JOALL (JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND LITERATURE)
Vol. 8 No. 1, February 2023
ISSN (print): 2502-7816; ISSN (online): 2503-524X
Available online at https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/index.php/joall/article/view/21997
https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v8i1.21997

Getting published in international journals: Perception of Indonesian scholars in linguistics and language education on the issues they face

[1]Zifirdaus Adnan, [2]Bambang Kaswanti Purwo

[1]University of New England, AUSTRALIA
Elm Avenue, Armidale NSW 2351

[2]Atmajaya Catholic University of Jakarta, INDONESIA
Jalan Jenderal Sudirman RT 02 RW 04 No 51, Karet Semanggi, Jakarta 12930

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received: June 6, 2022
Revised: July 18, 2022
Accepted: Oct 8, 2022

Keywords:
research-article
international journal
multicultural scholars
research context

Conflict of interest:
None

Funding information:
Directorate of Research, Technology and Community Service of DIKTI 2019

Correspondence:
Safnil Arsyad, English Education Postgraduate Program of the Education Faculty of the University of Bengkulu Bengkulu, INDONESIA
safnil@unib.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Developing countries, including Indonesia, have considered publishing research articles (RAs) in international journals (IJs) increasingly crucial. For the Indonesian Government, publishing RAs in international journals is vital to increase its competitive power academically as Indonesian universities are entering a global competition to attract students. Therefore, publishing RAs in international journals is becoming more and more important, e.g. for promotion, especially at senior levels. This study reports on the second and most widespread national-level survey of a three-year project funded by the former Indonesian Government through its Ministry of Research and Higher Education (MRHE). The central question is, "What are the key factors contributing to their lack of international research publications making the number low compared to smaller nations such as Thailand (before 2017)". This article reports the results of the second survey, with a much bigger population sample from many more universities located in many more regions covering all the major islands in Indonesia than the first survey reported in our previous article. The bigger data size is important based on the premise that the broader and the more diverse the information sources, the more comprehensive the information will be and the better understanding we gain. Some of the findings support the past results, but some are different from them.

How to cite (APA Style):
Adnan, Z., Purwo, B.K. (2023). Getting published in international journals: Perception of Indonesian scholars in linguistics and language education on the issues they face. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, 8(1), 19-40. **https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v8i1.21997**

Publishing research articles (RAs) in international journals (IJs) has been considered increasingly crucial by developing countries, including Indonesia. Such publication is essential both for research and practical reasons. For research, it is to expand knowledge and increase their researchers' participation in world academic conversation as they can contribute 'unique' perspectives specific to their social, cultural and political contexts. Personally, publishing in reputable international journals could boost one's academic career. However, getting their article published in a reputable international journal is a complex and difficult task to do. For academics from developing countries, often termed 'multi-lingual scholars' (MLSs), whose native language is not English and they were not under British rule, Commonwealth countries, the task of preparing a RA and getting it published in an English-language international journal become even more difficult due to weak English and unfamiliar academic traditions and expectations. Therefore, a high number of academics from different countries have studied the issue to discover the factors contributing to the issue, yielding numerous RAs, book chapters and books, which are impossible to review all in RA literature review. Hence, only some key RAs, and the most recent ones, will be reviewed, with more coverage on publications on RAs related to Indonesia.

A critical study was published by Salager-Meyer (2008), who looks at the sources of many of the difficulties from a postcolonial perspective, initially proposed by Edward Said (1977, 1993). A key theoretical assumption of this perspective is that even though most of the formerly colonized countries, called the oriental countries or 'the East' have declared their independence, they are not completely free from the control of their former colonial masters, termed 'the West', including the West European countries, especially the Anglo-American countries, which have a more significant amount of power to dominate the East economically and culturally. With such a superior power, the West defines the world consciousness, whereas the East is portrayed as 'mysterious'. In contrast, the West is defined as 'logical, cultured and normal' and, therefore, is the model to be followed. Regarding research and its publication, the West, especially the Anglo-American countries, also dominate and have been dubbed as the 'Centre' of knowledge production, while the East, developing countries, are a 'Periphery' with implications including setting the rules and standards. In her analysis, Salager Myer argues that scholars from peripheral countries face enormous challenges to meet those rules and standards to be able to publish in a 'Centre' journal. Many other researchers also found the funding issue and other similar challenges. Another major publication, a review of 39 studies on the issue, Uzuner (2008) also cites funding problems besides English language problems, failure to comply with the standard style of international academic writing, the time-consuming and

laborious nature of writing for publication in English, lack of interaction with members of the main academic groups, and possible bias against multilingual researchers' submission are all factors that have been reported. The issue of lack of funding to carry out studies was also cited by Man et al. (2004). More recent studies on MLSs from other peripheral countries have also been published, for example, from India (Lahiri, 2011), Poland (Lopaciuk-Gonczaryk, 2016), Iran (Maniati & Jalilifar, 2018), Mainland China (Mu, 2019), from Indonesia by Arsyad et al. (2019), Adnan et al. (2021) and from Taiwan (Chien, 2019).

A concept closely related to post-colonialism, promoted by the West, is neoliberalism, which propagates 'competition' through a free market, less government subsidy for its people, zero tariffs, etc. The Indonesian government seems to have been a follower of this concept, stressing that Indonesian scholars have to publish in reputable international journals because publishing RAs in international journals is important to increase Indonesia's international academic competitive power. This is because Indonesian universities are entering a global competition to attract students and academics to improve the quality of tertiary education. This point is stated in the Grand National Research Plans (RIRN) and the Academic Promotion Guidelines (*Pedoman Operasional Penilaian Angka Kredit Kenaikan Jabatan Akademik/Pangkat Dosen)* both published by the Ministry of Research and Higher Education (Ristekdikti) (2019). Therefore, publishing RAs in international journals is becoming more and more important for promotion, especially at senior levels. For example, a senior academic cannot gain a professorship without two international publications in a reputable journal, defined as being indexed in recognized international databases such as Scopus. The former Minister for Research, Technology and Higher Education, Mohammad Nasir, even threatened to suspend professorial allowances if the professors did not publish as expected. Even though a lowest rank academic is not required to publish in an international journal, publishing in such a journal can benefit their academic career sooner or later. It is because the more they publish internationally, the quicker they can go up the academic career ladder. An academic with many international RA publications can become a professor at a young age. The government also provides a financial incentive for each RA an academic publishes in a reputable international journal. In 2015 the financial incentive was increased to Rp100,000,000 or approximately US$6896 (Nursalikah, 2015). With such a strong push to increase RA publication in international journals for competition purposes, Indonesia falls into the trap of neoliberalism and post-colonialism, particularly the use of Scopus index as the only benchmark for quality recognized by the Ministry, which received strong criticism from many senior academics (Supriyatno, 2016) and parliamentarians (Sarnapi, 2019) as it is restrictive, preventing many senior academics from being promoted to a professorship. Eventually, this policy (of singling out the Scopus database) was

rightly abandoned. By 2018, other database indexes were recognized, including Web of Science. Nevertheless, Indonesia is still within the confinement of the post-colonial legacy provided by the West. It is encouraging, however, that the Ministry has developed its indexation frameworks to assess RAs and journals, which could be called 'Sinta Scientific Indexation' with six rates (Sinta1-Sinta 6), which better cater to the needs of Indonesian scholars, who cannot compete in the 'unbalanced' global competition system created in the West, due to poor funding and language issues as shown in the literature; even though the Ministry recognizes non-English-language journals, in reality, it is undeniable that these days the academic world is dominated by English. Although the presence of SINTA frameworks alleviates the publication burden for lower rank scholars as they accept publication in Indonesia language journals, generally, professors or those who aspire to become professors, still have to work hard to gain publication in English journals as there are not many Indonesian-language journals which have achieved the status of 'reputable international journal'.

Hence, the struggle of the Ministry to win in the 'unbalanced' international RA publication competition continues. By 2016, the number of Indonesian RAs in international journals indexed in Scopus was below smaller countries such as Thailand (Lukman et.al., 2016, KIS Paper, 2016). Hence, the Government stepped up its campaign to address the issue and took several significant moves. These include the merging of the DIKTI with the Ministry of Research and Technology (although this merger has been reversed by the current Government), the establishment of the Indonesian Research Fund, and the release of the first Grand Plan of National Research) 2016 known in Indonesia as RIRN. The moves seem to have significantly pushed up the number; that is, in 2019, it reached the highest number of RA publications among the ASEAN countries, taking over Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand, but according to Mohamad Nasir, the then Minister for Research, Technology and Higher Education, the quality is still in question (Seftiawan, 2019). The Indonesian number was boosted by conference proceedings considered lower in quality than refereed RAs (Redaksi Fin, 2019). Moreover, Indonesia has yet to catch up with other smaller countries in Asia and the Pacific countries, such as South Korea. Thus, the question "Why outputs of such a big country are low", remains. As well, relying too much on numbers alone has also been criticized in favour of the (direct) economic impact of research on the country. The government might need to consider this idea seriously due to depleting economic resources.

Many studies have looked at research and publishing in Indonesia, and the influence of the unequal rivalry is obvious. They all mention a lack of financial issues, barriers connected to legislation and laws, an expansive attitude toward research, and university rules and procedures. Policy and regulatory studies examine how government policies and regulations stifle

research and discourage academics from undertaking it. Nielsen (2010), for example, analyzed and contrasted policies and regulations in economically rising nations like Indonesia, such as Brazil, Malaysia, and Singapore. They discovered that research funding in Indonesia is insufficient and well below the desired level, at only 0.08 per cent of the national domestic product (NDB), compared to a benchmark of roughly 1%. Researchers will find it challenging to secure adequate financing to do a significant study with this amount. The study also discovered that the rule is overly restrictive, making it extremely difficult to get funds and generate results when the research is done. Meeting regulatory standards is quite tricky, especially when writing and publishing high-quality material.

McCarthy and Ibrahim (2010), who looked at the elements that influence the growth of social sciences, came to similar conclusions. They discovered problems on three scales: macro, *meso* (middle), and micro (individual). They discovered that the Indonesian government lacked a national structure for sponsoring and producing high-quality research and a financial incentive to do so. They also discovered that financial concerns, such as academics' too-low salaries, drove them to engage in a greater number of non-research activities to augment their income, for example, working as a consultant or a teacher outside of their university. Other concerns include the lack of long-term support for research facilities and the lack of job security in research occupations at the individual level. Similarly, Karetji (2010), who examined the knowledge sector in Indonesia from a wider perspective, discovered another financing issue: the Government's preference for technology and engineering over other areas. He also discovered a problem with the need for a defined career path for academics and a disconnect between research and government policy.

Because all of the studies mentioned above indicate a shortage of research funding, Brodjonegoro and Greene investigated the topic and discovered that challenges in obtaining funds and rigidity in reporting systems are substantial barriers to high-quality research. As a result, they argued for the foundation of the 'Dana Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia' (DIPI), or the Indonesian Research Fund, which has since received official funding. The effectiveness of this funding system remains to be seen. Despite the Minister of Research and Higher Education's acknowledgment of the issue of insufficient financing and his vow to enhance it, funding for the 2017 fiscal year was cut, meaning other areas still appear to be more significant than research.

Two research projects are being executed. One is carried out by the University of Indonesia in collaboration with the Centre for Innovation Policy and Governance, which is funded by the Global Development Network. This research is an investigation into Indonesian research reform. The macro, meso (middle), and micro (individual) levels of research are examined in this study,

which focuses on social sciences. It looks at seven case studies from Indonesian provinces such as Aceh and Papua. This study looks at government policy and regulation at the macro level, how universities interpret policy and regulation and build their strategy and management, and how these middle-level rules and regulations affect individual researchers at universities at the micro level. The Indonesian Science Academy (AIPI) is conducting the other study, which is funded by an Australian-Indonesian collaboration called Knowledge Sector Initiative (KIS) (Nugroho et al., 2016). This research is titled 'Buku Putih Pendidikan Tinggi' (the White Book of Higher Education), and it focuses on the subject of Indonesia's mono-disciplinary or 'linearity' approach to research vs the multi-disciplinary approach. This research has yet to be published anywhere. Nonetheless, the consultative group of these two research projects indicated that the investigations should include conceptual and philosophical difficulties and provide a suitable solution to modify the constraining factors, according to Nugroho et al. (2016). The concerns previously recognized in prior studies, such as the discrepancy between research and practice, are among the issues to be explored.

As previously said, these studies look into structural and environmental issues inhibiting those universities from doing research. While these studies help identify the problems associated with poor research outputs, there is still much more work to be done, for instance, to consider the difficulties that individual researchers encounter in writing and publishing their studies. When academics have boosted their research output, what should they do next? Many research projects funded by the Ministry of Education were already completed in the past. However, the low number of publications published in international journals shows that much of the work is still unpublished. It's difficult to say how many government-funded research projects haven't been published in international journals, but the Minister of Research and Higher Education's comments suggest that the number is not insignificant. According to Nugroho et al. (2016), the key causes are the restricted quantity of funds available and the short amount of time available. This implies, the projects' only output is reports sent to the respective universities and funding sources. More recently, Cargill et al. (2017) trained a group of Indonesian university senior academics from the Agricultural Institute of Bogor, West Java, who discovered issues similar to those of previous researchers. However, just a few Indonesian academics were involved in the research.

The above studies are informative regarding external obstacles to carrying out research and publishing, mainly in terms of policies, and funding, involving a small number of participants and 'Java centric'. What is lacking is research on the internal issues with the academics themselves from their perspectives, as they perceive them, e.g. their knowledge and skills to write internationally acceptable RAs, their attitudes, and the obstacles that inhibit

them from writing RAs and publishing in international journals (IJs), involving a much larger number of participants from outside Java, especially the central and eastern Indonesia. With the concentration of studies on western parts of Indonesia, mainly in Java, we need information regarding the situation in other areas, particularly in central and eastern parts of Indonesia. This study addresses this information gap.

The purpose of this study was to address the main question, "What are the reasons for the lack of international research publications by Indonesian scholars?" involving participants not only from western Indonesia but also from central and eastern Indonesia. Hence, this study promised a great potential to reveal information from these parts of Indonesia to address the issue. Specific questions accompanied the central question as below.

1) What key factors inhibit Indonesian MLSs from publishing in IJs?
2) How do these factors work together to lead to non-publication? What are the attitudes of Indonesian researchers regarding publication in international journals whose editorial teams are mostly non-Indonesians?
3) How do they perceive their research compared to the studies by researchers in developed countries such as Australia, the UK and the United States of America?
4) What are the most effective ways to make researchers publish in reputable international journals?

METHOD

As stated earlier, this article is the second report of a three-year project. This whole project employed a mixed method to address the research questions with a high degree of rigour, namely, quantitative and qualitative methods. This paper, however, reports mainly the results of an expanded form of the survey conducted previously. The results of this (previous) research were reported in another article (Adnan et al., 2021). The quantitative method employed a national survey and statistical analyses with the assumption that the statistical tool of analyses can analyze and reduce the complex and massive amount of data to patterns that can be further analyzed. This type of data analysis is necessary because the survey for this second paper attracted 206 participants who completed the survey. The survey asked detailed questions developed from the main and specific questions presented earlier.

Data Analysis Procedure

As in the first survey, the study was conducted with high reliability and validity. Reliability means to what extent we minimize errors so that the results are credible. To ensure reliability, the team employed two levels of data analysis. These are a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and a confirmatory factorial analysis (CFA), which are part of the SPSS statistical package. The

purpose of PCA is to discover patterns in a large amount of large and complex data. The PCA statistical analysis instrument isolates the 'error'. So, we can take only the 'valid' one. The CFA was conducted to confirm or otherwise the components (factors) we found in the PCA. This is followed by the final review, interpretation and analysis.

In short, the main steps of the statistical analysis include 1. Computing the responses into the SPSS statistic, where the PCA method is housed; 2. Conducting the data reduction analysis to find the principal components or factors, conducting the CFA, reviewing the steps and the results, and interpreting them.

FINDINGS

The central purpose of this project was to discover the factors contributing to the issue of lack of RA publication. Indonesian multilingual scholars in language-related disciplines, including Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, and Language Education, have a low quantity of RAs published in reputable international journals (IJs). As stated earlier, the 206 returned responses were analyzed using the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and CFA (Confirmation Factorial Analysis) statistical applications. The PCA is the first-level analysis, and the CFA is the second-level of analysis, a more rigorous analysis to confirm, or otherwise, the results of the first analysis. Except for the KMO and Barlett's Tests and data reduction analysis, only the CFA analysis results will be presented in this article for three reasons. First, they are the most reliable results; second is the limitation of journal space; finally, some of the results are similar to avoid repetition.

The Results of the PCA

The statistical analyses yielded results presented in two key tables. The tables are as follows. Table 1 reveals KMO and Barlett's Test results; Table 2 shows the overall results of the data reduction procedure.

The Results of the KMO and Barlett's Tests

The results of both tests are good, meeting all the conditions required by the statistical analysis. Statistically, the requirements are that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling result has to be larger than point five (>0.5), and the significance of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity should be 0.05 (5%) or lower. The data meet all these requirements after a KMO and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity analysis or 'Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA)' as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of KMO and Bartlett's test of sphericity analyses

	The KMO and Bartlett's Tests	
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		**0.788**
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2722.791
	df	406.000
	Sig.	0.000

As Table 1 shows, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling result is 0.788, which is significantly higher than 0.5, and the significance of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is 0.00, also lower than 0.05. This means that the factorial analyses could be continued.

These results are higher than the results found in the first survey due to the increase in the population sample size. For example, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (0.788) was higher than that of the first survey, which was 0.595, and the value of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is also better, that is, 2722.791 versus 1154.175 both with the significance of 0.00. Logically, it should also increase the credibility of the results.

The Results of the Data (Variable) Reduction Procedure

The overall results of the data reduction analysis are presented in Table 2. Before examining the contents of Table 2, it is necessary to understand its structure. In the far left column, 'Initial EVs' contained the Eigenvalues of all the components, and the results of the data reduction process, including those with a value below one. Extraction Sums of 'Squared Loadings' present the extraction process results, which discard the components with below one value and retain those with values greater than one (to be eligible as a component). 'Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings' shows the results after the rotation process. The key figures to consider in these columns are those under 'Cumulative variance' as it indicates the explanatory power of the data. Now let us examine the results.

Table 2 shows that the data reduction procedure yielded ten components, but only eight components have greater than one EVs. These components may be classified as independent factors closely correlated with the dependent variable, i.e. lacking in the publication of RAs, with different degrees of significance as indicated by the different EVs; the higher the EV, the higher the correlation is. In other words, the higher the EV of a component, the higher the contribution of the component in explaining the issue in question. Thus, in the 'Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings' column, only the eight retained components figures were further analyzed; the rest (Components #9 and #10) were not considered.

Table 2. The results of the data reduction procedure

Total variance explained									
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extract of sum square loadings			Rotation sums of square loadings		
Com-ponent	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5,906	21,094	21,094	5,906	21,094	21,094	4,039	14,427	14,427
2	5,020	17,929	39,023	5,020	17,929	39,023	3,570	12,748	27,175
3	2,064	7,373	46,396	2,064	7,373	46,396	2,708	9,672	36,847
4	1,649	5,888	52,284	1,649	5,888	52,284	2,427	8,667	45,514
5	1,522	5,434	57,718	1,522	5,434	57,718	1,985	7,088	52,602
6	1,260	4,500	62,218	1,260	4,500	62,218	1,717	6,133	58,736
7	1,097	3,919	66,137	1,097	3,919	66,137	1,611	5,752	64,488
8	1,041	3,718	69,855	1,041	3,718	69,855	1,503	5,367	69,855
9	.847	3,024	72,879						
10	.799	2,854	75,733						

One key point in this table (Table 2) is the 'The total cumulative percentage of the variance' (the last line of the far-right column) because it indicates the explanatory power or the contribution the total components make to the dependent variable. This percentage is 69.855 which is also significantly higher than the 55.560 found in the first survey, suggesting that the significant increase in the size of the population and the fact that they come from many more tertiary educations across Indonesia improves the explanatory strength of the data. The other notable figures are in the column '% of Variance' as these figures indicate the respective contribution of each component to the central issue under question. They will be referred to when discussing the CFA results.

The Results of the CFA

The eight components found in the (PCA) data reduction analysis were statistically re-analyzed to confirm the components, the variables and their respective Eigenvalues (EVs). The results are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Table 3 summarises the results of the CFM of the components with their respective variables identified in the statistic procedure with 'codes of analysis' (First column). These results are clarified by providing the names of the components (factors) and their variables with their respective Eigen value and ranked in Table 4. These results were further analyzed to group them according to the commonality of the variables, as well as the degree of the contribution of each variable to the component. Chapter 5 provides the summary of the results of the grouping analysis, the components in each group, as well the degree of the

contribution of each variable relative to the component (Eigenvalue) and the name of each variable. Hence, this table presents the complete summary of the outcomes of the analyses of the CFA results.

The Results of the CFA Data Reduction Analysis

As shown in Table 3, we found eight components associated with the issue in question (the dependent variable), as presented in Columns 1 to 8. These components were named and presented with their rankings and variables with their respective eigenvalue in Table 4. As shown in Table 4, the components are Component 1 (Column 1), knowledge and understanding of the purposes of publishing RAs in IJs; Component 2, the inhibiting factor one: Lack of self-confidence; Component 3, the inhibiting factor two: Lack of knowledge and skills to produce RAs that meet the standards of IJs; Component 4, solution one: Improving knowledge and skills through learning; Component 5, inhibiting factor tree: Negative attitudes against international journals (IJs); Component 6, solution 2: Improving skills and productivity through practice and external assistance; Component 7, Inhibiting factor 4: Ineffective and/or Inadequate external encouragement and support; Component 8, positive attitude regarding publication. This result forms an interesting finding because we have four more components playing roles compared to those found in Survey 1 (reported in the previous article) (Adnan et al., 2021).

Interestingly, this finding suggests that the issue in question is more complex than what we found in Survey 1. This shows the importance of broadening and diversifying the sample of the data sources from only 72 respondents from five universities to 206 and from many more universities across Indonesia.

Table 3. The Results of the CFA with Eigenvalues

	Rotated Component Matrix(a)							
	Components							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Codes of analysis #11 (CoA)	.934							
CoA#12	.934							
CoA#13	.879							
CoA#14	.879							
CoA#15	.563							
CoA#21		.872						
CoA#22		.864						
CoA#23		.759						
CoA#24		.739						
CoA#25		.574						
CoA#31			.720					

Rotated Component Matrix(a)								
	Components							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
CoA#32			.714					
CoA#33			.697					
CoA#35			.632					
CoA#34			.575					
CoA#41				.763				
CoA#42				.739				
CoA#43				.704				
CoA#44				.600				
CoA#51					.722			
CoA#52					.707			
CoA#53					.689			
CoA#61						.896		
CoA#62						.712		
CoA#71							.808	
CoA#72							.729	
CoA#82								.794
CoA#81								.728
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.								
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.								
a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.								

Therefore, it supports the basic principle of research that the larger the data size, the closer we are to the true situation in the Indonesian academic population.

Table 4 The summary of the analyses of the components (factors) and their variables with their respective Eigen value and their rankings

FACTORS/COMPONENTS	CODES OF STATISTICAL ANALISIS (CoA)	VARIABLES	Eigen Value
Component 1- Knowledge and understanding of the purposes of publication in international journals (IJs)	#11	To improve self-good reputation	.934
	#12	To gain credits for promotion	.934
	#13	To gain self-satisfaction atau pride	.879
	#14	To improve the reputation of the institution (own Department/faculty and university)	.879
	#15	To gain financial incentive	.563
Component 2- Inhibiting factor 1:	#21	I am not confident with my analytical skills. My research output does not meet the criteria of Ijs.	.872

FACTORS/COMPONENTS	CODES OF STATISTICAL ANALISIS (CoA)	VARIABLES	Eigen Value
Lack of self-confidence	#22	I am not confident that my RA would be accepted because the quality is not equivalent to international research articles.)	.864
	#23	I am afraid that the quality of my RA is too low.	.759
	#24	I am afraid if my manuscript is not accepted by the editor and reviewer of an international journal	.739
	#25	The quality of my research is inadequate [for a reputable international journal	.574
Component 3 Inhibiting factor 2: Lack of knowledge and skills to produce RAs that meet the standards of IJs.	#31	I do not know the format of an international research article.)	.720
	#32	I don't have adequate knowledge regarding the publication of how to publish research articles in reputable international journals.)	.714
	#33	International references are inadequate in the library.	.697
	#34	Writing a research article for a reputable international journal is too difficult for me.	.632
	#35	My English is too weak to write publishable articles.	.575
Component 4 Solution 1: Improving knowledge and skills through learning.	#41	Meningkatkan kemampuan Improve knowledge and skills. (I need to improve my knowledge and skills.)	.763
	#42	I need to study the format of articles acceptable to international journals, e.g. from guidebooks to RA writing, and the like.	.739
	#43	I need to frequently attend workshops on publication in reputable international journals.	.704
	#44	I need to request mentoring by a successful academic.	.600
Component 5 Inhibiting factor 3: Negative attitudes against International journals (IJs)	#51	I am not interested in reputable international journals.	.722
	#52	Reputable [international] journals are not needed as they only make trouble in life.	.707
	#53	I don't like reputable international journals as they have become a tool by advanced countries to control other countries.	.689

FACTORS/COMPONENTS	CODES OF STATISTICAL ANALISIS (CoA)	VARIABLES	Eigen Value
Component 6 Solution 2: Improving skills and productivity through practice and external assistance	#61	Write articles in Indonesian and then ask a translator to translate them into English.	.896
	#62	I need to write as many RAs as possible (even though in Indonesian) to be published in nationally accredited journals).	.712
Component 7 Inhibiting factor 4: Ineffective and/or Inadequate external encouragement and support.	#71	Patchy support from own university in terms of finance and facilities, e.g. international references (recent RAs from IJs., books etc.) despite rhetorical encouragement.	.808
	#72	Support from RistekDikti seems available but Inadequate and/or ineffective due to various reasons, including being unknown to some, too complicated to access, no journals, and lack of info (lack of socialization).	.729
Component 8 Positive Attitude regarding publication	#81	Very happy if I could publish, but I do not have the capacity to do it.)	.794
	#82	I want to, but I do not have the time to do it due to many other Tasks).	.728

The results of the interpretation and grouping analyses

As presented in Table 5, Column 1, based on the interpretation of the commonalities of the variables within each component, another interesting fact was found that the components had to be classified into three groups. Group 1, the 'Inhibiting factors' influencing the dependent variable ('lack of RA publication in IJs'); Group 2, The solution to the issue in question (the independent variable) and Group 3, The motivating factors.

Table 5 The summary of the grouping analysis of the components (factors) and their combined Eigenvalues

Group names	Names of Components (factors)	The degree of the group influence is based on the combined % rates of the variance (see Table 2, Column 6 from left)
Group 1 The inhibiting factors	Component 2-Inhibiting factor 1: Lack of self-confidence; Component 3 Inhibiting factor 2: Lack of knowledge and skills to produce RAs that meet the standards of IJs; Component 5 Inhibiting factor 3: Negative	33.93%

Group names	Names of Components (factors)	The degree of the group influence is based on the combined % rates of the variance (see Table 2, Column 6 from left)
	attitudes against International journals (IJs); Component 7 Inhibiting factor 4: Ineffective and/or Inadequate external encouragement and support.	
Group 2 The Motivating factors	Component 1- Knowledge and understanding of the purposes of publication in international journals (IJs); Component 8 Positive Attitude regarding publication.	24.81%
Group 3 The solutions	Component 4 Solution 1: Improving knowledge and skills through learning; Component 6 Solution 2: Improving skills and productivity through practice and external assistance	11.32%

Each of these groups offers more important findings, so each is discussed concerning the research questions below.

From Table 5, we can identify three more interesting new findings different from those in Survey 1. The first and the most important one as far as the main research question is that we found four components inside Group 1: the inhibiting factors, i.e. Component 2-Inhibiting factor 1: Lack of self-confidence; Component 3 Inhibiting factor 2: Lack of knowledge and skills to produce RAs that meet the standards of IJs; Component 5 Inhibiting factor 3: Negative attitudes against International journals (IJs); Component 7 Inhibiting factor 4: Ineffective and/or Inadequate external encouragement and support. This total number of components is twice the number found in Survey 1 (two components), but none of them has the highest position in terms of the percentage of variance as we found in Survey 1. The highest position in the current study is occupied by Component *Knowledge and understanding of the purposes of publishing RAs in IJs*.

However, with the four components in Group 1, the inhibiting factors are still the most dominant in influencing the dependent variable because if their rates of covariance *(See Table 2)* are combined, they form a much higher figure, i.e. 33.926% (17,929 + 7,373 + 5.434 + 3.19 = 33.926%), compared to 21.094% for *Knowledge and understanding of the purposes of publishing RAs in IJs*, suggesting they account more for the dependent variable. This suggests that although a considerable percentage of the scholars clearly understand the purpose and benefits of publishing their RAs in IJs, the inhibiting factors, as a

group, are still dominant in influencing them to not publish RAs. In other words, no matter how strong the awareness of the objects and benefits is, for the majority of the participants, more is needed to beat the inhibiting factors. Even after combining this component with the other potentially motivating component, Component Component 8, Positive attitude regarding publication, the inhibiting factors group still dominates/is more influential. Hence, this finding confirms the corresponding finding in Survey 1. This finding is surprising because most of the previous studies reviewed earlier, e.g. Karetji (2010), point to lack of funding as the dominant factor influencing the low quantity of RA publications by Indonesian scholars in international journals. The reason could be that the participants in previous studies on the issue mostly came from Java, mainly major universities, who tend to focus more on funding as an issue, not research skills and confidence, perhaps due to better access to training and research resources such as the library and the internet; while for the large number of scholars from outside Java who participated in the current study, lack access to such training and resources may be more prevalent. There is a variable that concerns inadequate financial support. However, it appears far below the rank in Component number seven (See Table 4), suggesting that it was not perceived as a strong influencer.

The second finding is that within the Inhibiting Factors Group, the variable 'Lack of self-confidence' (Table 3, CoA#21) is now having greater EVs exceeding 'The Lack of knowledge and skills to produce RAs that meet the standards of IJs' (CoA#22, EV.864). This factor was the most dominant among the inhibiting factors in Survey 1. This may be due to the serious extent of their perceived 'lack of knowledge and skills that has degraded the self-confidence of the majority of the participants from outside Java. Lack of training and resources may have contributed, too, as the adage that 'the fear of the unknown' may influence some people's perception.

DISCUSSION

As mentioned earlier, the components of this group, put together, are still the most dominant compared to the rest of the three groups as it has four different components, which form four underlying factors influencing the issue in question (dependent variable) (Table 5). The most dominant factor is Component 2, lack of self-confidence. This finding answer specific question number two. This component has five variables associated with it. The first and most important variable is '*I am not confident with my analytical skills*'. '*My research output does not meet the criteria of IJs*' because this variable gained the highest EV value of 0.872 (See Table 4, CoA#21). 'Lacking confidence in own skills' leads to lacking confidence in own research output, with the EV of 0.864, and this is followed by 'lacking in confidence to meet the criteria of an IJ including lacking in confidence their own RAs. The low confidence level was

worsened by the fear that their research would be rejected by editors or reviewers (CoAs #23, #24, respectively). Both are supported by a good level of EVs, 0.79 and 0.739, respectively, and these are further deteriorated by yet another expression of lack of confidence in the quality of own research, albeit with a lower EV of 0.69 (CoA#25). In short, the degree of self-confidence is terrible. This finding supports the hypothesis proposed in the National Grand Plan for research (*Rencana Induk Riset Nasional* or RIRN) that Indonesian academics lack confidence in their research and analysis. This factor confirms the finding of Arsyad et al. (2019). It is also in line with the finding of Brinn et al. (2001), indicating that British Accounting and Finance scholars were reluctant to send manuscripts to an accounting and finance journal in the USA, fearing rejection.

The second important factor perceived by the scholars as holding them back from publishing in IJs concerns 'Inhibiting factor 2: Lack of knowledge and skills to produce RAs that meet the standards of IJs'. The most critical variable that contributes to this factor (See Table 4) is a lack of knowledge regarding the format of an article in an international journal (CoA#31) with the highest EV of 0.872. This variable is followed by ignorance regarding how to publish in an IJ (CoA#22), with an EV of 0.864. The situation is worsened by a 'lack of international references', with an EV of 0.697. These references are necessary for the academics to be able to upgrade their knowledge and skills to prepare RAs and, more crucially, to conduct an up-to-date literature review to ensure that their papers contribute to the existing literature, e.g. by identifying a knowledge gap. The next variable, with the EV of 632, is an acknowledgment that writing a RA of international quality is too difficult. This variable is followed by the last variable contributing to this factor which is a statement that their English is too weak to write an RA article publishable in English. The variables making up this factor resemble the multiple issues raised by Salager-Meyer peripheral authors have to overcome when trying to publish internationally.

The third inhibiting factor is Negative attitudes against International journals (IJs). This finding is not found in the literature reviewed earlier. This component also seems marginal as it has a variance of 5.434% (Table 2), so it is not widespread amongst academics, and it is weaker than the positive attitude. However, it is worth explaining as it is not found in the literature. The variables, especially 'making trouble in life' and 'a tool by advanced countries to control other countries.' may be a negative response to the government's requirement that an RA be published in an IJ indexed in Scopus. Being indexed in Scopus is considered an important benchmark to measure the quality of an RA. Indeed there was a strong rejection by some academics for adopting such a policy in 2016, especially when the then Minister for Research, Technology and Higher Education, M. Nasir, threatened to stop the professorial allowance of a professor when they do not publish RAs as expected. For nationalist

academics, the requirement to publish in a Scopus-indexed journal might have been considered an insult to their pride as a nation. A result of the debate is the establishment of an Indonesian standard indexation called '*Sinta*'.

The fourth inhibiting factor is 'Ineffective and/or Inadequate external support'. This factor doesn't seem to play a very significant role as it attracts only a small percentage of variance, i.e. 5.919% and is ranked number seven amongst the components. It is associated with two variables. The first variable is 'Patchy support from own university in terms of finance and facilities, e.g. international references (recent RAs from IJs, books, etc.) despite rhetorical encouragement', with an EV of 0.808. This result is in line with the finding in many previous studies reviewed in the literature earlier e.g. (Karetji, 2010; Nielsen, 2010; McCarthy and Ibrahim, 2010), which also point to the issue of lack of financial support. The second variable is 'Support from RistekDikti seems available but inadequate and/or ineffective due to various reasons including unknown to some, too complicated to access, lack of info (lack of socialization)'. This variable suggests that the incentives provided by the Ministry are felt as something distant and not easy to gain. With such a low position in the ranks of the component and with an EV of 0.729, it does not play an important role. Some academics even suggested that the awarding is different from the announced criteria.

CONCLUSION

This research intended to find answers to one main question, which is "What are the key factors contributing to their lack of international research publications making the number low compared to smaller nations", accompanied by more specific questions concerning specific factors, self-confidence and solution to the problem. Surprisingly, the most dominant factors are not financial as found in the literature, but the lack of confidence and capacity to produce RAs that meet international standards. These inhibiting factors are backed up by two other factors, namely negative attitudes against international journals and publishing in them as well as inadequate support. The evidence for the presence of the dominant factors is strengthened by the scholars' suggested solutions, that is, the need to learn hard through self-learning, learning from others and a great deal of practice. Hence, the main reason for the low quantity of RAs in the fields selected for this study is not financial but lack of competence.

Nevertheless, a more probing qualitative investigation is still necessary, considering that all the components only accounted for slightly over 69,855% of the issue (Table 2, far-right column, last line). The rest may lay in the qualitative data, the interviews. The qualitative data analysis will be reported in another article.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT
We would like to thank the Ministry of Research and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia for funding this research.

REFERENCES

Adnan, Z. (2014). Prospects of Indonesian research articles (RAs) being considered for publication in 'centre' journals: a Comparative study of rhetorical patterns of RAs in selected humanities and hard sciences. In *Occupying Niches: Interculturality, Cross- culturality and Aculturality in Academic Research.* New York: Springer International Publishing.

Adnan, Z. (2009). Some Possible Problems for Indonesian Research Articles (RAs) when Submitted to International Journals. Asian EFL Journal, 11(1), n.p.

Adnan, Z., Arsyad, S, Purwo, B.K. (2021). Perceptions of Indonesian Multilingual Scholars about Preparing and Publishing Research Manuscripts in International Journals. *Studies in Language and Education*, 8 (1), 65-83.

Arsyad, S.; Purwo, B.K.; Sukamto, K.E.; Adnan, Z. (2019). Factors hindering Indonesian lecturers from publishing articles in reputable international journals. *Journal of English as a Foreign Language (JEFL)*, Vol 9, No. 1, 42-70.

Brinn, T; Jones, M and Pendlebury, M (2001). Why do UK accounting and finance academics not publish in top US journals? *British Accounting Review*, pp. 223–232.

Brodjonegoro, S., S. & Greene, M.P. (2012). Creating an Indonesian Research Fund. Retrieved from Scidev 28 October 2018. https://www.scidev.net/global/communication/columns /biomed-analysis-indonesia-needs-a-central-science-fund.html

Cargill, M., O'Connor, P., Raffiudin R., Sukarno. N., Juliandi. B., & Rusmana, I. (2017). Scientists publishing research in English from Indonesia: Analysing outcomes of a training intervention to inform institutional action. In Cargill, M., O'Connor, P. (2017). *Publishing Research in English as an Additional Language: Practices, Pathways and Potentials.* Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press.

Chan, Phil (2014) Introduction to factor analysis/ principal components analysis, including interpretation. SPSS for newbies: Exploratory factor analysis (principal components) https://www.youtube.com/ watch?v=x4GFIzKzf2.

Chien, S. (2019). Writing for scholarly publication in English for Taiwanese researchers in the field of English teaching. *SAGE Open*, 2019, Vol.9(3).Brinn, Tony; Jones, Michael and Pendlebury, Maurice (2001) Why do UK accounting and finance academics not publish in top U

journals? British Accounting Review, pp. 223–232.
Creswell, John W. (2009) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mix Method Approaches*, Los Angeles: Sage
Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. TESOL Quarterly, 38, 666–688.
Davies, C. a. S., C. . (2010). Mentoring a literature review. Retrieved from Melbourne: http://www.semannslattery.com.
Dian, S. S. (2014). Analisis Struktur Retorika dan F itur Linguistik Teks Bagian Pendahuluan Artikel Jurnal Penelitian Berbahasa Indonesia Dalam Bidang Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora. University of Bengkulu.
Flowerdew, J. (1999). Writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(2), 123–145.
Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. TESOL Quarterly, 34(1), 127–150.
Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to non-native-speaker contributions: An interview study. TESOL Quarterly, 35,121–150.
Glen, Stephanie (2019). Snowball Sampling: Definition, Advantages and Disadvantages. https://www.statisticshowto.datasciencecentral.com/snowball-sampling/. Accessed on12 November 2019.
Haemmerlie, Frances M. and Montgomery, Robert L. (1984) Purposefully Biased Interactions: Reducing Hetero-social Anxiety Through Self-Perception Theory. *Journal Personality and Social Psychology,* Vol. 47. No. 4.
Li, Y. (2002). Writing for international publication: The perception of Chinese doctoral researchers. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12, 179–193.
J.P. Man, J.G. Weinkaif, M. Tsang & D.D. Sin, (2004) Why do some countries publish more than others? An international comparison of research funding, English proficiency and publication output in highly ranked general medical journals, *European Journal of Epidemiology* **19**, pp. 811–817.
Patricia Jenkinson (2014) Perception Basics: Key Definitions and Stages in the Perceptual Process. Published on Jul 10, 2014; Accessed: 22 October 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1QdLu98P49
Tardy, C. (2005). "It's like a story": Rhetorical knowledge development in advanced academic literacy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4, 325–338.

Karetji, P. (2010). Overview of the Indonesian Knowledge Sector. Retrieved from (http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/indo-ks8-overview.pdf)

Kurniawan, B. (2017, 30 January 2017). Guru Besar yang Tidak Publikasi Karya Ilmiah Tidak Dapat Tunjangan (Professors who do not Publish Research Articles Will not Receive Allowances). *Detik* (A weekly magazine), p. 1. Retrieved from https://news.detik.com/berita/d-3408976/guru- besar-yang-tidak-publikasi-karya-ilmiah-tidak-dapat-tunjangan.

Lahiri, S. (2011). India-focused publications in leading international business journals *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol.28(2), pp.427-447.

Lopaciuk-Gonczaryk, B. (2016). Collaboration strategies for publishing articles in international journals - A study of Polish scientists in economics. *Social Networks*, Vol.44, p.50(14).

Maniati, M.; Jalilifar, A. (2018). Strategies for publishing in English journals: A study of the perceptions of Iranian scholars. *Learned Publishing*, October 2018, Vol.31(4), pp.355-365

Mu, C. (2019)(eBook). *Understanding Chinese Multi Scholars' Experiences of Writing and Publishing in English.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer.McCarthy, J. and I., Rustam. (2010). Review of Social Science Capacity BuildingSupport to Indonesia's Knowledge Sector. Jakarta: Ausaid, Jakarta. Retrieved from (http://dfat.gov.au/ about-us/publications/Documents/indo-ks9-socialscience.pdf).

Nielsen, G. (2010). Comparative Experiences of Middle-Income Countries. Jakarta: AusAID, Jakarta Retrieved from (http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/indo-ks10- comparative-experience.pdf).

Nugroho, Y. P., Budiati dan Ruhanawati, Siti (2016). Mengatasi Hambatan Penelitian di Universitas (Overcoming Research Obstacles in Universities). Retrieved from Jakarta: http://www.ksi-indonesia.org/files/ 1464160545$1$DYOBW$.pdf

Nursalikah, A. (2015). Artikel Ilmiah Tembus Internasional, Pemerintah Berikan Rp 100 Juta. *Republika* (Weekly newspaper, Jakarta).

Prabowo, D. (2016, 19-12-2016). Menteri M Nasir Klaim Angka Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah Meningkat Tahun 2016 (Minister M. Nasir claims the number of research article publications increased in 2016). *Kompas*, p. 1. Retrieved from http://nasional.kompas.com /read/2016/12/19/12350941/ menteri.m.nasir. klaim.angka.publikasi.jurnal.ilmiah.meningkat.tahun.2016

Quantitative Specialist (2014) Factor Analysis in SPSS (Principal Components Analysis) - Part 3 of 6 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v= fZ_R4Zs1AZo

Redaksi Fin. (2019). Kualitas Publikasi Ilmiah RI Masih Kalah dari Malaysia. *Fajar Indonesia*, 26 October 2019.

Rifai, M. A. (1995). Pegangan Gaya Penulisan, Penyuntingan dan Penerbitan Karya Ilmiah Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Ristekdikti (2019). *Pedoman Operasional Penilaian Angka Kredit Kenaikan Jabatan Akademik/Pangkat Dosen*. Jakarta: Ristekdikti

Ristekdikti. (2016a). *Rencana Induk Riset Nasional 2015-2045*. Jakarta: Ristekdikti.

Ristekdikti. (2016b). *Panduan Pelaksanaan Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat di Perguruan Tinggi.* Jakarta: Ristekdikti.

Ristekdikti. (2016c). *Pedoman Beasiswa Unggulan Dosen Indonesia Luar Negeri Tahun 2016.* Jakarta: Direktorat Kualifikasi Sumberdaya Manusia Direktorat Jenderal Sumber Daya Iptek danDikti, Ristekdikti.

Ristekdikti. (2017). *Panduan Pelaksanaan Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat di Perguruan Tinggi.* Jakarta: Ristekdikti.

Ristekdikti. (2017b). *Petunjuk Teknis Peraturan Menteri Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi, Nomor 20 Tahun 2017 Tentang Tunjangan Profesi Dosen dan Tunjangan Kehormatan Profesor*. Jakarta: Ristekdikti Retrieved from http://www.kopertis12.or.id/2017/02/21/petunjuk-teknis-permenristekdikti-no-20- tahun-2017.html.

Safnil. (2016a). Potential Problematic Rhetorical Style Transfer from First Language to Foreign Language: a Case of Indonesian Writing Research Article in English. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 11(3).

Said, E.W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, E. W. (1977). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.

Santoso, U. (2015, 7 May2015). Kriteria Jurnal Internasional Menurut Dikti. Retrieved from https://sivitasakademika.wordpress.com/2015/05/07/kriteria-jurnal-internasional- menurut-dikti/

Sarnapi (2020). Keliru Jika Syarat Publikasi Ilmiah Terindeks Scopus. *Pikiran Rakyat*, 26 February 2020.

Seftiawan, D. (2019). Jumlah Dosen dan Publikasi Ilmiah belum Sebanding. *Pikiran Rakyat*, 13 September, 2019.

Supriyatna, H. (2016). Antimainstream, ADRI Tolak Monopoli Indeks Jurnal Internasional. *Bhirawa Online*, 22 July 2020. Retreaved from Http://www.harianbhirawa.co.id/antimainstream-adri-tolah-monopoli-indeks-jurnal-internasional/

Wijanarko, Y. (2017, 15 January 2017). Menristekdikti Tuntut Unpad Tingkatkan Publikasi Ilmiah (Minister for Research, Technology and Higher Education Demands that Padjadjaran University Increases Scientific Publications, Headline news report. Pikiran Rakyat, p. 1. Retrieved from http://www.pikiran- rakyat.com/pendidikan/ 2017/01/15/menristekdikti-tuntut-unpad-tingkatkan-publikasi- ilmiah-390665