IJMR E-ISSN: 3109-9777
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEACH

# STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF INNOVATIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES IN INDONESIAN LANGUAGE COURSES: A NARRATIVE LITERATURE REVIEW

**Ida Ayu Made Wedasuwari[1], Ida Bagus Nyoman Mantra[2]**
[1]Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia
Email : dayuweda@unmas.ac.id, bagusmantra@unmas.ac.id

| E-ISSN : 3109-9777 | | |
|---|---|---|
| Received: Oktober 2026 | Received: Oktober 2026 | Received: Oktober 2026 |

***Abstract :***

*Indonesian language courses in higher education are expected to develop students' academic communication skills. However, evidence regarding how students experience emerging learning strategies remains scattered and difficult to compare. This study employs a narrative literature review of ten empirical articles published between 2021 and 2025 that examine students' perceptions of or experiences with online learning, YouTube, social media, ChatGPT, Project-Based Learning (PjBL), and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in Indonesian language courses, supplemented by three supporting articles on educational policy and learning outcomes. The findings were synthesized thematically without aggregating numerical results across studies. Most studies reported generally positive responses, particularly regarding ease of access, media attractiveness, and collaboration. Nevertheless, students' responses were not uniform. Students in the online learning study by Chaesar and Setiyoningsih preferred face-to-face instruction; perceptions of ChatGPT were generally positive, although motivation received the lowest rating; and Praptanti et al.'s sentiment analysis found that negative posts were the most prevalent. Recurring challenges included internet connectivity, clarity of instructions, time management, and assignment workload. Nearly all studies relied on perception questionnaires administered at a single institution with relatively small samples, and none directly measured students' language proficiency. Consequently, definitive conclusions regarding learning effectiveness cannot yet be drawn. This review proposes a three-level evidence framework encompassing acceptance, learning experience, and learning outcomes. It also indicates that ease of technology use was rated more highly than motivation in the three studies reporting both indicators, while some studies made claims of effectiveness that exceeded the scope of their available evidence. Future research should integrate students' perceptions with measurable learning outcomes.*

***Keywords:*** *Student perceptions; learning experiences; innovative learning strategies.*

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesian language courses in higher education involve more than spelling and sentence structure. Students across all academic disciplines are expected to read sources critically, construct written arguments, participate in discussions, and present ideas. These skills are used in almost every other university course. The legal basis for this requirement is clear. Article 35, paragraph (3), of Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education requires higher education curricula to include courses in religion, Pancasila, civics, and the Indonesian language (Republic of Indonesia, 2012). Zulfadhli et al. (2023) reviewed policy documents and previous literature and concluded that the

policy has generally been implemented, although several challenges remain. These include teaching materials that do not always match students' needs, students' inadequate foundational language skills, and insufficient innovation in digital learning components.

One of the most frequently reported concerns is that course materials are too general and insufficiently connected to students' fields of study. Syafruddin (2025) surveyed 469 students from 40 study programs at 16 higher education institutions. Students' perceptions of the course were highly positive and correlated with their need for culturally responsive digital learning materials. Findings reported by Praptanti et al. (2025), however, were less encouraging: among more than 10,000 social media posts about the course, 48% were negative, 35% neutral, and 17% positive. These findings may appear contradictory, but they were derived from different data sources—questionnaires in one study and online posts in the other—and therefore should not be directly contrasted.

Innovation in Indonesian language courses also relies heavily on technology. Mutmainah (2022) and Utami and Rukiati (2022) asked students about the use of YouTube as a learning medium, while Noor Komari Pratiwi et al. (2024) examined students' perceptions of ChatGPT. The functions of these two technologies differ. Videos make lecturers' explanations available in a format that students can replay, whereas ChatGPT becomes involved in students' task-completion processes and raises concerns about academic integrity that do not arise in the same way with video.

Innovation may also involve changing students' roles. In Project-Based Learning (PjBL), students work on projects that result in tangible products; in Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), language is learned through the completion of tasks with communicative purposes. Akbar et al. (2025) reported that 41 students from the Faculty of Economics at Garut University considered PjBL relevant, interactive, and motivating, while identifying time management and project complexity as challenges. Nita (2025) studied 60 first-semester Civil Engineering and Mechanical Engineering students at Eka Sakti University who learned through TBLT supported by Google Classroom. Mean questionnaire scores for learning experience, benefits, and effectiveness were in the very high category, whereas the score for challenges—particularly unstable internet connectivity—was in the high category.

Students' responses to online learning illustrate how varied learning experiences can be. Chaesar and Setiyoningsih (2021) found that 124 students considered online access and applications easy to use, but most still preferred face-to-face learning. Gani et al. (2023), by contrast, concluded that online learning was highly effective based on responses from 45 students in the Informatics Education program at Hamzanwadi University. These differences may be related to study programs, technological readiness, or the wording of the questions; this review cannot establish their precise causes.

The issue underlying this review is the tendency to treat positive perceptions as evidence of success. Deslauriers et al. (2019) compared two approaches to teaching university physics and found that students in active-

learning classes learned more, as measured by tests, but felt that they had learned less. The context was physics rather than Indonesian language learning, so the findings cannot simply be transferred to the present context. Nevertheless, they demonstrate that perceived learning and actual learning outcomes may move in different directions. These two dimensions must therefore be distinguished when evaluating claims of effectiveness.

Accordingly, this article aims to (1) identify innovative strategies and media examined in Indonesian language courses in higher education between 2021 and 2025; (2) synthesize students' perceptions and experiences regarding the benefits, engagement, relevance, and challenges of their implementation; and (3) map research gaps, particularly the gap between students' perceived effectiveness and measured learning outcomes. The contribution of this review lies in its thematic synthesis of traceable literature, rather than in testing the effectiveness of any particular strategy.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study takes the form of a narrative literature review (NLR). Unlike a systematic review, which follows standardized search and quality-appraisal protocols, a narrative review allows authors to select, compare, and interpret studies according to relevant themes (Sukhera, 2022). This flexibility is also a limitation, since insufficiently explained source selection may introduce bias. To address this concern, this section describes how the sources were searched, selected, and examined (Page et al., 2021).

The literature search and source re-examination were conducted in November 2026 through the GARUDA index, official journal websites, and web search engines. The keywords included "Indonesian language learning," "Indonesian language course," "student perceptions," "learning experiences," "project-based learning," "task-based language teaching," "YouTube," and "ChatGPT," in both Indonesian and English, with a publication-year range of 2021–2025. The search did not follow a systematic protocol and did not cover subscription-based databases. Its coverage is therefore incomplete, and some relevant studies may have been missed.

Core studies were selected if they met four criteria: publication between 2021 and 2025, a higher education setting, student participants, and reporting of students' perceptions or learning experiences in an Indonesian language course. The study by Utami and Rukiati (2022) was retained even though its respondents were enrolled in an English study program, because they were Indonesian students taking an Indonesian language course. This process yielded ten core studies. Three additional articles—Zulfadhli et al. (2023) on policy, Fuadin (2025) on PjBL, and Kurniati et al. (2024) on a quasi-experimental writing study—were used as contextual sources because they did not directly investigate students' perceptions.

For each article, information was recorded on its context and sample, strategy or medium, research design and instruments, findings related to perceptions, and reported challenges. The findings were then grouped into four

themes: active learning strategies; digital media and technology; student perceptions and the relevance of course materials; and implementation barriers. Evidence quality was assessed descriptively by considering sample size, research design, instrument clarity, numerical consistency, and whether learning outcomes were measured.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Characteristics of the Reviewed Studies

The ten core studies indicate that "innovation" in Indonesian language courses more often refers to the use of new media or platforms than to a redesign of pedagogy. Four studies examined online learning and video (Chaesar & Setiyoningsih, 2021; Gani et al., 2023; Mutmainah et al., 2022; Utami & Rukiati, 2022), one examined social media for speaking practice (Riyanti, 2024), and one focused on ChatGPT (Pratiwi et al., 2024). Only two studies examined pedagogical strategies: PjBL (Akbar et al., 2025) and TBLT supported by Google Classroom (Nita, 2025). The remaining two studies did not test a particular strategy: Yasin et al. (2026) connected students' perceptions with their need for teaching materials, while Praptanti et al. (2025) analyzed student sentiment. The details are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of the ten core studies

| Study | Context and sample | Strategy / medium | Design and instruments | Main findings |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chaesar & Setiyoningsih (2021) | 124 undergraduate and diploma students, semesters I and III | Online learning | Descriptive survey; 22-item questionnaire (4-point scale) | Easy access 66.1%; applications easy to use 78.2%; motivation evenly divided (48.4% : 48.4%); workload increased 57.3%; tendency to prefer face-to-face learning |
| Gani et al. (2023) | 45 Informatics Education students, Hamzanwadi University | Online learning (Zoom most preferred) | Qualitative descriptive; questionnaire and interviews | Most considered online learning highly effective; most interviewees preferred online learning |
| Mutmainah et al. (2022) | 118 students from various classes and study programs, Jember | YouTube | Cross-sectional survey; 13-item questionnaire (5-point scale) | Article text: 71.2% liked it, 24.8% did not (abstract: 90% : 10%) |
| Utami & Rukiati (2022) | 66 English Study Program students, Jember State Polytechnic | YouTube videos | Descriptive; Google Form (4-point scale) | Easy to learn 94%, interested 94%, motivated 91%; overall ratings: 68% good, 32% very good; no barriers reported |

| Study | Context and sample | Strategy / medium | Design and instruments | Main findings |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Riyanti (2024) | Approximately 70 second-semester students (inconsistent count) | Social media (WhatsApp dominant) for speaking | Descriptive; questionnaire; interviews with 7 students and 3 lecturers | Positive 72%, negative 28%; barriers included devices, data quotas, connectivity, and speaking anxiety |
| Pratiwi et al. (2024) | 92 Informatics Engineering students who used ChatGPT (out of 170) | ChatGPT | Quantitative descriptive survey; 12 items (5-point scale) | Agreement: ease 60.5%, understanding 60.5%, active participation 57.6%, satisfaction 49.5%, motivation 40.2% |
| Akbar et al. (2025) | 41 Faculty of Economics students, Garut University | PjBL | Quantitative survey | Relevant, interactive, motivating; challenges included time and project complexity |
| Nita (2025) | 60 first-semester Civil and Mechanical Engineering students, Eka Sakti University | TBLT + Google Classroom | Explanatory sequential mixed methods; questionnaire ($\alpha = 0.823$) and interviews with 10 students | Means: experience 3.33; benefits 3.47; effectiveness 3.56 (very high); challenges 2.94 (high), internet 3.50 |
| Syafruddin et al. (2025) | 469 students, 40 study programs, 16 higher education institutions | Culturally responsive digital learning materials (needs) | Correlational | Very positive perceptions; $\tau b = 0.672$; $\rho = 0.794$ |
| Praptanti et al. (2025) | 1,200 students, 10 higher education institutions; more than 10,000 posts | Sentiment analysis | Mixed quantitative approach: survey, sentiment analysis, GPA | Negative 48%, neutral 35%, positive 17%; $r = -0.48$ with GPA |

Several patterns emerge from the table. Sample sizes ranged from 41 to 1,200 students; however, eight of the ten studies involved fewer than 130 respondents, and almost all were conducted at a single institution, sometimes within a single study program. Nearly all studies relied on questionnaires. Interviews were used in only three studies (Gani et al., 2023; Nita, 2025; Riyanti, 2024; Atqia et al., 2021). Among the articles that could be examined, none measured students' language competence through tests or product assessments. Praptanti et al. (2025) did use cumulative GPA, but GPA is not a measure of learning outcomes in this particular course. Four studies were conducted during the pandemic (Chaesar & Setiyoningsih, 2021; Gani et al., 2023; Mutmainah et al., 2022; Prawira, 2023; Utami & Rukiati, 2022), meaning that emergency remote-learning conditions may have influenced respondents' answers.




Figure 1. Number of respondents in the ten core studies. Source: compiled by the authors from the reviewed articles

Figure 1 further highlights the issue shown in Table 1. The two large-scale studies, Syafruddin et al. (2025) and Praptanti et al. (2025), were correlational or based on online data. In contrast, studies that directly examined a pedagogical strategy (Akbar et al., 2025; Rambe et al., 2025; Nita, 2025) involved only 41 and 60 respondents. Thus, the evidence most directly related to the question of whether a strategy works is also the smallest in scale and most localized. These findings are more appropriately interpreted as case studies of a particular class or faculty than as a representation of Indonesian university students in general.

2. Active Learning Strategies: Project-Based Learning and Task-Based Language Teaching

Akbar et al. (2025) surveyed 41 students from the Faculty of Economics at Garut University who participated in PjBL in an Indonesian language course. According to the article's abstract, students considered the learning process more relevant, interactive, and motivating, and reported progress in organizing ideas, analyzing problems, and working in groups. The challenges identified were time management and project complexity. It should be noted that all these claims were based on students' own assessments. The article did not compare language proficiency before and after the project; therefore, "progress" in this context refers to perceived progress.

Two supporting articles provide information about outcomes rather than perceptions alone. Fuadin and Fauziya (2022) implemented PjBL in a compulsory general Indonesian language course at the Indonesia University of Education (UPI), using six stages of work and assessing students' product portfolios. The mean score for the general work criteria was 86, while the final anthology received a score of 86.2. Without a comparison group or baseline measurement, these scores indicate that the products met the lecturer's criteria but do not show the extent of improvement. Kurniati et al. (2024) used a quasi-experimental design involving 32 sixth-semester students in the Indonesian Language study program at Muhammadiyah University of Pringsewu. Thus, its context was not a compulsory general course. The study reported an improvement in writing quality (paired-samples t-test, $p < 0.05$). The abstract alternately refers to "problem-based" and "project-based learning," and does not provide mean scores; consequently, the findings should be interpreted cautiously until the full

text has been examined. In this review, this was the only study that presented writing achievement data before and after the intervention.

Nita (2025) studied 60 first-semester students in the Civil Engineering and Mechanical Engineering programs at Eka Sakti University using an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design: a questionnaire (Cronbach's alpha = 0.823) followed by interviews with ten students. The mean scores for learning experience, benefits, and effectiveness were 3.33, 3.47, and 3.56, respectively, on a four-point scale; all were in the very high category. The mean score for challenges was 2.94 (high category). The highest-rated challenge was unstable internet connectivity (3.50), followed by longer task-completion time (3.20); confusion about instructions received a lower score (2.67). In the interviews, students valued working with peers and being able to access assignments at any time, but complained about slow connections and unclear instructions. Some addressed these issues by asking their peers for help.

One point should be noted when interpreting Nita (2025). The "effectiveness" category included items such as "learning outcomes have improved" (mean = 3.72), which nevertheless represented self-assessment. This means that the score measured students' belief that they had learned better, rather than improvement demonstrated through testing. The respondents were also first-semester engineering students who had never taken a language proficiency test, so their basis for comparison with other learning approaches may have been limited.

PjBL and TBLT both position students as active participants, but they differ in their focus. PjBL centers on a product developed over an extended period, whereas TBLT focuses on shorter communicative tasks. These two studies cannot establish which approach is superior because their samples, instruments, and indicators differ. Based on the available evidence, it can only be stated that both approaches were well received by non-language students and that both depend on clear instructions, time management, and platform support. The authors interpret this to mean that tasks or projects connected to students' fields of study are more likely to be perceived as meaningful; however, this interpretation has not been directly tested by any study included in this review.

3. Digital Media and Learning Technologies

Mutmainah et al. (2022) surveyed 118 students from various classes and study programs in Jember using a 13-item questionnaire with a five-point scale. The abstract reported that 90% of students considered YouTube effective and enjoyable, while 10% did not. The results section, however, presented different figures: 71.2% liked it, 24.8% did not like it, and the remainder were less positive. In addition, 60.3% strongly agreed and 27% agreed that YouTube accommodated their learning interests. The discrepancy between the abstract and the article's main text is substantial enough to affect the conclusion; therefore, the abstract should not be cited without checking the full text. The article also did not explicitly report implementation barriers, and its conclusion referred to an "English class course" despite examining an Indonesian language course, suggesting insufficient manuscript editing.

Utami and Rukiati (2022) studied 66 students from the English Study Program at Jember State Polytechnic who took an Indonesian language course using YouTube videos. Agreement rates were very high: 94% agreed or strongly agreed that the material was easy to learn, 94% were interested, and 91% felt motivated. The overall ratings were 68% good and 32% very good. No barriers or objections were reported. The four-point scale had no neutral option, the sample came from a single study program, and the questionnaire was the only data source. Therefore, these figures are more appropriately interpreted as evidence of initial acceptance of the medium than as proof of improved language skills.

The findings of the two YouTube studies are consistent in terms of acceptance, but they do not answer the pedagogical question. Liking a video does not necessarily mean that students become more capable of writing paragraphs or constructing arguments. Mutmainah et al. mentioned discussions in the comment section but did not report how these discussions were assessed. Utami and Rukiati did not provide details of the learning activities accompanying the videos, such as text analysis or viewing-based writing tasks. This gap makes it difficult to translate acceptance figures into teaching recommendations.

Pratiwi et al. (2024) surveyed 92 Informatics Engineering students who had used ChatGPT to study Indonesian (from an initial pool of 170 students) using a 12-item questionnaire. The percentages of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed varied across indicators: 60.5% for ease of completing assignments, 60.5% for understanding, 57.6% for active participation, 49.5% for satisfaction, and only 40.2% for motivation. For the last indicator, 23.4% of respondents disagreed. Neutral responses were also substantial, ranging from 27.9% to 41.8%. Students' perceptions were positive, but not as uniformly positive as the abstract's summary might suggest. The article's authors themselves emphasized the need for usage limits, lecturer guidance, and attention to academic ethics.

The online-learning studies present two different pictures. Among 124 students, Chaesar and Setiyoningsih (2021) found that 66.1% agreed that online access was easy, 78.2% considered the applications easy to use, and 71.8% felt that the materials were consistent with the learning plan. However, motivation was evenly divided (48.4% agreed that online learning increased motivation, while 48.4% disagreed); 57.3% felt that their learning workload had increased; and 65.3% sometimes or frequently experienced miscommunication with lecturers. In general, students also preferred face-to-face learning. Gani et al. (2023) reached a more definitive conclusion: among 45 Informatics Education students at Hamzanwadi University, most considered online learning highly effective, and most interviewees preferred online learning. Differences in study programs—informatics students may be more familiar with digital devices—as well as sample size and question wording may explain some of this discrepancy. However, the exact causes cannot be established from the two articles.

Riyanti (2024) examined the use of social media for speaking instruction among second-semester students and reported 72% positive perceptions and 28%

negative perceptions. WhatsApp was the most frequently used platform (65.4%). The reported challenges included inadequate devices, data quotas and connectivity, small screens, and anxiety about speaking in front of the class. The number of respondents reported in the article is inconsistent: 70 students in the abstract and methods, 75 in the results, and 72 in the discussion. The design is also described as qualitative despite the extensive use of percentages. Accordingly, the figures should be treated as broad tendencies rather than precise measurements.

4. Student Perceptions, Relevance of Course Materials, and Sentiment toward the Course

Syafruddin et al. (2025) provide the broadest picture in terms of coverage: 469 students from 40 study programs at 16 higher education institutions. Perceptions of the Indonesian language course were in the very positive category and were positively correlated with the need for culturally responsive digital learning materials (Kendall's tau-b = 0.672; Spearman's rho = 0.794). Because the design was correlational, this relationship cannot be interpreted to mean that such materials improve students' perceptions. A more cautious interpretation is that students who value the course are also more aware of the need for learning materials that suit their backgrounds. The correlation figures still need to be checked against the full text of the article.

Praptanti et al. (2025) took a different approach by analyzing social media post sentiment and questionnaire responses from 1,200 students at ten higher education institutions. Negative sentiment was the most prevalent (48%), followed by neutral (35%) and positive (17%) sentiment. Negative sentiment was correlated with GPA ($r = -0.48$). The authors identified academic difficulties, teaching methods, and relevance to students' fields of study as contributing factors. The study has several methodological limitations. Although it describes its design as quasi-experimental, it does not present the results of an experiment; the relationship between individual posts and individual GPA is not explained; and GPA is not a measure of learning outcomes in the Indonesian language course. Therefore, the findings are better interpreted as an indication that satisfaction with the course is uneven, rather than as evidence of a causal relationship.

Reading the two studies together yields an important lesson: students' responses depend on how they are asked. Questionnaires completed at the request of lecturers or researchers tend to produce positive evaluations (Syafruddin et al., 2025; Utami & Rukiati, 2022), whereas posts written spontaneously in online spaces tend to be more critical (Praptanti et al., 2025). The authors interpret this difference as possibly reflecting social desirability effects in surveys. However, neither article tested this possibility, so it remains a hypothesis. Regardless of the explanation, studies relying solely on questionnaires may present a more favorable picture than students' actual experiences.

Direct evidence concerning the relevance of course materials remains limited. Syafruddin et al. (2025) show that students want contextually

appropriate learning materials, while Praptanti et al. (2025) identify relevance to students' fields of study as one source of negative sentiment. Nita (2025) and Akbar et al. (2025) studied engineering and economics students, respectively, but did not compare discipline-specific tasks with general tasks. Thus, the proposition that discipline-based projects or tasks are more meaningful remains a plausible hypothesis rather than an established finding.

5. Barriers to Implementing Innovative Strategies

Technical barriers appeared in almost every study involving digital platforms. Unstable internet connectivity received a score of 3.50 in the challenge category in Nita (2025); data quotas, devices, and connectivity were reported by Riyanti (2024); and Chaesar and Setiyoningsih (2021) noted that limited access made group work difficult. In other words, innovations that assume all students have adequate devices and internet connections risk creating inequalities in learning experiences. Studies conducted during the pandemic reported these barriers in the context of studying from home. Whether the barriers remain equally significant after the return to on-campus learning is not addressed by the articles reviewed.

Pedagogical barriers varied according to the strategy. In TBLT, Nita (2025) reported confusing instructions and longer task-completion times compared with conventional learning. In PjBL, Akbar et al. (2025) identified time management and project complexity as challenges. In online learning, Chaesar and Setiyoningsih (2021) found that 65.3% of respondents sometimes or frequently experienced miscommunication with lecturers, while 57.3% felt that their learning workload had increased. These recurring patterns suggest that the quality of activity design—including clear instructions, staged tasks, and feedback—helps shape students' experiences, alongside the choice of method.

Other challenges relate to artificial intelligence technology. Pratiwi et al. (2024) emphasized the need to address academic ethics and integrity, while motivation was the lowest-rated indicator (mean = 3.15). Mutmainah et al. (2022) noted that some students became more selective about the audio and visual quality of videos. These concerns were less prominent than connectivity barriers, but they indicate that acceptance of technology depends on the quality of its presentation and the rules governing its use.

## CONCLUSION

The 2021–2025 literature indicates that innovation in Indonesian language courses in higher education has primarily taken the form of online learning, videos, social media, ChatGPT, PjBL, and TBLT. Students generally accepted these strategies, particularly because of ease of access, the appeal of the media, and opportunities for collaboration. However, acceptance was not uniform, and some studies reported contrasting findings: a preference for face-to-face learning (Chaesar & Setiyoningsih, 2021), low motivation among ChatGPT users (Pratiwi et al., 2024), and the predominance of negative sentiment on social media (Praptanti et al., 2025).

The main contribution of this review is analytical. Mapping the levels of

evidence shows that all core studies stop at acceptance and, in some cases, learning experience. Cross-study analysis indicates that ease of using technology is not accompanied by an equivalent level of motivation, while examination of the claims reveals instances in which claims of effectiveness are overstated in relation to the available evidence. The three propositions advanced in this review may serve as a starting point for future research, and Table 2 can be used by instructors and researchers to assess the extent to which claims of effectiveness are supported by data.

The most consistent barriers are internet connectivity and devices, clarity of instructions, time management, and assignment workload. These barriers indicate that changing the medium or method alone is insufficient. Task design, lecturer support, and alternative access arrangements must also be considered. Technology should be treated as a means, while the success of innovation should be evaluated in terms of measurable learning outcomes.

**REFERENCES**

Akbar, M., Halimahnur, W., Qoriah, D., Kulsum, U., Garut, U., Garut, U., & Garut, U. (2025). Project-Based Learning sebagai Strategi Inovatif Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di Perguruan Tinggi : Perspektif Mahasiswa Ekonomi. *1*(2), 78–87.

Ari Suryawati Secio Chaesar, & Titi Setiyoningsih. (2021). Student Perceptions on Online Learning for Indonesian General Course In The Pandemic Covid-19 Phase. *Aksis : Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, *5*(2), 337–354.

Atqia, W., Hendrawanto, Y., & Alimastussa'diyah. (2021). Persepsi Dosen dan Mahasiswa Terhadap Pembelajaran Daring Bahasa Indonesia Pada Masa Pandemi Covid 19. *Indonesia :Jurnal Pmebelajaran Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, *2*(2), 92–105.

Chaesar, A. S. S., & Setiyoningsih, T. (2021). Student Perceptions On Online Learning For Indonesian General Course In The Covid-19 Pandemic Phase. *AKSIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 5(2), 337–354.

Cahyawati, D. G. (2020). Persepsi Mahasiswa Terhadap Pembelajaran Daring Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19: Hambatan, Tingkat Kesetujuan, Materi, Beban Tugas, Kehadiran, dan Pengelasan Dosen. *JINOTEP (Jurnal Inovasi Dan Teknologi Pembelajaran): Kajian dan Riset Dalam Teknologi Pembelajaran*, *7*(2), 124–132.

Deslauriers, L., McCarty, L. S., Miller, K., Callaghan, K., & Kestin, G. (2019). Measuring Actual Learning Versus Feeling Of Learning In Response To Being Actively Engaged In The Classroom. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *116*(39), 19251–19257.

Finefter-Rosenbluh, I., & Berry, A. (2024). With Or Without You? Exploring Student Perception Survey Assessment Data As A Teacher-Student (Un)Shared Process. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *30*(3), 227–240.

Fuadin, A. H. (2025). Penguatan Karakter Santun Dalam Berbahasa Melalui Model Project-Based Learning di Kalangan Mahasiswa. *Semantik*, *14*(2), 161–176.

Gani, R. H., Ernawati, T., Supratmi, N., Wijaya, H., & dan Pembelajaran, J. (2023). Efektivitas Pembelajaran Daring Mata Kuliah MKU Bahasa Indonesia PadaMahasiswa Universitas Hamzanwadi Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Evaluasi dan Pembelajaran*, *5*(1), 2023–2031.

Green, B. N., Johnson, C. D., & Adams, A. (2006). Writing Narrative Literature Reviews For Peer-Reviewed Journals: Secrets Of The Trade. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 5(3), 101–117.

Kurniati, L., Syaputri, W., Efendi, Y., Tussolekha, R., & Saputry, D. (2024). Improving Bahasa Indonesia Writing Skill: A Project-Based Learning Experimental Study. *JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia)*, *10*(3), 775–782.

Mutmainah, S. (2022). The Students ' Perception on YouTube as Online Learning Media for Indonesian Language General Course during Covid 19 The Students ' Perception on YouTube as Online Learning Media for Indonesian Language General Course during Covid 19 Pandemic. *Pendidikan : Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, *7*(9).

Nita, O. (2025). Enhancing Indonesian Language Learning Through TBLT and Google Classroom in Higher Education: Students' Perceptions. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *13*(1), 145.

Noor Komari Pratiwi, Bambang Yulianto, Mintowati, M., Haris Supratno, Syamsul Sodiq, & Mulyono, M. (2024). Persepsi Mahasiswa terhadap Penggunaan Chatgpt: Peluang dan Tantangan bagi Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia sebagai Mata Kuliah Wajib pada Kurikulum Perguruan Tinggi. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, *10*(3), 2727–2742.

Page, M. J., et.al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *134*, 178–189.

Praptanti, I., Wahyudi, W., Saputra, W. A., Wiarsih, C., & Irianto, S. (2025). Student Sentiment and Academic Achievement in Indonesian Language Learning. *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, *17*(1), 397–408.

Pratiwi, N. K., Yulianto, B., Mintowati, M., Supratno, H., Sodiq, S., & Mulyono, M. (2024). Persepsi Mahasiswa Terhadap Penggunaan Chatgpt: Peluang dan Tantangan Bagi Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Sebagai Mata Kuliah Wajib Pada Kurikulum Perguruan Tinggi. Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra, 10(3), 2727–2742.

Prawira, I. A. (2023). Persepsi Mahasiswa Terhadap Artificial Intelligenci Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, *11*(1), 104–116.

Rambe, L. N., Batubara, N. A., & Dilla, F. (2025). -Perceptions Of Information Systems Students At Universitas Muhammadiyah Riau Toward Learning Effective Sentences. *Jurnal Edukasi Dan Teknologi Pembelajaran*, *1*(3), 173–185.

Republik Indonesia. (2012). Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi.

Riyanti, A. (2024). Persepsi Mahasiswa Terhadap Penggunaan Platform Media Sosial untuk Pembelajaran Berbicara. *Jurnal KIBASP( Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajaran)*, *8*(1), 167–186.

Sitorus, J. P. (2025). Persepsi Mahasiswa Uph Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia Angkatan 2020 Terhadap Pembelajaran Sintaksis Melalui Platform Pembelajaran Ms . Teams. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, *1*(2), 1–13.

Subiyantoro, S., Degeng, I. N. S., Kuswandi, D., & Ulfa, S. (2023). Eksplorasi Dampak Chatbot Bertenaga AI (ChatGPT) Pada Pendidikan: Studi Kualitatif Tentang Manfaat dan Kerugian Exploring the Impact of AI-Powered Chatbots (ChatGPT) on Education: A Qualitative Study on Benefits and Drawbacks. *Jurnal Pekommas*, *8*(2), 157–168.

Sukhera, J. (2022). Narrative Reviews: Flexible, Rigorous, And Practical. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, *14*(4), 414–417.

Syafruddin, S. W. (2025). Students Perceptions Of The Indonesian Language Course And Their Correlation With The Need For Culturally Responsive Digital Learning Materials. *Sawerigading*, *31*(1), 276–286.

Utami, L. D., & Rukiati, E. (2022). Students' Perspectives Of Youtube As A Learning Media In Indonesian Language Course. *Journal of Language, Communication, and Tourism*, *1*(1), 12–19.

Zulfadhli, M., Anshori, D. S., & Sunendar, D. (2023). Kebijakan Pembelajaran Mkwk Bahasa Indonesia Di Perguruan Tinggi: Implementasi Dan Tantangannya. *Semantik*, *12*(1), 125–140.