

A Systematic Analysis on Secondary School English Teachers' Scientific Articles

**Esti Kurniasih¹, Fahri², Ririn Pusparini³, Lies Amin Lestari⁴, Wiwiet Eva Savitri⁵,
Zainul Aminin⁶, Lisetyo Ariyanti⁷**

Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

¹ estikurniasih@unesa.ac.id, ² fahri@unesa.ac.id, ³ ririnpusparini@unesa.ac.id,
⁴ lieslestari@unesa.ac.id, ⁵ wiwieteva@unesa.ac.id, ⁶ zainulaminin@unesa.ac.id,
⁷ lisetyoariyanti@unesa.ac.id

Abstract

As professional teachers, teachers are expected to be able to produce scientific works by conducting research, not only experimental but also classroom action research (CAR). Henceforth, from their research, they are expected to be able to produce a scientific article and publish it in reputable national or international journals. Due to the importance of scientific articles for the teachers' career, therefore, this study aims to describe the profile of secondary school English teachers' competencies in writing a scientific article. By using a rubric adapted from CARS model, it was found out that they still got many difficulties in writing a good scientific article. Those difficulties cover constructing and developing the introduction section which comprises general background information about the phenomenon being investigated, the results of relevant previous studies and theoretical framework, research gaps, novelty, and research objectives; elaborating the research method and discussion which refers to the results of relevant theories and previous studies; and neglecting the use of the last ten-year references. Regarding those unsatisfactory results, therefore, it is strongly suggested for the them to learn deeper by having more practices and trainings or workshops on conducting research and writing scientific articles as the output of their research.

Keywords: Classroom Action Research; Scientific Article; Teachers' Competencies

INTRODUCTION

Indonesian government through the ministry decree has released teacher and lecturer certification laws which one of the requirements of teacher and lecturer certification is able to produce scientific works, including scientific article. It is stated in the Nation Constitution number 14, 2005 about teacher and lecturer profession that teacher must have competencies of pedagogic, professional, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. These four competencies have holistic characteristics since they are interconnected as teachers' professional characteristics (Suadiyatno et al., 2020). Moreover, scientific works are significant for teachers to improve their careers since these works can be one of the requirements for promotion to a functional position. Besides, the scientific works are evidences of how a teacher has innovation to overcome a problem, exclusively academic problems dealing with teaching and learning process. As professional teachers, they are expected to be able to produce scientific works through conducting research, not only experimental but also classroom action research (CAR). Henceforth, from their research, teachers are expected to be able to produce a scientific article and publish it in reputable national or international journals. By publishing an article, teachers can be considered that they have improved their competencies in writing a scientific work, innovated in teaching and learning process, and taken an active role for contributing to the body of knowledge.

One kind of research conducted by teachers that involves teachers as a whole in solving any problems in teaching and learning process in class is classroom action research (CAR). It is because a problem in CAR is a problem that teachers encounter during teaching and learning activities in class triggered by dissatisfaction towards process and results of teaching and learning in class, focused on activities in class, and resolved through action during teaching and learning (Syah, M, 2016). Furthermore, Ary et al. (2010) explained that CAR is conducted to improve teaching and learning process in hoped that there is a better change to improve the quality of education.

A number of research have explained how significant the teachers in producing a scientific article and what strategies can be employed by them in writing and publishing it to appropriate proceedings, journals, or media (Suadiyatno et al., 2020; Hanum, 2009). Nevertheless, a few research discussed the profile of teachers' competencies in writing a scientific article, exclusively on teachers of junior high school. Hence, discussing the profile of teachers' scientific articles is significant for teachers in order to understand how to write an article well. More specifically, teachers can realize what they have to pay attention when they write a scientific article (Saripudin, 2014).

Therefore, this study aims to describe the profile of secondary school English teachers' competencies in writing a scientific article. In this regard, teachers' articles are analyzed dealing with the systematics of a scientific article and the description of each component in an article whether it elucidates the topic clearly or not.

In terms of word etymology, the term "competence" comes from English, namely "competence" or "competency," which means proficiencies, abilities, and skills. Referring to this etymological aspect, the term "competence" is finally defined based on its use in different contexts. In education, for example, competence is often interconnected with performance, which is defined as the ability to do something or a task.

Akhmetova (2013) mention several characteristics of teacher's competence. Those are (1) it is concerned with the teacher's ability to carry out tasks; (2) it includes knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics; and (3) it is about teaching skills and experience that determines teachers' productivity. Similarly, (Latiana, 2019) added that teachers' competency standards are divided into three interrelated components: learning management, professional development, and academic mastery. Moreover, based on the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture (Permendikbud, 2018) about Academic Qualifications Standards and Teachers' Competencies, the competencies that a teacher must possess include pedagogical, personality, professional, and social competencies gained through various teachers' professional developments or teacher training programs. These four teacher competencies are integrated into their performance in the learning process.

Without ignoring other competencies, professional teachers must possess professional competencies. These competencies must be developed in order to achieve learning goals at school. Professional competencies are pivotal for teachers to develop since they include the teacher's abilities to master the subject matter and manage the learning process. (Zulmiyetri et al., 2019) explained that professional competencies are understood by teachers who have broad and deep knowledge about the subject matter (field of study) taught, as well as master the methodology including having a knowledge of the theoretical concept, choosing the appropriate teaching method, and applying it in the teaching and learning process.

Moreover, Adi (2007) asserts that professional competencies are abilities or competencies related to adjusting teacher duties. These competencies are completely crucial and directly reflected in teachers' performance. Furthermore, the level of teachers' professionalism can be seen from the following competencies: (1) the ability to understand the education base; (2) the ability to understand the field of educational psychology; (3) the ability to master the subject matter based on the subject taught; (4) the ability to design and utilize various media and

learning resources; (5) the ability to carry out learning evaluations; (6) the ability to prepare the learning programs, and (7) the ability to carry out research and think scientifically to improve the teaching performance.

Regarding scientific articles, scientific work has some characteristics that make it different from non-scientific work. Prihastuti, et al. (2016) lists those differences, namely: (1) it is an essay or writing about a particular field of science; (2) it is based on objective facts and/or the results of logical reasoning; (3) it is the results of research, literature studies, and/or thoughts arranged in an organized and systematic manner, in a variety of scientific or popular scientific writings; and (4) it is presented in good and appropriate language. Scientific writing further also has several types: research articles, papers, research reports, theses, working papers, theses, and dissertations.

Exclusively, a scientific article is a piece of writing about an issue/topic or problem supported by relevant theories and references and published in a scientific journal, proceedings, book chapters, and others. Scientific articles even can be in the form of research findings, which are from field research or conceptual research. In line with this idea, Komara (2017) says that scientific articles are summaries of complete research reports such as undergraduate theses, theses, and dissertations. Similarly, Hanum (2009) says that scientific articles are concise summaries of research reports or findings which are frequently published in research-based journals.

As mentioned previously, scientific articles are written and develop based on the research findings. Using guidelines for writing scientific articles, its writing systematics is grouped into three parts, namely: (1) the initial part consisting of title and abstract; (2) the core part consisting of introduction, body and conclusion; and (3) the final part consisting of a bibliography and attachments (if any). After writing scientific article draft is accomplished, it will be followed by editing process, particularly in terms of the article's substance or content and language. The results of the editing process are then used as the basis for determining whether the article is worth publication (Komara, 2017).

Moreover, Murphy (2008) applied the CARS Model designed by John Swales to assess his EFL students' articles since this model has helped students deal with the difficulties they encountered in their attempts to write academic English articles. This model consists of three moves, and every move consists of several steps. Move one, i.e., establishing a territory, consists of three steps: claiming centrality, generalizing the topic, and reviewing previous research items. Move two, i.e., establishing a niche, consists of four steps: counter-claiming, indicating a gap, question-raising, and continuing a tradition. The last move, namely occupying a niche consists of four steps: outlining purposes, announcing present research, announcing principal findings, and indicating the structure of the research article. Henceforth, the rubric for assessing the teachers' scientific articles in this study is adapted from the rubrics proposed by Komara (2017) and Swales (in Murphy, 2008) (see Table 1).

METHOD

This study applied a qualitative research method, which described and interpreted the data to get a clear picture of teachers' scientific articles written by junior high school English teachers in Surabaya. It is as explained by Creswell (2012) that qualitative research method is the one of research methods that involves collecting and analyzing the non-numerical data to understand concepts, opinions or experiences. It is a means for describing and interpreting the meaning individuals or group ascribe to social or human problem. This study was conducted in Surabaya and mainly applied to fourteen junior high school English teachers in Surabaya. Those teachers were selected by the chair of Surabaya Junior High School English teacher association. Meanwhile, the objects of this research were their scientific articles that the researchers

identified and analyzed in terms of the systematics of every component in a scientific article. Moreover, the instrument used in this study was a rubric adapted from the CARS model designed by John Swales (in Murphy, 2008). The components in the rubric consist of seven aspects, including (1) the novelty of an idea in the written article; (2) background of the study, research problems/questions, the results of the previous studies, and theoretical framework; (3) the clear description of research method; (4) results and discussions that refer to the relevant theories and previous studies; (5) originality; (6) the use of the last ten-year references; and (7) the use of acceptable and/or appropriate language structure (see Table 1).

Table 1. Rubric of a Scientific Article

No	Aspects	Score Interval
1	Novelty of an idea in the written article	1-10
2	Background of the study, research problems/questions, the results of the previous studies, and theoretical framework	1-20
3	The clear description of research method	1-10
4	Results and discussions that refer to the relevant theories and previous studies.	1-30
5	Originality	1-10
6	The use of the last ten-year references	1-10
7	The use of acceptable and/or appropriate language structure	1-10

Adapted from John Swales (in Murphy, 2008) and Komara (2017)

The procedures of collecting data in this study were: (1) keeping in touch with the chair of Surabaya Junior High School English teacher association; (2) collecting fourteen teachers' scientific articles that were selected by the chair of Surabaya Junior High School English teacher association; and (3) classifying the articles based on the topics in order to make the analysis of the articles more accessible. Henceforth, the data collected were analyzed through several steps: (1) identifying the articles in terms of the systematics of every component in a scientific article; (2) classifying the components of an article using a rubric adapted from the CARS model designed by John Swales (in Murphy, 2008); (3) analyzing the articles in terms of the systematics of every component in a scientific article using the rubric adapted from (Komara, 2017) and CARS model designed by John Swales (in Murphy, 2008); (4) describing the results of the analysis; and (5) drawing conclusion.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

As previously mentioned in the research objective, this study aims to describe the profile of secondary school English teachers' competencies in writing a scientific article. There were fourteen teachers' scientific articles that were identified and analyzed in terms of the systematics of every component in a scientific article. Those articles were then analyzed using a rubric adapted from Komara (2017) and CARS model designed by John Swales (in Murphy, 2008). As stated in the adapted rubric, there are seven aspects that must be analyzed, they are: (1) the novelty of an idea in the written article; (2) background of the study, research problems/questions, the results of the previous studies, and theoretical framework; (3) the clear description of research method; (4) results and discussions that refer to the relevant theories and previous studies; (5) originality; (6) the use of the last ten-year references; and (7) the use of acceptable and/or appropriate language structure.

Table 2. The Score of the Teachers' Scientific Article

No	Aspects	Article													
1	The novelty of an idea in the written article,	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	1	1	1	1
2	Background of the study, research problems/questions, the results of the previous studies, and theoretical framework,	8	7	8	7	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
3	The clear description of research method,	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	Results and discussions that refer to the relevant theories and previous studies,	5	7	8	8	4	7	4	8	8	8	5	4	5	8
5	Originality,	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
6	The use of the last ten-year references,	2	5	4	2	0	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	4	2
7	The use of acceptable and/or appropriate language structure.	8	7	8	7	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7
		5	6	5	8	8	7	6	7	6	8	7	6	7	6
		8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8

Below is the description of the profile of secondary school English teachers' competencies in writing a scientific article viewed from the systematics of every component in a scientific article.

Article 1#

At the beginning of the article, the researcher clearly identified the research site. However, it was better for the researcher not to mention the research site clearly in his scientific article. Next, the researcher has also stated his research objective explicitly without including the logical reasons underlying it. Additionally, the researcher did not include the year of reference in the literature review section. For the Method section, he briefly mentioned his research design and data collection techniques. The researcher also did not refer to his discussion section in relation to the relevant theories and previous studies findings. In conclusion, the researcher has clearly and in detail explained the topic. However, there is no list of references.

In terms of novelty, there were some previous research studies with similar topics. The differences lay in their research participants and the language skills being investigated. For the language aspect, this article was written using an acceptable language structure to ensure it is comprehensible to readers.

Article 2#

In the Abstract, the researcher did not clarify or state the purpose of her research and did not explain the background reasons behind her topic. Furthermore, there is no research method, and the results of her study are not provided.

In the Introduction section, the researcher has already provided a vivid explanation of the study's background, supported by tangible underlying reasons and facts. Unfortunately, she did not mention the results of relevant previous studies. Meanwhile, in the Literary Review section, she has clarified some relevant theories but without mentioning the source. In the Method section, the researcher only mentioned the steps of the method applied without providing any

details on the research procedures. She also briefly explained the findings and discussion without referring to the results of previous studies and theories, as stated in the Literature Review section. In the Conclusion section, she clearly and in detail concludes the topic. However, there is no list of references.

In terms of novelty, there have been previous research studies on similar topics. The differences lay in their research participants and the language skills being investigated. For the language aspect, this article was written using an acceptable language structure so that it is easy for readers to understand.

Article 3#

There is an Abstract section; instead, the author begins his article directly with an Introduction section. In the Introduction section, the researcher has clearly stated the background of his study. However, some previous research findings and relevant theories were not thoroughly explained in this section. Additionally, the year of reference was not mentioned in the article. Meanwhile, there were vague descriptions of the research design and procedures. Instead, the researcher only explained the steps involved in developing the materials. The researcher has provided detailed results; however, he did not relate them to the preliminary research findings or relevant theories. Moreover, the researcher has clearly and in detail concluded the topic. However, there is no list of references.

In terms of novelty, basically, this article was written based on the researcher's personal experience in developing web-based teaching materials. It was further written and developed using an acceptable language structure so that it is comprehensible to readers.

Article 4#

The researcher began her article with an Abstract that was presented clearly and concisely. She explained the underlying background and purpose of writing her article. However, the other components of the Abstract section were not stated.

In the Introduction section, the researcher has provided an obvious explanation of the study's background, supported by apparent underlying reasons and facts. Additionally, she has explicitly stated her purpose for conducting research and the results of some relevant previous studies. Meanwhile, she has clarified some relevant theories, and these theories are detailed in the year of reference. However, the Method section was not stated in this article. Meanwhile, she briefly explained the findings and discussion without referencing the results of previous studies or relevant theories, as stated in the Literature Review section. However, she has clearly and in detail explained the topic and concluded it. In addition, the researcher has already listed some references from the last ten years.

In terms of novelty, however, there were some previous research studies on similar topics. The differences lay in their research participants and the language skills being investigated. For the language aspect, this article was written using an acceptable language structure so that it is easy for readers to understand.

Article 5#

Several components were not stated in the article, such as Method, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. In the final section of the article, i.e., the bibliography, the researcher has already listed some last ten-year references. However, there were no citations in the body of the article. The article also contains many grammatical mistakes and errors.

Article 6#

The researcher began her article with an Abstract that was presented clearly and concisely. She explained the underlying background and purpose of writing her article.

In the Introduction section, the researcher has already provided a clear explanation of the study's background, supported by apparent underlying reasons and facts. Additionally, she has explicitly stated her purpose for conducting research and the results of some relevant previous studies. Meanwhile, she has clarified some relevant theories, and these theories were detailed

in the year of reference, which is more recent than the last ten-year references. She has also clearly explained the findings and discussion but without referring to the results of previous studies and relevant theories, as stated in the Literature Review section. Moreover, she has clearly and in detail concluded the topic. She also listed some references that were more recent than the last ten years.

In terms of novelty, there have been previous research studies on similar topics. The differences lay in their research participants and the language skills being investigated. For the language aspect, this article was written using an acceptable language structure so that it is easy for readers to understand.

Article 7#

The researcher did not include an Abstract section; instead, she directly started her article with the Introduction section.

In the Introduction section, the researcher provides an unclear background to their study. Besides, the research objective and the results of some previous research were not stated. Meanwhile, the researcher listed and explained some irrelevant theories. The Method section was also explained unclearly and irrelevant to the topic of the article. The researcher has provided detailed results; however, she did not relate them to the preliminary research findings or relevant theories. In the Conclusion section, the researcher clearly and in detail explain the conclusions drawn from this part. She also listed some references that were more recent than the last ten years.

In terms of novelty, however, there were some previous research studies on similar topics. The differences lay in their research participants and the language skills being investigated. For the language aspect, this article was written using an acceptable language structure so that it is comprehensible to readers.

Article 8#

The researcher began her article with an Abstract that was presented clearly and concisely. She also explained the underlying background and purpose of writing her article. However, the other components of the Abstract section were not stated.

In the Introduction section, the researcher has already provided a clear explanation of the study's background, supported by apparent underlying reasons and facts. Additionally, she has explicitly stated her purpose for conducting research and the results of some relevant previous studies. Meanwhile, she has clarified some relevant theories, and these theories were detailed in the year of reference, which is more recent than the last ten-year references. Besides, most of the components in the Method section were clearly described. Similarly, the researcher has clearly explained the findings and discussion, referring to the results of previous studies and relevant theories as stated in the Literature Review section. For the conclusion, she has clearly and in detail explained this part. She also listed some references that were more recent than the last ten years.

In terms of novelty, there have been previous research studies on similar topics. The differences lay in their research participants and the language skills being investigated. For the language aspect, this article was written using an acceptable language structure so that it is easy for readers to understand.

Article 9#

The researcher began his article with an Abstract that was presented clearly and concisely. He explained the purpose of his article, the research procedures, and the research findings.

In the Introduction, the researcher has already provided a vivid explanation of the study's background, supported by apparent underlying reasons and facts. Additionally, he has stated his purpose for conducting research. However, the results of some relevant previous studies and theories were not provided. The Literary Review and Method sections were neither well-developed. Moreover, the researcher has provided detailed results, as he did not refer to the

preliminary research findings or relevant theories. Similarly, the researcher has neither mentioned nor explained the Conclusion and References section.

Article 10#

The researcher began her article with an Abstract that was presented in a clear and detailed manner. She explained the purpose of writing her article, research design, research participants, research instruments, and research findings.

In the Introduction, the researcher has already provided a clear explanation of the study's background, supported by apparent underlying reasons and facts. Additionally, she has explicitly stated her research purpose and the results of some relevant previous studies. However, she did not explain the Literary Review and Method section. The Results section was described in detail, but there was no explanation in the Discussion section. For the Conclusion, she has clearly and in detail explained this part. Moreover, the researcher listed some references that were more recent than the last ten years.

In terms of novelty, previous research studies have explored similar topics. The differences lay in their research participants and the language skills being investigated. Regarding the language aspect, this article was written in an acceptable language structure, making it easy for readers to understand.

Article 11#

The researcher began her article with an Abstract that presented the underlying background, the purpose of writing her article, and the research findings.

The Introduction was not well developed, as the researcher did not provide further explanation of the research background, objectives, and gaps in her article. She only mentioned one previous study in the Introduction section. She has detailed some previous research findings from 2014 to 2022 and presented them in a table format. However, most of the components in the Method section were not clearly described. Similarly, the Results and Discussion, and Conclusion sections were not explained well. The researcher has already listed some recent ten-year references, which fulfill the standard of writing the year of references. In general, this article was written in an acceptable language structure, making it easy for readers to understand.

Article 12#

The researcher did not elaborate on the novelty, research gaps, research background, and relevant theories. The Method employed, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion were also not elaborated well. Fortunately, the researcher has already listed some recent ten-year references, which fulfill the standard of writing the year of references.

Article 13#

The researcher began his article with an Abstract that described the underlying research background, research objectives, research method, and research findings.

The Introduction was not well elaborated, as the researcher did not provide any further explanation of the research background, research objectives, research gaps, or novelty in his article. The researcher has described two relevant theories; unfortunately, these two theories were not supported by the results of relevant previous studies. Furthermore, the Method, Results, and Discussion sections were not clearly described. Additionally, the researcher did not refer to the findings and discussion of the relevant theories presented in the Literary Review section. The Conclusion has already been stated in the article, but it was presented in the form of numbers and points rather than paragraphs. In the final section of the article, the researcher has listed references that extend beyond the last ten years. In addition, this article also contains many grammatical mistakes and errors, as well as run-on sentences. Thus, readers had difficulties comprehending this article.

Article 14#

The researcher began her article with an Abstract that was presented clearly and concisely. She explained the underlying research background and purpose of writing her article. However, the

other components of the Abstract section were not stated.

In the Introduction, the researcher has already provided a clear explanation of the study's background, supported by tangible underlying reasons and facts. Besides, she has also stated the purpose and significance of conducting the research. The other components, such as the results of relevant previous studies and research gaps, were not explicitly explained in this section. Meanwhile, she has clarified some relevant theories, which were detailed in the year of reference, a more recent year than the last ten-year references. In addition, the component, like the results of some relevant previous studies, was not explained explicitly in this section. Next, the Method section was not elaborated either in this article. In the next section, the researcher has already described the results, but she did not discuss the results in relation to the relevant theories. Similarly, the Conclusion section was not clearly explained in this article. However, the researcher has listed some references that are more than ten years old.

In terms of novelty, previous research studies have explored similar topics. The differences lay in their research participants and the language skills being investigated. Regarding the language aspect, this article was written in an acceptable language structure, making it easy for readers to comprehend.

Discussion

The above findings indicate that the fourteen teachers' scientific articles fulfilled all aspects in a rubric adapted from Komara (2017) and CARS model designed by John Swales (in Murphy, 2008). In other words, all teachers have been able to produce systematic articles although there are still some weaknesses in the articles, which are exclusively attributed to the second, third, and sixth aspects (see Table 2).

Since the introduction of the article consisting of the background of the study, research problems/questions, the results of the previous studies, and the theoretical framework is significant, the teachers have to pay sufficient attention to their articles. A number of studies argue that a clear, concise, and engaging introduction section establishes the article's content (Barroga & Matanguihan, 2022; Tavakol & O'Brien, 2023; Naeem et al., 2023). Tavakol and O'Brien (2023), for example, emphasized that the introduction section is arguably one of the most critical elements of a written piece of research work. They also recommended several points below;

1. Set the context for the research,
2. Establish a theoretical or conceptual framework to support your study,
3. Define key variables both conceptually and theoretically,
4. Critically appraise relevant papers during the literature review,
5. Review previous studies to identify and define the knowledge gap by assessing what has already been studied and what areas remain unexplored,
6. Clearly articulate the rationale behind your study, emphasizing its importance in the intended field,
7. Clearly define your research objectives, questions, and hypotheses.

Tavakol and O'Brien (2023)

Besides, elaborating on the research method and discussion, which refers to the results of relevant theories and previous studies, also becomes a challenge for teachers when they write scientific articles. Regarding this, they need to consider that a clear and well-defined research method in an article is crucial for ensuring the legitimacy, credibility, and reliability of the research findings. It also can help researchers understand the specific approach and methods used to reach conclusions. Bahishti (2022) explained that research methodology plays a vital role since it guides the researcher in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. Moreover, the choice of research methodology can have a significant impact on the outcome of the study as it is critical in ensuring the validity, reliability, and generalizability of research

findings. In short, the researchers must be able to determine the type of research methodology for their study so they can conduct the research without significant difficulties.

Moreover, the teachers often neglected to use references from the last ten years. Instead, they frequently cited any relevant theories without paying attention to when those theories were formulated. In this case, citing or referencing recent articles in the research paper assures that the paper and the information in the paper are up to date (Santini, 2018; Das, 2018). It builds trust between the authors of the paper and the readers since it indicates that the article can improve the body of knowledge.

For the first, the fourth, the fifth, and the seventh aspects (see Table 2), the teachers' articles are good enough. It indicates that teachers have considered those aspects to be significant, as stated in their articles. Nevertheless, they remain to improve their article, for they can make a big contribution to the body of knowledge.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and its discussion, it can finally be concluded that the secondary school English teachers still got many difficulties in writing a good scientific article. Those difficulties cover constructing and developing the Introduction section, elaborating the research method and discussion which refers to the results of relevant theories and previous studies, and neglecting the use of the last ten-year references. Therefore, referring to the results on the secondary school English teachers' competencies in writing a scientific article, it is then strongly suggested that the teachers learn deeper by having more practices and training or workshops on conducting research and writing scientific articles as the output of their research. By so doing, hopefully, they will be encouraged and motivated to do scientific works that are significant for them to improve their careers as well as to contribute actively to the development of science or knowledge and to innovate during the process of teaching and learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank the support of the Professional Journal of English Education (PROJECT Journal) which allowed the publication of our articles. The author also thanks to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments to revise the paper. Many thanks also to Universitas Negeri Surabaya for the support to this study.

REFERENCES

- Adi, S. (2007). Kurikulum, KTSP, studi banding, dan IHT. *Word Press*.
- Akhmetova, N. S. (2013). Professional competence teacher: Theoretical aspects. *Education and Science Without Borders*, 7(4), 76–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2017.1383237>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education. 8th Edition* (Issue 112). Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Bahishti, A. A. (2022). The vital role of research methodology in addressing the research questions. *International Journal of Methodology*, 1(1), 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.21467/ijm.1.1.2016.29>
- Barroga, E., & Matanguihan, G. J. (2022). A practical guide to writing quantitative and qualitative research questions and hypotheses in scholarly articles. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, 37(16), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2022.37.e121>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. In *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (Vol. 4).
- Das, S. (2018). The importance of including the latest references in your research papers.

- Medicine & Health*, 13(2), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.17576/mh.2018.1302.01>
- Hanum, F. (2009). Strategi Penulisan Karya Ilmiah. *Strategi Penulisan Karya Ilmiah*, November, 1–4. <http://staff.uny.ac.id/sites/default/files/pengabdian/farida-hanum-msi-dr/strategi-penulisan-karya-ilmiah-2009.pdf>
- Komara, A. (2017). Menulis Artikel dan Karya Ilmiah. *Online*(<http://www.lpmptjateng.go.id/web/index.php/arsip/artikel/174-menulis-artikel-dan-karya-ilmiah>), diakses, 12.
- Latiana, L. (2019). Peran sertifikasi guru dalam meningkatkan profesionalisme pendidik. *Edukasi*, 1(3), 1–16. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/edukasi/...> · PDF file
- Murphy, T. P. (2008). Territory-Niche-Argument. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 156(January 2008), 227–235. <https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.156.19mur>
- Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A step-by-step process of thematic analysis to develop a conceptual model in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22(October), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789>
- Permendikbud. (2018). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI Nomor 15 Tahun 2018 tentang Pemenuhan Beban Kerja Guru, Kepala Sekolah dan Pengawas Sekolah. *Menteri Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan RI*, 53(9), 1689–1699.
- Prihastuti E, Kokom Komariah, Rizqie Auliana, F. R. (2016). Upaya Meningkatkan Kompetensi Guru Sekolah Dasar Melalui Penulisan Karya Ilmiah. *Seminar Nasional 2013"Kesiapan SMK Dalam Implementasi Kurikulum 2013" Jurusan PTBB FT UNY*, 14 Desember 2013, 315–334.
- Santini, A. (2018). The importance of referencing. *Journal of Critical Care Medicine*, 4(1), 3–4. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jccm-2018-0002>
- Saripudin. (2014). FAKTOR-faktor yang mempengaruhi kompetensi profesional guru. *Invotec*, X(1), 67–88.
- Suadiyatno, T., S. D., Muliani, Arsyad, M., & K, A. (2020). Pelatihan strategi penulisan artikel ilmiah pada jurnal bereputasi nasional dan internasional bagi guru di SMKN 1 Sekotong kabupaten Lombok Barat. *Jurnal Pengabdian UNDIKMA*, 2(2), 29–31.
- Syah, M, N. S. (2016). Classroom Action Research as professional development of teachers in Indonesia. *Jurnal Tarbawi*, 13(1), 1–16.
- Tavakol, M., & O'Brien, D. (2023). The importance of crafting a good introduction to scholarly research: strategies for creating an effective and impactful opening statement. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 14, 84–87. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.6499.82af>
- Zulmiyetri, Nurhastuti, & Safaruddin. (2019). *Penulisan Karya Ilmiah*. Prenadamedia Group.