

Type Your Article Title Here. No Longer Than 15 Words

First Author¹, Second Author², Third Author³

¹Department, Faculty, Institution, City, Country

²Department, Faculty, Institution, City, Country

³Department, Faculty, Institution, City, Country

Corresponding author: name@institution.ac.id · ORCID: 0000-0000-0000-0000

Received: dd Month yyyy · Revised: dd Month yyyy · Accepted: dd Month yyyy · Published: dd Month yyyy

<https://doi.org/10.xxxxx/responsive.vxxxix.xxxxx>

ABSTRACT

Write the English abstract here, 200-250 words in a single paragraph, with no citations, no abbreviations, no footnotes, and no sentences copied verbatim from the body. Cover five elements in this order: (1) the problem and why it matters beyond the immediate setting; (2) the objective of the study; (3) the design, data, and analytical strategy, stated concretely enough for a reader to judge it; (4) the principal findings, including the direction and magnitude of any relationship rather than a promise that findings will be discussed; and (5) the contribution to theory and to practice or policy. Write for a reader outside Indonesia who does not know the local institutional context, and spell out any programme, agency, or regulation the first time it appears. The abstract is the part of the article most widely read and indexed, so it must stand alone as a complete account of the study.

Keywords: three to five terms; arranged alphabetically; separated by semicolons; not repeated from the title

ABSTRAK

Tulis abstrak berbahasa Indonesia di sini sebagai terjemahan setia dari abstrak bahasa Inggris, bukan versi yang berbeda isinya. Panjang 200-250 kata, satu paragraf, tanpa acuan, tanpa singkatan, dan tanpa catatan kaki. Versi Indonesia disediakan untuk pembaca nasional; versi Inggris adalah versi yang diindeks dan dibaca secara internasional.

Kata kunci: tiga sampai lima istilah; disusun alfabetis; dipisahkan titik koma

INTRODUCTION

Times New Roman 11 pt, justified, single spacing, first-line indent 0.5 cm.

Open with the empirical or policy problem and establish why it matters to readers beyond the immediate setting. Then move from the general phenomenon to the specific case, situating it in the international literature rather than only in national policy documents.

State explicitly what is already known, what remains unresolved, and why the gap is worth closing. A merely descriptive gap- this case has not been studied- is not sufficient. Identify a theoretical, methodological, or contextual gap that limits current understanding.

Close the introduction with the research question or hypothesis, the objective of the study, and one or

two sentences on the intended contribution. A short roadmap of the article is optional.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Do not summarise sources one by one. Organise the literature by theme, debate, or theoretical position, and show where scholars disagree, what evidence supports each side, and what remains untested.

Draw on international peer-reviewed literature as the primary basis, complemented by regional and national scholarship. Where the argument depends on Indonesian-language sources, explain their content for readers who cannot consult them.

End this section with the analytical framework used in the analysis: the concepts, their expected relationships, and the propositions or hypotheses derived from them. The framework stated here must be the one carried through to the discussion.

METHODS

Report the methods in enough detail for another researcher to appraise and, in principle, repeat the study.

Research design

Name the design and justify why it fits the research question, rather than merely declaring it qualitative or quantitative.

Setting and case selection

Describe the site, period, and unit of analysis, and state the criteria by which the case, sample, or respondents were selected.

Data sources and collection

Specify instruments, sampling procedure, achieved sample size, response rate where applicable, number and profile of informants, and the period of fieldwork. Deposit or describe instruments so reviewers can inspect them.

Data analysis

State the analytical procedure and the software used. For quantitative work, give the model specification, variable operationalisation, and tests of assumptions. For qualitative work, describe the coding process, the number of coders, and how disagreement was resolved.

Validity, reliability, and trustworthiness

Report the measures taken: triangulation, member checking, audit trail, reliability coefficients, robustness checks, or equivalent.

Ethical considerations

State the ethics approval body and reference number where applicable, and how informed consent, anonymity, and data protection were handled. If no formal approval was required, say so and explain why.

RESULTS

Present analysed evidence, not raw data, and organise the section around the research questions rather than around instruments or fieldwork chronology.

Report findings neutrally here and reserve interpretation for the discussion. Every table and figure must be referred to in the text and must add information the text does not already carry.

Table 1. *Descriptive title of the table in sentence case*

Variable	Category	n	%
Item	Description	—	—
Item	Description	—	—

Source: authors' analysis of primary data, 2025.

DISCUSSION

Interpret the findings against the framework set out in the literature review. Explain what the results mean, not what they were.

Compare the findings with prior studies, stating where they converge, where they diverge, and what accounts for the divergence. This is the section in which the article earns its citations, and it is where locally framed manuscripts most often fall short of international standards.

Set out the theoretical contribution and the implications for policy or practice separately, and keep each proportionate to the evidence actually presented.

State the limitations of the study honestly, design, sample, measurement, or scope, and identify the specific further research they imply.

CONCLUSION

Answer the research question directly and state the contribution in one or two sentences. Do not restate the results section, introduce new data, or add citations here.

Recommendations, where offered, must follow from the findings and name the actor who would act on them.

DECLARATIONS

Author contributions

Describe each author's role using CRediT terms, for example: A.B. conceptualisation, methodology, writing (original draft); C.D., investigation, formal analysis; E.F. supervision, writing (review and editing).

Funding

Name the funder and grant number, or state that the research received no external funding.

Conflicts of interest

Declare any financial or non-financial interest that could be seen to influence the work, or state that there is none.

Data availability

State where the data supporting the findings can be obtained, including repository name and identifier, or explain why the data cannot be shared.

Use of generative AI

Disclose any use of generative AI tools in preparing the manuscript, naming the tool and its purpose. AI tools cannot be listed as authors, and the authors remain fully responsible for the content.

Acknowledgements

Acknowledge non-author contributions such as field assistance, access, or comments on drafts.

REFERENCES.

APA 7th edition. Minimum 25 sources for a research article. At least 80 per cent peer-reviewed journal articles; at least 60 per cent published within the last ten years, with older works cited only when foundational. All references in Roman script. Include a DOI or a stable URL for every source that has one. Manage citations with a reference manager such as Mendeley or Zotero. Cite work from this journal only where it is substantively relevant; citation of the journal is never a condition of acceptance

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Hermann, M. G. (2008). Content analysis. In A. Klotz & D. Prakash (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in international relations* (pp. 151–167). Palgrave Macmillan.

Kusumaningrum, D. (2016). Interdependence versus truth and justice: Lessons from reconciliation processes in Maluku. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 20(1), 34–49.
<https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.17998>

Wooldridge, M. B., & Shapka, J. (2012). Playing with technology: Mother–toddler interaction scores lower during play with electronic toys. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 33(5), 211–218.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2012.05.0>

