Ishel
International Seminar on Humanity, Education, and Language
Universitas Negeri Jakarta | Online Conference |
eISSN 3124-9396
Volume 2 , July 2026

VOCATIONAL STUDENTS' DIFFICULTIES IN PROFESSIONAL CONTENT WRITING: A REFLEXIVE THEMATIC ANALYSIS

Muthia Damaiyanti[1], Ilza Mahyuni[2], Yumna Rasyid[3]
Universitas Negeri Jakarta[123]
Email: muthiadamaiyanti@gmail.com[1], ilzamayuni59@gmail.com[2], yumna.rasyid@unj.ac.id[3]

ABSTRACT
Professional content writing involves linguistic, rhetorical, and contextual demands that extend beyond conventional language accuracy. This study examined vocational English students' reported difficulties in writing content for business and professional purposes. Semi-structured interviews with 20 students at Politeknik Negeri Padang were analyzed using theoretically informed reflexive thematic analysis across five domains: professional discourse, rhetorical and genre challenges, classroom industry communication, digital adaptation, and cognitive writing processes. The findings revealed reported difficulties in producing appropriate linguistic expressions, constructing persuasive messages, addressing audience expectations, adapting content to digital platforms, and managing idea development and revision. These difficulties were interpreted as interconnected aspects of professional communication rather than independent writing problems. Contrasting responses further indicated that students' perceived difficulties varied according to their experiences, confidence, and exposure to English language writing tasks. These findings suggest that understanding vocational students' writing challenges requires attention to the interaction between language use, communicative purposes, and learning contexts. The study contributes an integrated, context sensitive interpretation of professional content-writing difficulties, highlighting the need to consider linguistic, rhetorical, professional, digital, and cognitive demands together in vocational English writing education.

Keywords: *vocational English students; professional content writing; writing difficulties; reflexive thematic analysis; professional communication*

INTRODUCTION
The ability to produce effective professional content has becoming prominent in contemporary business communication, particularly as organizations rely on digital platforms to establish their identities, communicate with stakeholders, promote products and services, and engage diverse audiences (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Louhiala-Salminen & Kankaanranta, 2011). In this evolving communication landscape, professional content writing extends beyond the production of grammatically accurate texts. It requires writers to make informed decision regarding to linguistic, rhetorical, and communicative choices that respond to specific audiences, purposes, organizational expectations, and digital environments (Bhatia, 2004; Hyland, 2019). Consequently, preparing students to produce professional content has become a key responsibility of vocational higher education

© 2026 Muthia Damaiyanti, Ilza Mahyuni, Yumna Rasyid**.** Published by Universitas Negeri Jakarta. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21009/ishel.v2i1.69800

institutions, particularly those offering English programs oriented toward business and professional communication (Bargiela-Chiappini et al., 2013; Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998)

Unlike general academic writing, professional content writing is shaped by communicative purposes and the social and institutional contexts in which texts are produced and circulated. Professional writers are expected not only to demonstrate linguistic accuracy but also to select appropriate rhetorical strategies, construct persuasive messages, maintain a consistent professional tone, and adapt their writing to different genres and communication platforms. Genre oriented perspectives emphasize that writing practices are closely associated with socially recognized communicative purposes and the expectations of particular discourse communities (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993). Similarly, Hyland (2004) highlights the importance of understanding writing as a socially situated practice in which linguistic choices are influenced by disciplinary and communicative contexts. These perspectives suggest that successful professional content writing requires the integration of linguistic resources, genre knowledge, audience awareness, and contextual understanding rather than the isolated application of grammatical rules.

The importance of such integrated competence is particularly evident in vocational English education, where learning is expected to prepare students for communication tasks relevant to their future professional environments. Within English for Specific Purposes (ESP), language instruction is understood in relation to learners' target needs and the communicative practices of specific academic or occupational settings (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998). From this perspective, professional content writing instruction should provide opportunities for students to understand how English is used to accomplish authentic business communication purposes. Students need to recognize not only what constitutes linguistically acceptable writing but also how professional texts are organized, how messages are tailored to intended audiences, and how communication strategies respond to workplace expectations.

These considerations are directly relevant to the Diploma 4 English for Business and Professional Communication program at Politeknik Negeri Padang, Indonesia, where content writing forms part of students' preparation for professional communication practices. Through content writing instruction, students are expected to develop the ability to produce English-language content for business and digital communication purposes. Such tasks may involve creating company profiles, promotional materials, website content, and social media messages. However, producing these texts requires students to coordinate multiple aspects of writing, including vocabulary selection, rhetorical organization, persuasive communication, audience engagement, and adaptation to different media. The complexity of these requirements raises important questions about the difficulty's students experience while learning to produce content that meets professional communication expectations.

Writing itself is a complex cognitive activity involving interconnected processes of planning, translating ideas into language, and reviewing written texts (Flower & Hayes, 1981). In professional content writing, these cognitive processes operate alongside additional communicative demands, including the need to consider organizational identity, target audiences, genre conventions, and digital platforms. Students may therefore experience difficulties not only when constructing grammatically accurate sentences but also when generating relevant ideas, selecting persuasive expressions, organizing content effectively,

eISSN 3124-9396
Volume 2 , July 2026

and revising their writing in response to communicative purposes. Moreover, the growing importance of digital communication introduces further challenges because writing practices must be adapted to the characteristics and expectations of different online environments.

Previous empirical research has provided evidence of the challenges experienced by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in developing their writing abilities. Aldayel et al. (2026), for instance, investigated academic writing difficulties among Indonesian EFL university students and identified linguistic, affective–motivational, and educational factors influencing their writing experiences. These findings suggest that writing difficulties extend beyond grammatical accuracy. Nevertheless, this study was situated within academic writing, where communicative expectations differ from those associated with professional content production. Its findings therefore do not directly explain how learners negotiate audience engagement, persuasive communication, organizational identity, and industry-specific expectations when producing professional content.

Within vocational education and English for Specific Purposes (ESP), researchers have emphasized the importance of aligning English instruction with occupational communication needs. Sitio et al. (2026) conducted a needs analysis involving Indonesian polytechnic students and highlighted language skills relevant to academic and professional contexts, particularly speaking and reading. Similarly, Saputro and Savitri (2025) examined the English learning needs of vocational students specializing in visual communication design, drawing on the perspectives of students, teachers, and industry practitioners. These studies reinforce the importance of workplace relevance and industry-responsive instruction. However, their primary emphasis is on broader English-language needs rather than the specific difficulties of producing professional written content for business and digital communication.

A related body of research has investigated the relationship between digital platforms and EFL writing development. Purnama (2024) examined the role of social media in supporting EFL students' writing skills, while Jin (2025) investigated Facebook-integrated writing activities in relation to writing proficiency and anxiety among university students. Istikhori and Muamaroh (2026) likewise explored students' experiences of social media use for writing development. Collectively, these studies illustrate the relevance of digital platforms to language learning. However, using digital media as a learning tool is not equivalent to producing professional digital content for specific audiences, organizational purposes, and platform conventions. These studies therefore offer limited direct evidence about students' experiences of the rhetorical and communicative demands of professional digital content production.

Taken together, the reviewed studies point to a contextual and analytical gap at the intersection of EFL writing, vocational education, ESP, and digital professional communication. Prior research has examined writing difficulties, occupational language needs, and technology-supported writing from different perspectives. However, the studies considered here have not specifically investigated how vocational English students experience and interpret the interconnected linguistic, rhetorical, professional, digital, and cognitive demands of professional content writing within a business-oriented educational program. This distinction matters because professional content writing requires learners to coordinate multiple forms of knowledge and make context-sensitive communicative

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21009/ishel.v2i1.69800

decisions rather than simply produce grammatically accurate texts. The present study does not claim that multidimensional writing difficulties have been entirely overlooked; instead, it addresses the need for a contextually grounded interpretation of these difficulties in professional content writing.

Accordingly, this study aims to explore the difficulties experienced by vocational English students in professional content writing and to develop an interpretative understanding of the patterns underlying these difficulties. The study is guided by the following research question: What difficulties do vocational English students experience in professional content writing for business and professional communication purposes? By addressing this question, the study seeks to contribute to the understanding of professional content writing difficulties in vocational English education. It provides contextually insights into students' perceived challenges. The findings may inform the design of instructional materials and learning activities that respond to students' identified needs and the communicative demands of professional environments, including subsequent development of corpus-informed and industry-simulated writing instruction.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative case study design to investigate the difficulties experienced by vocational English students in professional content writing. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews. This approach supports the development of interpretative themes that capture patterned meanings across participants' response. The study was conducted in the Diploma 4 English for Business and Professional Communication program at Politeknik Negeri Padang, Indonesia. Participants comprised 20 students who had completed the Content Writing for Business and Professional Purposes course. All students in the class participated in the study, allowing for an examination of their experiences within a clearly defined instructional context. The investigation focused on students' perceived difficulties in producing English-language content for business and professional communication, with the aim of identifying learning needs relevant to workplace-oriented writing instruction.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews guided by a theoretically informed interview protocol. The protocol was developed by drawing on perspectives from genre studies and professional discourse (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993; Hyland, 2004), English for Specific Purposes (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998), and cognitive approaches to writing (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Before data collection, the interview protocol was reviewed by subject-matter experts to evaluate the clarity, relevance, and alignment of the questions with the intended areas of inquiry. The semi-structured format allowed participants to describe their writing experiences in detail and enabled the researcher to pursue relevant issues through follow-up questions. All interviews were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed for analysis.

The interview transcripts were analysed using Reflexive Thematic Analysis (RTA), following Braun and Clarke's methodological approach (2006, 2019, 2021). Analysis involved an iterative process of familiarization with the transcripts, generating initial codes, examining relationships among codes, developing and reviewing candidate themes, and refining their conceptual boundaries and interpretations. Throughout this process, the researcher moved recursively between the interview data, emerging analytical patterns, and

eISSN 3124-9396
Volume 2 , July 2026

the research question to construct coherent and meaningful themes. Consistent with the principles of RTA, theme development was guided by the interpretative significance of patterned meanings rather than the frequency of particular responses. This approach enabled an in-depth examination of how students experienced the linguistic, rhetorical, professional, digital, and cognitive demands of professional content writing within a vocational education context.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result shows that five themes are interpreted as the student's problems. They are Professional Discourse Gap, Rhetorical and Genre Challenge, Classroom Industry Communication Gap, Digital Adaptation Challenge, and Writing as a Cognitive Process.

Table 1. Theme and Focused Categories

Theme	Focus categories	code
Professional Discourse Gap	Grammar Accuracy	LD-GA
	Vocabulary Use	LD-VU
	Natural Expression	LD-NA
	Lexical Pattern Awareness	LD-LPA
Rhetorical and Genre challenge	Audience Awareness	RGA-AA
	Persuasive Strategy	RGA-PS
	Genre Structure	RGA-GS
Classroom–Industry Communication Gap	Industry Relevance	PIC-IR
	Professional Tone	PIC-PT
	Authentic Task Adaptation	PIC-ATA
Digital Adaptation Challenge	Platform Awareness	DMA-PA
	Digital Audience Adaptation	DMA-DAA
	Media-Oriented Writing	DMA-MOW
Writing as a Cognitive Process	Idea Development	CWP-ID
	Translating Ideas into Text	CWP-TI
	Revising and Refining	CWP-RR

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21009/ishel.v2i1.69800

Professional Discourse Gap: Negotiating Accuracy, Naturalness, and Appropriate Expression

Participants described uncertainty not only about grammatical choices but also about whether English expressions sounded appropriate for professional communication. This theme covers difficulties concerning grammar accuracy, vocabulary use, natural expression, and lexical pattern awareness. P04 identified specific language forms that prompted hesitation:

"Yang paling sering bikin aku bingung biasanya tenses sama preposition. Kadang suka ragu harus pakai past tense atau present perfect, terus 'in', 'on', dan 'at' juga sering ketuker." (P04)

English translation: "What confuses me most is usually tenses and prepositions. I sometimes hesitate between the past tense and present perfect, and I often mix up 'in', 'on', and 'at'."

It illustrates perceived uncertainty during grammatical decision-making rather than an independently assessed error rate. Other participants located the difficulty in the naturalness of professional expression. P10 described content that seemed to transfer Indonesian phrasing directly into English:

"tidak juga, kadang lebih sering terdengar seperti bahasa indonesia yang di-inggriskan. terkesan kurang natural. ai juga kadang malah bikin lebih kaku lagi." (P10)

English translation: "Not really. Sometimes it sounds more like Indonesian translated into English, so it does not feel natural. AI sometimes makes it even stiffer."

The contrast between correctness and naturalness is analytically significant. Participants' suggest that professional content writing involves judgements about conventional expressions and audience-appropriate wording beyond sentence-level grammar. The reference to AI also shows that technological assistance was not always perceived as resolving concerns about naturalness. These are reported perceptions of language use, not direct measurements of linguistic competence.

Rhetorical and Genre Challenge: Transforming Information into Persuasive Communication

Participants associated effective content writing with audience engagement, persuasive language, and purposeful textual organisation. Their difficulties concerned not simply recognising the need for hooks, calls to action, openings, or endings, but deciding how to realise these communicative functions in writing. P10 explained: "menemukan cta dan hook yang tepat, biar audiens tertarik. jadi audiens tidak hanya membaca itu sebagai kalimat ajakan, tapi benar2 dibawa." (P10)

English translation: "Finding the right CTA and hook so that the audience becomes interested. The audience should not simply read it as an invitation but should actually be drawn in."

P04 similarly described uncertainty about composing a compelling opening and a coherent ending:

eISSN 3124-9396
Volume 2 , July 2026

"Iya, pernah. Biasanya yang paling bikin bingung itu bagian pembuka, karena harus bisa langsung menarik perhatian pembaca. Kadang penutup juga suka bingung mau dibuat bagaimana biar tetap nyambung dan nggak terlalu tiba-tiba selesai." (P04)
English translation: "Yes. The opening is usually the most confusing part because it needs to attract the reader's attention immediately. Sometimes I also struggle with the ending so that it remains connected and does not finish too abruptly."

These difficulties connect audience awareness (RGA-AA), persuasive strategy (RGA-PS), and genre structure (RGA-GS). They suggest a perceived gap between recognising the communicative purpose of content and confidently choosing textual resources to achieve it.

Classroom–Industry Communication Gap: Perceived Readiness and Professional Expectations

The Classroom Industry Communication Gap theme concerns participants' perceptions of workplace expectations relative to their classroom experiences. P03 anticipated greater complexity in professional writing:

"saya rasa belum sepenuhnya. saya rasa content writing di dunia kerja lebih complex dari content writing di kelas." (P03)

English translation: "I think ts not complete. I think content writing in the workplace is more complex than content writing in the classroom."

P03 also associated writing demands with the simultaneous pressures of ideation and deadlines:

"menentukan ide dan deadline disaat yang bersamaan merupakan tantangan bagi saya." (P03)
English translation: "Developing ideas and dealing with deadlines at the same time is a challenge for me."

These students point to anticipated professional demands involving creativity, time management, and communicative accountability. Yet perceived classroom industry alignment was not uniformly negative. P07 considered field-based project experience relevant:

"Sudah, karna kami terjun ke lapangan dan tau situasi yg akan kami kerjakan untuk projek yg di berikan" (P07)
English translation: "Yes, because we went into the field and understood the situation in which we would carry out the assigned project."

The contrast qualifies the theme: students varied in how they evaluated classroom relevance and their own readiness. Industry relevance (PIC-IR), professional tone (PIC-PT), and authentic task adaptation (PIC-ATA) therefore represent perceived relationships between educational tasks and professional communication, not independently verified workplace standards. Authentic task exposure should not be equated with demonstrated professional competence.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21009/ishel.v2i1.69800

Digital Adaptation Challenge: Writing Across Platforms and Audiences

Participants described platform-specific writing demands associated with websites and professional social media. P19 emphasised the relationship between text and website presentation:

"Sepertinya wordpres, Menurut saya WordPress cukup sulit karena harus menyesuaikan tulisan dengan layout website dan tampilan kontennya" (P19)
English translation: "Probably WordPress. I think WordPress is quite difficult because the writing needs to be adjusted to the website layout and the presentation of its content."

By contrast, P14 emphasised the register and credibility associated with LinkedIn:

"Menurut saya LinkedIn paling sulit, karena harus menggunakan bahasa yang profesional tapi tetap menarik dan tidak terlalu kaku. Selain itu, isi kontennya juga harus terlihat lebih kredibel dan relevan dengan dunia kerja." (P14)

English translation: "I think LinkedIn is the most difficult because the language needs to be professional but still interesting and not too rigid. The content also needs to appear more credible and relevant to the workplace."

These students suggest that digital adaptation can concern layout-sensitive writing, professional tone, and audience expectations. Platform awareness (DMA-PA), digital audience adaptation (DMA-DAA), and media-oriented writing (DMA-MOW) overlap with rhetorical and professional domains. Purely technical difficulties operating software were not treated as evidence of writing difficulty unless connected to textual or communicative decisions.

Writing as a Cognitive Process: From Idea Generation to Revision

Participants reported difficulties at different points in composing, including generating an idea, transforming it into coherent text, and identifying what to revise. P10 distinguished knowing the product from finding a suitable content concept:

"idenya, udah tau mau kontenin produk apa tapi idenya ga tau" (P10)
English translation: "The idea itself. I already know which product I want to create content about, but I do not know what idea to use."

P14 described the subsequent challenge of organising available ideas:

"Iya, pernah. Kadang ide yang ada di kepala sebenarnya banyak, tapi sulit menyusunnya menjadi tulisan yang rapi, jelas, dan enak dibaca karena bingung menentukan alur dan pilihan katanya." (P14)

English translation: "Yes. Sometimes I actually have many ideas in mind, but it is difficult to organise them into clear, well-structured, and readable writing because I am unsure about the flow and word choices."

Revision also involved uncertainty about evaluation. P12 explained:

"Cukup bingung dan juga ragu karena merevisi tulisan sendiri karna terkadang bingung salah nya dimana" (P12)

eISSN 3124-9396
Volume 2 , July 2026

English translation: “I feel quite confused and uncertain when revising my own writing because sometimes I do not know where the mistakes are.”

The three focused categories, idea development (CWP-ID), translating ideas into text (CWP-TI), and revising and refining (CWP-RR) thus capture related but distinguishable reported challenges. Their intersection suggests that students perceived writing as an iterative process of generating, organising, evaluating, and improving content.

Negative, Contrasting, and Qualifying Accounts

The analysis considered responses that challenged or qualified the assumption that participants experienced similar difficulties. A negative account was interpreted in relation to a specific anticipated difficulty. Contrasting and qualifying difficulties were retained to show variation in confidence, task conditions, and perceived readiness

Contrasting linguistic and rhetorical experiences

Some participants did not report the difficulties described by others. P03 expressed confidence in expressing ideas in English:

“sejauh ini tidak, saat saya memiliki ide yang bagus mmm, saya bisa mengubahnya ke bahasa inggris dengan baik.” (P03)

English translation: “So far, no. When I have a good idea, I can express it in English quite well.”

P01 likewise described persuasive writing as relatively manageable:

“kalau untuk persuasif mungkin ga terlalu sulit ya, karena lebih banyak ke mengajak audiens aja” (P01)
English translation: “Persuasive writing may not be particularly difficult because it mainly involves encouraging the audience to take action.”

These responses qualify the linguistic and rhetorical themes by showing that particular challenges were not reported by every participant. Self-reported ease does not establish independently measured proficiency.

Conditional professional confidence

Some participants expressed confidence while recognising limits to their professional readiness. P14 stated:

“Cukup percaya diri, karena saya merasa sudah memahami dasar-dasar content writing seperti menentukan tone, menyesuaikan dengan audiens, dan membuat pesan lebih menarik. Tapi saya juga masih perlu banyak belajar dan pengalaman supaya hasil kontennya bisa lebih profesional dan sesuai dengan kebutuhan klien.” (P14)

English translation: “I am fairly confident because I understand the fundamentals of content writing, such as determining tone, adapting to audiences, and making messages more engaging. However, I still need further learning and experience to produce more professional content that meets clients’ needs.”

P20 distinguished confidence at internship level from full-time employment:

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21009/ishel.v2i1.69800

"Untuk kualitas anak magang saya cukup percaya diri. Kalau untuk yang bekerja full time mungkin belum..." (P20)

English translation: "I am fairly confident at an intern's level, but perhaps not yet at the level of a full-time employee."

Such students are better understood as qualifying rather than unequivocally negative cases. They suggest that perceived professional readiness varies according to anticipated responsibilities and experience.

Positive classroom industry alignment

P17 offered a positive assessment of practical classroom activities:

"sudah banget menurut saya, karna pada pembelajaran kemaren itu kami langsung disuruh praktek mengurus media sosial sama website dari UMKM..." (P17)

English translation: "Very much so, in my opinion, because during the course we were directly involved in managing social media and websites for a small business."

This account challenges any uniform claim of perceived classroom–industry mismatch. Nevertheless, perceived authenticity is not equivalent to independently demonstrated professional competence.

Language exposure as a contextual qualification

P19 reported that a project did not require English-language content:

"Semua ide ide yang bagus sudah tertuang dan kami tidak ada masalah di bahasa inggris, karena memang projectnya tidak menggunakan bahasa inggris" (P19)

English translation: "All our good ideas were expressed, and we did not have problems with English because the project did not actually use English."

This is not evidence of English writing competence or a straightforward negative case. The absence of reported English-language difficulty reflected the absence of an English-language task demand. Distinguishing direct experience from anticipated difficulty is essential when interpreting interview accounts across participants with different task exposure.

Taken together, the negative, contrasting, and qualifying accounts refine the five-domain interpretation. Reported difficulties were differentiated, conditional, and shaped by the writing situations participants described.

The analysis suggests that linguistic, rhetorical, professional, digital, and cognitive demands were frequently interconnected. First, linguistic choices were associated with rhetorical purpose. Participants' concerns about natural expressions, hooks, and calls to action suggest that choosing words in professional content writing is also a decision about audience engagement and communicative effect. Second, genre organisation intersected with platform adaptation: website layout, professional register, and credibility were described as context-dependent writing considerations. Third, cognitive processes intersected with

eISSN 3124-9396
Volume 2 , July 2026

anticipated professional demands, including producing original ideas, developing coherent messages, and working under deadlines.

In addition, the contrasting statement prevent a simple deficit interpretation. Confidence in one aspect of writing did not necessarily extend to all others; positive classroom experiences did not guarantee perceived readiness for independent professional work. Furthermore, reports of no English-language difficulty sometimes reflected limited exposure to English-language tasks rather than confidence or proficiency.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations are considered when interpreting the findings. First, the study relied on participants' self-reported experiences collected through semi-structured interviews. The findings represent students' perceptions, reflections, and reported difficulties rather than independently assessed levels of professional content-writing competence. Accounts of grammar, vocabulary, rhetorical organisation, and digital communication were not systematically corroborated through analyses of written products or direct observations of writing processes.

Second, participants did not have equivalent opportunities to produce professional content in English during classroom projects. Some reported undertaking relevant projects in Indonesian. Their reflection may therefore combine directly experienced difficulties, anticipated challenges, and broader perceptions of English writing rather than experiences from a common English language writing task. This variation limits direct comparison and cautions against treating an absence of reported difficulty as evidence of competence.

Finally, the study examined students' perspectives rather than independently documenting expectations from employers, clients, or professional writers. The classroom industry communication gap should consequently be interpreted as perceived alignment or mismatch, not as a directly measured discrepancy between curriculum and industry standards. Future research could combine interviews with authentic English-language writing samples, composing-process observations, and perspectives from industry practitioners to investigate the relationship between reported difficulties and observable professional writing practices.

CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that participants' reported difficulties extended beyond grammatical accuracy and vocabulary selection. Students described challenges related to producing natural and contextually appropriate expressions, adapting content to intended audiences, developing persuasive messages, organising texts for communicative purposes, and adjusting writing to digital platform conventions. They also reported difficulties in generating ideas, transforming ideas into coherent texts, and revising their writing. These experiences suggest that professional content writing was perceived as involving multiple communicative and composing demands rather than isolated linguistic skills.

An important interpretation of the findings concerns the interrelated nature of these difficulties. Participants' responses suggested that linguistic choices, rhetorical purposes, professional expectations, digital platform conventions, and cognitive writing processes were often perceived as connected aspects of professional content production. However, the reported difficulties varied across participants and writing contexts. Some students expressed

confidence in particular writing tasks, while others perceived their classroom projects as relevant preparation for professional practice. Differences in exposure to English-language writing tasks further qualified the interpretation of their reported experiences.

Based on the findings, several suggestions are proposed to address the difficulties reported by vocational English students in professional content writing. First, writing instruction should provide more explicit support for students in selecting appropriate vocabulary, constructing natural expressions, and using grammatically accurate language in professional contexts. Particular attention should be given to how linguistic choices relate to the intended meaning, audience, and communicative purpose of the content, rather than treating language accuracy as an isolated aspect of writing.

Second, writing assignments should communicate professional expectations more clearly and ensure that English-language writing is practised when it is an intended learning outcome. Third, instructional support should extend throughout the writing process, particularly during idea development, drafting, and revision. Finally, future research may examine students' actual writing products and composing processes alongside their reported experiences. This would help determine how the difficulties identified through interviews are reflected in written texts and writing practices. Further investigation across different vocational learning contexts is also recommended to better understand variations in students' experiences, particularly differences in exposure to English-language professional writing tasks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aldayel, H. S., Pravitasari, H., & Fadillah, N. (2026). Factors affecting academic writing difficulties among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) university students. Acta Psychologica, 263, Article 106250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2026.106250

Bhatia, V. K. (1993). Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings. Longman.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 16(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2019.1628806

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. SAGE Publications.

Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach. Cambridge University Press.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365–387. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). English for specific purposes: A learning-centred approach. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2004). Genre and second language writing. University of Michigan Press.

Istikhori, A. S., & Muamaroh, M. (2026). Exploring social media to improve students' writing skills at tertiary level. Ruang Kata, 6(1), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.53863/jrk.v6i01.2180

eISSN 3124-9396
Volume 2 , July 2026

Jin, S. (2025). Writing in the digital age: Understanding the relationship between social media use and college students' writing skills and anxiety. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12, Article 1048. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05443-1

Purnama, I. G. A. V. (2024). The role of social media toward EFL students' writing skills. RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 10(1), 58–65. https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.10.1.2024.58-65

Saputro, D. A., & Savitri, W. E. (2025). Need analysis on English for Specific Purposes of visual communication design student at vocational high school. Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching, 4(2), 139–151. https://doi.org/10.37249/jlllt.v4i2.892

Sitio, I. T., Hadiani, D., Permata, N. N., & Latipah, Y. (2026). Need analysis of an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) course for Indonesian vocational tertiary students. Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues, 9(1), 43–58. https://doi.org/10.21043/jetli.v9i1.36215

Swales, J. M. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge University Press.