DOI: 10.33096/tamaddun.v23i2.845

JURNAL BAHASA, SASTRA DAN BUDAYA TAMADDUN LIFE

ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

Addressing Learning Barriers and Needs in Scientific Writing: A Study of Indonesian Language and Literature Education Students

Received: November 2024
Accepted: December 2024
Published: December 2024

Nurfathana Mazhud
Corresponding Authors' Email: nurfathana.mazhud@umi.ac.id
Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia

Nurmiah Muin
Email: nurmiah.muin@umi.ac.id
Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia

Abstract

This study investigates the learning barriers and needs of Indonesian Language and Literature Education (PBSI) students at the Faculty of Letters, Muslim University of Indonesia (UMI), in the context of writing scientific papers, proposals, and theses. Adopting a descriptive qualitative approach supplemented by quantitative questionnaire data, the research gathered insights through structured questionnaires, informal interviews, and classroom observations. The findings indicate that students encounter multifaceted challenges stemming from both internal factors such as low motivation, limited academic writing exposure, and self-efficacy concerns and external factors, including constrained time due to family and work responsibilities, a lack of standardized thesis guidelines, and minimal mentoring support. Despite recognizing the importance of robust academic writing skills, students frequently struggle with topic selection, constructing cohesive frameworks, and selecting appropriate research methods. These obstacles underscore the need for more practice-oriented instruction, continuous feedback loops, and comprehensive institutional support mechanisms. Recommendations include incorporating structured mentorship programs, providing faculty-wide writing manuals, and introducing iterative writing exercises within the Scientific Paper Writing Technique (TPKI) course. The implications of this study are threefold. Theoretically, it contributes to ongoing discourse regarding needs-based pedagogy in academic writing. Practically, it offers a roadmap for instructors, administrators, and policymakers to design targeted interventions that enhance student writing proficiency. Policy-wise, the findings stress the significance of establishing writing centers and standardized guidebooks to ensure consistent quality and compliance with academic standards. While the sample was confined to mid- and final-year PBSI students, future research could expand the scope by examining longitudinal progress in writing competencies or comparing outcomes across different disciplines and institutions. Overall, this study emphasizes the centrality of well-structured, context-specific support systems in cultivating effective scientific writing skills and advancing the scholarly contributions of undergraduate students.

Keywords*: Writing Difficulties, Learning Needs, Scientific Paper Writing, Higher Education.*

JURNAL BAHASA, SASTRA DAN BUDAYA
TAMADDUN LIFE
ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of technology in the era of Society 5.0 has transformed the educational landscape, compelling higher education institutions to adapt and innovate in order to meet growing demands for advanced literacy and critical thinking skills. One notable area requiring attention is the capacity to compose scholarly work—an essential skill not only for academic success but also for sustaining a robust culture of research and innovation. Writing scientific papers cultivates higher-order thinking, fosters analytical capabilities, and underscores the importance of evidence-based reasoning (Salam, 2022). In the context of Indonesian language and literature studies, developing a writing culture becomes a strategic investment, as it both refines the intellectual output of students and strengthens their ability to contribute substantively to the academic community.

Despite its recognized importance, writing scientific papers remains a complex endeavor for many undergraduate students. Preliminary observations and curricular reviews suggest that learners in Indonesian Language and Literature Education programs frequently encounter difficulties ranging from identifying pertinent research topics to articulating coherent arguments. These challenges often result in a delay in thesis completion and reduced publication outcomes (Permana & Nurhidayat, 2021). Moreover, policy mandates—such as those specified by Permenristekdikti No. 50 of 2018 requiring undergraduate students to publish their scientific work—underscore the urgency of addressing these issues. The importance of guiding students toward producing quality scholarship is further amplified by the institutional imperative to maintain high academic standards and meet accreditation requirements.

Writing a scientific paper is a critical skill for students, enhancing their academic capabilities and preparing them for future research endeavors. The systematic structure of scientific papers, which typically includes sections such as introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD), is essential for conveying research findings effectively (Meo, 2018). Mastery of scientific writing not only aids in the articulation of complex ideas but also fosters critical thinking and logical reasoning, which are vital in academic settings (Haryono & Adam, 2021). Furthermore, engaging in scientific writing helps students develop a deeper understanding of their subject matter, as it requires thorough literature review and data analysis (Nisa et al., 2023). Moreover, the ability to write scientifically is increasingly recognized as a necessary competency in various fields, contributing to professional development and knowledge dissemination (Rahim et al., 2023). Educational programs that emphasize scientific writing can significantly improve students' writing skills and their confidence in presenting research (Indrawati et al., 2020). Ultimately, the practice of writing scientific papers is integral to academic success and the advancement of knowledge within the scientific community (Yousuf, 2024).

Each course or material that must be achieved by students as per the curriculum applied, of course, is also different in the learning needs needed. Likewise, with the material "Writing Scientific Papers" which is a prerequisite for graduation that must be taken in participating in a series of lecture activities. Writing a scientific paper for most students is considered complicated. Moreover, when it comes to scientific writing that is inseparable from linguistic rules, problem understanding, and theory so that students are able to produce maximum scientific work. The difficulties of students and writing scientific papers are the same as the very diverse learning needs.

The learning needs of students are of course very different from the learning needs of students even though they are the same as a category of students. As reported in the online Kompas Newspaper media (Notrianon, 2016), it is explained that there are 7 things that make students

ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

significantly different from students, namely (1) students think rationally, (2) critical, that is the characteristic of students, (3) students are oriented to the future, (4) students are able to shoulder heavy responsibilities, (5) dare to act and dare to speak up, (6) students can adapt to the social environment, and (7) an independent person.

Within this context, the research problem centers on identifying and analyzing the specific barriers Indonesian Language and Literature Education students face in writing scientific papers, as well as the learning needs that must be addressed to enhance their writing proficiency. Although several studies have investigated academic writing challenges among university students (Abidin et al., 2021; Sudjana, 2014), few have offered a focused examination of Indonesian Language and Literature undergraduates' difficulties within the framework of a dedicated Scientific Paper Writing Technique course (TPKI). Consequently, the gap in the literature pertains to an in-depth, context-specific exploration of how students' personal (internal) and situational (external) factors impede their writing process, and which pedagogical interventions may best respond to these constraints.

Guided by the aforementioned research gap, the current study sets forth the following objectives:

1. *To identify* the internal and external obstacles Indonesian Language and Literature Education students encounter when preparing scientific papers, proposals, or theses.
2. *To analyze* the specific learning needs that emerge from these obstacles and the instructional support students require to strengthen their writing skills.
3. *To propose* recommendations for refining instructional strategies and course design in the TPKI curriculum, thereby improving the quality of students' scientific writing.

This study holds both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it enriches the body of knowledge concerning academic writing challenges by shedding light on the distinctive experiences of Indonesian Language and Literature Education students, a cohort whose linguistic and disciplinary context remains underexplored. Methodologically, the research contributes to literature on needs analysis in higher education, offering a replicable framework for investigating learning barriers. Practically, the findings can inform curricula developers, educators, and policymakers in designing effective interventions—such as targeted writing workshops, structured mentoring, and practical guidelines—that align with student needs and institutional standards. This alignment is expected to bolster students' confidence, expedite the thesis-writing process, and enhance scholarly output, thereby meeting both academic and policy-driven demands for publication.

Unlike prior studies that typically examine broad writing difficulties in general undergraduate populations, this research offers a focused investigation of Indonesian Language and Literature Education students in the TPKI course context. The specialized attention to both internal (e.g., motivation, self-efficacy, reading habits) and external (e.g., time constraints, family responsibilities, institutional demands) factors ensures a nuanced understanding of the problem. By prioritizing a learner-centered perspective, the study underscores the pivotal role of course design and instructional practices in nurturing productive scientific writing habits, thus providing a unique contribution to the existing scholarship on academic literacy development.

METHOD

JURNAL BAHASA, SASTRA DAN BUDAYA TAMADDUN LIFE
ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach, supported by quantitative elements obtained through a questionnaire. The descriptive qualitative approach is used to explore and interpret students' learning barriers and needs in depth, whereas the quantitative data offer a broad overview of the trends and patterns in these learning challenges. By combining these approaches, the study provides both a rich contextual understanding and measurable indicators of student experiences.

The population for this research includes students enrolled in the Indonesian Language and Literature Education (PBSI) Study Program at the Faculty of Letters, Muslim University of Indonesia (UMI). Specifically, the study focuses on two groups:

1. *Active TPKI Course Students (Semester 5–7):* Students who are currently programming the Scientific Paper Writing Technique (Teknik Penulisan Karya Ilmiah—TPKI) course in the 2024 academic year.
2. *Final-Year Students Preparing Their Thesis:* Students who have completed the TPKI course and are in the process of writing their final thesis.

A purposive sampling method was used to select participants who are most likely to provide rich and relevant data regarding the challenges and needs in writing scientific papers. This sampling strategy ensures that the study specifically engages students who can directly speak to the research objectives—those actively involved in writing or preparing to write a thesis.

Two key variables were defined operationally to prevent misinterpretation. "Learning difficulties" referred to the various internal and external obstacles that students encountered, such as lack of motivation, unfamiliarity with research methods, or competing responsibilities. "Learning needs" encompassed the specific instructional support, resources, and pedagogical strategies that students felt were essential to develop their writing competence. These operational definitions offered a clear framework for categorizing and analyzing the collected data.

Data collection was carried out using a questionnaire and follow-up interviews. The questionnaire combined fixed-response and open-ended items to capture quantitative metrics alongside qualitative insights. It covered demographic details, learning barriers, and specific needs or preferences for academic writing support. Questionnaires were distributed both online and in print form, providing participants with anonymity to encourage honest responses. Informal interviews were then conducted with a subset of willing students to explore certain responses in greater depth, clarify ambiguous points, and gather nuanced perspectives that might not emerge from structured questions alone. In addition to these primary methods, classroom observations of the TPKI course were conducted to note the dynamics of student participation and engagement with writing-related tasks.

Data analysis proceeded in two distinct but interrelated stages. The quantitative responses from closed-ended questionnaire items were coded and subjected to descriptive statistical analysis, including frequencies and percentages, to identify prevalent trends and patterns. Wherever relevant, cross-tabulations were performed to examine variations among different student subgroups, such as those in different semesters. Meanwhile, the qualitative data from open-ended questionnaire items, informal interview transcripts, and classroom observations were examined using a thematic analysis approach (Clarke & Braun, 2017). Researchers familiarized themselves with the content, identified and coded meaningful statements, grouped these codes into themes, and iteratively refined them to capture the essence of participants' experiences. This combination

ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

of quantitative indicators and qualitative depth allowed the study to construct a comprehensive picture of both shared and unique aspects of student challenges and needs.

Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from each participant. The aims, procedures, and confidentiality measures of the research were explained in detail, and participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any stage without penalty. The study conformed to institutional ethical standards, ensuring respect for participants' privacy and autonomy. These ethical provisions, together with transparent documentation of the sampling approach, data collection instruments, and analytic techniques, contribute to the replicability of the study. Researchers aiming to duplicate or extend these findings in similar educational contexts would be able to adopt the methods and procedures described here, thereby enhancing the trustworthiness and applicability of the results.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study aims to find out information related to the Analysis of Learning Needs of Indonesian Language and Literature Education Study Program (PS PBSI) Students in Writing Scientific Papers. The data sources in this study were PS PBSI students in semester 5 and semester 7 for students who are currently programming the Scientific Paper Writing Technique (TPKI) course or students who have graduated from the course. The research instrument used a questionnaire and interview which aimed to collect data related to student responses regarding learning needs in writing scientific papers, especially in the lecture process, supporting factors and obstacles faced by students. Based on this, it is hoped that through this study, realistic and accurate information can be obtained related to the analysis of learning needs for students in writing scientific papers, proposals or theses and can improve the quality of learning that is more meaningful for students.

Findings

The primary objective of this study was to gather comprehensive information regarding Indonesian Language and Literature Education (PBSI) students' challenges and needs in writing scientific papers, proposals, or theses within the framework of the Scientific Paper Writing Technique (TPKI) course. Data were collected through questionnaires, informal interviews, and classroom observations, providing insights into both quantitative trends and qualitative nuances. The findings presented below detail the key outcomes of the data collection process.

A majority of the students involved in this research were enrolled in, or had recently completed, the TPKI course. Their responses indicate that the process of writing a final research paper (proposal or thesis) poses significant hurdles, particularly in identifying viable research topics, structuring arguments, and understanding research methodologies. This challenge is compounded by various internal and external factors, which are further elaborated in subsequent sections.

1. Informal Interviews

To supplement the questionnaire data, a series of unstructured interviews was conducted with selected students. These interviews, summarized in Table 1, focused on key areas such as research approaches, topic selection, perceived difficulties in thesis preparation, and expectations for the TPKI course.

TAMADDUN JURNAL BAHASA, SASTRA DAN BUDAYA LIFE
ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

Table 1. Results of Informal Interviews

No.	Interview Question Indicators	Interview Summary Results
1.	What research approaches do you predominantly understand?	The majority of students know both types of quantitative and qualitative approaches, especially the type of classroom action research (CAR).
2.	How do you understand how to determine research ideas?	Dominant stated that they found it quite difficult to get ideas for writing scientific papers because they did not have any writing experience.
3.	Which part do you think is quite difficult in compiling a thesis proposal?	The majority of them said that the difficult parts in preparing a proposal were the background description, preparing a framework of thought, preparing instruments, and data analysis techniques.
4.	How do you expect the TPKI lecture process to be?	Basically, students suggest that the form of lectures be dominated by practice so that they have
5.	By writing scientific papers, do you gain new experiences and knowledge?	Some students clearly stated that they were able to gain new and useful knowledge in describing problems and finding appropriate solutions.
6.	When you are assigned to write a scientific paper, does it make you a diligent reader?	Students spontaneously answered that reading activities were still at the stage of necessity only, not based on desire and high curiosity.
7.	What is the biggest challenge you face when writing a proposal or thesis?	Determining research topics, integrating references, and designing appropriate methodologies according to the field of research being conducted.
8.	What are your hopes for ideal learning in MK TPKI?	The majority of students expect the practice of preparing a thesis proposal so that they can complete their studies on time.

Overall, the interviews revealed that although students possess a basic understanding of research approaches, they often struggle to translate theoretical knowledge into a well-structured proposal. The emphasis on practice-based learning was highlighted as a crucial element to support their development.

2. Questionnaire Results

Students completed a structured questionnaire designed to capture both quantitative and qualitative data on their experiences with the TPKI course. This section synthesizes the main findings.

2.1. TPKI Course Lectures

Students generally characterized TPKI course sessions as a blend of theoretical lectures and classroom discussions. While the foundational knowledge shared by lecturers was deemed valuable, many respondents felt that the practical application of these concepts remained limited. This perceived gap between theory and hands-on practice led students to suggest more frequent exercises focused on research design, drafting, and peer reviewing.

ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

2.2. Lecturer Teaching Methods

Analysis of questionnaire data showed that the discussion method was most frequently employed by lecturers. Students appreciated the collaborative environment fostered by discussions, which encouraged them to articulate questions, challenge assumptions, and refine their understanding of scientific writing. However, several respondents also noted the importance of structured input (e.g., mini-lectures) to clarify complex material and prevent misconceptions.

2.3. Difficulty Level of Material

Nearly all participants (approximately 99%) rated the material on writing scientific papers, especially the development of research proposals and theses, as “difficult.” These difficulties were commonly traced to a combination of inadequate background knowledge, limited academic writing practice, and uncertainty about research protocols and data analysis procedures. This finding highlights an urgent need for instructional interventions that specifically target the identified pain points.

2.4. Barriers to Understanding the Material

Questionnaire data suggested a range of barriers that align with internal and external factors. Internally, students cited low motivation, difficulties in comprehending theoretical frameworks, and limited exposure to academic reading. Externally, they mentioned competing assignments, work or family obligations, and minimal institutional support for writing development. These findings resonate with those from the informal interviews, underscoring the multiplicity of influences that shape writing experiences.

2.5. Presentation of Course Material

Most respondents indicated that the delivery of course content heavily relied on student-led presentations, with designated groups responsible for discussing specific topics. While this format fostered a degree of student engagement, it also revealed uneven mastery of the subject matter. Students acknowledged that their critical-thinking abilities were adequately honed, yet they seldom had opportunities to translate this theoretical comprehension into concrete writing outputs.

2.6. Preferred Research Approaches

The questionnaire results showed that students were more interested in the qualitative descriptive research approach compared to the quantitative approach, especially in the previous semester students programmed classroom action research which is a type of qualitative research. In general, the qualitative approach only focuses on in-depth observation to understand a phenomenon so that the data collected is descriptive and narrative in nature which comes from the results of interviews, questionnaires, tests, and observations. Students are less interested in the quantitative descriptive research type due to the lack of students' ability to collect data numerically and statistical analysis used to answer research questions and test hypotheses. The process and meaning are more emphasized in qualitative research, while the theoretical basis is used as an implementing procedure so that the focus of the research is in accordance with the facts in the field with the understanding that qualitative research starts from data, utilizes theory as explanatory material and ends with a theory.

ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

2.7. Use of Learning Media

Students reported routine use of digital aids, such as slide presentations, throughout TPKI classes. They found the availability of projectors and online materials helpful for visual engagement, yet the reliance on digital formats did not automatically translate into better academic writing skills. Participants frequently mentioned a desire for more interactive or hands-on media for instance, guided writing platforms or collaborative editing software to facilitate real-time feedback and iterative practice.

2.8. Learning Module Availability

A notable gap emerged concerning the absence of a well-defined learning module or faculty-level thesis writing handbook. Students expressed difficulty in ensuring the systematic arrangement of their research proposals due to inconsistent guidance across classes. The lack of a standardized reference exacerbated confusion about formatting, methodological requirements, and citation protocols.

2.9. Difficulty in Determining Research Title

A large proportion of students (across both questionnaire and interview data) struggled to select a suitable title for their final project, citing multiple factors including uncertainty about personal research interests, insufficient familiarity with the existing literature, and hesitancy about the feasibility of proposed topics. Students recognized that identifying a relevant and clear title was crucial to maintaining motivation and successfully completing a well-structured thesis.

2.10. Obstacles in Writing Thesis Completion

When asked about the main hindrances in finalizing their proposals or theses, participants highlighted difficulties in articulating an adequately justified background of the study, formulating cohesive problem statements and objectives, and aligning chosen methodologies with research questions. The shortage of comprehensive and up-to-date references further complicated these stages, forcing many to rely on limited or outdated literature sources.

2.11. The most difficult part in compiling a proposal or thesis

Several components of a proposal or thesis—especially the background, conceptual framework, and methods sections—were repeatedly cited as posing the greatest challenges. Students noted that these components demand the ability to synthesize existing theories, establish logical connections, and communicate methodological decisions effectively. The lack of practice, guidance, and feedback in these areas was evident across both survey and interview results.

2.12. Course Needs and Recommendations

Students who have filled out the questionnaire suggested that the TPKI lecture process requires guidance and direction in the form of continuous theory and practice in overcoming the problem of determining research topics, research frameworks (background, problem formulation, objectives and benefits of research), research methods, samples or research data, and data analysis and basic concepts in compiling research proposals or theses. There are also those who expect a module containing concrete examples of compiling research titles.

TAMADDUN JURNAL BAHASA, SASTRA DAN BUDAYA LIFE
ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

Discussion

Scientific work is the result of a person's thoughts and imagination which is confirmed by others and has been tested for its truth and can be accepted and written scientifically (Sudjana, 2014). The present study set out to identify and analyze the challenges Indonesian Language and Literature Education (PBSI) students face in writing scientific papers, as well as the learning needs that might help them overcome these obstacles. The results revealed that most students encounter significant difficulties in formulating research topics, developing logical arguments, and navigating methodological procedures. These challenges can be attributed to both internal factors (e.g., low motivation, limited academic writing practice, self-perceived lack of talent) and external factors (e.g., multiple assignments, lack of time due to family obligations, insufficient institutional guidelines). The interplay of these factors aligns with the research objectives, which aimed to identify learning barriers and uncover the specific supports students need to enhance their writing competence.

From an internal perspective, the prevalence of low motivation and limited self-efficacy was especially salient. Students reported apprehension about engaging with academic literature and doubt about their ability to write effectively an issue also highlighted by Bandura's concept of self-efficacy, wherein beliefs about one's capabilities significantly influence performance outcomes (Putera et al., 2023). On the external side, institutional requirements such as comprehensive theses, strict deadlines, and pressure to publish exacerbate the stress levels of students, sometimes overshadowing the developmental process of learning to write effectively. These findings address the central research problem by demonstrating not only what obstacles exist, but also why they are so prevalent among PBSI students.

The current findings resonate with existing scholarship on academic writing challenges. Permana and Nurhidayat (2021) have previously noted that a lack of motivation and insufficient writing experience are key impediments to successful research output in undergraduate contexts. Similarly, Abidin et al. (2021) emphasize the importance of early and consistent exposure to writing skills to build a coherent sense of structure and argumentation. The study's revelation that most students prefer qualitative approaches especially Classroom Action Research mirrors broader trends in language and literature fields, where qualitative methods often feel more accessible for exploring discourse and contextual phenomena (Sudjana, 2014).

However, the present findings expand upon past research by providing a detailed account of how these challenges manifest within the specific framework of a Scientific Paper Writing Technique (TPKI) course. While earlier studies have investigated general writing difficulties, few have delved into the unique combination of internal and external constraints in Indonesian Language and Literature programs. This specificity contributes novel insights, particularly regarding the role of practice-based pedagogy and the absence of standardized thesis-writing guidelines at the faculty or institutional level. The lack of such guidelines was a recurring theme, supporting the notion that institutional infrastructures play a critical role in shaping academic writing proficiency (Salam, 2022).

The empirical evidence points to a clear demand for more practice-oriented and iterative instruction. Students repeatedly expressed the need for structured guidance, clear examples of well composed proposals, and continuous feedback. Implementing workshop-style sessions within TPKI courses where students actively draft, revise, and receive real-time input could foster the iterative learning environment they desire. Moreover, introducing a comprehensive writing module or handbook specifically tailored for PBSI students may address the common issue of

ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

inconsistent formatting, incomplete references, and unclear methodological procedures. Theoretically, these findings shed light on the importance of a needs-based pedagogical framework in academic writing. While standard curricular models often focus on general writing competencies, this study demonstrates the efficacy of tailoring instruction to learners' specific contexts, interests, and constraints especially in fields that merge linguistic analysis with cultural or literature-based inquiry. Embedding self-efficacy theories (e.g., Bandura) and motivational constructs into writing courses may enhance student engagement, reduce anxiety, and cultivate a stronger sense of ownership over the research process. At the policy level, results suggest that universities and faculties could benefit from instituting structured mentor programs or writing centers dedicated to thesis support. Such initiatives could help streamline the thesis-writing process; thus, meeting accreditation demands while nurturing meaningful academic growth. Aligning these resources with national mandates (e.g., Permenristekdikti No. 50 of 2018) could further ensure that student outputs meet the quality and rigor required for publication, thereby strengthening both individual academic careers and institutional reputations.

Despite its comprehensive approach, this study is not without limitations. First, time constraints limited the scope of classroom observations, potentially leaving out fluctuations in student performance or motivation across different phases of the semester. Second, the use of a purposive sampling strategy focusing on students in semesters five to seven and those close to thesis completion may restrict the generalizability of the results to other student populations, such as first- or second-year undergraduates. Third, while the study relied on a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, more longitudinal data could offer deeper insights into how writing skills evolve over the entirety of a student's academic journey. Finally, the research did not incorporate a detailed comparative analysis between students who excel in writing and those who struggle consistently, which could further illuminate specific intervention strategies.

Building on these findings, future studies could adopt longitudinal designs that track writing development from the early stages of undergraduate education through thesis completion. Such research would clarify how particular interventions such as structured mentoring, writing workshops, or the introduction of standardized guidebooks impact student performance over time. Additionally, comparative investigations across multiple universities or faculties could shed light on how institutional resources and policies influence student success in scientific writing. There is also room for more nuanced psychological or ethnographic research exploring the role of self-efficacy, motivation, and peer support networks in shaping writing behaviors and outcomes. Finally, an in-depth examination of successful student writers could reveal best practices or coping strategies that might be integrated into broader writing programs.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study underscore the multifaceted challenges faced by Indonesian Language and Literature Education (PBSI) students in writing scientific papers, proposals, and theses within the Scientific Paper Writing Technique (TPKI) course. Students reported persistent difficulties in identifying research topics, applying methodological frameworks, and structuring coherent arguments obstacles that align closely with the study's primary objectives of illuminating barriers to successful academic writing and determining effective pedagogical support. Both internal factors (e.g., low motivation, limited self-efficacy, and inadequate exposure to academic reading) and external factors (e.g., competing responsibilities, lack of standardized guidelines, and

ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

institutional pressures) contribute to these challenges, reflecting the complex interplay between personal attributes and the broader learning environment.

Beyond explicating these hurdles, this research carries significant implications for theory, practice, and policy. Theoretically, the study enriches current discourse on academic writing by illustrating how motivational and contextual variables can significantly influence learners' performance in specialized language and literature programs. In practical terms, the insights gained here argue for a more comprehensive, practice-oriented curriculum one that integrates hands-on writing exercises, iterative feedback, and dedicated mentorship to bolster students' confidence and competence. From a policy perspective, the findings point to the value of structured institutional supports, such as the introduction of department-wide thesis writing manuals and writing centers, to ensure consistency and rigor in academic writing practices.

The study's outcomes also suggest direct applications in classroom and program settings. Lecturers could employ scaffolded assignments and workshop-based approaches, which guide students step by step through the stages of topic selection, proposal drafting, and data analysis. Institutions could establish peer support networks or involve senior students in mentor-mentee programs, strengthening the sense of community and shared learning responsibility. Such interventions not only address the immediate challenges but may also contribute to fostering a sustainable culture of academic writing.

Despite its contributions, the research has certain limitations that warrant acknowledgment. The purposive sampling focused primarily on mid- to final-year undergraduates enrolled in or recently completing the TPKI course, potentially constraining the generalizability of the findings to earlier semesters or students in other fields of study. Observational data, while valuable, were collected over a limited timeframe, possibly omitting variations in student engagement that occur throughout the semester. Additionally, although the study utilized both quantitative and qualitative methods, future examinations could benefit from a more extensive longitudinal design to capture how writing competencies evolve over multiple academic terms.

To build upon these findings, subsequent research could examine the long-term efficacy of targeted writing interventions by tracking cohorts from their first semesters through graduation. Comparative studies involving different universities, faculties, or academic disciplines would further illuminate how institutional policies and resource allocations shape student experiences and outcomes. It may also be fruitful to investigate high-performing student writers, gleaning best practices or coping strategies that could be incorporated into broader instructional models and writing support programs.

Overall, this study highlights that the task of guiding students toward high-quality, publication-worthy academic writing demands an integrative approach—one that unites pedagogical innovation, institutional backing, and learner engagement. By elucidating the barriers PBSI students face and identifying the kind of support they most urgently require, the research not only advances scholarly discourse in the field of academic literacy but also offers practical roadmaps for improved instructional strategies. Ensuring that students develop the confidence and skills to navigate the challenges of scientific writing ultimately enriches both their academic trajectories and the broader landscape of Indonesian higher education.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to the Research and Human Resources Development Institute of the Muslim University of Indonesia as the provider of funding support for the 2024

ISSN 0216 – 809X (Print)
ISSN 2685 – 4112 (Online)

Fiscal Year Outstanding Research. We would also like to thank PBSI students who were willing and cooperative in collecting research data so that it could be carried out properly.

REFERENCES

Abidin, Y., Misbah, B. F. J., Putra, A. W., & Ertinawati, Y. (2021). *Kemahiran berbahasa Indonesia untuk perguruan tinggi: Buku pegangan mata kuliah wajib umum (MKWU) Bahasa Indonesia kurikulum 2013 di perguruan tinggi*. Bumi Aksara.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The journal of positive psychology*, *12*(3), 297-298.

Elvina, E. 2018. Peningkatan Aktivitas dan Proses Keterampilan Membaca Intensif dengan Strategi Preview, Question, Read, Self Recitation, Test (PQRST). *Pendas : Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*. https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v3i1.1025

Haryono, A. and Adam, C. (2021). The implementation of mini-research project to train undergraduate students' scientific writing and communication skills. Jpbi (Jurnal Pendidikan Biologi Indonesia), 7(2), 159-170. https://doi.org/10.22219/jpbi.v7i2.15838

Indrawati, S., Subadiyono, S., & Turama, A. (2020). The development of scientific paper teaching materials using process-genre approach. Retorika Jurnal Bahasa Sastra Dan Pengajarannya, 13(2). https://doi.org/10.26858/retorika.v13i2.13671

Meo, S. (2018). Anatomy and physiology of a scientific paper. Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences, 25(7), 1278-1283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjbs.2018.01.004

Nisa, K., Ramadhan, S., & Thahar, H. (2023). Writing scientific articles for undergraduate students: a need analysis. International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (Ijere), 12(3), 1696. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i3.24999

Nontrianon. 2016. Inilah 7 Perbedaan Siswa dengan Mahasiswa. Dilansir pada laman https://muda.kompas.id/baca/2016/02/13/inilah-7-perbedaan-mahasiswa-dengan-siswa/ terbit tanggal 13 Februari 2016.

Permana & Nurhidayat. 2021. Pengaruh Motivasi Belajar dan Minat Belajar terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Karya Ilmiah. Jurnal Semiotika Vol.22, No.2. Jawa Timur: Universitas Jember.

Putera, Z. F., Shofiah, N., & Widiowati, T. 2023. Penerapan Metode Inkuiri dalam Pemilihan Topik Tulisan Akademik Vol.18, No.1.

Rahim, F., Kher, D., & Harisman, Y. (2023). Professional competence enhancement of high school teachers through scientific paper writing training. Lectura Jurnal Pendidikan, 14(2), 432-443. https://doi.org/10.31849/lectura.v14i2.15176

Salam. 2022. *Penalaran dalam Karya Tulis Ilmiah.* Yogyakarta: Mata Kata Inspirasi.

Sudjana, Nana. 2014. *Penilaian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Sugiyono. 2022. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Utami, S. E., Tiwana, E., Alfauzi, E., & Maharani, I. 2023. Analisis Kemampuan Menulis dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Kelas X SMK Al-Washliyah. Jurnal Pedagogi: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, Vol.9, No.1, Halaman 1–11. https://doi.org/10.47662/pedagogi.v9i1.537

Yousuf, R. (2024). Essential steps in writing and publishing a scientific research paper. Bangladesh Journal of Medical Science, 23(1), 12-17. https://doi.org/10.3329/bjms.v23i1.70663