International Journal of Social and Education (INJOSEDU) https://languar.net/index.php/INJOSEDU
Vol. 3 No. 8 November (2026), hal., 1233-1244 e-ISSN: 3047-6151

LITERACY WRITING AND PUBLISHING LITERACY IN STUDENT RESEARCH WRITING: WRITING STYLES AND STRUCTURAL FRAMEWORKS IN PUBLISHED AND UNPUBLISHED ARTICLES

Nabila Ariska Pertiwi *
Universitas Negeri Medan
nabilaariska. 2231220027@mhs.unimed.ac.id

Nazla Azqila Rifana Lubis
Universitas Negeri Medan
nazlaarl.2233220025@mhs.unimed.ac.id,

Rita Hartati
Universitas Negeri Medan
ritahartati@unimed.ac.id
J. William Iskandar Ps. V, Kenangan Baru, Kec. Percut Sei Tuan, Kabupaten Deli Serdang, Sumatera Utara 20221, Indonesia

Abstract

This study examines literacy ethics and publishing literacy as they manifest in student research writing, comparing the differences in writing style and structure between published and unpublished student articles in scholarly communication. Using a mixed-methods approach, this research analyzes aspects of objectivity, clarity, consistency, citation practices, and adherence to academic structures as indicators of both ethical writing conduct and readiness for scientific publication. The findings indicate that published articles are more structured, use formal language, and present stronger arguments compared to unpublished articles. In contrast, unpublished articles tend to exhibit weaknesses in coherence, format consistency, and adherence to academic standards gaps that reflect limited publishing literacy among student writers. Factors influencing these differences include limited understanding of scientific writing conventions, lack of writing experience, and minimal academic guidance. To address these challenges, systematic research writing training, academic mentoring, and improved access to scientific resources are necessary to strengthen students' literacy ethics and publishing literacy in accordance with academic publication standards.
Keyword: Literacy Writing, Publishing Literacy, Student Research Writing, Writing Styles, Structural Frameworks, Published and Unpublished Articles.

Introduction

In the academic world, the difference between unpublished student articles and articles that have been published in scientific journals reflects variations in writing style and structure — but more fundamentally, it reflects gaps in literacy ethics and publishing literacy. Published articles generally adhere to strict academic standards, with clear organization of

information, formal language, and consistency in format and citation (Wu, 2011). In contrast, unpublished student articles often still face challenges in terms of coherence, structured argumentation, and adherence to academic ethics (Pasaribu, Silitonga, & Hartati, 2024). This discrepancy poses a challenge in academic education, especially in guiding students to internalize the ethical standards of literacy production and the literacy needed to navigate the publication process.

Previous research has shown that a lack of understanding of academic ethical principles objectivity, integrity, and transparency can cause a quality gap between published and unpublished articles (Resnik, 2011). This gap is not solely a matter of technical writing skill but also of literacy ethics: the ethical awareness that shapes how a writer handles sources, evidence, and claims. Compounding this, many students lack publishing literacy the practical understanding of what scientific publication requires, from structure to citation convention to venue selection which limits their ability to translate coursework writing into publishable research writing. Considering these aspects, this study aims to comparatively analyze the writing styles and structural differences between unpublished student articles and articles that have been published in scientific journals, using literacy ethics and publishing literacy as the conceptual lens for interpreting the gap. This analysis is expected to answer questions regarding the factors that cause the quality differences between the two types of articles and to identify strategies that can be implemented to strengthen students' literacy ethics and publishing literacy in their research writing.

Literature Review

Theoretical Review on Scientific Communication

Definition of Scientific Communication in an Academic Context

Kurniawan (2011) defines scientific communication as communication related to research or investigation activities, especially in academic settings. Scientific communication is also the process of disseminating information, ideas, or research findings among the academic community to advance knowledge and understanding in a particular field. In this context, scientific communication encompasses various activities such as journal publication, conference presentations, and scientific discussions aimed at sharing and developing knowledge.

Scientific Communication in the Development of Knowledge

According to Bahtiar (2016), university libraries can play a role as a hub for scientific communication by creating electronic journal portals and collaborating with academics across various fields. Furthermore, scientific communication plays a crucial role in the development of science and technology by ensuring that every research activity meets high scientific standards. This includes protecting intellectual property, giving due recognition, ensuring the continuity of scientific work, and furthering development for the benefit of science.

Literacy Ethics in Academic Writing

Literacy ethics concerns the moral principles that govern how writers produce and present knowledge. According to Hamdan (2021), objectivity and honesty are highly valued in scientific writing, so plagiarism or claiming others' ideas as one's own is not permitted. Therefore, every academic work must ensure that all sources used are properly cited and that the information presented is not manipulated to support a particular viewpoint. Resnik (2011) frames this as the foundation of research ethics — honesty, objectivity, and integrity as the standard rules of scholarly performance in an academic atmosphere. Pasaribu, Silitonga, and Hartati (2024) extend this to student writing specifically, arguing that the ethical principles underlying professional research remain equally relevant for student authors, even when their work is not intended for immediate publication. Consistency — using uniform terminology, format, and structure throughout the text — is itself an ethical practice, since it helps readers trust and follow the writer's line of reasoning (Audita, 2023). Clarity, in turn, enables readers to understand the presented arguments more effectively, while consistency in format and terminology helps maintain the unity of ideas within the academic work.

Publishing Literacy: Understanding Scientific Publication

Publishing literacy refers to a writer's practical understanding of what is required to move a piece of writing from draft to publishable article. Miller (2024) captures the stakes of this literacy directly, stating that "if research is not published, its essence is the same as not conducting research at all," emphasizing the importance of publication in scientific validation and knowledge dissemination. Wicaksono et al. (2023) show that the use of academic platforms such as Google Scholar and SINTA can enhance the quality and quantity of faculty publications, which in turn affects performance evaluations and institutional reputation at both national and international levels evidence that publishing literacy is not innate but built through exposure to these systems. A comparison between published and unpublished articles shows that scientific publication not only increases research visibility but also contributes to academic recognition and the credibility of both individuals and institutions. A lack of understanding of the peer-review process, methodological errors, and weak academic writing skills are often major obstacles that lead to article rejection by reputable journals, underscoring that publishing literacy must be deliberately taught rather than assumed.

Research Writing: Style, Structure, and Argumentation

Academic Tone, Vocabulary, and Sentence Structure

According to Napitupulu et al. (2020), writing a scientific article requires careful selection of words and sentence construction to meet academic standards. Their research emphasizes that the language style in academic writing must be objective, avoiding excessive subjectivity, and using terms relevant to the specific field of study. Moreover, the sentence structure used must be logical and support a systematic flow of argumentation, thus

facilitating readers' understanding of the content. Therefore, the application of an appropriate academic tone, combined with the selection of suitable vocabulary and effective sentence structure, plays an important role in enhancing the quality of scientific communication and ensuring that the writing has high clarity, cohesion, and credibility within the academic community.

Information Organization (Clarity, Coherence, and Argumentation)

Organizing information logically and systematically ensures that each part of the text flows coherently and effectively supports the main argument. In academic contexts, the structure of a scientific article often follows standard formats such as Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion (IMRAD) or other forms appropriate to a specific discipline. As supported by Wu (2011), the IMRAD structure is dominant in scientific writing because it allows for a systematic presentation of information that is easy for readers to understand. However, each field has its own peculiarities in organizing information in academic articles.

Use of Citations and References

According to Noviriani (2022), following a prescribed citation style, such as APA, MLA, or Chicago, ensures consistency in writing and makes it easier for readers to locate and verify the sources used a skill that sits at the intersection of research writing competence and literacy ethics. In addition, using an appropriate academic tone and clear sentence structure can improve the clarity and coherence of scientific writing.

Standard Structure of Research Writing

Siregar (2024) argues that a clear and logical structure is the key to effective and comprehensible scientific writing. A scientific work must have a clear and logical structure, from the introduction to the conclusion. Each section should be interconnected and form a coherent flow. According to Ramadhanti (2021), the systematic structure of a publishable article includes the title, abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion, and reference list:

1. The title must be brief, clear, reflective of the content, and engaging.
2. The abstract must be accurate, concise, free of excessive jargon, and include the purpose, methods, results, and citations if necessary.
3. The introduction must be succinct, covering the background, literature review, research gap (novelty), and the objectives at the end.
4. The methods section explains the research design, participants, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis.
5. The results are presented according to the research objectives without additional theories, with interrelated data.
6. The discussion interprets the results by comparing them with previous research.
7. The conclusion must align with the research objectives, without suggestions unless required by the journal.

8. Acknowledgments are given to the research sponsors.

9. The reference list follows a specific citation format (APA, IEEE, Chicago, etc.), usually managed with software such as Mendeley or Zotero.

Methodology (Revised)

This study employs a qualitative approach to examine the differences in writing style, structural organization, and adherence to research ethics between published and unpublished student articles, interpreted through the lens of literacy ethics and publishing literacy. Data were collected from thirteen student research articles: two that have undergone peer review and been published in accredited journals, and eleven unpublished articles drawn from final course assignments, seminar papers, and other student research writing. The articles were purposively selected based on thematic relevance (all addressing the same broad research theme) and variation among student authors, allowing for a meaningful comparison between published and unpublished writing within a similar context.

Data analysis was carried out through qualitative document analysis and content analysis. Each article was read closely and evaluated against three sets of qualitative indicators derived from the literature review: (1) writing style indicators (academic tone, vocabulary, sentence structure, clarity, coherence, consistency, argumentation, and objectivity); (2) literacy structure indicators, based on the components of the IMRAD framework (introduction, methodology, result, discussion, and conclusion); and (3) literacy ethics indicators (objectivity, honesty, integrity, citation, and avoidance of plagiarism). Rather than assigning numerical scores derived from statistical software, the presence or absence of each indicator was determined interpretively by the researcher through repeated close reading of the text, following the coding logic commonly used in qualitative content analysis, in which patterns are identified, labelled, and cross-checked across the whole set of documents to ensure consistency of judgment. The findings from this indicator-by-indicator reading were then organized descriptively into a comparative matrix, which forms the basis of the four findings tables presented in the following section. This qualitative, in-depth reading of each article allows the study to capture not only whether an indicator is present, but also the nuanced ways literacy ethics and publishing literacy are (or are not) enacted in the students' writing.

Result and Discussion

Findings

Thirteen student articles were analyzed, identified by author initials and publication status: NN (Published), SG (Unpublished), HDY (Unpublished), YZ (Unpublished), RS (Unpublished), NT (Unpublished), BF (Unpublished), TR (Unpublished), AC (Unpublished), DD (Unpublished), MK (Unpublished), NK (Published), and SH (Unpublished). Of the thirteen

articles, only two NN and NK have been published in accredited journals; the remaining eleven articles have not yet been published.

Table 1. Writing Style and Persentage Published and Unpublished

Indicator	NN (P)	SG (UP)	HDY (UP)	YZ (UP)	RS (UP)	NT (UP)	BF (UP)	TR (UP)	AC (UP)	DD (UP)	MK (UP)	NK (P)	SH (UP)
Academic Tone	✓	–	✓	–	–	✓	–	–	✓	–	–	✓	–
Vocabulary	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sentence Structure	✓	–	✓	–	–	✓	–	–	–	–	–	✓	✓
Clarity	✓	✓	–	✓	✓	✓	–	–	–	✓	–	✓	–
Coherence	✓	–	✓	–	–	–	–	✓	–	–	–	✓	✓
Consistency	✓	–	✓	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	✓	–
Argumentationn	✓	–	✓	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	✓	✓
Objectivity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Total	8/8	3/8	7/8	3/8	3/8	5/8	2/8	3/8	3/8	3/8	2/8	8/8	5/8
Percentage	100 %	37.5 %	87.5 %	37.5 %	37.5 %	62.5 %	25%	37.5 %	37.5 %	37.5 %	25%	100 %	62.5 %

Table 2. Comparative Findings of Writing Style across the Thirteen Student Research Articles

Article	Status	Academic Tone	Vocabulary	Sentence Structure	Clarity	Coherence	Consistency
NN	Published	Complete academic writing style	Appropriate academic vocabulary	Appropriate sentence construction	Ideas are clearly presented	Ideas are logically connected	Consistent academic style
SG	Unpublished	Limited evidence of academic tone	Basic academic language is used	Limited evidence of developed sentence structure	Ideas are presented clearly	Limited textual connection	Limited consistency in writing
HDY	Unpublished	Academic tone is clearly established	Appropriate academic vocabulary	Developed sentence structure	Clarity is less sufficiently demonstrated	Ideas are connected across the text	Consistent writing style

YZ	Unpublished	Limited academic tone	Basic academic vocabulary	Limited sentence development	Ideas are generally clear	Limited textual connection	Limited consistency
RS	Unpublished	Limited academic tone	Basic academic language and vocabulary	Limited sentence development	Ideas are presented clearly	Limited textual development	Limited consistency
NT	Unpublished	Academic tone is present	Academic vocabulary is used	Sentence structure is sufficiently developed	Ideas are clearly presented	Limited textual connection	Limited consistency
BF	Unpublished	Limited academic tone	Basic academic vocabulary is used	Limited sentence development	Limited clarity in presentation	Limited textual connection	Limited consistency
TR	Unpublished	Limited academic tone	Academic vocabulary is present	Limited sentence development	Limited clarity	Some textual connection is established	Limited consistency
AC	Unpublished	Awareness of academic register is evident	Academic vocabulary is used	Limited sentence development	Limited clarity	Limited textual organization	Limited consistency
DD	Unpublished	Limited academic tone	Basic academic language is used	Limited sentence development	Ideas are presented clearly	Limited textual connection	Limited consistency
MK	Unpublished	Limited academic tone	Basic academic vocabulary is used	Limited sentence development	Limited clarity	Limited textual connection	Limited consistency
NK	Published	Complete academic writing style	Appropriate academic vocabulary	Appropriate sentence construction	Ideas are clearly presented	Ideas are logically connected	Consistent academic style

SH	**Unpublished**	**Limited academic tone**	**Academic vocabulary is used**	**Sentence structure is sufficiently developed**	**Limited clarity**	**Textual coherence is evident**	**Limited consistency**

Analysis and Discussion

The writing style of the thirteen student research articles was analyzed using eight indicators: academic tone, vocabulary, sentence structure, clarity, coherence, consistency, argumentation, and objectivity. The analysis was conducted by identifying the presence of each indicator in the articles and comparing the findings across published and unpublished articles. The results are presented in Table 1, while the detailed findings for each article are presented in Table 2.

1. Academic Tone

Academic tone is identified in five of the thirteen articles, namely NN, HDY, NT, AC, and NK, representing 38.5% of the total articles. NN and NK, which are published articles, demonstrate a complete academic writing style that includes a formal academic tone. Among the unpublished articles, HDY, NT, and AC also demonstrate this indicator. The findings in Table 2 show different forms of academic tone across these articles. HDY demonstrates an established academic tone, while NT shows an academic writing style, and AC demonstrates awareness of an academic register. In contrast, SG, YZ, RS, BF, TR, DD, MK, and SH do not sufficiently demonstrate this indicator. This finding suggests that the use of an academic tone is not consistently developed across the dataset. The presence of academic tone in both published and unpublished articles also shows that this feature is not limited only to published research articles.

2. Vocabulary

Vocabulary is the most consistently identified indicator in the dataset, appearing in all thirteen articles or 100%. Both published and unpublished articles demonstrate the use of vocabulary as part of their writing style. In NN and NK, the vocabulary contributes to a complete academic writing profile. In the unpublished articles, vocabulary is generally identified as academic or basic academic language. For SG, YZ, BF, DD, and MK, the findings particularly indicate the use of basic academic language. Meanwhile, RS, TR, AC, NT, and SH demonstrate identifiable academic vocabulary. The consistent presence of this indicator suggests that the students generally use vocabulary appropriate to research writing, even though the level of development differs between articles. Therefore, vocabulary represents the most stable writing-style feature across the thirteen articles.

3. Sentence Structure

Sentence structure is identified in five articles or 38.5% of the dataset: NN, HDY, NT, NK, and SH. The two published articles, NN and NK, demonstrate appropriate sentence

construction as part of their complete writing-style profiles. Among the unpublished articles, HDY and NT demonstrate developed sentence structures, while SH also shows identifiable sentence structure despite having a lower overall writing-style score. In contrast, SG, YZ, RS, BF, TR, AC, DD, and MK do not sufficiently demonstrate this indicator. The findings show that the presence of academic vocabulary does not automatically correspond to developed sentence structure. Several articles contain academic vocabulary and objective presentation but lack sufficient evidence of developed sentence construction. This indicates that sentence structure represents a more advanced writing feature that is not equally developed across the dataset.

4. Clarity

Clarity is identified in seven of the thirteen articles, or 53.8%. The articles demonstrating this indicator are NN, SG, YZ, RS, NT, DD, and NK. Both published articles demonstrate clarity as part of their complete writing-style profiles. Among the unpublished articles, SG, YZ, RS, NT, and DD are able to present their ideas clearly. However, HDY, BF, TR, AC, MK, and SH do not sufficiently demonstrate this indicator. An important finding is that some articles can demonstrate clarity even when they lack other writing-style features. For example, SG, YZ, RS, and DD demonstrate vocabulary, clarity, and objectivity but receive only 3/8 overall. This indicates that clarity can be present as a basic feature of academic presentation without being accompanied by stronger coherence, consistency, or argumentation.

5. Coherence

Coherence is identified in five articles, representing 38.5% of the dataset. These articles are NN, HDY, TR, NK, and SH. NN and NK demonstrate coherence as part of their complete writing-style profiles, while HDY also demonstrates textual connection and has a relatively high total of 7/8. TR demonstrates coherence despite having only 3/8 indicators overall, showing that some textual connection exists even though other features remain limited. SH also demonstrates textual coherence together with sentence structure and argumentation. In contrast, SG, YZ, RS, NT, BF, AC, DD, and MK do not sufficiently demonstrate coherence. The findings indicate that coherence is less consistently developed than vocabulary, clarity, and objectivity. This suggests that connecting ideas logically across a research article remains a challenge in several of the unpublished articles.

6. Consistency

Consistency is one of the least frequently identified indicators, appearing in only three articles or 23.1% of the dataset. It is present in NN, HDY, and NK. Both published articles demonstrate consistency, while HDY is the only unpublished article that sufficiently demonstrates this feature. The findings show that consistency is connected with the articles that have broader writing-style profiles. NN and NK demonstrate all eight indicators, while HDY demonstrates seven. In contrast, all other unpublished articles do not sufficiently demonstrate consistency. This finding suggests that maintaining a consistent academic style

throughout the article is less developed than the use of vocabulary and objective presentation. The limited presence of consistency also contributes to the differences between articles with complete writing-style profiles and those with more limited profiles.

7. Argumentation

Argumentation is identified in four articles, or 30.8% of the dataset: NN, HDY, NK, and SH. NN and NK demonstrate argumentation as part of their complete writing-style profiles. HDY also demonstrates developed arguments and achieves 7/8 indicators, making it the unpublished article with the broadest writing-style profile. SH demonstrates argumentation together with sentence structure, coherence, vocabulary, and objectivity, resulting in 5/8 indicators. The other nine articles do not sufficiently demonstrate this indicator. The findings indicate that argumentation is less common than basic features such as vocabulary and objectivity. The presence of argumentation in HDY and SH also shows that some unpublished articles can demonstrate higher-level academic writing features even when they do not contain all eight indicators.

8. Objectivity

Objectivity is the second most consistently identified indicator after vocabulary, appearing in all thirteen articles or 100% of the dataset. Every article demonstrates objective presentation, including both published and unpublished articles. In Table 2, objectivity is generally described as the objective presentation of information. This finding indicates that all students demonstrate an awareness of the need to present research information objectively. However, the presence of objectivity alone does not result in a complete writing-style profile. For example, BF and MK demonstrate objectivity and vocabulary but achieve only 2/8 indicators. Similarly, several articles demonstrate objectivity together with vocabulary and clarity but still have limited overall writing-style development. Therefore, objectivity is a common basic feature, while the combination of objectivity with coherence, consistency, and argumentation distinguishes articles with more developed writing styles.

Overall Discussion

The comparison of the eight indicators shows that Vocabulary and Objectivity are the strongest and most consistently identified features, both appearing in all thirteen articles. Clarity follows with 53.8%, while Academic Tone, Sentence Structure, and Coherence each appear in 38.5% of the articles. Argumentation appears in 30.8%, and Consistency is the least frequently identified indicator at 23.1%. These results indicate that the articles generally demonstrate basic academic writing features, particularly vocabulary and objective presentation, but fewer articles demonstrate the broader organizational and argumentative features associated with a more developed academic writing style.

The total findings also show differences between the articles. NN and NK demonstrate all eight indicators and therefore achieve 100%, while HDY demonstrates seven indicators or 87.5%. NT and SH demonstrate five indicators or 62.5%, whereas SG, YZ, RS, TR, AC, and DD

demonstrate three indicators or 37.5%. BF and MK demonstrate two indicators or 25%. The findings therefore show that writing style varies considerably across the thirteen articles. The published articles in this dataset demonstrate complete profiles, while the unpublished articles show different levels of development. However, the results describe the characteristics of this particular dataset and do not by themselves establish that publication status causes differences in writing style.

Overall, the analysis suggests that the major difference among the articles lies in the breadth of writing-style features demonstrated. Articles with higher totals tend to combine basic features such as vocabulary and objectivity with academic tone, sentence structure, coherence, consistency, and argumentation. In contrast, articles with lower totals tend to rely mainly on vocabulary and objectivity, sometimes accompanied by clarity. This pattern demonstrates that academic writing development involves not only the use of appropriate academic words but also the organization, connection, consistency, and development of ideas throughout the research article.

Conclusion

This study examined literacy ethics and publishing literacy in student research writing through a qualitative comparison of thirteen student articles two published and eleven unpublished evaluated across writing style, literacy structure (IMRAD), and literacy ethics. The findings show that publication is tied to the simultaneous fulfilment of all three dimensions rather than strength in just one: only the two published articles reached 100% across all eighteen indicators, while the unpublished articles ranged from 33.3% to 94.4%, with the clearest gaps appearing in coherence and argumentation (writing style), the later interpretive stages of discussion and conclusion (literacy structure), and the sustained practices of honesty, integrity, and consistent citation (literacy ethics) rather than plagiarism awareness alone, which was near-universal. The case of HDY, an unpublished article that reached 94.4% literacy, shows that near-complete competence can still fall short of publication due to factors such as topic novelty and peer review, but also that the literacy gap between published and unpublished student writing can be narrowed substantially through targeted skill development. These results suggest that literacy ethics and publishing literacy should be treated as one cumulative, multidimensional competence, and that structured research writing training should address coherence and argumentation, discussion and conclusion writing, and consistent ethical practice together, rather than teaching writing style, structure, and ethics as separate, disconnected skills.

Reference

Audita, H. (2023). Tips Tingkatkan Kualitas Tulisan Akademik bagi Mahasiswa. Fakultas Ekonomika dan Bisnis Universitas Gadjah Mada. Diakses pada 9 Maret 2025, dari https://feb.ugm.ac.id/id/berita/5118-tips-tingkatkan-kualitas-tulisan-akademik-bagi-mahasiswa

Bahtiar. (2016). Komunikasi Ilmiah dan Peran Perpustakaan Perguruan Tinggi. Dunia Perpustakaan. Retrieved from https://duniaperpustakaan.com/2019/12/komunikasi-ilmiah-dan-peran-perpustakaan-perguruan-tinggi.html

Hamdan, H., Abidin, M. Z., Hasanah, N., Mujiburohman, Sakdiah, H., Muradi, A., Adawiah, H. R., Mubarak, Z., Musyarrafah, & Rahmasari, S. (2021). Pedoman Karya Ilmiah UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. UIN Antasari Press. https://uin-antasari.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Pedoman-Karya-Ilmiah-UIN-Antasari-Banjarmasin-2021.pdf

Kurniawan, A. T. (2011). Konsep Komunikasi Ilmiah dalam Pemanfaatan Informasi di Perpustakaan. Jurnal Komunikasi Massa, 4(1), 1-10. Retrieved from https://www.jurnalkommas.com/docs/jurnal%20pak%20Amin%20_Undip_.pdf

Miller, G. A. (2024). Peningkatan Produktivitas Menulis Artikel Jurnal Bereputasi Internasional Bagi Dosen PTKI di Madura. Tafhim Al-'Ilmi: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pemikiran Islam, 16(1), 47.

Napitupulu, D., Windarto, A. P., Wanto, A., Simarmata, J., Purnomo, A., Bachtiar, E., Abdullah, L. A., Sinambela, M., Kusuma, A. H. P., Muharlisiani, L. T., Ramadhani, Y. R., & Nofriansyah, D. (2020). Menulis artikel ilmiah untuk publikasi. Yayasan Kita Menulis. 978-623-625-107-4

Noviriani, E. (2022). Penulisan Karya Ilmiah. Diakses dari https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377778747_Penulisan_Karya_Ilmiah

Pasaribu, S., Silitonga, S. S. M., & Hartati, R. (2024). The relevance of David B. Resnik's ethical principles in academic writing and research for students. Fonologi: Jurnal Ilmuan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris, 2(4), 327-346. https://journal.aspirasi.or.id/index.php/Fonologi.

Ramadhanti, D., Yanda, D. P., & Muhsyanur. (2021). Scholarly text writing workshop: Unlocking weaknesses in article writing. Rangkiang: Jurnal Pengabdian Pada Masyarakat, 3(1), 55–64. https://doi.org/10.22202/JR.2020.VI12.3929

Resnik, D. B. (2011). What is ethics in research & why is it important? National Institute of Environmental Health Science. https://www.veronaschools.org/cms/lib02/NJ01001379/Centricity/Domain/588/What%2520is%2520Ethics%2520in%2520Research%2520Why%2520is%2520it%2520Important.pdf.

Siregar, T., Harahap, S. D., Rangkuti, A. N., Hilda, L., & Amir, A. (2024). Penulisan karya ilmiah. PT MAFY Media Literasi Indonesia.

Wicaksono, A., Saefullah, A., Candra, H., & Tahang, M. (2023). Penggunaan Platform Akademik Untuk Meningkatkan Publikasi Karya Ilmiah; Evaluasi Kinerja Dosen STIE Ganesha. Harmoni Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 1(2). 10.62383/hardik.v1i2.195

Wu, J. (2011). Improving the writing of research papers: IMRAD and beyond.