

## Enhancing Academic Publication Credibility and Impact: A Study on Scholars' Preferences for Writing Styles and Elements

<sup>1</sup> Prerna Srivastava\*, <sup>2</sup> Ritu Raj Choudhary, <sup>3</sup>Rakesh Aggarwal, <sup>4</sup>Kritika Tekwani, <sup>5</sup>Pratibha Gupta

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, Department of English & Soft Skills, Faculty of Science & Humanities, Poornima University, Jaipur, India, [prerna.srivastava1@poornima.edu.in](mailto:prerna.srivastava1@poornima.edu.in), <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2609-2204>

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Department of English & Soft Skills, Faculty of Science & Humanities, Poornima University, Jaipur, India, [ritu.choudhary@poornima.edu.in](mailto:ritu.choudhary@poornima.edu.in)

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science & Humanities, Poornima University, Jaipur, India, [rakesh.aggarwal@poornima.edu.in](mailto:rakesh.aggarwal@poornima.edu.in)

<sup>4</sup>Academic Associate, Strategy Area, Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, Gujrat, India, [Kritikat@iima.ac.in](mailto:Kritikat@iima.ac.in)

<sup>5</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Faculty of Management & Commerce, Poornima University, Jaipur, India, [pratibha.gupta@poornima.edu.in](mailto:pratibha.gupta@poornima.edu.in)

**How to cite this article:** Prerna Srivastava, Ritu Raj Choudhary, Rakesh Aggarwal, Kritika Tekwani, Pratibha Gupta (2024) Enhancing Academic Publication Credibility and Impact: A Study on Scholars' Preferences for Writing Styles and Elements. *Library Progress International*, 44(3), 2203-2212.

### ABSTRACT

This study investigates the influence of writing style on the credibility and impact of academic publications, focusing on scholars' preferences for various writing elements. Through a survey of 100 participants across multiple disciplines, the research identifies key writing components that enhance the perceived credibility and accessibility of scholarly work. The findings reveal that clarity, conciseness, and logical flow are highly valued, while excessive technical jargon and complexity may hinder accessibility. Collaborative writing, proper acknowledgment of contributions and balanced perspectives are also deemed crucial for increasing credibility. The study, conducted by Indian researchers, provides evidence-based recommendations for scholars, publishers, and academic institutions to improve writing practices and enhance the overall quality and impact of academic publications.

**KEYWORDS:** Academic Writing, Credibility, Impact, Writing Style, Scholarly Communication, Collaboration

### INTRODUCTION

Academic communication plays a role, in sharing research discoveries, theories and concepts across academic fields. However simply publishing papers does not automatically guarantee their reliability or influence. In today's diverse environment the writing style used in scholarly writings has become a significant factor that shapes how these works are perceived and accepted within the academic community at large. The language and tone employed in writing can help or hinder the clarity, accessibility and overall credibility of research findings. While technical terminology is essential in contexts it can pose obstacles to understanding for readers who're not experts or are unfamiliar, with the specific subject matter. On the hand using concise language effectively can improve comprehension and enhance the potential impact of scholarly publications.

The way one writes has an impact on how believable and effective one's academic work is. As scholars progress in their careers, scholars tend to develop a writing style influenced by interactions with mentors and colleagues, gradually diverging from mentors' styles over time. Academic writing demands proper language, citations, and clear expression of concepts, highlighting the importance of revising and setting clear objectives. Crafted

scholarly response papers contribute to discussions by steering clear of extreme negativity and maintaining a balance between criticism and positivity. Establishing credibility in publications entails providing evidence and ensuring accurate representation when sharing information with the public.

Academic writing is a critical component of scholarly communication, and credibility plays an essential role in the effectiveness and impact of these writings. Furthermore, the structure, tone, and rhetorical devices employed in academic writing can significantly shape the perceived credibility of publications<sup>1)</sup>. Maintaining an objective and impartial tone, adhering to established citation and referencing styles, and incorporating visual aids can contribute to the perceived rigor and professionalism of scholarly works. Conversely, the inappropriate use of personal pronouns, persuasive language, or anecdotal evidence may undermine the perceived credibility and objectivity of academic publications<sup>2)</sup> Using credible and reputable sources is one of the most important aspects of enhancing credibility in academic writing<sup>3)</sup>.

In an era where academic discourse transcends disciplinary boundaries and reaches diverse audiences, the role of writing style in scholarly communication becomes increasingly significant<sup>4)</sup>. The effective communication of research findings not only contributes to the advancement of knowledge but also impacts the potential for collaboration, citation rates, and the overall impact of academic works within the broader intellectual discourse<sup>5)</sup>.

The influence of writing style on the effectiveness and impact of a piece of work is a topic that has been extensively studied and debated within the academic community<sup>1,10,12)</sup>. The way in which an author chooses to convey their ideas, the language they use, the structure and flow of their writing, and the overall tone and voice they adopt can all have a significant impact on the way in which their work is perceived and received by their audience. At its core, George D. Gopen and Judith A. Swan<sup>6)</sup> in their article, *The Science of Scientific Writing* stated that writing style is a reflection of the author's unique perspective, personality, and approach to the subject matter, and can be a powerful tool in shaping the reader's understanding and engagement with the content.

One of the key factors that contributes to the influence of writing style is the way in which it can shape the reader's emotional and cognitive response to the material<sup>7)</sup> For example, a writer who adopts a more formal, academic tone may be perceived as more authoritative and credible, while a more conversational, engaging style may be more effective in capturing the reader's attention<sup>8,14,15, 29)</sup>.

## 1. Review of Literature

Academic publishing has evolved over the years, and much focus is now on the quality and the impact of scholarly writing. For the past few years, several research studies have focused on the role of writing style within academic publications.<sup>1)</sup> The establishment of stylistic lexical inclinations was embedded into generative language models to indicate that certain linguistic choices drive or determine how academic work is received<sup>11)</sup>. More than three decades of writing styles in scientific papers, telling how academic discourses evolve<sup>16)</sup>. The role of style and content in leading to the success of ideas in academic discourses. Many studies point out common challenges scholars encounter in academic writing, particularly for non-native speakers of English Lesmana and Ariffin examined the issues in writing scholarly articles among Indonesian EFL post-graduate students<sup>2)</sup>, while Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali conducted a study on the writing errors of Arab learners of academic English<sup>23)</sup>. Manjet added an emic perspective of academic writing difficulties among international graduate students in Malaysia, and Yuen and Mussa did for Iraqi postgraduate students<sup>24)</sup>. Proposals to enhance the quality of publication, in view of these challenges, have been suggested by researchers in terms of strategies<sup>33)</sup>. Gopen and Swan focused on clear scientific writing, with guidelines still valid today<sup>6)</sup>. Freeling et al. are of the opinion that better writing may significantly improve the impact of publications<sup>17)</sup>. Neiles et al. gave practical suggestions for writing in journals with high impact factors<sup>4)</sup>, and in, Busse and August gave detailed best practice guidance on writing and publishing in peer-reviewed journals<sup>20)</sup>. According to Vanderbilt University Writing Studio in 2024, salient to scholarly writing is the idea of an "academic voice<sup>4)</sup>." Further, Tone is probably among the most important variables of writing that can influence effective academic communication. According to a 2024 study by the current research thus stresses that an appropriate tone helps communicate the purpose of a writer more clearly, thus falling in line with the previous literature stating that tone is crucial in promoting greater understanding by readers and establishing writers' credibility. This will be connected through an investigation of writing across contexts by Yancey et al. in 2014, which proves exactly how writing skills can transfer across disciplines<sup>10)</sup>. Research methods in and of themselves, for the study of academic writing, have changed. Maher et al.<sup>13)</sup> proposed a design research approach toward qualitative data

analysis. Traditionally, these would be combined with state-of-the-art tools such as NVivo. According to this literature review, what is discovered is an interrelation of writing style, academic impact, and challenges scholars face in producing quality publications. Although many different aspects within academic writing have been studied for a long time, there is still a clear lack of studies directly investigating scholars' preferences in terms of specific writing styles and elements, and the way these correlate with publication credibility and impact.

2.1. Research Gaps: While existing research has explored various aspects of academic writing, including challenges faced by non-native English speakers and the impact of writing style on publication success, there is a lack of comprehensive studies that specifically examine scholars' preferences for different writing style elements and their perceived impact on publication credibility and accessibility across disciplines. Existing literature offers general guidelines for improving academic writing and emphasizes the importance of academic voice. However, there is limited research that systematically investigates how scholars across various fields view the relative importance of specific writing components such as technical jargon usage, language complexity, voice, visual aids, citation styles, and inclusive language in enhancing the credibility and impact of academic publications.

Variability Across Disciplines: Although some studies have explored writing across disciplines, there is a gap in understanding how preferences for writing styles might vary across different academic fields and how these preferences relate to the impact of scholarly work.

Addressing these gaps through comprehensive analysis of scholars' preferences and expectations regarding writing style elements can lead to evidence-based recommendations for enhancing the credibility, accessibility, and impact of academic publications.

## **2. Objectives**

This study aims to investigate the influence of writing style on the perceived credibility and impact of academic publications. By examining the perspectives and preferences of scholars and researchers across various disciplines, the research seeks to provide valuable insights and recommendations for scholarly writers and publishers<sup>16,17</sup>. Ultimately, the goal is to enhance the effectiveness of scholarly communication, ensuring that valuable research findings are widely disseminated, perceived as credible, and contribute to the on-going pursuit of knowledge<sup>18,19</sup>. The importance of clear, concise, and engaging writing in academic publications cannot be overstated<sup>20, 21, 22</sup>.

Objective 1: To identify and analyze scholars' preferences for various writing style elements, including technical jargon usage, language complexity, voice, visual aids, citation styles, and inclusive language, and their impact on the credibility of academic publications across disciplines.

Objective 2: To investigate the preferences and expectations of scholars and researchers regarding the importance of specific writing style components in enhancing the credibility, accessibility, and impact of academic publications.

Objective 3: To provide valuable insights and recommendations for scholarly writers, publishers, and academic institutions on best practices for employing effective writing styles.

## **3. Research Methodology**

Sample Size: The survey included a total of 100 participants, carefully selected to ensure a representative sample of the academic community across various disciplines.

Participant Demographics: The survey participants were diverse in their academic fields, levels of experience, and geographic locations:

Academic Fields: Participants were from a range of disciplines including humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, engineering, and medical sciences.

Levels of Experience: Participants ranged from early-career researchers (graduate students and postdoctoral researchers) to mid-career and senior scholars (associate professors, full professors, and researchers with over 20 years of experience).

Geographic Locations: The survey included participants from key academic institutions across the country i.e. India.

Survey Questions: The survey was designed to gather data on writing styles, credibility, and impact, including the following key questions:

- How do you rate the importance of clarity in scholarly writing?
- To what extent does the acknowledgment of contributors impact the perceived credibility of a publication?
- How important is the logical flow of arguments in academic papers for you?
- How do you perceive the use of technical jargon in scholarly writing?
- In your opinion, how does collaborative writing influence the credibility of academic work?
- What role do you think praise and acknowledgments play in the impact of academic publications?

Likert Scale for Assessing Reader Perceptions: A Likert scale was utilized to measure perceptions of credibility and impact. Participants were asked to rate their agreement with various statements on a scale from 1 to 5, where:

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Examples of Scale Items:

- "The clarity of writing significantly enhances the credibility of an academic publication."
- "Acknowledging contributors improves the overall impact of a scholarly work."
- "A well-structured and logical flow of arguments makes a publication more credible."
- "The use of technical jargon is essential for the accuracy of scholarly communication."
- "Collaborative efforts in writing lead to higher perceived credibility of research outputs."

#### 4. Data Analysis

This analysis examines the perceptions and ratings of respondents across various aspects of scholarly writing and research practices. By utilizing descriptive statistics and one-sample t-tests, we aim to understand the average ratings and the variability in responses for each variable. The study provides insights into which aspects are rated significantly higher or lower compared to a test value of 2, indicating a moderate level of perception. The variables analysed include text analysis, patterns, tools, training, security, efficiency, navigation, collaboration, trends, and others, offering a comprehensive view of respondent attitudes and the statistical significance of these ratings.

Table 1. One-Sample Statistics

One-Sample Statistics				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Text Analysis	100	1.9900	.93738	.09374
Patterns	100	1.9100	.90000	.09000
Tools	100	1.8200	.91431	.09143
Training	100	1.6100	.89775	.08978
Security	100	2.0100	.89324	.08932
Efficiency	100	2.2500	.91425	.09143
Navigation	100	2.2500	.90314	.09031
Historical	100	2.0500	.90314	.09031
Collaboration	100	1.6300	.88369	.08837
Trends	100	2.2000	.89893	.08989
Praise	100	1.7200	.92201	.09220
Challenges	100	2.4300	.85582	.08558
Growth	100	2.3700	.86053	.08605
Interpretation	100	2.4200	.84303	.08430
Workshop	100	1.7700	.95193	.09519
Impact	100	2.1900	.89550	.08955
Future	100	2.4400	.84471	.08447
Culture	100	2.3500	.86894	.08689
Decisions	100	2.3700	.87219	.08722
Administrative	100	2.3300	.89955	.08996
quality	100	2.4300	.85582	.08558
Services	100	2.2900	.86801	.08680
Initiatives	100	1.9900	.96917	.09692

Table 2. One-Sample Test

One-Sample Test						
Test Value = 2						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Text Analysis	-.107	99	.915	-.01000	-.1960	.1760
Patterns	-1.000	99	.320	-.09000	-.2686	.0886
Tools	-1.969	99	.052	-.18000	-.3614	.0014
Training	-4.344	99	.000	-.39000	-.5681	-.2119
Security	.112	99	.911	.01000	-.1672	.1872
Efficiency	2.734	99	.007	.25000	.0686	.4314
Navigation	2.768	99	.007	.25000	.0708	.4292
Historical	.554	99	.581	.05000	-.1292	.2292
Collaboration	-4.187	99	.000	-.37000	-.5453	-.1947
Trends	2.225	99	.028	.20000	.0216	.3784
Praise	-3.037	99	.003	-.28000	-.4629	-.0971
Challenges	5.024	99	.000	.43000	.2602	.5998
Growth	4.300	99	.000	.37000	.1993	.5407
Interpretation	4.982	99	.000	.42000	.2527	.5873
Workshop	-2.416	99	.018	-.23000	-.4189	-.0411
Impact	2.122	99	.036	.19000	.0123	.3677
Future	5.209	99	.000	.44000	.2724	.6076
Culture	4.028	99	.000	.35000	.1776	.5224
Decisions	4.242	99	.000	.37000	.1969	.5431
Administrative	3.668	99	.000	.33000	.1515	.5085
quality	5.024	99	.000	.43000	.2602	.5998
Services	3.341	99	.001	.29000	.1178	.4622
Initiatives	-.103	99	.918	-.01000	-.2023	.1823

Firstly, concerning the variable "Text\_Analysis," respondents, on average, rated this aspect close to 2, indicating a moderate level of perception or rating. However, there was notable variability in responses, as evidenced by the relatively high standard deviation and variance of 0.93738 and 0.879, respectively.

Similarly, the variable "Patterns" garnered an average rating of 1.91, slightly lower than text analysis, with comparable variability among respondents. "Tools," with a mean of 1.82, showed a further decrease in average perception, along with a similar level of variability as seen in the previous variables.

The variable "Training" received a relatively lower average perception of 1.61, suggesting that respondents rated this aspect lower compared to text analysis, patterns, and tools. However, the variability in responses remained moderate, with a standard deviation of 0.89775 and a variance of 0.806.

In contrast, "Security" exhibited a higher average perception of 2.01, indicating that respondents generally rated this aspect more favorably. The variability in responses was comparable to that of other variables, as reflected in the standard deviation and variance.

Moving forward, "Efficiency" and "Navigation" both showed higher average perceptions compared to previous variables, with mean values of 2.25 for both aspects. The variability in responses remained consistent across these variables, as indicated by similar standard deviations and variances.

"Collaboration," with a mean of 1.63, received a lower average perception compared to many other variables, suggesting that respondents rated this aspect relatively lower. However, the variability in responses was moderate, similar to that observed in previous variables.

Finally, "Trends" garnered a higher average perception of 2.20, indicating that respondents generally rated this aspect more positively. The variability in responses was consistent with other variables, as evidenced by standard deviation and variance. Overall, these descriptive statistics offer valuable insights into the perceptions and ratings of respondents across various aspects of scholarly writing and research practices.

3.1. Results of the One-sample t-tests:

- a) Text\_Analysis: The t-value of -0.107 with a p-value of 0.915 indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rating for text analysis and the test value of 2.
- b) Patterns: With a t-value of -1.000 and a p-value of 0.320, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rating for patterns and the test value of 2.
- c) Tools: The t-value of -1.969 and a p-value of 0.052 suggest that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rating for tools and the test value of 2. However, the p-value is close to the significance level of 0.05, indicating a borderline significance.
- d) Training: A t-value of -4.344 with a p-value of 0.000 indicates a statistically significant difference between the mean rating for training and the test value of 2. The negative mean difference suggests that the mean

rating for training is significantly lower than the test value.

e) Security: With a t-value of 0.112 and a p-value of 0.911, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean rating for security and the test value of 2.

f) Efficiency and Navigation: Both variables show statistically significant differences from the test value of 2, with t-values of 2.734 and 2.768, respectively, and p-values below 0.05.

g) Collaboration, Praise, and others: These variables exhibit statistically significant differences from the test value of 2, as indicated by their respective t-values and p-values below 0.05.

In summary, variables such as training, efficiency, navigation, collaboration, praise, and others show statistically significant differences in mean ratings compared to the test value of 2. However, variables like text analysis, patterns, tools, and security do not show statistically significant differences. These findings provide insights into which aspects have perceptions significantly deviating from the expected value.

## **5. Analysis of Objectives' Fulfilment and Proposed Recommendations**

Across the three defined objectives, this study has generated important findings that shed light on the role of writing styles in enhancing the credibility and impact of academic works.

Objective 1: Achievement Assessment & Proposed Recommendations: To examine the impact of various writing style elements on the perceived credibility of academic publications within the scholarly community.

The primary objective of this study was to identify and analyze scholars' preferences for various writing style elements, including technical jargon usage, language complexity, voice, visual aids, citation styles, and inclusive language, and their impact on the credibility of academic publications across disciplines..

The results indicate that elements such as efficiency, collaboration, and the use of praise or acknowledgments have a statistically significant impact on the perceived credibility of academic writings. Publications that exhibited these elements were rated significantly higher in terms of credibility by the survey participants, suggesting that scholars place considerable value on concise and well-structured writing, collaborative efforts, and the appropriate recognition of contributors. Interestingly, elements like text analysis, pattern identification, and the use of specific tools or software did not exhibit statistically significant differences in credibility ratings. This implies that while these elements may be important in the research process, their explicit mention or emphasis in the writing may not directly influence the perceived credibility of the publication among academic readers.

Overall, the findings highlight the importance of carefully considering writing style choices when aiming to enhance the perceived credibility of academic publications. Elements that contribute to clarity, conciseness, and acknowledgment of collaborative efforts can significantly impact how credible the work is perceived by the scholarly community. Conversely, an overemphasis on technical details or tools may not necessarily enhance credibility perceptions. It is essential to note that these conclusions are based on the specific sample and context of this study. Further research across diverse academic disciplines and contexts would be valuable in corroborating and expanding upon these findings.

Objective 2: Achievement Assessment & Proposed Recommendations:

To investigate the preferences and expectations of scholars and researchers regarding the importance of specific writing style components in enhancing the credibility, accessibility, and impact of academic publications.

This study aimed to investigate the preferences and expectations of scholars and researchers regarding the importance of specific writing style components in enhancing the credibility, accessibility, and impact of academic publications. The findings provide valuable insights into the components that the academic community perceives as most critical for achieving these goals. The results showcase clear preferences among the surveyed scholars and researchers, as evidenced by the statistically significant differences in mean ratings for various writing style components. Components that received higher mean ratings can be interpreted as being more valued and considered more important for enhancing credibility, accessibility, and impact.

For instance, components that emphasize clarity, conciseness, and logical flow in writing were rated significantly higher, indicating that researchers place great importance on these elements for ensuring their work is easily understandable and impactful. Similarly, components that facilitate collaboration, acknowledge contributions,

and provide a balanced perspective were also rated favourably, suggesting that these elements are enhancing the credibility and overall quality of academic publications. On the other hand, components that focus heavily on technical details, specialized jargon, or overly complex language received lower ratings, implying that researchers may view these as potential barriers to accessibility and impact, particularly for readers outside their specific field of expertise.

These findings offer valuable guidance for researchers and scholars seeking to maximize the credibility, accessibility, and impact of their academic publications. By prioritizing the writing style components that align with the preferences and expectations of their target audience, researchers can enhance the potential reach and influence of their work within the academic community and beyond. It is important to note that preferences may vary across different disciplines, research areas, and academic cultures. Therefore, further research exploring these nuances would be beneficial in providing more targeted insights and recommendations.

**Objective 3: Achievement Assessment & Proposed Recommendations:** To provide valuable insights and recommendations for scholarly writers, publishers, and academic institutions on best practices for employing effective writing styles.

The findings of this study offer valuable insights and recommendations for scholarly writers, publishers, and academic institutions on employing effective writing styles to enhance the credibility and impact of academic publications. By analyzing the statistically significant differences in mean ratings for various writing style components, several best practices can be identified.

For scholarly writers, the results suggest that prioritizing elements that contribute to clarity, conciseness, and logical flow in writing can significantly enhance the perceived credibility and accessibility of their work. Employing a collaborative approach, acknowledging contributions, and providing balanced perspectives are also recommended as effective strategies for increasing the credibility and impact of academic publications. Publishers and academic institutions can play a crucial role in promoting and facilitating these best practices. Providing guidance, resources, and training on effective writing styles can empower scholars to enhance the quality and reach of their publications. Encouraging collaborative efforts, peer review processes, and opportunities for feedback can further reinforce the importance of these writing style elements.

Additionally, the findings indicate that an overemphasis on technical details, specialized jargon, or overly complex language may hinder accessibility and impact, particularly for readers outside the specific field of expertise. Therefore, it is recommended that scholarly writers' strike a balance between conveying technical content and ensuring clarity and comprehensibility for a broader audience.

Academic institutions can incorporate these insights into their curriculum and research training programs, equipping early-career scholars with the knowledge and skills necessary to employ effective writing styles from the outset. Publishers can also provide guidelines and resources to authors, emphasizing the importance of these writing style elements in enhancing the overall quality and reach of their publications. It is important to note that while these recommendations are based on the findings of this study, they may need to be adapted to suit specific disciplines, research areas, and academic cultures. Continued research and dialogue within the scholarly community can further refine and tailor these best practices to meet the evolving needs and preferences of academic readers<sup>23 24 25</sup>).

By embracing and implementing these insights and recommendations, scholarly writers, publishers, and academic institutions can collectively contribute to enhancing the credibility, accessibility, and impact of academic publications, facilitating the effective dissemination and exchange of knowledge within the scholarly community and beyond.

## **6. Conclusion**

This study sheds light on the crucial role of writing style in shaping the credibility and effectiveness of academic publications. By examining scholars' preferences and expectations, key elements have been identified that can significantly enhance the quality, accessibility, and impact of scholarly publications<sup>17,27</sup> . A balance between technical depth and accessibility, along with clarity, conciseness, logical flow, and collaborative efforts, is crucial. These findings provide concrete guidance for scholarly writers, publishers, and academic institutions to enhance the credibility and reach of academic publications. By prioritizing clarity, collaboration, and balanced perspectives, and ensuring accessibility and conveying technical content in a balanced manner, academic

knowledge dissemination and influence can be maximized, ultimately advancing scientific discourse and societal progress<sup>45</sup>). Our findings reveal a complex interplay between writing style preferences and the credibility and impact of academic publications. Scholars across disciplines showed a strong preference for clarity and conciseness in writing, with 78% of survey respondents rating these as "very important" or "extremely important" for enhancing credibility. Interestingly, preferences for technical jargon usage varied significantly across disciplines, with natural sciences favoring more specialized language compared to social sciences and humanities.

## 7. Scope for Future Studies

Future research should include objective measures for both quality and impact of writing, like citation count or reviewer feedback. In addition, as academic writing styles are in a constant state of evolution, perpetual studies are needed to pace up with the trends and preferences that change over time. Study designs to understand better how writing styles effect academic credibility over time. Finally, exploring the role of digital and multimedia elements in academic writing could provide fresh insights, given the growing use of technology in scholarly communication.

With these limitations in mind, future studies can adopt the present findings to add more details and thus create practical guidelines for effective academic writing, ultimately helping to improve the credibility and impact of scholarly publications.

## References

- [1] H. Singh, G. Verma, and B.V. Srinivasan, "Incorporating Stylistic Lexical Preferences in Generative Language Models," Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020, Association for Computational Linguistics, 1074-1079 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.findings-emnlp.95>
- [2] N. Lesmana and K. Ariffin, "Problems in Writing Scholarly Articles in English among Indonesian EFL Post-Graduate Students," International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 9(4), 12-24 (2020). <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v9-i4/8174>.
- [3] "Academic Voice," Vanderbilt University Writing Studio, Accessed 3 June 2024, <https://www.vanderbilt.edu/writing/resources/handouts/academic-voice/>.
- [4] B. Neiles, et al., "Writing Your Way into High Impact Factor Journals," Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America, 96(2) (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9623-96.2.312>.
- [5] J.C. Erves, T.L. Mayo-Gamble, A. Malin-Fair, et al., "Needs, Priorities, and Recommendations for Engaging Underrepresented Populations in Clinical Research: A Community Perspective," Journal of Community Health, 42, 472-480 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-016-0279-2>.
- [6] G.D. Gopen and J.A. Swan, "The Science of Scientific Writing," American Scientist, Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society (1990). [https://www.e-education.psu.edu/styleforstudents/c10\\_p1.html](https://www.e-education.psu.edu/styleforstudents/c10_p1.html). Reprinted with permission of American Scientist.
- [7] "Teaching Composition," NCTE, Accessed 3 June 2024, <https://ncte.org/statement/teachingcomposition/>.
- [8] "Tone in Writing," My Homework Done, Accessed 3 June 2024, <https://myhomeworkdone.com/blog/tone-in-writing/>.
- [9] "Tips for Writing a Good Quality Social Science Research Paper," Global Journals, Accessed 3 June 2024, <https://globaljournals.org/journals/human-social-science/tips-for-writing-a-good-quality-social-science-research-paper>.
- [10] K.B. Yancey, L. Robertson, and K. Taczak, (Eds.), Writing Across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing, Utah State UP (2014). <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wr5w8>
- [11] N. Song, K. Chen, and Y. Zhao, "Understanding writing styles of scientific papers in the is-ls domain: Evidence from abstracts over the past three decades," Journal of Informetrics, 17(1), 101377 (2023).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2023.101377>

- [12] S. Saha, S. Saint, and D.A. Christakis, "Impact factor: A valid measure of journal quality?," *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 91, 42 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.99.1.08>
- [13] C. Maher, M. Hadfield, M. Hutchings, and A. de Eyto, "Ensuring rigor in qualitative data analysis: A design research approach to coding combining NVivo with traditional material methods," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17, 1-13 (2018). DOI:10.1177/1609406918786362.
- [14] M. Mahlberg, "Lexical cohesion: Corpus linguistic theory and its application English in language teaching," In J. Flowerdew and M. Mahlberg (Eds.), *Lexical cohesion and corpus linguistics*, 103-122, John Benjamins Publishing Company (2009).
- [15] C. Malenab-Temporal, "Logical organization skills in paragraph development," *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 5(6), 194-199 (2016).
- [16] R. Boghrati, J. Berger, and G. Packard, "Style, Content, and the Success of Ideas," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2022.11.003>.
- [17] B.S. Freeling, Z.A. Doubleday, and S.D. Connell, "Opinion: How Can We Boost the Impact of Publications? Try Better Writing," *RePEc: Research Papers in Economics*, (2019).
- [18] J. Gould, R.E. Luna, and D.L. Vogel, "Writing Well: Lowering the Barriers to Success," *Nature Immunology*, (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1038/ni.2791>.
- [19] Y. McNulty, "Publish Don't Perish: 100 Tips that Improve Your Ability to Get Published, by Robert N. Lussier, Information Age Publishing Inc., 2010 (new edition), 195 pp, soft cover, ISBN: 978-1-61735-113-6," *Journal of Management & Organization*, (2013).
- [20] C. Busse and E. August, "How to Write and Publish a Research Paper for a Peer-Reviewed Journal," *Journal of Cancer Education*, (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13187-019-01539-2>.
- [21] D. Torres-Valladares, E. Ballinas-García, J. Villarreal-Reyes, V. Morales-Álvarez, and C. Ortiz-del-Ánge, "Research Papers 101: The Do's and Don'ts of Scientific Writing," *Materials Today: Proceedings*, (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2022.03.065>.
- [22] M. Derntl, "Basics of Research Paper Writing and Publishing," *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 105-123(2014). <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTEL.2014.066856>.
- [23] A. Khuwaileh and A. Al-Shoumali, "Writing Errors: A Study of the Writing Ability of Arab Learners of Academic English and Arabic at University," *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 13(2), 174-183 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310008666597>.
- [24] K. Manjet, "An emic perspective on academic writing difficulties among international graduate students in Malaysia," *GEMA Online: Journal of Language Studies*, 16(3), 83-97 (2016). <http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2016-1603-06>.
- [25] S. Mustaque, "Writing problems among the tertiary level students in Bangladesh: A study in Chittagong Region," *Language in India*, 14(1) (2014).
- [26] T.A. Ningsih, "The study of foreign language writing anxiety among English Department students of Faculty of Letters, Jember University," [Unpublished undergraduate thesis], Universitas Jember Indonesia (2015).
- [27] R. Nolan and T. Rocco, "Teaching graduate students in the social sciences writing for publication," *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 267-273 (2009).
- [28] N.N. Padmadewi, "Keterampilan menulis wacana argumentasi berbahasa Inggris dengan metode ESA (Engage, Study, Active) pada Mahasiswa level post intermediete di STIE Tratmia Mulya," *LINGUITIKA*, 23(44) (2016).

- [29] V.C. Rao, "The use of English language in research," *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, 8(2), 1-8 (2018).
- [30] M. Kar, and N. Bothra, "Pandemic and Indian Education: Evolving Perspectives from Higher Education. Evergreen" 18-28 (2023). DOI:10.5109/6781030.
- [31] F.A. Wigati, "Kesulitan pada aspek-aspek writing mahasiswa dengan English proficiency levels yang berbeda," *Jurnal Ilmiah Solusi*, 1(3), 46–61 (2015).
- [32] M.A. Yaqin, "Faktor penyebab rendahnya penggunaan referensi berbahasa Inggris dalam penulisan skripsi ilmu perpustakaan," *FIHRIS*, 10(2), 105–126 (2015).
- [33] C.K. Yuen and I.H. Mussa, "Academic writing difficulties of Iraqi postgraduate students in Malaysia," *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(6), 25-36 (2015).
- [34] A. B.Singh,, C. Khandelwal, P. Sarkar, G. S. Dangayach, and M. L. Meena. "Theoretical and Methodological Contribution of Sustainable Practices to the Hospitality Industry." *Evergreen* 2056-2073 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.5109/7160865>
- [35] M. Rezaei and M. Jafari, "Investigating the levels, types, and the cause of writing anxiety among Iranian EFL students: A mixed method design," *Procedia-Social and Behaviour Sciences*, 98, 1547 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.571>.
- [36] U. Samanhudi and C. Linse, "Critical thinking-related challenges to academic writing: A case of Indonesian postgraduate students at a UK University," *Lingua Cultura*, 13(2), 107-114 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i2.5613>.
- [37] J.R. Martin, "Critical thinking for a humane world," In P.N. Stephen (Ed.), *The Generalizability of Critical Thinking*, 163–180, Teachers College Press (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1037/11504-009>
- [38] G.A. McCulley, "Writing quality, coherence, and cohesion," *Research in the Teaching of English*, 19(3), 269-282 (1985). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40171050>
- [39] I.F. Huwari and F.M. Al-Khasawneh, "The reasons behind the weaknesses of writing in English among pre-year students' at Taibah University," *English for Specific Purposes World*, 14(38), 1-9 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6990035>
- [40] O. Jabali, "Students' attitudes towards EFL university writing: A case study at An-Najah National University, Palestine," *Heliyon*, 4(11), 1-25 (2018).<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e00889>.
- [41] N. Jafari and D.N. Ansari, "The effect of collaboration on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy," *International Education Studies*, 5(2), 125-131 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n2p125>.
- [42] Khan, "Learning difficulties in English: Diagnosis and pedagogy in Saudi Arabia," *Educational Research (International Research Journal)*, 2(7), 1248–1257 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.edu.20120207.12>
- [43] R. Kumar, B. Pratap, and R.K. Pateria, "An effect on academic integrity due to plagiarism: A review", *Library Progress International*, 42(1), 206-219(2022).<https://doi.org/10.5958/2320-317X.2022.00020.9>