

Building Primary School Teachers' Capacity for Instructional Innovation through Academic Writing Mentorship: A Community Engagement Program in East Jakarta

Mohamad Syarif Sumantri ^{1*}, Laely Farokhah ², Maisa Hurul Aeni ², Wily Wandari ², Venna Puspita Sari ², Dessy Norma Juita ²

¹ Department of Educational Technology, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

² Department of Elementary Teacher Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

* Corresponding author: sayarifsumantri@unj.ac.id

To cite this article: Sumantri, M.S., Farokhah, L., Aeni, M.H., Wandari, W., Sari, V.P., & Juita, D.N. (2026). Building Primary School Teachers' Capacity for Instructional Innovation through Academic Writing Mentorship: A Community Engagement Program in East Jakarta. *Indonesian Journal of Community Service in Education*, 2(3), 137-151. <https://doi.org/10.64421/ijcse.v2i3.108>

Articles Information	Abstract
Received : 05-08-2026 Revised : 08-08-2026 Accepted : 09-08-2026 Published : 30-09-2026	Primary school teachers possess classroom experiences, yet many require support in transforming them into publishable scholarly works. This community service program aimed to strengthen teachers' scientific writing competence and encourage the development of a sustainable teacher-writer community at SDN Pondok Bambu 06, East Jakarta. The program was implemented through orientation, scientific writing workshops, individual and group mentoring, evaluation, and sustainability planning. Participants' knowledge was evaluated using a 15-item pretest and posttest, supported by observations and reviews of their writing progress. The results indicated that participants demonstrated a high level of initial knowledge and maintained mastery after the program. The scope for measurable score gains was limited because baseline performance was already high, while pretest and posttest participation was not fully identical. The program provided a systematic foundation for identifying classroom problems, organizing academic ideas, and preparing scholarly manuscripts. Continued mentoring and portfolio-based assessment are recommended to strengthen sustainable writing practices. Keywords: Scientific Writing; Primary School Teachers; Teacher Mentoring; Classroom Action Research; Professional Development.
	Abstrak Guru sekolah dasar memiliki pengalaman pembelajaran, tetapi banyak yang memerlukan dukungan untuk mengubah pengalaman tersebut menjadi karya ilmiah yang sistematis dan layak dipublikasikan. Program pengabdian kepada masyarakat ini bertujuan memperkuat kompetensi penulisan ilmiah guru serta mendorong terbentuknya komunitas guru penulis yang berkelanjutan di SDN Pondok Bambu 06, Jakarta Timur. Program dilaksanakan melalui orientasi, lokakarya penulisan ilmiah, pendampingan individu dan kelompok, evaluasi, serta perencanaan keberlanjutan. Pengetahuan peserta dievaluasi menggunakan pretest dan posttest sebanyak 15 butir, didukung oleh observasi dan penelaahan perkembangan tulisan. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa peserta memiliki pengetahuan awal yang tinggi dan tetap mempertahankan penguasaan yang baik setelah program. Ruang peningkatan skor terukur relatif terbatas karena kemampuan awal peserta sudah tinggi, sedangkan partisipasi pretest dan posttest tidak sepenuhnya sama. Program ini memberikan landasan sistematis bagi guru dalam mengidentifikasi masalah pembelajaran, mengorganisasi gagasan akademik, dan menyusun naskah ilmiah. Pendampingan berkelanjutan dan penilaian berbasis portofolio direkomendasikan untuk memperkuat praktik menulis secara berkesinambungan. Keywords: Penulisan Ilmiah; Guru Sekolah Dasar; Pendampingan Guru; Penelitian Tindakan Kelas; Pengembangan Profesional.

Copyright ©2026 Mohamad Syarif Sumantri, Laely Farokhah, Maisa Hurul Aeni, Wily Wandari, Venna Puspita Sari, Dessy Norma Juita

Indonesian Journal of Community Service in Education (IJCSE) is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0)

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>



1. INTRODUCTION

The professionalism of primary school teachers is evaluated not only by their instructional implementation but also by their ability to reflect upon, test, and communicate these practices through scientific means such as classroom action research (CAR), learning innovation reports, and published articles. This is essential because pedagogical competence, without the capacity to document and provide evidence of practice, risks confining teaching experience to individual knowledge that is challenging to evaluate, develop, or disseminate. Rohmatulloh et al. (2024) found that teacher professionalism is shaped by a combination of personality, pedagogical ability, and social competence. Consequently, the writing of scientific papers should be regarded not merely as an administrative requirement, but as a process that integrates pedagogical reflection, professional responsibility, and academic communication. Rathert and Okan (2015) reinforce this argument by demonstrating that teachers' engagement in writing for publication can foster a sense of ownership, courage, and authority over their professional practice. Nevertheless, motivation for professional development alone does not ensure teachers' ability to produce scientific papers without sufficient technical skills and institutional support. Sumantri and Whardani (2017) identified a relationship between achievement motivation and the professional competence of primary school teachers; however, this relationship must be actualized through a concrete platform that transforms motivation into academic output. Paniagua and Istance (2018) further emphasize the importance of teachers' roles as designers of learning environments that consistently reflect evidence-based practices. Thus, scientific writing skills serve as a strategic instrument enabling teachers to convert learning experiences into professional knowledge that can be validated, developed, and disseminated within the educational community.

However, the ability to write scientific papers remains a challenge for many primary school teachers in Indonesia. (Adri et al. 2022) found that primary school teachers generally have a positive perception of the benefits of CAR for their professional careers, but their technical understanding of preparing research reports remains low. This gap between positive attitudes and technical competence is the root of the main problem: teachers' motivation to write is already present, but not supported by adequate skills. Setiadi (2020) showed that focused guidance with a collaborative approach significantly improved teachers' understanding of preparing CAR reports, even within a relatively short period of mentoring—providing empirical evidence that this gap is amenable to intervention. Ulma et al. (2023) added that teacher awareness of the importance of self-reflection through CAR still needs to be further developed, as reflection is often conducted in an unstructured manner and merely as an administrative formality. Karolčík and Marková (2025) also found that teachers' perceptions of educational innovation are strongly influenced by the extent to which they feel institutionally supported; This indicates that the success of scientific writing mentoring also depends on structural support from the school, not just the individual initiative of the teacher.

This condition is also related to broader educational quality achievements. Kiriana and Wideasih (2023) demonstrated that utilizing learning outcome data through the Education Report platform plays a

crucial role in driving improvements in the quality of national education. This is relevant because suboptimal literacy and numeracy data should serve as a catalyst for teachers to conduct reflective research on their own practices, rather than simply passively receiving evaluation scores. Teacher writing skills also need to be seen in the context of broader teacher professional development efforts in Indonesia. Sumantri et al. (2018) found that teacher training programs and self-regulation of student teachers play an important role in building science teaching competency; Handayani et al. (2023) also show that the implementation of Professional Teacher Education (or PPG in Indonesian abbreviation) makes a positive contribution to the pedagogical competence of early childhood educators; while Nisa et al. (2024) documented various innovative teacher strategies in creating creative Indonesian language learning. This third study shows that various teacher professional development schemes - training, certification, and learning innovation - have been widely researched, but the specific dimension of assistance in writing scientific papers for primary school teachers has still received relatively little attention, even though scientific writing is the estuary that unites all of these professional development abilities into a form that can be documented and published. Latifah et al. (2023) also found that primary school teachers need teaching materials that support students' communication and reasoning abilities; this finding is relevant because the quality of the teaching materials produced by teachers themselves is directly proportional to the extent to which they are able to write reflectively and systematically.

Similar conditions were also seen at SDN Pondok Bambu 06, East Jakarta, which was a partner in this service activity. Even though the school has been accredited A and shows good institutional quality in aspects of administration, learning management, and basic education services, the teacher's ability to conduct classroom research and scientifically document learning innovations is still not optimally developed. The teachers at this school have diverse teaching experience (age range 26–54 years) and have taken basic training in implementing the Merdeka Curriculum and using digital platforms, but data-based learning practices and research-based classroom reflection are still rarely carried out. The results of school reflection and self-evaluation also show that student achievements in literacy and numeracy aspects are not yet fully consistent with the minimum competency indicators set, so scientific documentation of learning practices becomes increasingly important as a basis for continuous improvement.

Teacher involvement in learning communities is still limited to internal school forums and has not developed into a professional community based on scientific publications. Muspiroh et al. (2022) found that the formation of professional learning communities plays an important role in building teachers' scientific literacy skills in basic education environments. This finding is relevant because it shows that a scientific writing culture cannot grow solely from individual initiative, but rather requires a collective forum for discussion and feedback between colleagues. Wulansari et al. (2022) added that assistance in journal management based on the Open Journal Systems (OJS) can open up teacher access to a wider range of publications. This indicates that the obstacles for teachers in publishing do not always lie in their writing ability alone, but also in the lack of access to appropriate publication channels. Ritonga et al. (2022) also emphasized the importance of integrity in implementing community service programs as a basis for the

results of activities to be truly useful and accountable to partners and implementers. This principle is relevant as a reminder that scientific writing assistance must be carried out by upholding academic honesty, not just by pursuing administrative output targets. As a precedent, previous community service teams have also carried out similar activities in different contexts. Sumantri et al. (2024) documented community service through the implementation of the Independent Curriculum for teachers on Tunda Island, demonstrating that structured mentoring for teachers in areas with limited access can have a positive impact on understanding curriculum policies. This experience serves as a basis for the belief that a similar approach can also be applied to the context of mentoring scientific writing at SDN Pondok Bambu 06.

Based on these issues, this community service activity is designed to provide systematic assistance to teachers at SDN Pondok Bambu 06 in writing scientific papers, starting from formulating learning problems, compiling simple research proposals such as classroom action research (CAR), to writing and publishing scientific articles. This activity is also aimed at fostering a culture of writing and sharing good practices among teachers through the formation of a teacher-writer community, as a means of continuous professional development. This activity is in line with the Merdeka Belajar-Kampus Merdeka (MBKM) policy, specifically in supporting the achievement of Key Performance Indicator (IKU) 5 regarding the utilization of lecturers' work results by the community, as well as IKU 2 regarding student experiences off-campus. This activity also represents a tangible contribution to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 4; Quality Education. Through this mentoring in writing scientific papers, it is hoped that primary school teachers will not only improve their knowledge and skills in writing, but will also be able to use scientific papers as a catalyst in creating learning innovations that have a direct impact on improving the quality of learning in primary schools.

2. PROBLEMS AND TARGET COMMUNITY

This section maps the community's problems and establishes the program targets based on initial observations, a review of school conditions, and discussions with SDN Pondok Bambu 06. The mapping revealed a gap between teachers' rich pedagogical experience and their ability to transform that experience into documented, tested, and disseminable scholarly knowledge. Therefore, the community service program focused on two interrelated needs: strengthening scholarly writing competence and establishing a culture of sharing good practices grounded in scientific literacy.

2.1. Community Problems

SDN Pondok Bambu 06 is an A-accredited public primary school with strong institutional quality in administration, instructional management, and primary education services. Nevertheless, internal reflection and evaluation indicate that student achievement in literacy and numeracy remains suboptimal. Some students continue to experience difficulty understanding texts and solving numerical problems. This condition requires teachers to continue developing, testing, and evaluating instructional strategies that respond to actual classroom needs.

The first problem concerns teachers' limited understanding of classroom research methodology, particularly Classroom Action Research. Teachers have experience identifying learning difficulties and implementing various instructional innovations, but not all are able to formulate problems operationally, establish objectives and intervention designs, determine data-collection techniques, analyze results, and draw conclusions systematically. Consequently, instructional reflection is generally conducted informally and has not yet produced empirical evidence that can serve as a basis for continuous instructional improvement.

The second problem is that scholarly writing and publication skills remain underdeveloped. Teachers still encounter difficulties transforming teaching experiences into academic ideas, organizing article structures, using academic language, managing citations and references, and adapting manuscripts to journal or proceedings requirements. Limited experience in revising and submitting manuscripts has also meant that innovative instructional practices have not yet been documented as reports, articles, or books that other teachers can use. This condition restricts the dissemination of practical knowledge, professional development, and teachers' contributions to improving educational quality.

The third problem is the limited development of a culture of sharing data-informed good practices. Teacher learning-community activities remain largely confined to internal school forums and have not yet evolved into a professional community that regularly conducts scholarly discussions, peer review, writing mentorship, and dissemination of innovation results. The absence of a teacher-writer community means that writing is often viewed as an individual activity that is difficult to sustain. Furthermore, documentation of instructional innovations has not been managed systematically, so valuable experiences do not consistently become shared knowledge or references for school decision-making.

Based on these problems, the program was designed to provide an integrated intervention through scholarly writing training, mentoring in the preparation of Classroom Action Research, the provision of guidelines and model manuscripts, revision clinics, and publication guidance. The program was also directed toward establishing a discussion group or teacher-writer community as a forum for sharing experiences, providing feedback, and sustaining a culture of data-informed reflection. This design positions scholarly writing not merely as an administrative output but as a means of developing measurable and sustainable instructional innovation.

2.2. Target Community

The program partner is SDN Pondok Bambu 06, located at 148 Pahlawan Revolusi Street, Pondok Bambu Urban Village, Duren Sawit District, East Jakarta Administrative City, Special Region of Jakarta. The school is situated in a densely populated urban residential area and has long served the primary education needs of the surrounding community. Its status as an A-accredited educational institution and one of the reference schools in the area provides strategic potential for developing and disseminating innovative instructional practices.

The program's direct beneficiaries were approximately 30 participants, primarily classroom teachers and subject teachers at SDN Pondok Bambu 06. Most teachers held bachelor's degrees in Primary School Teacher Education, supported by subject teachers in physical education, arts, English, and Scout extracurricular activities. The teachers' age range, approximately 26 to 54 years, reflected diversity in teaching experience, pedagogical perspectives, information-technology proficiency, and adaptability to educational change. Most teachers had also attended basic training on the implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum, the use of digital platforms, and deep-learning-oriented pedagogy.

These characteristics were the main reasons for selecting the target community. The teachers had a solid pedagogical foundation, classroom experience, and readiness to adopt innovations, but still required support in transforming their experience into systematic, publishable scholarly work. Diversity in age and competence also enabled the program to apply a collaborative mentoring model, in which more experienced teachers shared contextual knowledge while teachers with greater technological proficiency supported reference management, digital writing, and the publication process. The principal and school administrators provided institutional support by allocating time, space, facilities, and policies that encouraged program sustainability.

The indirect beneficiaries were the students and the school. Students received more responsive instruction, while the school obtained documentation of good practices and a teacher-writer community to support quality improvement.

3. METHODS

This community service activity was carried out at SDN Pondok Bambu 06, East Jakarta, as an effort to address the problem of low teacher skills in writing scientific papers and the lack of a culture of sharing good practices based on scientific literacy in the school environment. The implementation of the activity was systematically designed through five main stages, namely socialization, training, technology application, mentoring and evaluation, and program sustainability, by actively involving partners at each stage over a period of 5 months. A complete description of the approach, location and participants, implementation stages, supporting tools and media, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms is presented in the following subsections.

3.1. Approach and Program Activities

This community service activity utilizes a mentoring and structured training approach, aimed at providing direct guidance to teachers in compiling scientific papers, both in the form of research articles and reference books on good learning practices. (Setiadi, 2020) demonstrated that focused guidance with a collaborative approach—combining group explanations and individual guidance—significantly improved teachers' understanding of preparing CAR reports in a relatively short period of time. This finding underpinned the selection of a multi-layered mentoring approach (group and individual) for this activity. (Rathert & Okan, 2015) added that the process of writing for publication contributes to the development

of teachers' sense of ownership and professional authority as authors, so mentoring is designed not only to produce outputs but also to foster teachers' self-confidence as contributors of knowledge. Mentoring encompasses the formulation of learning problems, drafting, revision, and publication preparation, along with the provision of learning resources in the form of reading materials, scientific writing guides, CAR guides, and examples of good scientific articles for teachers to reference.

3.2. Location and Participants

The activity was carried out at SDN Pondok Bambu 06, located in Pondok Bambu Village, Duren Sawit District, East Jakarta, at a distance of approximately 7.5 km or a 10–15-minute drive from Jakarta State University. The participants were SDN Pondok Bambu 06 teachers with a Bachelor's degree in Primary School Teacher Education, supported by four subject teachers (sports education, art, English, and scout extracurricular instructors), with an age range of 26–54 years old, reflecting the diversity of teaching experience and level of technology mastery. The individual output targets included five teachers, each of whom was expected to produce one good practice book with an ISBN and one article ready to be submitted to the *Sinta 6* journal. This activity also involved two community service students who helped with activity preparation, assisted with program implementation at the school, and compiled activity reports and non-article output materials such as videos and infographics.

3.3. Stages of Program Implementation

The program was implemented systematically through five main stages over eight months: program socialization (month 1), scientific writing training (month 2), individual scientific writing mentoring (months 3 to 6), scientific paper evaluation and feedback (month 6), publication of scientific papers in accredited journals (month 7), and bookkeeping, certificate delivery, and reporting of activity results (month 8). Specifically, the five stages are:

- 1) Socialization Program: Introducing the program's objectives and benefits to partners through meetings, seminars, or discussions involving school stakeholders. Partners actively provided initial data, facilitated meetings, and provided input to ensure the program met school needs.
- 2) Scientific Writing Training: Providing theoretical and practical materials on how to express ideas, the structure of scientific articles, and the systematic steps of CAR, enabling teachers to identify real-life classroom learning problems and develop initial plans for scientific papers.
- 3) 3) Technology Implementation: Teachers use a digital platform (Schologue Learning Management System) as a shared workspace to upload drafts of scientific papers and boldly participate in discussions and feedback, tailored to the abilities and needs of participants.
- 4) Mentoring and Evaluation: Conducted individually and in groups to ensure teachers can apply the knowledge they have learned. Technical support and consultation are provided through mentoring sessions; teachers revise their work based on feedback and report on writing progress regularly.
- 5) Sustainability Program: Directed at developing local capacity and establishing independent communities or discussion groups of teacher writers, so that teachers can share experiences and

practices effectively and continue to utilize their writing skills without relying on external mentors after the program ends.

3.4. Tools, Media, and Materials

This activity is supported by several materials and media, including: (1) a CAR-based primary school teacher scientific paper writing module containing classroom action research guidelines, scientific article structure, academic writing techniques, and publication procedures, available in PDF/ePub digital format; (2) ready-to-use scientific article templates and good practice books according to journal standards (e.g., Sinta 6 journal format) and ISBN; and (3) the Schoology Learning Management System as a cloud-based digital collaboration space. Wulansari et al. (2022) showed that mentoring in managing digital platform-based journals can open teachers' access to broader and more structured publication platforms, emphasizing that providing a digital platform is not just an administrative support tool, but an important component that bridges the gap between teachers' written drafts and the formal publication process.

3.5. Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring is carried out regularly through direct observation of teacher participation in training and mentoring sessions, interviews, and review of draft scientific papers uploaded to digital platforms. Laelah and Aeni (2022) found that effective interpersonal communication between supervisors and students has a significant effect on learning outcomes. This finding is relevant because the quality of interaction between the mentor team and teachers during mentoring sessions determines the success of the revision process and completion of scientific work, not just the training material itself. Evaluation of program success is measured through achievement indicators in the form of: (1) increased knowledge and skills of primary school teachers in writing scientific papers; (2) compiling drafts or scientific articles resulting from innovative learning practices, with a target of five books with ISBNs and five articles ready to be submitted to the Sinta 6 journal; (3) the formation of a community of teacher writers as a forum for sharing practices and professional development; and (4) publication of teacher scientific articles in local and national journals or proceedings. The success of the program can also be seen from the fulfillment of mandatory service outputs, namely ISSN journal articles, activity videos, collaboration nameplates, proof of student involvement, partner recognition letters, proof of partnerships, and profiles of community service activities.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This community service program aimed to strengthen primary school teachers' ability to produce scholarly writing as a means of reflection and documentation of good practices. It was implemented through mentoring stages consisting of program orientation, training, technology implementation, mentoring and evaluation, and sustainability. This section presents the pretest and posttest evaluation results and interprets them in light of the quality of the available data.

4.1. Implementation of Activities and Partner Participation

During program orientation, the team explained the program objectives and the benefits of scholarly writing for teachers' professional development. The training combined explanations and exercises on identifying instructional problems, Classroom Action Research, article structure, academic language, citations, references, and publication. Technology was used to support draft preparation, communication, and feedback, while mentoring and evaluation were directed toward mapping participants' progress and follow-up needs.



Figure 1. Teacher participation in the scientific writing mentorship: (a) participants attending the workshop; (b) participants engaging in guided learning and evaluation activities.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the teachers participated directly in the workshop and used laptops and mobile devices to follow the material and access learning and evaluation activities. Their involvement supported the collaborative mentoring process and provided an initial foundation for subsequent assistance in developing scholarly manuscripts.

Knowledge was assessed using a 15-item pretest and posttest. Fourteen teachers completed the pretest and 12 completed the posttest; only nine participants could be matched by identity. The results were therefore presented through descriptive analysis of all respondents and paired analysis, so score changes were not directly attributed to the training without considering differences in participant composition.

The pretest profile showed that participants were predominantly female and held bachelor's degree/Diploma IV qualifications. Of the 14 respondents, seven had previously attended similar training, five had written an article, and three had published a scholarly work. These experiences indicate a relatively high level of baseline readiness before the program.

Table 1. Pretest Respondent Profile

Characteristic	Number of Participants	Percentage
Female	11	78.57%
Male	3	21.43%
Bachelor's degree/Diploma IV	13	92.86%
Doctoral degree	1	7.14%
Previously written an article	5	35.71%
Previously published a scholarly work	3	21.43%
Previously attended similar training	7	50.00%

Note: Percentages are based on 14 pretest respondents.

4.2. Descriptive Analysis of Pretest and Posttest Results

The descriptive analysis showed that the mean pretest score was 14.29 out of a maximum score of 15, equivalent to 95.24%. The pretest median was 14.50, the standard deviation was 0.91, and scores ranged from 12 to 15. These values indicate very high baseline mastery and relatively little score variation. For the posttest, the official scores exported from Quizizz produced a mean of 11.92, or 79.44%, with a median of 12.50, a standard deviation of 2.43, and a range of 7-15. After the posttest responses were rescored using an answer key consistent with the pretest, the mean increased to 13.00, or 86.67%, with a median of 13.50, a standard deviation of 1.71, and a range of 10-15.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for the Pretest and Posttest

Measurement	N	Mean	Percentage	Median	SD	Min-Max
Pretest	14	14.29	95.24%	14.50	0.91	12-15
Official Quizizz posttest	12	11.92	79.44%	12.50	2.43	7-15
Rescored posttest	12	13.00	86.67%	13.50	1.71	10-15

Note: The maximum score was 15. Rescoring was conducted using the same answer key as the pretest.

Descriptively, neither the official scores nor the rescored results showed an improvement after the training. The mean difference between the pretest and official posttest was -2.37 points, while the difference between the pretest and rescored posttest was -1.29 points. However, these comparisons cannot be treated as individual changes because the number and composition of participants differed between the two measurements. Pretest scores that were close to the maximum also created a ceiling effect, leaving very limited room for improvement even if participants acquired new understanding or skills during the training.

4.3. Paired-Participant Analysis

A paired analysis was conducted for nine participants whose identities could be matched with confidence. In this group, the mean pretest score was 14.22, or 94.81%. The mean official posttest score was 11.89, or 79.26%, whereas the mean rescored posttest result was 12.89, or 85.93%. The mean change based on the official scores was -2.33 points, while the mean change based on the rescored results was -1.33 points. No participants showed an increase in score. In the official version, two participants had unchanged scores and seven had lower scores; in the rescored version, three participants had unchanged scores and six had lower scores.

Table 3. Score Changes among Nine Matched Participants

Indicator	Official Scores	Rescored Results
Mean pretest	14.22 (94.81%)	14.22 (94.81%)
Mean posttest	11.89 (79.26%)	12.89 (85.93%)
Mean change	-2.33 points	-1.33 points
Median change	-2.00 points	-1.00 points
Participants with increased scores	0	0
Participants with unchanged scores	2	3
Participants with decreased scores	7	6
Wilcoxon test	W = 0; p = 0.0156	W = 0; p = 0.0313

Note: The Wilcoxon test used data from the nine participants who could be matched. The p-value indicates a difference in the direction of lower posttest scores.

The Wilcoxon test showed a significant difference between the pretest and posttest using both the official scores and the rescored results. However, this statistical significance should not be interpreted directly as evidence that the training caused a decline in ability. A causal interpretation is not supported because the evaluation included only nine matched pairs, some participants did not complete both tests, baseline scores were very high, and posttest scoring was not fully consistent. Therefore, the most cautious conclusion is that the available data did not show an immediate improvement in knowledge scores after the training.

4.4. Item Analysis and Scoring Consistency

The item-level analysis showed that participants retained strong mastery of several aspects. In the rescored posttest, all participants correctly answered items on academic language, the benefits of publication for teachers, and sources of scholarly references. Mastery was also relatively high for the fundamentals of article preparation, the function of keywords, the credibility of publication sources, and the article-review process, with correct-response rates ranging from 91.67% to 100%. In contrast, items concerning the research methods section and conclusion writing had correct-response rates of 66.67%, while the item on the function of an abstract reached 75.00%. These results indicate that content requiring structural understanding and the ability to integrate article components should be reinforced through example-based exercises and draft reviews.

Further examination identified anomalies in the official Quizizz scoring. The total number of correct responses according to the official scores was 143, whereas rescoring with the same answer key used for the pretest produced 156 correct responses. Differences appeared across six topics: introduction content, the research methods section, the relationship between results and discussion, academic language, plagiarism and citation, and the credibility of publication sources. For several items, responses with substantively identical content were recorded as correct for some participants but incorrect for others. This condition reduces the validity of interpretations based on the official scores and makes the rescored results an important comparison.

Table 4. Items Showing Differences between Official Scores and Rescored Results

Item Topic	Pretest	Official Posttest	Rescored Posttest
Introduction content	100.00%	50.00%	83.33%
Research methods section	85.71%	58.33%	66.67%
Relationship between results and discussion	78.57%	66.67%	91.67%
Academic language	100.00%	83.33%	100.00%
Plagiarism and citation	100.00%	66.67%	83.33%
Credibility of publication sources	100.00%	83.33%	91.67%

Note: Pretest percentages are based on 14 respondents and posttest percentages on 12 respondents; item-level comparisons do not represent individual change.

The findings for the item concerning the relationship between results and discussion further demonstrate the importance of verifying the answer key. The official scores showed 66.67% correct responses, while the rescored results reached 91.67%, higher than the pretest achievement of 78.57%. A difference of 25 percentage points between the official and rescored results can alter conclusions about participants' mastery of the material. Therefore, the answer key, response options, time limits, and platform settings must be checked before the data are used as a basis for assessing program effectiveness.

4.5. Discussion of Program Impact

The evaluation results reveal a situation that requires multidimensional interpretation. First, a mean pretest score above 95% indicates that the instrument primarily measured basic knowledge that participants had already mastered. Some participants had attended similar training, written articles, or even published scholarly works. Under these baseline conditions, the instrument had low sensitivity for detecting growth after the training. Improvement among participants who had already scored 14 or 15 was nearly impossible to observe, even if they developed in more complex areas such as formulating problems, constructing arguments, integrating data, or improving coherence in their writing.

Second, differences in the number of participants and inconsistent identifiers made comparisons across the full groups susceptible to composition bias. Participants with certain baseline scores may not have completed the posttest, while some posttest respondents had no corresponding baseline data. This is evident from the fact that only nine matched pairs could be identified. The decline in the mean may therefore have been influenced by who completed the posttest rather than solely by changes in knowledge resulting from the training. Using the same participant codes from the outset is essential for ensuring that subsequent evaluations accurately represent individual change.

Third, a multiple-choice evaluation captures only a small portion of the program outcomes. The objectives of the community service program were not limited to declarative knowledge about article structure; they also included the ability to formulate instructional problems, prepare proposals or Classroom Action Research, produce article drafts, revise them based on feedback, and prepare manuscripts for publication. These are performance-based abilities and are more appropriately measured through portfolios, draft-quality rubrics, mentoring progress notes, and completed products. Therefore, pretest and posttest scores should be treated as preliminary indicators rather than the sole measure of success.

Although the data did not show an improvement in cognitive scores, the program remains highly relevant to the partner's needs. The situational analysis indicated that teachers had rich instructional experience but still required support to document it scientifically and disseminate it through professional communities. Training and mentoring provided a systematic framework for transforming classroom experience into research problems, reflective data, and scholarly outputs. More substantive program impacts are expected to emerge gradually through the quality of drafts, consistency of writing activities, establishment of a teacher-writer group, and successful publication, rather than solely through immediate score changes after a single training session.



Figure 2. Teachers' active participation during the scientific writing mentorship session.

Figure 2 documents the teachers' active engagement during the mentorship session. Participants followed the presentation, used digital devices to access supporting materials, and responded to the ongoing discussion. This involvement is an important process outcome because developing scholarly writing competence requires sustained participation, opportunities to exchange classroom experiences, and continued guidance in transforming instructional practices into structured manuscripts.

4.6. Evaluation Implications and Follow-Up

Based on these results, the next stage of evaluation should improve the instruments, participant identification, measurement timing, and achievement indicators. The instruments should use more challenging and equivalent pretest and posttest items, including case-based questions that ask participants to identify weaknesses in article structure, improve problem formulations, or assess the alignment of methods with research objectives. The answer key must be verified by more than one team member and pilot-tested before being used on a digital platform. Each participant should use the same identification code so that all data can be analyzed in matched pairs.

The posttest should not be administered only immediately after the training; it should also be supplemented with a retention test after participants have completed the mentoring process. In addition, the assessment should include product indicators such as completeness of draft structure, accuracy of problem formulation, methodological consistency, quality of discussion, citation accuracy, and manuscript readiness for submission. An analytic rubric can be applied to both initial and revised drafts so that skill development can be observed objectively. These data can then be combined with attendance, participation in discussions, participant feedback, and the number of completed works.

With these improvements, program success can be assessed more comprehensively in accordance with the objectives of the community service activity. The preliminary conclusion from the available data is that an increase in knowledge was not detected; however, this result was strongly influenced by the ceiling effect, differences among respondents, and scoring anomalies. Continued mentoring, product-based assessment, and the establishment of a teacher-writer community are key steps for ensuring that acquired

knowledge develops into writing skills and instructional innovations that can be documented and disseminated.

5. CONCLUSION

The conclusion should summarize the main findings of the community service program and highlight its contribution to addressing the problems identified within the target community. The authors should briefly present the program's principal results and explain how it contributed to improving knowledge, skills, awareness, or other aspects relevant to the community. The conclusion must directly relate to the program objectives and emphasize the significance and impact of the activities that were implemented. The authors may also provide brief recommendations for future community service initiatives or potential improvements to similar programs in other contexts. The conclusion should be concise and must not repeat the detailed explanations presented in the preceding sections.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank the Faculty of Education, Jakarta State University, for funding this community service activity through the 2026 Faculty Leading Areas scheme, contract number 222/PPK-FIP/KONTRAK-P2M/III/2026. Thanks are also expressed to the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM) of Jakarta State University for administrative support and validation of the implementation of this activity. The author would also like to thank the Principal of SDN Pondok Bambu 06, East Jakarta, along with the teacher council and the entire school community, for their willingness to be partners and contribute actively throughout the implementation of the activities.

7. REFERENCES

- Adri, H. T., Fauziah, R. S. P., Suherman, I., Sesrita, A., Indra, S., Syamsudin, D., & Sudjani, D. H. (2022). Persepsi Guru Sekolah Dasar Terhadap Penelitian Tindakan Kelas Untuk Karir Profesional. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan MH Thamrin*, 6(2), 80–89.
- Handayani, O. D., Sumantri, M. S., & Dhieni, N. (2023). Pelaksanaan Pendidikan Profesi Guru (PPG) dalam peningkatan kompetensi pedagogik pendidik PAUD. *Jurnal Ilmiah Potensia*, 8(1), 1–11.
- Karolčík, Š., & Marková, M. (2025). How teachers perceive innovations in education. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 18(1), 39–55.
- Kiriana, I. N., & Widiasih, N. N. S. (2023). Implementasi Rapor Pendidikan dalam meningkatkan kualitas pendidikan nasional. *Widya Accarya*, 14(2), 156–164.
- Latifah, N., MS, Z., Sumantri, M. S., & Setiawan, B. (2023). Elementary School Teachers' Perceptions of Indonesian Elementary School Textbooks: A Case Study. *Journal of Higher Education Theory & Practice*, 23(1).

- Muspiroh, N., Kusmawan, U., & Sumantri, M. S. (2022). Professional learning community efforts in building scientific literacy skills of Islamic primary school teachers. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 2468(1), 060030.
- Nisa, K., Sumantri, M. S., & Kurniawan, M. B. (2024). Inovasi Guru dalam Menciptakan Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia yang Kreatif dan Menyenangkan. *NIZHAMIYAH*, 14(1), 38–56.
- Paniagua, A., & Istance, D. (2018). *Teachers as designers of learning environments the importance of innovative pedagogies*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
- Rathert, S., & Okan, Z. (2015). Writing for publication as a tool in teacher development. *Elt Journal*, 69(4), 363–372.
- Ritonga, M., Syafaruddin, S., Tolentino, T., Hasibuan, K., Hasibuan, M., & Hasibuan, S. B. (2022). Peningkatan Pemahaman Dosen Terhadap Strategi Penulisan Dan Publikasi Artikel. *INTEGRITAS: Jurnal Pengabdian*, 6(1), 34–44.
- Rohmatulloh, H., Damashita, F. A., Jannah, F. A., Trihantoyo, S., & Nuphanudin, N. (2024). Upaya Sekolah dalam Meningkatkan Profesionalisme Guru di SMPN 4 Sidoarjo. *Pubmedia Jurnal Penelitian Tindakan Kelas Indonesia*, 1(3), 11.
- Setiadi, I. (2020). Upaya peningkatan pemahaman guru dalam menyusun laporan ptk melalui pembimbingan terfokus dengan pendekatan Kolaboratif. *Jurnal Kajian Pembelajaran Dan Keilmuan*, 4(1), 72–80.
- Sumantri, M. S., Edwita, E., Abustang, P. B., Wijaya, S., Triana, H., & Jayadi, J. (2024). Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat melalui Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka bagi Guru di Pulau Tunda. *Jurnal Pengabdian Pada Masyarakat*, 9(2), 312–319.
- Sumantri, M. S., Prayuningtyas, A. W., Rachmadtullah, R., & Magdalena, I. (2018). The roles of teacher-training programs and student teachers' self-regulation in developing competence in teaching science. *Advanced Science Letters*, 24(10), 7077–7081.
- Sumantri, M. S., & Whardani, P. A. (2017). Relationship between Motivation to Achieve and Professional Competence in the Performance of Elementary School Teachers. *International Education Studies*, 10(7), 118–125.
- Ulma, D. R., Hidayah, D. F., Aisyah, R., Taufiqoh, U., Junjunan, H., & Mufaroj, R. Z. (2023). Mengembangkan Kesadaran Guru tentang Pentingnya Refleksi Diri Melalui Penelitian Tindakan Kelas. *Jurnal Kreativitas Mahasiswa*, 2(1), 1–12.
- Wulansari, A., Kusumaningrum, W. R., & Arochman, T. (2022). Pendampingan pengelolaan jurnal berbasis open journal system untuk publikasi ilmiah guru di kabupaten magelang. *Kumanula: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 5(3), 474.