

Training on the Use of Mendeley for the International Scientific Writing Program of Schoolteachers in Bengkulu

Lina Tri Astuty Beru Sembiring¹⁾ | Suwarni²⁾ | Syaiful³⁾ | Iin Widya Ningsih⁴⁾ | Rozi Eka Putri⁵⁾ | Fhatur Ananda Sidiq⁶⁾

^{1,2,3,4,5,6}Universitas Dehasen Bengkulu

¹sembiringlina07@unived.ac.id | ²suwarni.h13@gmail.com | ³saipulbengkulu02@gmail.com |

⁴iinwidyabengkulu21@gmail.com | ⁵roziekaputri5@gmail.com | ⁶fhaturanandasidiq@gmail.com

Abstract: Accurately managing citations and references is crucial to writing international scholarly articles, yet it remains challenging for teachers unfamiliar with reference management software. This community service initiative aimed to improve teachers' citation-management competency through Mendeley training and to evaluate participants' technology acceptance and satisfaction. The program ran from May to June 2026. It involved 55 teachers from the International Scholarly Article Writing Training Group. It used a hybrid approach that combined face-to-face sessions at FKIP, Universitas Dehasen Bengkulu, with online mentoring via Zoom. Training covered Mendeley installation, reference and citation management, Microsoft Word integration, and technical troubleshooting. We measured cognitive competency using a one-group pretest–posttest design (12 items). We also assessed acceptance and satisfaction using a Likert questionnaire integrating the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Kirkpatrick's Reaction Model. Results showed a significant score increase from pretest ($M = 40.91$) to posttest ($M = 77.88$), $t(54) = 20.77$, $p < .001$, with a mean normalized gain (N-Gain) of 0.65 (Medium-to-High). Acceptance was also high overall ($M = 4.15$): Perceived Ease of Use scored highest ($M = 4.60$), followed by Perceived Usefulness ($M = 4.40$), Attitude and Behavioral Intention ($M = 4.00$ each), and Reaction and Satisfaction ($M = 3.75$). These findings indicate that the practice-based, hybrid training produced measurable short-term competency gains alongside strong acceptance; as evaluation was limited to the immediate post-training period, claims of sustained Mendeley adoption remain to be confirmed through follow-up observation.

Keywords: Mendeley Training; Technology Acceptance Model; Reference Management; Scientific Writing; Teachers.

Introduction

Publishing in peer-reviewed international journals has become a real benchmark of quality and credibility, not just for university faculty, but increasingly for schoolteachers as well (Djarmika, Prihandoko, & Nurkamto, 2023; Fithriani, Ichsanda Rahman Hz, & Yuni Kurniati, 2023). Sharing classroom-based research in internationally indexed journals is now directly tied to career growth and ongoing professional development (Hyland & Jiang, 2025), making academic writing a skill that teachers need to actively build rather than take for granted (Flowerdew, 2023). Still, non-native English-speaking teachers frequently run into steep hurdles, from wrestling with formal academic English to figuring out the unfamiliar structure of international research papers (Alinasab, 2022; Janssen & Ruecker, 2022). To help bridge this gap, English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) provides structured, hands-on training that gives teachers the practical confidence and technical know-how they need to prepare publication-ready work.

Beyond language proficiency alone, an often overlooked challenge is getting citations and references right. Both prospective and practicing teachers frequently struggle with citation rules, which easily leads to accidental plagiarism (Festas, Seixas, & Matos, 2022; Romanowski, 2022). This issue is particularly evident among Indonesian schoolteachers, who regularly find citation rules and formal academic phrasing to be major roadblocks to getting their research published (Wahyudiati, Qurniati, & Putri, 2026). It is a critical hurdle: international journals hold authors to exacting, field-specific referencing standards, and papers that miss the mark are routinely rejected right at the editor's desk, no matter how strong the actual research findings are (Mahmud & Mohd Tahir, 2024).

Reference management software has been widely proposed as a practical solution to this technical bottleneck. Mendeley, in particular, allows users to organize large reference collections, annotate source documents, and automatically generate in-text citations and bibliographies through integration with word-processing software (Singh, Mahawar, & Singh, 2022). From the perspective of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the extent to which users adopt such software is shaped by their perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, which subsequently influence their attitude and behavioral intention toward continued use (Davis, 1989; Davis, Bagozzi, & Warshaw, 1989). Community-based training programs that introduce Mendeley to academic communities have reported measurable improvements in participants' citation accuracy and confidence (Syaharuddin et al., 2021), suggesting that structured, hands-on exposure to reference management tools can meaningfully reduce the technical burden associated with scientific writing.

Current citation-training programs still leave three clear gaps wide open. First, most workshops cater to university faculty and graduate students, largely sidelining schoolteachers even though teachers face the exact same publication pressures to advance their careers (Djatkika et al., 2023; Romanowski, 2022); in fact, getting a handle on reference software remains an unresolved struggle for teachers even after general writing programs wrap up (Wahyudiati et al., 2026). Second, existing programs aimed at preventing citation errors lean almost entirely on basic pretest–posttest exams. While these tests capture whether participants memorized the concepts, they completely miss how teachers actually feel about using the software or whether the workshop format worked well for them (Zhang, Chu, Liu, & Lu, 2023; Zhang, Chu, Qiu, Zainuddin, & Li, 2024). Third, while researchers frequently use TAM to track tech adoption and Kirkpatrick's model to evaluate workshops, they almost always use them separately; practically no community outreach initiative has brought both frameworks together to look at participant satisfaction and real software uptake at the same time (Quinton, Tidmarsh, Parry, & Cumming, 2022).

This gap is particularly salient in the context of Indonesian schoolteachers who are concurrently expected to produce internationally publishable manuscripts and to master unfamiliar digital tools with limited institutional mentoring or time allocation. During informal discussions with the schoolteachers prior to the workshop, it became apparent that nearly all participants were still handling citations and references manually and had never used reference management software before. While these initial findings came from qualitative conversations rather than a structured quantitative survey, the challenges teachers described lined up closely with patterns documented in earlier literature (Wahyudiati et al., 2026). These shared difficulties provided clear justification for organizing this targeted community service training program.

Building on this identified gap, the present community service program was designed to provide structured, hands-on training in the use of Mendeley as a citation and reference management tool for the Kelompok Guru Peserta Pelatihan Penulisan Artikel Ilmiah Internasional, a group of schoolteachers

engaged in an ongoing international scientific writing initiative facilitated by Universitas Dehasen Bengkulu. Distinct from prior interventions that relied primarily on pretest-posttest knowledge measures, this program adopted a dual theoretical evaluation framework, combining the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989; Davis et al., 1989) and the Reaction level of Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Training Evaluation Model (Kirkpatrick, 1994), in order to capture both participants' acceptance of Mendeley as a technology and their satisfaction with the training process itself. The training was delivered through a hybrid format, combining face-to-face sessions at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP) of Universitas Dehasen Bengkulu with online mentoring via Zoom Meeting, an approach consistent with recent evidence suggesting that blended training designs can effectively balance technical scaffolding with participants' time constraints (Elviani & Sudatha, 2023; Zhang et al., 2023). This paper reports the design, implementation, and perception-based evaluation of this training program, with the aim of contributing empirical, theory-grounded evidence on the acceptance and training satisfaction associated with reference management software training among schoolteachers.

Realization of Activities

This community service program employed a structured, practice-oriented training model evaluated through a comprehensive dual framework combining the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989; Davis et al., 1989) and Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Training Evaluation Model (Kirkpatrick, 1994), specifically integrating Level 1 (Reaction) and Level 2 (Learning). The initiative took place over a two-month period, from May to June 2026, comprising four structured meetings with a total instructional contact time of 16 hours (supplemented by 16 hours of guided independent practice, totaling 32 practical engagement hours). The program adopted a blended/hybrid delivery format: in-person sessions were conducted at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP), Universitas Dehasen Bengkulu, which provided multimedia labs, audio-visual support, and high-speed local network connectivity, while online mentoring and technical troubleshooting sessions were hosted via Zoom Meeting.

The program engaged 55 schoolteachers from the Kelompok Guru Peserta Pelatihan Penulisan Artikel Ilmiah Internasional in Bengkulu, representing various academic subjects and schools across the region. To optimize hands-on technical guidance and minimize operational bottlenecks, the instructional team consisted of three principal instructors (faculty members specializing in educational technology and academic writing) assisted by five technical laboratory tutors (senior educational technology assistants). This established a favorable facilitator-to-participant ratio of 1:7, ensuring close supervision, rapid troubleshooting, and tailored feedback during both offline and online sessions.

Given recent transitions across Elsevier's digital reference ecosystem, specifically the deprecation of legacy Mendeley Desktop, the training explicitly utilized the current generation: Mendeley Reference Manager (MRM v2.x) alongside the modern cloud integrated Mendeley Cite add in for Microsoft Word. Participants were provided with a structured training module titled "Pedoman Praktis Pengelolaan Referensi Ilmiah Berbasis Mendeley Reference Manager untuk Guru", distributed in both printed and interactive PDF formats containing visual step by step walkthroughs, metadata verification protocols, and technical troubleshooting FAQs.

The community service was implemented systematically through four sequential stages:

1. Stage 1: Preparation, Coordination, and Baseline Diagnostics (Meeting 1 – Hybrid, 3 Hours):

Activities: Coordination with school focal points, digital module distribution, laptop compatibility screening, Elsevier account setup, and the administration of a diagnostic Pre-Test

(Kirkpatrick Level 2) consisting of 12 objective multiple-choice items measuring baseline referencing literacy and digital citation awareness.

Success Indicator: 100% participation in the baseline pre-test and verified installation readiness across all participants' laptops.

2. Stage 2: Offline Practical Workshop (Meeting 2 – In-Person at FKIP Universitas Dehasen Bengkulu, 5 Hours):

Activities: Direct orientation on international publication standards and anti-plagiarism conventions, practical installation of Mendeley Reference Manager, integration of the Mendeley Web Importer browser extension, and hands-on exercises in database importing (Google Scholar, Scopus, CrossRef), manual metadata editing, and local PDF drag-and-drop indexing.

Success Indicator: At least 90% of participants successfully built a personal reference library containing a minimum of 10 fully indexed, metadata-verified scholarly entries.

3. Stage 3: Word Integration and In-Text Citation Practice (Meeting 3 – In-Person, 4 Hours):

Activities: Configuration of the *Mendeley Cite* add-in within Microsoft Word, guided practice in inserting single and multiple parenthetical citations, automated bibliography compilation, and dynamic switching across major international publication styles (e.g., APA 7th, IEEE, Vancouver).

Success Indicator: 100% of participants demonstrated the ability to compile a mock manuscript excerpt containing at least 5 synchronized in-text citations and an automatically generated, error-free reference list.

4. Stage 4: Online Mentoring, Troubleshooting, and Evaluative Diagnostics (Meeting 4 – Zoom Meeting, 4 Hours):

Activities: Breakout-room mentoring addressing specific manuscript referencing challenges, metadata conflict resolution, administration of the identical 12-item Post-Test (Kirkpatrick Level 2), and administration of the comprehensive Acceptance and Satisfaction Questionnaire (Kirkpatrick Level 1 and TAM).

Success Indicator: A statistically significant cognitive score improvement ($N\text{-Gain} \geq 0.70$; $p < 0.05$) and an overall acceptance/satisfaction rating exceeding the "High" threshold ($M \geq 4.00$).



Figure 1. Offline Sessions



Figure 2. Online sessions

To address the limitations of single-perspective evaluations, this study employed a triangulated evaluative design combining objective cognitive measurement with psychometric perception modeling:

1. Cognitive Learning Assessment (Kirkpatrick Level 2): To measure actual, objective competence acquisition attributable to the training, a one-group pretest–posttest assessment was administered. The instrument consisted of 12 multiple-choice questions developed from the training curriculum. Content validity was confirmed through expert review by three educational technology specialists using Aiken's V coefficient ($V \geq 0.82$), while test reliability was verified via the Kuder–Richardson 20 formula ($KR-20 = 0.81$). Data were analyzed using a paired-sample t -test to determine statistical significance and Hake's normalized gain (N -Gain) formula to quantify net learning improvement relative to baseline scores.
2. Perception and Acceptance Evaluation (Kirkpatrick Level 1 & TAM): Immediately following the post-test, participants completed a 22-item questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*). Kirkpatrick's Reaction level assessed instructional satisfaction, material relevance, and facilitator delivery, while the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989; Davis et al., 1989) evaluated participants' systemic adoption across four core dimensions: Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude Toward Using, and Behavioral Intention to Use. Responses were analyzed descriptively using mean scores and interpretative categories.

Results

Results of Cognitive Learning Assessment

Prior to the perception-based evaluation, participants' cognitive gains in referencing literacy were assessed using a one-group pretest–posttest design comprising 12 multiple-choice items. Descriptive analysis showed a mean pretest score of 40.91 (SD = 11.14) that increased to a mean posttest score of 77.88 (SD = 16.76) across all 55 participants. Because Shapiro–Wilk tests indicated a departure from normality in both the pretest and posttest distributions ($p < .05$), both a paired-sample t -test and its non-parametric counterpart were conducted to verify the robustness of the result. Both tests confirmed a statistically significant improvement (Table 1), $t(54) = 20.77$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 2.80$; Wilcoxon signed-rank $W = 0$, $p < .001$.

Table 1. Comparison of Pretest–Posttest Scores

	<i>Pretest M (SD)</i>	<i>Posttest M (SD)</i>	<i>t(54)</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Cognitive Score	40.91 (11.14)	77.88 (16.76)	20.77	<.001	2.80

Notes. $N = 55$. Wilcoxon signed-rank test as non-parametric support: $W = 0$, $p < .001$ (normality assumption violated based on Shapiro–Wilk test, $p < .05$).

To determine the magnitude of learning gain relative to the maximum possible improvement, Hake's normalized gain was calculated for each participant. The mean N Gain was 0.65 (SD = 0.26), placing it within the moderate to high range. As shown in Table 2, at the individual level 31 participants (56.4%) achieved a high gain category, 17 (30.9%) a moderate category, and 7 (12.7%) a low category. Facilitators attributed the lower scores to technical constraints, such as device limitations or session absence, rather than instructional shortcomings.

Tabel 2. Distribution of N-Gain Categories

Kategori N-Gain	n	%
Tinggi ($g \geq 0.70$)	31	56.4
Sedang ($0.30 \leq g < 0.70$)	17	30.9
Rendah ($g < 0.30$)	7	12.7
Total	55	100.0

Notes. Categories based on Hake's formula (1998): High ($g \geq 0.70$), Medium ($0.30 \leq g < 0.70$), Low ($g < 0.30$).

The magnitude of cognitive improvement observed in the present study (N Gain = 0.65; Cohen's $d = 2.80$) appears considerably larger than comparable interventions reported in the literature. Zhang et al. (2023), for instance, employed a quasi-experimental design with a genuine control group and reported an 18 percentage point improvement in writing quality among the experimental group, which is roughly half the raw score increase observed here. This discrepancy is unlikely to indicate a substantially more effective intervention; it more plausibly reflects a methodological limitation. Unlike Zhang et al. (2023), the present study used a one group pretest posttest design without a comparison group, leaving the observed gain vulnerable to alternative explanations such as item familiarity because the posttest reused the same 12 items as the pretest, along with maturation effects across the multi day training. Future iterations of this training should incorporate a control or waitlist comparison group to disentangle genuine competency gain from these threats to internal validity.

Comparison with Syaharuddin et al. (2021) requires similar caution. Although that study reported a comparable post training comprehension level (88.2%) among university students following a Mendeley workshop, its evaluation relied on a single post training questionnaire and observation rather than a paired pretest posttest measurement, making direct numerical comparison with the present N Gain statistically inappropriate. What the two studies do consistently suggest is that hands on workshop based instruction generates strong immediate comprehension gains among participants with little prior exposure to reference management software, though neither study, including the present one, provides evidence on whether these gains persist once participants return to independent academic writing without facilitator support.

Results of Participants' Evaluation

Following the completion of the hybrid Mendeley training program, participants were asked to evaluate both the training implementation and their acceptance of Mendeley using a structured questionnaire based on Kirkpatrick's Reaction model and the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). The questionnaire consisted of twenty-two items distributed across five constructs, namely Reaction and Satisfaction, Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude toward Using, and Behavioral Intention to Use. Responses from all 55 participants were analyzed descriptively using mean scores to identify participants' perceptions toward each construct.

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics for each evaluation construct.

Tabel 3. The descriptive statistics

Construct	Mean	Category
Reaction & Satisfaction	3.75	High
Perceived Usefulness	4.40	Very High
Perceived Ease of Use	4.60	Very High
Attitude	4.00	High
Behavioral Intention	4.00	High
Overall	4.15	High

As shown in Table 3, the overall evaluation of the training program obtained a mean score of 4.15, indicating a High level of participant acceptance and satisfaction toward both the training implementation and the use of Mendeley. This finding demonstrates that the hybrid training model was well received by participants and successfully introduced Mendeley as a practical tool for supporting scientific writing activities.

Among the five constructs, Perceived Ease of Use achieved the highest mean score ($M = 4.60$), followed closely by Perceived Usefulness ($M = 4.40$). These two constructs were categorized as Very High, suggesting that participants not only considered Mendeley highly beneficial for scientific writing but also perceived the application as easy to learn and operate after participating in the training sessions. Meanwhile, Attitude toward Using and Behavioral Intention to Use both obtained mean scores of 4.00, indicating a positive disposition toward continued use of Mendeley in future writing activities. The Reaction and Satisfaction construct recorded the lowest mean score ($M = 3.75$), although it remained within the High category, reflecting generally positive evaluations of the training process itself.

Overall, these descriptive findings indicate that the training successfully achieved its immediate objectives. Participants demonstrated favorable reactions toward the training implementation while simultaneously reporting strong acceptance of Mendeley as a digital reference management tool. The

consistently high mean scores across all constructs suggest that participants perceived the training as relevant to their professional needs and viewed Mendeley as capable of improving the efficiency of academic writing.

Several factors may explain these findings. First, the training employed a hands-on learning approach, enabling participants to directly practice installing Mendeley, managing references, integrating the software with Microsoft Word, and generating citations and bibliographies. Such practical experience likely reduced participants' uncertainty toward unfamiliar technology while strengthening their confidence in applying the software independently. Second, the hybrid training model, combining face-to-face workshops and online mentoring, provided continuous technical support that helped participants overcome difficulties encountered during independent practice. Third, the participants were actively involved in an international scientific writing program, making the training highly relevant to their immediate professional needs. This contextual relevance likely increased participants' motivation to adopt Mendeley as part of their academic writing process.

From a theoretical perspective, these findings support the complementary use of Kirkpatrick's Reaction Model and the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). Positive reactions toward the training indicate that participants perceived the program as relevant and beneficial, while the high acceptance of Mendeley reflects favorable perceptions of its usefulness and ease of use. Together, these findings suggest that effective training delivery can promote both participant satisfaction and technology acceptance.

The present findings are consistent with previous studies. Syaharuddin et al. (2021) reported that hands-on Mendeley workshops improved participants' confidence in citation management through direct practice. Similarly, Zhang et al. (2023) found that hybrid training combining face-to-face instruction and online mentoring enhanced participant engagement and learning experiences. Furthermore, Quinton et al. (2022) emphasized that positive participant reactions are an important indicator of training quality because they reflect the relevance of the learning activities to participants' professional needs. Collectively, these studies support the effectiveness of practical, hybrid-based Mendeley training in promoting participant satisfaction and technology acceptance.

Results of Reaction and Satisfaction

Tabel 4. Reaction and Satisfaction

Construct	Mean	Category
Reaction & Satisfaction	3.75	High

The findings indicate that participants responded positively to the implementation of the Mendeley training program. Although the Reaction and Satisfaction construct recorded the lowest mean among the five evaluated dimensions ($M = 3.75$), it remained within the High category, suggesting that the program successfully met participants' expectations regarding the training process and learning experience. This positive reaction is particularly important because it represents the first indicator of training effectiveness, reflecting participants' readiness to engage with and apply the competencies introduced during the program.

One explanation for these findings is the strong alignment between the training content and participants' professional needs. Rather than introducing Mendeley as a standalone digital application, the training embedded its use within authentic scientific writing activities, enabling participants to immediately apply the software to citation management and bibliography preparation. This contextualized approach

likely increased participants' perceived relevance of the training, as the acquired skills directly addressed challenges they encountered when preparing manuscripts for publication. Such alignment between learning activities and workplace demands has been widely recognized as an important factor influencing participants' satisfaction with professional development programs.

The positive reactions may also be attributed to the instructional strategy adopted throughout the program. The combination of hands-on practice and continuous mentoring enabled participants to actively construct procedural knowledge while receiving immediate feedback whenever technical difficulties arose. This scaffolded learning environment likely reduced uncertainty toward unfamiliar technology and promoted greater confidence in using Mendeley independently. Nevertheless, the comparatively lower evaluation of the training duration suggests that participants expected more opportunities to reinforce their practical skills. Since mastering reference management software requires repeated practice, extending guided mentoring sessions could further strengthen participants' confidence and facilitate sustained technology adoption.

These results offer partial support for Kirkpatrick's idea that enjoying a workshop sets the stage for actually using the skills later on, though the connection is not entirely clear-cut. Participant reaction and satisfaction scored lower than every other dimension in the evaluation, and without tracking whether teachers kept using Mendeley months later, concluding that positive reactions directly led to lasting habits would stretch the evidence too far.

This outcome contrasts with studies like Quinton et al. (2022) and Syaharuddin et al. (2021), where satisfaction served as a standout indicator of overall program quality. In this case, lower marks on pacing and session length point to practical scheduling challenges rather than issues with the material itself. While Zhang et al. (2023) highlighted how hands on mentoring boosts interest, their study overlooked how tightly packed schedules influence participant sentiment, which is an important factor that the present findings help make clear.

Results of Perceived Ease of Use

Tabel 5. Perceived Ease of Use

Construct	Mean	Category
Perceived Ease of Use	4.60	Very High

The findings indicate that participants perceived Mendeley as highly easy to use after completing the training program. This construct obtained the highest mean score among all evaluated dimensions ($M = 4.60$), indicating that participants considered Mendeley easy to learn, understand, and operate for managing references and citations. This finding suggests that the training successfully reduced participants' initial barriers to adopting reference management software, enabling them to develop confidence in using the application for scientific writing.

One possible explanation for this finding is the instructional design adopted throughout the training. Rather than introducing Mendeley through theoretical demonstrations alone, participants were guided to perform each step independently, including installing the software, organizing references, integrating Mendeley with Microsoft Word, and generating citations and bibliographies. This hands-on approach likely simplified participants' learning process by allowing them to immediately apply newly acquired knowledge. As participants became familiar with the software through repeated practice, they gradually perceived Mendeley as a manageable and user-friendly tool rather than a complex technological application.

Doi : <https://doi.org/10.47709/ppi.v4i02.9544>

The hybrid delivery model may have also contributed to participants' perceptions of ease of use. Face-to-face workshops enabled facilitators to provide direct technical guidance during the initial learning stage, while online mentoring offered continuous assistance when participants encountered difficulties during independent practice. This combination of immediate support and follow-up mentoring likely minimized technical obstacles and reduced participants' uncertainty when using unfamiliar software. As a result, participants were able to focus on completing citation-related tasks instead of overcoming operational difficulties.

These findings are consistent with the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which proposes that perceived ease of use is one of the primary determinants of technology acceptance. According to TAM, users are more likely to adopt a technology when they perceive it as requiring minimal effort to learn and operate. In the present study, the high level of perceived ease of use indicates that the training successfully created favorable conditions for participants to accept and utilize Mendeley in their academic writing activities.

The present findings are consistent with previous studies examining the adoption of reference management software. Davis (1989) argued that technologies perceived as easy to use are more likely to be accepted and integrated into users' routine practices. Similarly, Singh et al. (2022) reported that researchers' adoption of reference management software was strongly influenced by its perceived simplicity and ease of operation. Syaharuddin et al. (2021) also found that hands-on Mendeley workshops significantly improved participants' confidence in using the software through guided practice. Collectively, these studies support the present findings that practical training combined with continuous mentoring can effectively reduce technological barriers and strengthen participants' perceptions of ease of use.

Conclusion

The present community service program successfully implemented a hybrid Mendeley training model for schoolteachers participating in an international scientific article writing program. Overall, the findings indicate that the program achieved its intended objectives by generating positive participant responses toward both the training implementation and the adoption of Mendeley as a reference management tool. The overall evaluation produced a high mean score ($M = 4.15$), demonstrating that participants expressed favorable perceptions across all measured constructs. Among these, Perceived Ease of Use emerged as the highest-rated construct ($M = 4.60$), followed by Perceived Usefulness ($M = 4.40$), indicating that participants considered Mendeley not only highly beneficial for supporting scientific writing but also easy to learn and operate after completing the training. In addition, participants reported positive attitudes toward using Mendeley and expressed intentions to continue utilizing the software in future academic writing activities.

These findings suggest that combining Kirkpatrick's Reaction Model and the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) provides a useful framework for evaluating participants' acceptance of community-based technology training. The positive reaction toward the training, together with the high levels of perceived usefulness and ease of use, indicates that the hybrid, hands-on instructional approach was well received and reduced participants' initial hesitation toward adopting Mendeley. Separately, the cognitive assessment results ($M\text{-Gain} = 0.65$, $t(54) = 20.77$, $p < .001$) provide preliminary objective evidence that participants' referencing knowledge improved following the training. However, because this study employed a one-group design without a control group and measured outcomes immediately after training, these gains should be interpreted as short-term and program-specific rather than confirmed evidence of sustained competency transfer to independent academic writing practice.

Doi : <https://doi.org/10.47709/ppi.v4i02.9544>

Based on the findings of this community service program, future Mendeley training should provide longer and more intensive mentoring sessions, particularly for participants who are still developing confidence in mastering advanced software features. Although participants perceived Mendeley as easy to use and highly useful, the relatively lower responses regarding facilitator clarity and the intention to explore advanced features suggest that additional practice opportunities, smaller mentoring groups, and follow-up technical assistance may further strengthen participants' competence and confidence in applying Mendeley independently. Future training programs are also encouraged to incorporate advanced topics, such as collaborative reference libraries, PDF annotation, reference synchronization across devices, and integration with other academic writing tools.

Furthermore, future community service initiatives are encouraged to extend beyond immediate post training assessment by incorporating delayed follow up measurements, such as assessing whether cognitive gains and positive reactions translate into sustained Mendeley use and improved manuscript quality several months after training. Longitudinal evaluations examining citation accuracy in participants' actual submitted manuscripts would provide stronger evidence of the training's real world impact than single session pretest posttest and acceptance measures alone.

Acknowledgments

The community service team extends its gratitude to the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP) at Universitas Dehasen Bengkulu and the group of teachers participating in the international scientific article writing training for their support, cooperation, and active participation throughout the implementation of the community service activities.

References

- Alinasab, M. (2022). Introducing English for research publication purposes. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 11(1), 150. <https://doi.org/10.30466/IJLTR.2023.121279>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models. *Management Science*, 35(8), 982–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.35.8.982>
- Djarmika, D., Prihandoko, L. A., & Nurkamto, J. (2023). Understanding postgraduate students' research article publishing challenges in Indonesia (pp. 52–60). https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-162-3_8
- Elviani, Y., & Sudatha, G. (2023). ICT digital teaching module on the preparation of interactive student worksheets. *Mimbar Ilmu*, 28(2), 246–254. <https://doi.org/10.23887/mi.v28i2.61539>
- Festas, I., Seixas, A., & Matos, A. (2022). Plagiarism as an academic literacy issue: The comprehension, writing and consulting strategies of Portuguese university students. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 18, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00119-8>
- Fithriani, R., Ichsanda Rahman Hz, B., & Yuni Kurniati, E. (2023). Scholars in the making: Unravelling the publication quest through a community of writing practice. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 10(1), 221–238. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v10i1.31457>
- Flowerdew, J. (2023). John Flowerdew's essential bookshelf: English for research publication purposes

Doi : <https://doi.org/10.47709/ppi.v4i02.9544>

-
- (ERPP). *Language Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000071>
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2025). Scholarly discourse: The growth of English for Research Publication Purposes. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 16(5), 2159–2182. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2023-0250>
- Janssen, G., & Ruecker, T. (2022). Apoyo and English for Research Publication Purposes at a Latin American university. *TESOL Quarterly*, 56(2), 750–762. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3097>
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Mahmud, N., & Mohd Tahir, M. H. (2024). Mitigating plagiarism in ESL academic writing: Evaluating the efficacy of educational intervention. *Journal of Language and Education*, 10(3), 53–68. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2024.21568>
- Quinton, M. L., Tidmarsh, G., Parry, B. J., & Cumming, J. (2022). A Kirkpatrick model process evaluation of reactions and learning from My Strengths Training for Life™. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(18), 11320. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811320>
- Romanowski, M. H. (2022). Preservice teachers' perception of plagiarism: A case from a college of education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 20(3), 289–309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09395-4>
- Singh, A. K., Mahawar, K. L., & Singh, V. (2022). Adoptions of reference management software among the research scholars of India. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09557490231202241>
- Syahrudin, Mandailina, V., Pramita, D., Rahmania, R., Rosada, R., & Negara, H. R. P. (2021). Peningkatan kualitas publikasi mahasiswa dan sitasi karya ilmiah dosen melalui workshop manajemen software Mendeley. *Community Development Journal: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.31004/cdj.v2i1.1367>
- Wahyudiati, D., Qurniati, D., & Putri, F. (2026). Optimising madrasah teachers' competence in scientific writing in Suela Subdistrict, East Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara. *DINAMISIA: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 10(3), 1101–1114. <https://doi.org/10.31849/dinamisia.v10i3.30417>
- Zhang, Y., Chu, S. K. W., Liu, Y., & Lu, X. (2023). Effects of a hybrid training for plagiarism prevention module on plagiarism-free academic writing in higher education. *Educational Technology & Society*, 26(2), 1–18. [https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.202304_26\(2\).0001](https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.202304_26(2).0001)
- Zhang, Y., Chu, S. K. W., Qiu, X., Zainuddin, Z., & Li, X. (2024). Facilitating undergraduates' plagiarism-free academic writing practices in a blended learning scenario. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(1), 154–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2022.2102529>
-