian higher education. It aims to explore instructional strategies, implementation practices, and challenges across diverse academic disciplines, including nursing, pharmacy, psychology, computer science, and international trade. A qualitative case study was conducted at Universitas YPIB over a three-month period. Data were collected through classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis involving six lecturers and thirty students selected through purposive sampling. The findings reveal that effective instructional management requires adaptive teaching strategies, the integration of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), and alignment with disciplinary needs. However, several challenges persist, including varying levels of students' English proficiency, limited institutional support, and the absence of a standardized curriculum. This study highlights the importance of flexible instructional planning and cross-disciplinary collaboration to enhance teaching effectiveness. It contributes to the development of instructional management practices in higher education, particularly in the Indonesian context. Furthermore, this study offers a cross-disciplinary perspective by integrating instructional management and ESP within a single institutional context.

**Keywords:** *Instructional Management; English Teaching; Non-English Departments; Higher Education; ESP*

### Article History:

Received 18<sup>th</sup> March 2026

Accepted 27<sup>th</sup> April 2026

Published 28<sup>th</sup> April 2026



## INTRODUCTION

English plays a crucial role in higher education, particularly in non-English departments where students require it for academic access, professional communication, and global competitiveness. In Indonesia, English is widely taught across disciplines such as nursing, pharmacy, psychology, computer science, and international trade. However, differences in students' academic backgrounds and levels of English proficiency often hinder effective implementation. This diversity requires adaptive instructional strategies and effective management to ensure meaningful learning outcomes (Brown & Lee, 2025; Harmer, 2008).

Previous studies highlight the importance of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in aligning instruction with students' disciplinary needs (Basturkmen, 2015; Hall, 2016). ESP focuses on integrating relevant language skills and subject-specific content to meet learners' academic and professional demands (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998). Recent research further emphasizes the need for contextualized and needs-based instruction to respond to global and disciplinary demands (Hyland, 2019; Anthony, 2018; Ashepet et al., 2024).

Despite these developments, several challenges remain, including limited instructional materials, insufficient institutional support, and a lack of interdisciplinary collaboration (Sintia et al., 2025). In addition, variations in students' proficiency levels further complicate instructional practices, requiring flexible and responsive teaching approaches (Ellis, 2015).

However, while previous studies have extensively explored ESP in terms of materials development, needs analysis, and classroom practices, limited attention has been given to how English teaching is managed across different academic disciplines within a unified instructional framework. This gap is particularly evident in Indonesian higher education, where cross-disciplinary English instruction is widely implemented but lacks standardized instructional management practices.

Effective instructional management is essential to ensure alignment between teaching strategies, curriculum design, and assessment practices with students' disciplinary needs (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Macalister & Nation, 2019). Therefore, examining instructional management from a cross-disciplinary perspective is necessary to better understand how English teaching can be effectively organized and implemented.

This study aims to investigate the instructional management of English teaching across non-English departments at Universitas YPIB. It focuses on exploring instructional strategies, classroom implementation, and challenges encountered in diverse academic disciplines. This study contributes to the existing literature by providing a cross-disciplinary perspective that integrates instructional management and ESP within a single institutional context.

## METHOD

This study employed a qualitative case study design to explore the instructional management of English teaching across non-English departments. A case study approach was selected because it allows an in-depth investigation of complex instructional practices within a real-life institutional context (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Yin, 2018). This design is particularly suitable for capturing contextual dynamics and participants' perspectives in educational settings. The study was conducted at Universitas YPIB, Indonesia, over a period of three months.

### Participants

The study involved a total of 36 participants, consisting of six English lecturers and thirty students from non-English departments, including nursing, pharmacy, psychology, computer science, and international trade. Participants were selected using purposive sampling based on specific criteria, namely: (1) lecturers who teach English in non-English departments, and (2) students who are actively enrolled in English courses within their respective disciplines. This approach ensured that participants had direct experience relevant to the research objectives (Creswell, 2014; Palinkas et al., 2015).

### Instruments

Data were collected using three instruments: classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. Classroom observations were conducted to capture actual instructional practices, including teaching strategies, classroom interaction, and management techniques. Semi-structured interviews were used to explore participants' experiences and perceptions in greater depth, allowing flexibility while maintaining alignment with the research objectives (Dörnyei, 2007). In addition, document analysis of lesson plans and teaching materials was conducted to support and triangulate the data (Bowen, 2009).

### Procedures

The data collection process was carried out in three stages. First, classroom observations were conducted in six classes representing different disciplines to obtain authentic data on instructional practices. Second, semi-structured interviews were conducted with lecturers and selected students to gain deeper insights into teaching strategies and challenges. Finally, relevant documents were collected and analyzed to complement the observational and interview data. This sequential procedure enabled data triangulation and enhanced the credibility of the findings (Creswell, 2014).

## Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The analysis involved several stages: data familiarization, initial coding, categorization of codes, and the development of overarching themes (Miles et al., 2014). Coding was conducted iteratively to allow themes to emerge inductively from the data. The analysis focused on identifying patterns related to instructional management practices, teaching strategies, and challenges across disciplines.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, several validation strategies were applied, including data triangulation, member checking, and peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). An audit trail was also maintained to document the research process and enhance transparency and reliability.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings of the study and discusses them in relation to the research objectives and relevant theoretical perspectives. The analysis focuses on instructional management practices, teaching strategies across disciplines, and the challenges encountered in the implementation of English teaching in non-English departments.

### Instructional Management Practices

The findings indicate that instructional management in English teaching across non-English departments consists of three interconnected components: planning, classroom implementation, and evaluation. Lecturers generally design lesson plans by considering students' disciplinary backgrounds and learning needs; however, the degree of adaptation varies across departments.

Observational data reveal that lecturers apply flexible classroom management strategies to accommodate students with different levels of English proficiency. In several observed classes, lecturers combined teacher-centered approaches, such as explanation and direct instruction, with student-centered activities, including group discussions and presentations. This combination enabled lecturers to maintain instructional structure while encouraging active student participation.

Interview data further support these findings. One lecturer stated, *"I adjust my teaching depending on the students' major because each department has different needs."*

Another lecturer added, *"Sometimes I have to simplify the material because students have different levels of understanding."*

In terms of evaluation, lecturers employ various forms of assessment, such as assignments, presentations, and written tests. These methods not only assess students' general language proficiency but also evaluate their ability to apply English in discipline-specific contexts.

### Teaching Strategies Across Disciplines

The findings reveal that lecturers apply different instructional strategies depending on students' academic disciplines, reflecting the need to adapt teaching practices to specific learning contexts.

In the nursing and pharmacy departments, instruction focuses on medical and scientific terminology, as well as reading comprehension of academic texts. In contrast, in the computer science department, emphasis is placed on understanding technical vocabulary and interpreting documentation written in English. Meanwhile, in the psychology and international trade departments, communication skills such as speaking and presentations are prioritized through discussions, role plays, and presentations.

The variation in instructional focus across departments is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. English Teaching Focus Across Departments

Department	Focus of Teaching	Main Skill
Nursing	Medical terminology	Reading & Speaking
Pharmacy	Scientific texts	Reading
Computer Science	Technical documentation	Reading
Psychology	Case discussion	Speaking
International Trade	Communication	Speaking

As shown in Table 1, different departments emphasize specific language skills based on their disciplinary needs. For example, nursing and pharmacy place greater emphasis on reading skills and specialized terminology, while psychology and international trade focus more on speaking and communication skills. This variation highlights the importance of adapting instructional strategies to align with the linguistic demands of each discipline. Interview data further support these findings. One lecturer explained, *"Students in nursing need more vocabulary related to medical terms."*

Another lecturer stated, *"Computer science students often find it difficult to understand technical documentation in English."*

Observational data also indicate that lecturers frequently adapt teaching materials and classroom activities based on students' disciplinary needs. This suggests that instructional flexibility plays an important role in supporting effective learning across different academic contexts.

### **Challenges in English Teaching**

The findings indicate several challenges in the implementation of English teaching across non-English departments. One major issue is the variation in students' English proficiency. Approximately 65% of students experience difficulties in understanding discipline-specific vocabulary, while around 70% report low confidence in using English during classroom activities.

This variation significantly affects classroom dynamics. Students with lower proficiency tend to struggle with basic vocabulary and comprehension, whereas more advanced students participate more actively in classroom activities. As a result, lecturers face difficulties in designing instructional strategies that can effectively accommodate diverse proficiency levels. Interview data further illustrate this challenge. One lecturer stated, *"Some students are fluent, but others struggle with basic vocabulary, so it is difficult to apply one strategy for all."*

Another lecturer added, *"In one class, I often have to adjust the material because students' abilities are very different."*

In addition to proficiency differences, limited institutional support also emerges as a significant challenge. In particular, the absence of a standardized curriculum leads lecturers to rely on their own teaching approaches, which may result in inconsistencies across departments.

Observational data support this finding, showing that teaching practices and materials vary considerably between departments. This indicates that institutional factors play an important role in shaping the effectiveness and consistency of English teaching across disciplines.

### **Discussion**

The findings of this study highlight the important role of instructional management and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in supporting effective English teaching across non-English departments. The integration of adaptive teaching strategies and discipline-specific content reflects the principles of ESP, which emphasize the alignment of language instruction with learners' academic and professional needs (Basturkmen, 2015; Hyland, 2014).

The results show that lecturers employ a combination of teacher-centered and student-centered approaches to address diverse learning needs. This finding is consistent with Richards and Rodgers (2014), who argue that effective language teaching requires a balance between structured instruction and interactive learning activities. The use of flexible strategies also supports the concept of contextualized language learning, which enhances students' engagement and comprehension (Nation & Macalister, 2010; Tomlinson, 2011).

Furthermore, the variation of instructional strategies across disciplines demonstrates the importance of adapting teaching practices to specific academic contexts. This finding aligns with previous studies on ESP, which highlight the need for needs-based instruction tailored to different fields of study (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998). By addressing discipline-specific language demands, lecturers can improve the relevance and effectiveness of English instruction.

However, the study also reveals significant challenges, particularly the variation in students' English proficiency and limited institutional support. These findings are in line with Ellis (2015), who emphasizes that differences in language proficiency can affect learning outcomes and classroom interaction. In addition, the lack of a standardized curriculum reflects broader issues in language program management, where institutional policies play a crucial role in ensuring consistency and quality (Richards, 2015).

More importantly, this study extends previous research by demonstrating how instructional management operates across multiple disciplines within a single institutional context. While earlier studies have primarily focused on classroom-level practices, this study highlights the interaction between teaching strategies, classroom implementation, and institutional factors. This finding suggests that effective ESP instruction requires not only pedagogical adaptation but also structured support at the institutional level.

Therefore, improving English teaching across disciplines requires both micro-level and macro-level approaches. At the classroom level, lecturers need to apply flexible and adaptive strategies to accommodate diverse learners. At the institutional level, universities should develop standardized ESP-oriented curricula, provide adequate teaching resources, and promote interdisciplinary collaboration to ensure consistency and effectiveness in English instruction.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrates that instructional management plays a significant role in supporting effective English teaching across non-English departments. The findings show that the use of adaptive teaching strategies and the integration of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) enable lecturers to address diverse disciplinary needs and enhance students' engagement in the learning process. In addition, this study highlights that variations in students' English proficiency and the lack of institutional support remain major challenges that affect the consistency of instructional practices. These findings indicate that effective English teaching across disciplines requires not only pedagogical flexibility at the classroom level but also structured support at the institutional level. This study contributes to the existing literature by providing a cross-disciplinary perspective on instructional management within a single institutional context. It emphasizes the importance of aligning teaching strategies, curriculum design, and assessment practices with students' disciplinary needs. Practically, the findings suggest that lecturers should adopt flexible and context-based teaching strategies, while higher education institutions are encouraged to develop standardized ESP-oriented curricula, provide adequate learning resources, and support continuous professional development. Future research is recommended to examine the effectiveness of specific ESP-based instructional models and their impact on students' academic and professional performance.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to Universitas YPIB, Indonesia, for providing support and facilitating this research. Appreciation is also extended to the lecturers and students who participated in this study for their valuable contributions and cooperation. The author is also grateful to colleagues who provided constructive feedback during the completion of this research.

## REFERENCES

- Anthony, L. (2018). *Introducing English for specific purposes*. Routledge.
- Ashepet, M. G., Vranken, L., Michellier, C., Dewitte, O., Mutyeber, R., Kabaseke, C., Twongyirwe, R., Kanyiginya, V., Kagoro-Rugunda, G., & Huyse, T. (2024). Assessing scale reliability in citizen science motivational research: lessons learned from two case studies in Uganda. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1–18.
- Basturkmen, H. (2015). *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. Springer.

- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2025). *Principles of language learning and teaching: A course in second language acquisition*. Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2002). *Research methods in education*. routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014a). *Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014b). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Douglas, D. (2000). *Assessing languages for specific purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998a). *Developments in English for specific purposes*. Cambridge university press.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998b). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008a). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008b). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition 2nd edition*. Oxford university press.
- Hall, G. (2016). *The Routledge handbook of English language teaching*.
- Harmer, J. (2008). *How to teach English* (Vol. 62, Number 3). Oxford University Press.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987a). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge university press.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987b). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centered Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2014). *English for academic purposes*. Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2019). English for specific purposes: Some influences and impacts. In *Second handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 337–353). Springer.
- Ishtiaq, M. (2019). Book Review Creswell, JW (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *English Language Teaching*, 12(5), 40.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Macalister, J., & Nation, I. S. P. (2019). *Language curriculum design*. Routledge.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis*. sage.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language Curriculum Design*. Routledge.
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). *Key issues in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Sintia, D., Perdana, I., & Karani, E. (2025). ESP in practice: A literature review of challenges faced by teachers and learners. *English Journal of Indragiri*, 9(2), 584–597.
- Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications* (Vol. 6). Sage Thousand Oaks, CA.