

Navigating Stylistic Hybridity: A Stylistic Analysis of Scientific Indonesian in University Students' Academic Writing

Christina Purwanti

Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang, Indonesia;
Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Indonesia

Rudy Pramono

Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang, Indonesia

Ida Bagus Putrayasa

Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Indonesia

I Nyoman Sudiana

Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Indonesia

I Putu Mas Dewantara

Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Indonesia

Abstract—This study investigates the stylistic characteristics of scientific Indonesian in university students' academic writing, identifying a pervasive phenomenon of stylistic hybridity. A qualitative descriptive design was employed, involving textual analysis of ten undergraduate research articles from various disciplines. The analysis was guided by an integrated framework drawing on Halliday and Hasan's cohesion theory and metadiscourse analysis. The findings reveal persistent challenges across multiple linguistic levels, including emotive and imprecise diction, syntactically complex yet functionally ineffective paratactic structures, mechanical use of cohesive devices, a strong preference for active voice, and fluctuating formal–informal tone. Quantitative indicators further show relatively low lexical density (45–55%) compared to professional academic writing. These patterns suggest that students are situated in a transitional phase, negotiating between colloquial expressiveness and scientific rigor. The study underscores the need for integrated stylistic training in academic writing curricula to enhance linguistic competence and strengthen the credibility of Indonesian as a language of global scholarship.

Index Terms—stylistics, scientific Indonesian, academic writing, stylistic hybridity, higher education

I. INTRODUCTION

As the national language and a mandated vehicle for science and technology (Law No. 24 of 2009), Indonesian is expected to function as a scientific language that conveys knowledge in an objective, concise, and systematic manner. However, a significant gap persists between this normative ideal and the actual writing practices of university students. Many student research papers exhibit a mixture of formal and informal registers, convoluted sentences, and weak discourse cohesion, which undermines both the quality of their academic work and the credibility of Indonesian as a language of science (Rahardi, 2019; Alwi & Dendy, 2017). Furthermore, stylistic analysis reveals that students' essays contain numerous deviations from standard Indonesian, particularly in orthographic conventions, lexical selection, and syntactic construction, indicating a lack of stylistic control in academic writing (Rasna et al., 2014). This challenge can be productively examined through stylistics, which analyzes the relationship between linguistic form and communicative function within specific contexts (Leech & Short, 2007). From a stylistic perspective, language use operates through the systematic integration of lexical choice, phrasal patterning, clausal structuring, and sentence construction, which together form the analytical basis for multilevel stylistic analysis (Putrayasa, 2021). In academic writing, stylistics is concerned with the effectiveness and appropriateness of expression, ensuring clarity, objectivity, and the construction of a persuasive scholarly persona. While previous studies have highlighted general challenges in Indonesian students' academic writing (e.g., Faridah, 2018; Tohamba, 2021), few have provided a fine-grained, multi-level stylistic analysis that captures the nuanced phenomenon of stylistic hybridity, the pervasive blending of distinct registers and rhetorical conventions.

Compounding this issue is the pervasive influence of digital communication, which prioritizes immediacy and expressiveness, thereby blurring the boundaries between informal and formal registers (Crystal, 2011). This creates a palpable tension between students' everyday linguistic habits and the rigid expectations of scientific discourse.

To address this gap, this study conducts a comprehensive stylistic analysis of students' academic articles. It aims to:

1. Identify the dominant stylistic features characterizing the use of scientific Indonesian in students' academic writing.
2. Examine how the concept of stylistic hybridity manifests in their diction, sentence structure, and use of cohesive devices.
3. Propose pedagogical implications for enhancing academic literacy in Indonesia.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Indonesian, as the national language, has been constitutionally mandated to function as a language of science and education (Law No. 24 of 2009). Beyond its status as the national language, Indonesian functions in social life as a stylistic resource that enables the expression of ideas, the construction of identity, and the realization of communicative intentions across a range of social domains (Putrayasa, 2021). This strategic role requires it to possess a register capable of conveying complex ideas with objectivity, precision, and systematic coherence. The development of this scientific register, however, is a relatively recent endeavor compared to languages with long-standing academic traditions. A standard grammar (Alwi et al., 2003) and formal terminological development have provided a foundation, yet the consistent application of these norms in practice, particularly among students, remains a significant challenge. In addition to the low quality of the language used to convey ideas, the sentences employed do not yet reflect linguistic politeness and ethical language use appropriate to the context (Putrayasa & Ramendra, 2022). Mastery of scientific style is a crucial aspect of academic maturity, reflecting precision in expressing scientific arguments (Alwi & Dendy, 2017). In reality, many student research papers reveal inconsistencies, combining formal and informal registers and exhibiting weak cohesion, which affects both the quality of their writing and the perceived credibility of Indonesian as a language of science (Rahardi, 2019).

The analysis of scientific language is deeply informed by stylistics, which examines the conscious and unconscious choices writers make at the levels of diction, syntax, and discourse within a specific context (Leech & Short, 2007). In writing, students use language not only pay attention to the type, unity, and structure of the sentence but also understand correctly the best way to use language (Putrayasa & Ramendra, 2022). In academic writing, stylistics is not merely concerned with aesthetic effect but with the effectiveness and appropriateness of expression in achieving communicative goals. From a stylistic perspective, the low quality of language used in conveying ideas, together with the failure of sentence construction to reflect contextual politeness and ethical norms, indicates a misalignment between linguistic form and the intended communicative and pragmatic functions (Putrayasa, 2023). An effective scientific style allows ideas to be communicated clearly while maintaining objectivity and constructing a credible authorial persona. From this perspective, stylistic analysis serves as a powerful tool for diagnosing students' linguistic competence and identifying areas for pedagogical intervention (Hyland, 2004). It connects linguistic form with rhetorical function, revealing how language choices shape meaning and persuade an academic audience.

A key concept emerging from studies of novice academic writing is that of stylistic hybridity, the blending of linguistic features from different registers within a single text. In the Indonesian context, this often manifests as a mix of formal academic lexicon and syntax with colloquial expressions, emotive language, and structures influenced by digital communication (Faridah, 2018; Tohamba, 2021). Previous studies indicate persistent stylistic problems in students' academic writing, including inappropriate diction, ineffective sentence structures, and nonformal elements, which reflect limited mastery of academic language conventions (Rasna et al., 2014). Explicit language instruction has been shown to reduce nonacademic expression patterns and improve stylistic control over sentence structure, vocabulary, and formal registers (Artika et al., 2018; Dewantara et al., 2024; Suandi et al., 2023). These findings provide empirical support for the concept of stylistic hybridity in novice academic writing in Indonesia and underscore the need to strengthen scientific language competence grounded in stylistic awareness. This hybridity can be interpreted as a transitional stage in the acquisition of academic discourse. Students are often caught between the expressive, informal styles dominant in their everyday digital communication (Crystal, 2011) and the rigid, impersonal conventions required by scientific writing. This creates a tension that results in inconsistent tone and register, undermining the stylistic unity and scholarly discipline of their texts (Hyland, 2004).

Research on academic writing, particularly within the systemic functional linguistics and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) traditions, has identified several core features of scientific style that students must master.

1. **Lexical Choices:** Scientific discourse demands precise, technical, and neutral diction. However, studies on Indonesian student writing frequently report the use of imprecise terminology and emotive adjectives, which weaken objectivity (Faridah, 2018; Tohamba, 2021).

2. **Syntactic Structures:** Expert academic writing often employs complex hypotactic structures to establish logical hierarchies between ideas. In contrast, student writing is frequently characterized by paratactic structures, leading to long, "stacked" sentences that lack subordination and logical flow (Hyland, 2004; Tohamba, 2021).

3. Cohesion and Meta discourse: Cohesion refers to the grammatical and lexical links that hold a text together, while meta discourse encompasses the ways writers guide, engage, and position themselves in relation to their readers and content (Hyland, 2004). Student writers often use cohesive devices, such as conjunctions, mechanically rather than semantically, and underuse critical interactional meta discourse like hedging to express appropriate caution and critical stance (Diaz & Al Fajri, 2023; Hyland & Tse, 2004).

4. Authorial Voice: A conventional feature of scientific writing is an impersonal tone, often realized through the passive voice, which foregrounds the research process over the re-searcher. Indonesian students, however, show a strong preference for active voice with first-person pronouns, indicating a negotiation between asserting authorial identity and adhering to conventional impersonality (Faridah, 2018; Hyland, 2004).

The prevalence of these stylistic challenges points to a significant gap in academic literacy instruction. Indonesian language courses at the tertiary level often focus on general grammar and composition rather than the specific rhetorical and stylistic conventions of scientific writing across disciplines (Heryani, 2021). This lack of explicit, discipline-integrated stylistic training means that students are left to infer the "secret rules" of academic discourse on their own, often resulting in the imitative and sometimes awkward adoption of features from English-language sources without a deep understanding of their function (Subandowo et al., 2025). Consequently, there is a pressing need for pedagogical models that directly address stylistic competence as a core component of academic success.

In summary, the literature establishes that the development of a mature scientific style in Indonesian is a complex process hindered by linguistic interference, digital influences, and insufficient pedagogical focus. This study contributes to this field by providing a systematic, multi-level stylistic analysis to document the specific manifestations of this challenge and to inform more effective academic writing instruction.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive approach, with textual analysis serving as the primary method of inquiry.

The dataset comprised ten research articles written by undergraduate students from various disciplines—including social sciences, education, and humanities at both public and private universities in Indonesia. A purposive sampling technique was used to secure a sample representing a spectrum of writing quality and disciplinary backgrounds.

The textual analysis was conducted using an analytical framework synthesizing concepts from systemic functional linguistics and meta discourse analysis. The following elements were systematically examined:

1. Diction: Formality, precision, and the use of emotive versus neutral language.
2. Sentence Structure: Syntactic complexity, the use of parataxis versus hypotaxis, and sentence economy.
3. Cohesion: Grammatical and lexical cohesive devices, informed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), and their pragmatic function, following Hyland's (2004) model of meta discourse.
4. Voice and Tone: Frequency of active versus passive voice and consistency in register maintenance.

To ensure analytical robustness, the process was conducted iteratively. Two independent coders analyzed the texts using the defined framework to establish inter coder reliability. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion until consensus was achieved. Supplementary quantitative data, such as the frequency distribution of active/passive voice and lexical density, were calculated to provide a more comprehensive description of the identified stylistic patterns.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The stylistic analysis reveals that Indonesian university students' academic writing is situated in a transitional phase. Although students demonstrate partial familiarity with scientific conventions, their texts consistently display instability in diction, syntactic organization, and discourse coherence. This instability manifests as stylistic hybridity, in which features of formal academic discourse coexist with informal, expressive, and digitally influenced language practices. Rather than reflecting simple linguistic deficiency, this hybridity indicates an ongoing negotiation between communicative fluency and epistemic discipline in academic knowledge construction. The hybridization of formal and informal language features indicates that students are still negotiating the boundaries between communicative fluency and scientific rigor (Hyland, 2004; Hyland & Tse, 2004). In the first layer of analysis, diction emerged as the most visible stylistic challenge. The frequent use of emotive adjectives and intensifiers such as *sangat penting* (very important) and *menarik sekali* (very interesting) suggests that students prioritize persuasive emphasis over epistemic neutrality. These lexical choices shift the focus from analytical reasoning to evaluative stance, thereby weakening the objectivity expected in scientific discourse. From a stylistic perspective, this pattern indicates limited control over evaluative language rather than a lack of vocabulary knowledge.

A closer observation of lexical selection reveals a limited awareness of terminological precision. Terms like "masalah sosial" (social problem) or "pendidikan berkualitas" (quality education) are frequently used without conceptual clarity or definitional grounding (Tohamba, 2021). This imprecision reflects a lack of semantic discipline, which affects the clarity of scholarly argumentation (Hyland, 2004). Interestingly, some students attempt to imitate the diction found in English-language research articles. They often translate technical terms directly into Indonesian without adjusting to

local academic norms (Hyland & Tse, 2004). This translation interference produces awkward phrasing, such as “dalam konteks penelitian ini dihipotesiskan bahwa ...” (“in this research context, it is hypothesized that ...”), which sounds unnatural in Indonesian academic style (Subandowo et al., 2025).

In terms of sentence structure, many students construct overly complex sentences that obscure meaning. Clauses are frequently stacked without proper syntactic hierarchy, leading to confusion (Tohamba, 2021). The tendency to produce long, multi-clausal sentences suggests an assumption that complexity equals sophistication, when in fact it often reduces precision (Hyland, 2004). The syntactic pattern of student writing reveals a dominance of parataxis rather than hypotaxis. Coordination markers like *dan* (and) and *serta* (as well as) are used excessively, while subordinating conjunctions such as *meskipun* (although) or *walaupun demikian* (nevertheless) are underused (Faridah, 2018). This imbalance weakens argumentative cohesion and logical flow (Hyland & Tse, 2004). The dominance of paratactic sentence construction reflects a tendency to accumulate ideas through coordination rather than through logically layered subordination. As a result, syntactic complexity is achieved structurally but not functionally. Long sentences with minimal hierarchical signaling often obscure causal or contrastive relations between propositions, reducing argumentative clarity.

Another noticeable feature is redundancy. Students frequently restate the same idea with slightly different wording, creating verbosity rather than emphasis (Hyland, 2004). This redundancy, though unintentional, signals limited awareness of rhetorical economy—a vital principle in scientific discourse (Hyland, 2004). When examining paragraph structure, it becomes clear that coherence is often built around thematic repetition rather than logical progression (Tohamba, 2021). Many paragraphs begin with broad generalizations and fail to develop specific claims or empirical evidence. As a result, the argument appears circular rather than cumulative (Hyland, 2004). From a stylistic viewpoint, this pattern illustrates a dependence on narrative rather than analytical modes of writing (Hyland, 2004). Students tend to describe phenomena rather than analyze relationships between concepts. This descriptive style, while informative, lacks the explanatory precision required in scientific argumentation (Faridah, 2018).

Another linguistic aspect that deserves attention is cohesion. Cohesive devices in student writing are often mechanical rather than semantic. The frequent use of connectives like *oleh karena itu* (therefore) or *selain itu* (in addition) sometimes appears forced, as they are inserted without genuine logical necessity (Hyland, 2004). This mechanical use of connectors demonstrates that students are aware of the need for textual linkage but have not yet mastered the pragmatic dimension of cohesion (Hyland & Tse, 2004). Cohesion in scientific writing should not merely connect sentences—it should also signal logical reasoning and discourse hierarchy (Hyland, 2004). However, in many analyzed papers, cohesion functions more as a decorative tool than an argumentative mechanism. This finding suggests that stylistic awareness remains at a superficial level (Hyland & Tse, 2004).

The use of the passive voice is another important feature in scientific Indonesian. The data show that passive constructions are relatively rare in student writing, accounting for less than 25% of total clauses (Hyland, 2004). Instead, active sentences with first-person pronouns are frequently used, such as “saya melakukan penelitian ini” (I conducted this research). This stylistic choice indicates a preference for personal involvement over impersonality, which contradicts the conventional ethos of scientific discourse (Hyland, 2004; Hyland & Tse, 2004). The lack of passive constructions reduces objectivity and detracts from the perceived neutrality of academic claims (Hyland, 2004). Furthermore, pronoun usage reflects an identity negotiation process. Students appear to assert their authorship as a marker of confidence, but in doing so, they unintentionally diminish the impersonal authority expected in academic texts. This reveals a cultural tension between individual expression and institutional formality (Tohamba, 2021).

The analysis also identified a fluctuation between formal and informal tones within a single text. In some paragraphs, students employ highly formal vocabulary, while in others, they switch to conversational language (Faridah, 2018). This inconsistency disrupts the stylistic unity of the paper and weakens the impression of scholarly discipline (Hyland, 2004). Such stylistic fluctuation can be traced to the influence of digital literacy. The habits of writing on social media—where immediacy and expressiveness dominate—often spill into academic writing (Faridah, 2018). Consequently, students unconsciously adopt colloquial structures and emotive particles that reduce linguistic formality.

Another critical finding relates to lexical density. The average lexical density in student texts was found to be between 45% and 55%, lower than the typical density of professional academic writing, which averages above 60% (Hyland, 2004). This indicates that student writing contains more function words and fewer technical terms or conceptual nouns. Low lexical density reflects a dependency on general vocabulary rather than domain-specific terminology (Hyland, 2004). This suggests that students have yet to internalize disciplinary language, an essential component of linguistic competence in academia. From a stylistic perspective, lexical density is directly linked to cognitive sophistication. A writer with higher lexical density tends to use language as a tool for abstract reasoning rather than surface description. Therefore, improving lexical density is not merely a linguistic issue but also an intellectual one.

In addition to linguistic form, pragmatic features were also examined. The use of hedging expressions such as “dapat disimpulkan bahwa” (it can be concluded that) or “kemungkinan besar” (most likely) was limited. Instead, students often make categorical assertions, leaving no space for academic uncertainty (Hyland, 2004). This absence of hedging indicates a lack of rhetorical maturity. In scientific writing, hedging functions as a marker of critical thinking—it signals awareness of the limits of one’s claims (Hyland, 2004). Without it, the writing appears overly assertive and less credible. From the perspective of linguistic pragmatics, this categorical tone may reflect students’ educational background, where

certainty is often rewarded over analytical doubt (Tohamba, 2021). Therefore, stylistic refinement must be accompanied by a pedagogical shift that values critical modesty.

When analyzed from a genre perspective, the student texts partially conform to the structure of academic essays but fail to maintain stylistic discipline throughout (Hyland, 2004). While introductions often employ formal registers, the discussion sections revert to colloquial narrative tones. This imbalance indicates partial acquisition of genre conventions (Hyland, 2004). The role of stylistics in this context becomes central. Stylistics does not merely analyze linguistic form but also examines the relationship between language, thought, and social identity (Hyland, 2004). In this sense, the stylistic weaknesses of student writing mirror broader educational and cultural dynamics. The data also reveal that students exhibit creativity in expression, which sometimes clashes with academic conventions. Some students employ metaphorical phrases or rhetorical questions, such as “Apakah pendidikan kita sudah adil?” (Has our education become fair?) (Faridah, 2018). While engaging, such features deviate from the impersonal nature of scientific style.

These creative tendencies suggest that students are not resistant to language sophistication but rather lack guidance in channeling creativity within scientific frameworks. A balanced pedagogical approach is needed—one that values stylistic precision without suppressing expressive capacity. From a linguistic standpoint, the stylistic hybridity of student writing can be interpreted as a transitional stage in the evolution of Indonesian as a scientific language. As a relatively young academic language, Indonesian continues to adapt to the global conventions of scholarly communication while maintaining cultural authenticity. This adaptation process, however, creates stylistic tension. On one hand, students are encouraged to follow international standards of clarity and conciseness; on the other hand, the rhetorical richness of Indonesian culture values elaboration and contextual narrative (Tohamba, 2021). The coexistence of these tendencies results in stylistic hybridity.

The stylistic hybridity observed in student writing thus represents a site of linguistic negotiation—between modernity and tradition, global norms and local expressions (Hyland, 2004). This hybridity should not be viewed purely as a deficiency but as a linguistic reality of Indonesian academic discourse in transition. Pedagogically, these findings emphasize the need to integrate stylistic training into academic writing curricula. Instead of focusing solely on grammar and structure, language instruction should include analysis of tone, register, cohesion, and rhetorical stance. This would nurture both linguistic accuracy and intellectual discipline (Hyland, 2004). From an institutional perspective, universities should encourage lecturers to model good stylistic practices through exemplary academic writing. Exposure to well-written scholarly texts helps students internalize the stylistic norms of scientific Indonesian more effectively than prescriptive instruction alone.

Moreover, stylistic awareness should be embedded across disciplines, not limited to language departments. Every academic field from economics to engineering requires mastery of stylistic conventions that enable precise and credible communication of knowledge (Hyland, 2004). The stylistic development of students can also benefit from peer review practices. When students evaluate each other’s work, they become more conscious of language use and stylistic coherence. This collaborative reflection fosters metalinguistic awareness—a key factor in stylistic competence (Hyland, 2004).

In addition, digital tools such as corpus-based style checkers or academic writing software can assist in identifying stylistic inconsistencies. However, such tools must be complemented by human judgment to ensure contextual appropriateness and rhetorical nuance. Ultimately, the findings of this study reveal that stylistic competence in scientific Indonesian is not merely a matter of linguistic form but also of epistemological understanding. Writing style reflects how knowledge is constructed, validated, and communicated within a scholarly community (Hyland, 2004). This finding aligns with previous corpus-based studies showing that Indonesian scholars tend to use fewer hedging devices compared to their English counterparts (Sanjaya et al., 2015).

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY OF STYLISTIC FEATURES IN STUDENT WRITING

Stylistic Feature	Dominant Pattern	Percentage (%)	Interpretation
Diction	Emotive adjectives/adverbs	68%	Overuse of subjective language weakens scientific neutrality.
Sentence Structure	Multi-clausal parataxis	74%	Excessive coordination causes loss of precision.
Cohesion	Mechanical use of connectors	59%	Connectors often inserted without logical necessity.
Voice	Active (first-person)	75%	Preference for personal involvement reduces objectivity.
Tone	Inconsistent formal-informal	63%	Influence of digital writing habits affects formality.
Lexical Density	45–55%	-	Lower than professional standard (>60%), limiting technical precision.
Hedging	Limited use	31%	Lack of epistemic caution and critical stance.

Therefore, improving the stylistic quality of academic writing involves both linguistic refinement and cognitive transformation. Students must learn to view language as an instrument of reasoning, not just as a medium of expression. If nurtured properly, stylistic awareness can transform Indonesian academic writing into a more precise, persuasive, and intellectually grounded discourse. This, in turn, strengthens the position of Indonesian as a capable and credible language of science in the global academic landscape. In conclusion, the stylistic analysis demonstrates that while

students possess foundational writing skills, their mastery of scientific Indonesian remains developmental. Continuous exposure, feedback, and stylistic modeling are essential for cultivating a mature academic voice that aligns with the values of objectivity, clarity, and intellectual integrity.

This section presents a detailed stylistic analysis of Indonesian students' academic writing, supported by quantitative and qualitative data. The analysis focuses on diction, syntax, cohesion, voice, tone, and lexical density to identify stylistic patterns and linguistic tendencies. The table above demonstrates that stylistic weaknesses are distributed across multiple linguistic levels. The dominance of paratactic structures and emotive diction indicates a tendency toward expressive rather than analytical discourse.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF LEXICAL DENSITY BETWEEN STUDENT AND EXPERT WRITING

Group	Average Lexical Density (%)	Interpretation
Student Writers	45–55%	Reflects general vocabulary and descriptive focus.
Professional Academic Writers	60–70%	Indicates use of conceptual and technical terminology.

Lexical density analysis reveals that student writing employs a higher proportion of function words compared to expert writing, suggesting a descriptive rather than conceptual orientation in language use.

TABLE 3
VOICE USAGE IN STUDENT ACADEMIC WRITING

Voice Type	Frequency (%)	Interpretation
Active Voice (first-person)	75%	Indicates authorial assertion and personal involvement.
Passive Voice	25%	Reflects limited adoption of impersonal scientific tone.

The predominance of active voice reflects a communicative preference for personal engagement, which conflicts with the convention of objectivity in scientific discourse. This stylistic choice underscores the need for training in impersonal academic writing.

The findings paint a consistent picture of stylistic hybridity—a transitional blending of formal academic conventions with informal, expressive language. This phenomenon aligns with the view of academic writing as a social practice (Hyland, 2004), where students are still peripheral participants in the academic discourse community (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The syntactic patterns reflect a developmental stage in mastering the "dense" style required for academic packaging of complex information (Schleppegrell, 2004). The pragmatic failures in cohesion and the underuse of hedging reveal a superficial model of academic writing, focusing on formulas over underlying rhetorical principles. The negotiation of voice highlights a tension between individual expression and institutional expectation. The lower lexical density (45–55%) provides quantitative support for the qualitative observation that student writing is more descriptive than conceptual (Halliday, 1989). This stylistic hybridity is not merely a deficit but a reflection of the dynamic process of mastering scientific discourse in a linguistically evolving and digitally influenced context.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This study has delineated the distinctive stylistic profile of Indonesian students' academic writing, characterized by a persistent hybridity that blends formal conventions with informal, expressive language. The analysis confirms that challenges permeate all linguistic levels. This hybridity reflects a dynamic negotiation process—between global academic norms and local linguistic identities, and between digital informality and scholarly formality.

The primary contribution of this research lies in its systematic, multi-level stylistic analysis that captures this transitional phase. It moves beyond cataloging errors to interpreting them as signs of a living language adapting to new communicative demands. Stylistic competence, therefore, should be understood not merely as linguistic accuracy but as a marker of epistemic positioning within the academic community.

For practice, our findings argue for a pedagogical shift. Stylistic training must be integrated as a core component of academic literacy programs, moving beyond grammar instruction to include critical awareness of register, metadiscourse, and rhetorical stance. This training should be embedded across disciplines.

Future research could employ longitudinal or experimental designs to track stylistic development or measure the effectiveness of specific interventions. Further studies could also compare the stylistic choices of students and experienced scholars in the same disciplines.

Ultimately, fostering stylistic competence is integral to empowering Indonesian students to participate confidently in global scholarly conversations while simultaneously nurturing the growth and prestige of the Indonesian language as a robust medium for scientific knowledge.

Despite its contributions, this study is not without limitations. First, the dataset is limited to ten undergraduate research articles, which restricts the generalizability of the findings across disciplines and institutional contexts. Second, the analysis focuses on textual products rather than writing processes; therefore, it does not capture students' drafting strategies or revision practices. Finally, the study does not include comparative data from expert academic writers within the same disciplines, which would allow for a more nuanced benchmark of stylistic maturity. These limitations suggest that the findings should be interpreted as exploratory rather than definitive.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alwi, H., & Dendy, S. (2017). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia* [Indonesian Standard Grammar]. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- [2] Alwi, H., Dardjowidjojo, S., Lapoliwa, H., & Moeliono, A. M. (2003). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia* [Indonesian Standard Grammar] (3rd ed.). Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- [3] Artika, I. W., Narayukti, N. N. D., & Rasna, I. W. (2018). Pembinaan dan penggunaan bahasa dalam menulis karya ilmiah pada ekstrakurikuler karya ilmiah remaja (KIR) di SMA Laboratorium Undiksha [Development and use of language in writing scientific papers in the extracurricular youth scientific work (KIR) at Undiksha Laboratory High School]. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbbs.v8i1.20520>
- [4] Crystal, D. (2011). *Internet linguistics: A student guide*. London: Routledge.
- [5] Dewantara, P. M., Purwanti, C., Utama, I. M., & Wirahyuni, K. (2024). Penerapan Metode Pembelajaran TPS (Think, Pair, Share) untuk Menstimulus Keterampilan Menulis Mahasiswa [Implementation of the TPS (Think, Pair, Share) Learning Method to Stimulate Students' Writing Skills]. *Journal of Education Research*, 5(4), 5551–5556. <https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v5i4.1811>
- [6] Diaz, A., & Al Fajri, M. S. (2023). Hedging practices in soft science research articles: A corpus-based analysis of Indonesian authors. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10(1), 2249630. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2249630>
- [7] Faridah, D. (2018). Exploring academic writing needs of Indonesian EFL students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 602–610. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i3.15257>
- [8] Halliday, M. A. K. (1989). *Spoken and written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [9] Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- [10] Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- [11] Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156–177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156>
- [12] Heryani, H. (2021). Kemampuan mahasiswa menggunakan kalimat efektif dalam menulis karya ilmiah [Students' ability to use effective sentences in scientific writing]. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 8(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.31571/bahasa.v8i1.1134>
- [13] Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Leech, G. N., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Education.
- [15] Putrayasa, I. B. (2021). Political language variation: stylistic based study. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.45>
- [16] Putrayasa, I. B., & Ramendra, D. P. (2022). Unity of sentences charged with character education values in student essays: A syntactic study. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 6(1), 214-221. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v6n1.2194>
- [17] Putrayasa, I. B. (2023). Types and sentences structure charged with character education values essays of grade IV elementary school students in Bali Province: A syntactic study. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 7(1), 67-77. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v7n1.2258>
- [18] Rahardi, K. (2019). *Sosiopragmatik: Wacana, kekuasaan, dan ideologi dalam Bahasa* [Sociopragmatics: Discourse, power, and ideology in language]. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- [19] Rasna, I. W., Dewi, N. K. A. S., & Sudiara, I. N. S. (2014). Analisis kesalahan bahasa Indonesia pada esai mahasiswa Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia: Sebuah kajian ejaan, diksi, dan struktur [Analysis of Indonesian language errors in essays by students of the Indonesian Language and Literature Education Department: A study of spelling, diction, and structure]. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(1).
- [20] Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [21] Suandi, I. N., Sudiana, I. N., & Nurjaya, I. G. (2023). *Keterampilan berbahasa Indonesia berorientasi integrasi nasional dan harmoni sosial* [Indonesian language skills are oriented towards national integration and social harmony]. Jakarta: PT Rajawali Persada.
- [22] Subandowo, D., Sárdi, C., & Thresia, F. (2025). An investigation of English academic writing strategies employed by Indonesian graduate students in an English-medium instruction context. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 10, 38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-025-00345-w>
- [23] Tohamba, M. P. P. (2021). The challenges that Indonesian students face in academic writing: A cross-disciplinary study of academic literacies. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 6(2), 379–395. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v6i2.563>



Christina Purwanti was born in Indonesia. She earned a Bachelor's degree in Indonesian Language Education from Universitas Sanata Dharma, Yogyakarta, and a Master's degree in Education from Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia. She is currently pursuing her doctoral studies in Indonesian Language Education at Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Indonesia. She is a lecturer at Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang, Indonesia. Her teaching and research focus on academic writing, stylistics, discourse analysis, and Indonesian scientific language. She has published several articles on academic literacy and language pedagogy in national and international journals.

Ms. Purwanti's current research interests include stylistic hybridity in academic writing, scientific Indonesian, and the development of academic literacy in higher education. She may be contacted at christina.purwanti@uph.edu



Rudy Pramono was born in East Java, Indonesia. He obtained his Bachelor's degree in Tourism Studies, followed by a Master's degree in Management, and a Doctoral degree in Tourism and Hospitality Studies from accredited universities in Indonesia. He is a Professor at Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang, Indonesia. He has extensive academic and professional experience in tourism, hospitality management, research methodology, and academic writing. He has authored and edited numerous books and peer-reviewed journal articles in tourism, hospitality, leadership, and interdisciplinary social sciences.

Prof. Pramono's research interests include tourism and hospitality studies, academic literacy, interdisciplinary research methodologies, and the sociology of knowledge in higher education. He is actively involved in academic publishing, curriculum development, and scholarly peer review. He may be contacted

via email upon request.



Ida Bagus Putrayasa was born in Bali, Indonesia. He received his Bachelor's degree in Indonesian Language Education, followed by a Master's degree and a Doctoral degree in Linguistics and Language Education from leading universities in Indonesia. He is a Professor at Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Indonesia. His academic career spans teaching, research, and supervision in Indonesian linguistics, academic writing, and language pedagogy. He has published widely in the fields of Indonesian grammar, discourse analysis, and language education. Prof. Putrayasa's research interests include Indonesian scientific language, stylistics, functional linguistics, and academic writing development. He is an active member of national professional associations in linguistics and language education.



I Nyoman Suidiana was born in Bali, Indonesia. He earned his Bachelor's degree in Indonesian Language Education and completed his Master's and Doctoral degrees in Linguistics and Education from Indonesian universities. He is a Professor at Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Indonesia. His academic work focuses on Indonesian linguistics, discourse studies, and language assessment. He has contributed to several academic publications and research projects related to Indonesian academic discourse. Prof. Suidiana's research interests include discourse analysis, academic writing, and language policy in higher education. He is actively involved in research supervision and curriculum development.



I Putu Mas Dewantara was born in Bali, Indonesia. He completed his undergraduate and graduate studies in Indonesian Language Education and Linguistics at Indonesian higher education institutions. He is a lecturer at Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Indonesia. His teaching and research areas include Indonesian academic writing, language education, and applied linguistics. He has participated in collaborative research projects on language use in educational contexts. Dr. Dewantara's research interests focus on academic discourse, stylistic analysis, and Indonesian language development in higher education.