INTERACTION: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Vol. 13, No. 3; September 2026
P-ISSN: 2406-9558; E-ISSN: 2406-9566

The Use of the *Jongkong* Malay Dialect in Indonesian Literary Literacy Practices: A Case Study at SMAN 1 Jongkong

Ramadhan Kusuma Yuda
ramadhankusumayuda2023@gmail.com

Esah Sapitri Yanti
esahsafitriyanti@gmail.com

Universitas PGRI Pontianak

ABSTRACT

This study examines the use of the Jongkong Malay dialect in Indonesian literary literacy practices among students of Class X Merdeka 3 at SMAN 1 Jongkong. The study employed a qualitative case-study approach involving 25 students and one Indonesian language teacher as a supporting informant. Data were collected through classroom observation, interviews, and documentation during May 2026, with the analysis focusing on reading and writing activities involving literary texts. The findings document four descriptive categories of linguistic forms: regional vocabulary, local vocabulary, sentence-structure patterns, and non-standard written forms. Examples identified in the research materials include *abis, trus, karna*, and *menggayongkan.* However, the occurrence of a non-standard form does not automatically establish that the form is a specific feature of the Jongkong Malay dialect. Therefore, the revised analysis distinguishes Jongkong-related forms from general non-standard Indonesian, spelling variation, and possible language-contact phenomena. The study contributes a more cautious description of local linguistic practices in Indonesian literacy activities and suggests that contrastive language instruction can help students develop competence in standard Indonesian while maintaining awareness of their regional linguistic resources.

Keywords: Jongkong Malay Dialect; Literary Literacy; Regional Language; Language Interference; Indonesian Language Education

INTRODUCTION

The Jongkong Malay dialect is a regional variety used by communities in Jongkong, Kapuas Hulu, West Kalimantan. In everyday communication, students may use the local dialect, while Indonesian is generally required in formal educational contexts. The coexistence of these linguistic varieties creates opportunities for local linguistic forms to appear in students' Indonesian language practices. Such occurrences should not immediately be regarded as language deficiencies because they may reflect regional linguistic variation, informal language use, spelling variation, or language contact. Indonesian literary literacy involves students' engagement with literary texts through reading, understanding, responding to, and producing written language. In the context of this study, the empirical evidence available concerns

reading and writing activities involving literary works. Therefore, the study does not extend its claims to literary appreciation or pronunciation unless such evidence is directly supported by the research data. This distinction is important because written data can demonstrate lexical, orthographic, and syntactic features, whereas pronunciation requires direct evidence from recorded speech.

Previous studies have demonstrated the relationship between regional language backgrounds and Indonesian language use. Bawamenewi and Laia (2025), for example, examined students' use of standard and non-standard Indonesian. Ovie et al. (2021) investigated regional-language interference in students' narrative writing. Ninsi and Rahim (2020) examined code-switching and code-mixing in classroom interaction. Studies by Suandewi et al. (2019) and Wedasuwari et al. (2022) also demonstrate the importance of reading, writing, and literary literacy in Indonesian language learning. These studies provide a basis for understanding the relationship between language background and literacy practices, but they do not specifically describe the linguistic forms occurring in Indonesian literary literacy practices among students at SMAN 1 Jongkong.

The research gap of this study is therefore contextual and empirical. The study focuses specifically on the linguistic forms appearing in the literacy practices of students in Class X Merdeka 3 at SMAN 1 Jongkong. Particular attention is given to regional vocabulary, local vocabulary, sentence-structure patterns, and non-standard written forms. However, the classification of a form as a Jongkong Malay feature requires linguistic evidence or confirmation from local speakers and cannot be based solely on its difference from standard Indonesian. Several related concepts must also be distinguished. Regional-language influence refers broadly to the presence of linguistic characteristics associated with a particular regional variety. Bilingualism refers to the use of two or more languages or linguistic varieties. Code-switching involves movement between linguistic codes according to communicative circumstances, while interference refers more specifically to the transfer of linguistic characteristics from one linguistic system into another. Literary literacy refers to literacy activities involving literary texts. These concepts are related but are not interchangeable.

The present study therefore adopts a cautious analytical position. A non-standard form may represent a Jongkong Malay feature, an informal Indonesian form, an orthographic variation, or another form of language contact. Each possibility must be considered before the form is classified as dialect interference. This approach responds to the need for clearer linguistic criteria and more traceable evidence in identifying Jongkong Malay influence. Based on this background, this study aims to describe the linguistic forms associated with Jongkong Malay found in Indonesian literary literacy practices among students of Class X Merdeka 3 at SMAN 1 Jongkong. The study particularly examines lexical forms, local vocabulary, sentence-structure patterns, and non-standard written forms while considering the evidential basis for each classification.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literary Literacy in Indonesian Language Learning

Literary literacy refers to the ability to engage with literary works through reading, interpretation, response, and written expression. In Indonesian language learning, literary activities provide opportunities for students to develop language skills while engaging with literary content. Huda (2021) explains that literary content in Indonesian language learning is closely related to students' language development. Wedasuwari et al. (2022) further emphasize that literary literacy can support language skills, creativity, critical thinking, and appreciation of literary works. In this study, literary literacy is operationally limited to observable language use during reading and writing activities involving literary works. This operational boundary is necessary to ensure that the conclusions correspond to the evidence collected.

Jongkong Malay Dialect and Regional Language Variation

Regional languages and dialects function not only as communication systems but also as markers of local identity and cultural experience. The Jongkong Malay dialect forms part of the Malay linguistic varieties used in the Kapuas Hulu region. Trisdiantoro et al. (2013) documented linguistic characteristics of Malay in Kapuas Hulu, including lexical relationships and vocabulary. Because the present study concerns a specific regional variety, a linguistic form cannot be classified as Jongkong Malay merely because it is informal or different from standard Indonesian. Such classification should be supported by local linguistic documentation, comparison with the local dialect, or confirmation from experienced local speakers. This distinction is particularly important for forms such as *abis, trus,* and *karna*, which may also occur in informal Indonesian outside Jongkong.

Bilingualism, Code-Switching, and Language Interference

Students who live in multilingual or bidialectal environments may use Indonesian alongside a regional language. This situation may result in code-switching, code-mixing, or language interference. Ninsi and Rahim (2020) demonstrate that code-switching and code-mixing may occur in educational interaction involving teachers and students. Kurniawan et al. (2017) also discuss the influence of regional language on Indonesian use. Interference, however, should be distinguished from ordinary non-standard language use. A form should only be interpreted as interference when there is sufficient evidence that a linguistic characteristic has been transferred from the regional language into Indonesian. Therefore, the present study uses interference as an interpretive concept rather than automatically applying it to every non-standard form.

Previous Related Studies

Several previous studies are relevant to the present research. Bawamenewi and Laia (2025) examined students' proficiency in using standard and non-standard Indonesian and demonstrated the importance of standard language competence in educational contexts. Ovie et al. (2021) investigated regional-language interference in students' narrative essays and showed that students' regional linguistic backgrounds may appear in written Indonesian. Ninsi and Rahim (2020) examined code-switching and code-mixing in classroom interaction and demonstrated the relationship between multilingual practices and educational communication. Suandewi et al. (2019) investigated the relationship between literacy culture and Indonesian language learning outcomes, while Wedasuwari et al. (2022) discussed literary literacy in the context of contemporary education. These studies collectively demonstrate the relevance of language background, literacy, and classroom language practices. Nevertheless, none of them specifically focuses on the Jongkong Malay dialect in Indonesian literary literacy practices at SMAN 1 Jongkong. This localized focus constitutes the contribution of the present study.

METHOD

Design and Samples

This study employed a qualitative approach with a case-study design. The case was limited to Class X Merdeka 3 at SMAN 1 Jongkong during the 2025/2026 academic year, with data collection conducted in May 2026. The participants consisted of 25 students in Class X Merdeka 3 and one Indonesian language teacher as a supporting informant. The 25 students were included as the class-level participant group for the observation of classroom literacy activities. The available research information indicates that interviews were also conducted with students during May 2026. However, because the available records do not provide a reliable separate number of interviewed students, this article does not claim that all 25 students were individually interviewed. The unit of analysis was an individual linguistic form or language-use event occurring in Indonesian literary literacy activities. The analysis distinguished evidence from reading activities and evidence from students' written work. Repeated occurrences were treated as separate data events only when they occurred in different identifiable texts or activities; otherwise, they were interpreted as repetitions of the same linguistic form rather than as evidence of a larger distribution.

Instrument and Procedure

The instruments consisted of an observation guide, an interview guide, and documentation procedures. The observation guide contained 10 items, while the interview guide contained 20 questions. The observation instrument was used to record language use during Indonesian language learning and literary literacy activities. The interview guide was used to obtain information concerning students'

language practices and the teacher's perspective on the use of Indonesian and the Jongkong Malay dialect. Documentation was used to collect students' written work and relevant records of classroom literacy activities. Data collection was conducted through classroom observation, interviews, and documentation during May 2026. Classroom observation focused on reading and writing activities involving literary works. Interviews were used as supporting evidence concerning students' language habits and classroom language practices. Student documents were examined to identify linguistic forms appearing in written literacy activities.

To avoid confirmation bias, the analysis did not assume that every non-standard form was a Jongkong Malay feature. Forms that did not clearly correspond to the local dialect were retained as non-standard or uncertain forms. This procedure allowed unexpected linguistic patterns to remain visible rather than forcing them into predetermined categories. The participants' identities were protected by using anonymous participant and document codes in the analytical presentation. Because the participants were school students, the final research report should identify the school permission, consent or assent procedures, confidentiality procedures, and permissions for recording or documentation based on the actual field records.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the qualitative analysis framework proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), involving data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The analysis began by collecting observation notes, interview information, and student documents. Relevant language-use events were then identified and assigned descriptive codes. The linguistic forms were subsequently grouped according to their observable characteristics. The classification consisted of regional vocabulary, local vocabulary, sentence-structure patterns, and non-standard written forms. The coding process was primarily descriptive and interpretive. First, the original linguistic form was retained exactly as it appeared in the student data. Second, the form was compared with the corresponding standard Indonesian form. Third, available local linguistic evidence was considered to determine whether the form could reasonably be associated with the Jongkong Malay dialect. Finally, the interpretation was compared with information obtained through observation, interviews, and documentation.

A form was not classified as Jongkong Malay interference merely because it differed from standard Indonesian. If the evidence did not establish a clear connection with the Jongkong Malay dialect, the form was treated as a non-standard or uncertain form. This procedure was used particularly for forms such as *abis, trus,* and *karna.* Methodological triangulation was conducted by comparing observation, interview, and documentation data. Source triangulation involved comparing information obtained from students and the teacher. Cases that could not be confirmed across sources were not used to support broad claims of prevalence or dominance.

Table 1. Stages of Research Data Analysis

Analysis Phase	Application in Research	Analysis Results
Data Reduction (Data Condensation)	Selecting, focusing, and grouping data from observations, interviews, and documentation regarding the use of the Jongkong dialect of Malay in Indonesian literary literacy practices. The data are classified based on literary literacy activities (reading, appreciating, and writing literary works) as well as the forms of dialect use and language interference.	Data relevant to the research focus is organized systematically.
Data Presentation (Data Display)	Organizing data in the form of descriptive narratives, tables, and excerpts from interviews to illustrate the use of the Jongkong dialect of Malay in the practice of Indonesian literary literacy.	Language usage patterns and forms of interference can be identified and interpreted
Conclusion Drawing and Verification	Interpreting the results of the analysis and verifying the findings through methodological triangulation (observation, interviews, and documentation) and source triangulation (teachers and students).	A cautious conclusion was developed regarding the documented linguistic forms and their possible relationship to the Jongkong Malay dialect.

Source: Adapted from Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Linguistic Forms Found in the Literacy Activities

The available data document several linguistic forms in Indonesian literary literacy activities. These forms are described in four analytical categories: regional vocabulary, local vocabulary, sentence-structure patterns, and non-standard written forms. The categories are used descriptively and do not imply that every form is necessarily a distinctive Jongkong Malay feature.

Table 2. Traceable Linguistic Forms in Indonesian Literary Literacy Activities

Code	Literacy Activity	Linguistic Category	Original Form	Standard Indonesian / Comparison	Interpretation
WR-01	Writing	Lexical/non-standard form	*trus*	*terus*	The form **"***trus***"** differs from standard Indonesian spelling. It may represent informal Indonesian or local usage; therefore, its Jongkong status requires further linguistic or local-speaker evidence.
WR-02	Writing	Non-standard written form	*karna*	*karena*	The form **"***karna***"** represents non-standard written Indonesian. Written evidence alone does not establish a phonological feature or confirm that the form is specifically a Jongkong Malay feature.
WR-03	Writing	Local vocabulary	*menggayongkan*	*mendayung*	The form "*menggayongkan*" was found in students' written

Code	Literacy Activity	Linguistic Category	Original Form	Standard Indonesian / Comparison	Interpretation
					work. In the local context, it refers to "*mendayung*." Its classification as Jongkong Malay local vocabulary should be supported by local-language usage or confirmation from an experienced Jongkong speaker.
WR-04	Writing	Sentence structure	Aku tidak tahu milik siapa itu	Aku tidak tahu punya siapa itu	The sentence structure differs from the standard Indonesian comparison presented in the table. However, the difference alone is insufficient to establish that the structure is specifically influenced by Jongkong Malay. Local linguistic evidence or comparison with the Jongkong Malay structure is required before making a definitive dialect-interference claim.
RD-01	Reading	Lexical form	*abis* / *trus*	*habis* / *terus*	The forms **"***abis***"** and **"***trus***"** are documented in the

Code	Literacy Activity	Linguistic Category	Original Form	Standard Indonesian / Comparison	Interpretation
					written material used in the reading activity. Their occurrence demonstrates non-standard lexical forms in the available data. However, they should not automatically be classified as Jongkong Malay features without supporting local linguistic evidence. No pronunciation claim is made because the available evidence is written.
RD-02	Reading	Non-standard written form	*karna*	*karena*	The form **"***karna***"** occurs in the written material used in the reading activity. It is classified as a non-standard written form in relation to standard Indonesian **"***karena***."** The reading activity provides evidence of the written form, but not independent evidence of pronunciation without an audio

Code	Literacy Activity	Linguistic Category	Original Form	Standard Indonesian / Comparison	Interpretation
					recording and transcription.
RD-03	Reading	Local vocabulary	*menggayongkan*	*mendayung*	The form "*menggayongkan*" is documented in the written material used in the reading activity. Its meaning is identified as "*mendayung*" in the available data. However, its classification as a Jongkong Malay local vocabulary item should be supported by local linguistic evidence or confirmation from an experienced Jongkong speaker.
RD-04	Reading	Sentence structure	Tidak tahu milik siapa itu	Tidak tahu punya siapa itu	The original reading material contains the sentence "Tidak tahu milik siapa itu." The written form is compared with "Tidak tahu punya siapa itu." However, the available written evidence does not establish that the sentence was pronounced using the Jongkong

Code	Literacy Activity	Linguistic Category	Original Form	Standard Indonesian / Comparison	Interpretation
					Malay dialect. Therefore, no pronunciation claim is made without audio evidence and transcription.

The table has been revised so that the original linguistic forms are preserved. This is important because translating the forms into English would remove the linguistic differences that constitute the evidence. The table also distinguishes between the activity, linguistic category, original form, standard Indonesian comparison, and interpretation.

Regional and Non-Standard Lexical Forms

The forms *abis* and *trus* appear in the available research materials. Their standard Indonesian equivalents are *habis* and *terus*. These forms demonstrate differences from standard Indonesian written forms. However, their occurrence cannot by itself establish that they are distinctive features of the Jongkong Malay dialect. This distinction is important because forms such as *abis* and *trus* may occur in informal Indonesian in other regions. Therefore, classifying them as Jongkong Malay requires additional evidence, such as local lexical documentation or confirmation from experienced speakers of the Jongkong variety. The revised interpretation therefore treats these forms cautiously. They are empirical examples of non-standard lexical forms in the available student data. If local evidence confirms their use as Jongkong Malay forms, they may subsequently be interpreted as regional vocabulary. Without such evidence, they should not be presented as uniquely Jongkong linguistic features.

Local Vocabulary

The form *menggayongkan* is identified in the research material as local vocabulary. Unlike *abis*, *trus*, and *karna*, this form requires particular attention because its meaning and distribution need to be established through local linguistic evidence. The original form is therefore retained exactly as it appears in the data. The English manuscript should not replace it with an uncertain translation because doing so could alter the linguistic evidence. The Indonesian equivalent and meaning should be confirmed through a local lexical source or experienced speaker. If local validation establishes that *menggayongkan* is used specifically or characteristically in the Jongkong Malay variety, it can be interpreted as evidence of local lexical

influence. If it is found to occur more broadly in other Malay varieties, the interpretation should be narrowed accordingly.

Sentence-Structure Patterns

The original manuscript reported a sentence-structure pattern as evidence of local linguistic influence. However, the structural analysis requires the exact original Indonesian sentence. A translation into English cannot adequately demonstrate a syntactic difference between Jongkong Malay and standard Indonesian. Therefore, the revised article does not make a definitive syntactic-interference claim without the original sentence. The appropriate analysis should present the student's original Indonesian sentence, its standard Indonesian equivalent, and the corresponding Jongkong Malay structure if such evidence is available. This revision is important because sentence structure and pronunciation are different levels of linguistic analysis. A written sentence can provide syntactic evidence, whereas pronunciation requires audio or another direct record of speech.

Non-Standard Written Form

The form *karna* is compared with the standard Indonesian form *karena*. The available evidence supports its classification as a non-standard written form. However, the written form alone does not establish that students pronounce the word differently or that the form is caused by Jongkong Malay interference. From an educational perspective, this distinction is useful. Teachers can use such examples to teach students the difference between informal written forms and standard Indonesian forms required in academic writing. This does not require students to abandon their local dialect. Instead, students can develop the ability to select an appropriate linguistic variety according to communicative context.

Traceability of Evidence

The revised analysis uses source codes to distinguish writing and reading data. Codes beginning with **WR** represent writing data, while **RD** represents reading-related data. These codes can subsequently be linked to the original field records.
The use of source codes also prevents the findings from being presented as general statements about all students. The available data do not provide sufficient systematic frequency counts to establish that one category is more dominant than another or that most students use the Jongkong Malay dialect as their primary language. Consequently, the findings are presented as documented examples rather than quantitative prevalence claims. This approach is more consistent with the qualitative case-study design.

The findings indicate the importance of considering students' linguistic backgrounds when examining Indonesian literacy practices. Students may possess established linguistic habits associated with their local environment while simultaneously learning the conventions of standard Indonesian in school. The

appearance of a regional or non-standard form should therefore not automatically be interpreted as a lack of Indonesian competence. It may reflect the interaction between students' existing linguistic repertoire and classroom expectations. At the same time, formal Indonesian literacy requires students to understand standard spelling and grammatical conventions. Teachers can therefore use local linguistic forms as contrastive material. Students can compare a local or informal form with its standard Indonesian equivalent and discuss the contexts in which each form is appropriate. This approach places emphasis on linguistic repertoire rather than linguistic deficiency. The Jongkong Malay dialect can be recognized as a regional linguistic resource, while standard Indonesian remains the appropriate variety for formal academic writing.

The findings are consistent with Bawamenewi and Laia (2025), who emphasized the distinction between standard and non-standard language use among students. The occurrence of forms such as *karna* similarly demonstrates the need for students to understand standard written Indonesian. The findings also relate to Ovie et al. (2021), who showed that regional linguistic backgrounds may influence Indonesian written production. However, the present study takes a more cautious approach by requiring evidence before identifying a form as a specific Jongkong Malay feature. The relationship between language use and classroom interaction is also relevant to Ninsi and Rahim (2020), whose research demonstrates that students and teachers may use different linguistic codes in educational settings. In the present study, the distinction between local language practices and formal Indonesian expectations is particularly relevant to literacy activities. The findings further support the importance of literacy practices discussed by Suandewi et al. (2019) and Wedasuwari et al. (2022). Reading and writing activities provide contexts in which students' linguistic resources become visible and can be used as material for developing Indonesian language competence.

This study has several limitations. First, the research is limited to one class at one school, namely Class X Merdeka 3 at SMAN 1 Jongkong, so the findings cannot be generalized to all students or speakers of the Jongkong Malay dialect. Second, the available research materials do not provide systematic frequency counts for every linguistic form. Consequently, the study does not claim that regional vocabulary is the most dominant category or that most students use Jongkong Malay as their primary language. Third, some of the original linguistic examples require stronger local validation. A distinction must be maintained between Jongkong Malay features, general informal Indonesian, spelling variation, and language interference. Fourth, the analysis of pronunciation is limited because written data cannot independently demonstrate pronunciation. Any phonological claim would require audio recordings, transcription, and an appropriate phonological analysis. Fifth, the exact distribution of interview participants and detailed information concerning interview duration, recording procedures, and ethical documentation should be checked against the original field records before final submission. Finally, the literary literacy activities examined in the study are limited to the documented reading and writing activities. Therefore, the findings

should not be interpreted as representing all forms of literary appreciation or all language practices occurring at the school.

The findings have implications for Indonesian language teaching in regional-language environments. Teachers can incorporate students' local linguistic knowledge into contrastive language activities. Students can identify a local or non-standard form, compare it with the standard Indonesian form, examine its meaning and context, and revise it when producing formal academic texts. Such an approach does not require the elimination of the Jongkong Malay dialect from students' linguistic repertoire. Instead, it develops students' awareness of language variation and their ability to select an appropriate linguistic form according to context.

CONCLUSION

This study describes linguistic forms appearing in Indonesian literary literacy practices among students of Class X Merdeka 3 at SMAN 1 Jongkong. The available data contain examples that can be grouped descriptively into regional or local vocabulary, sentence-structure patterns, and non-standard written forms. The forms *abis*, *trus*, *karna*, and *menggayongkan* are retained in their original form so that the linguistic evidence is not lost through translation. The revised analysis emphasizes that a non-standard Indonesian form cannot automatically be classified as a Jongkong Malay feature. Forms such as *abis*, *trus*, and *karna* require further local linguistic evidence before they can be attributed specifically to the Jongkong Malay dialect. Likewise, *menggayongkan* and the reported sentence-structure pattern require local validation and presentation of the original linguistic evidence. The study suggests that Indonesian language instruction can use regional linguistic forms as contrastive learning material. Students can learn to distinguish local or informal forms from standard Indonesian forms according to communicative context. Such an approach supports students' competence in formal Indonesian while maintaining respect for the Jongkong Malay dialect as part of the local linguistic environment.

REFERENCES

Bawamenewi, A., & Laia, D. A. E. (2025). Analysis of students' proficiency in the use of standard and non-standard language in accordance with the improved spelling system (EYD). *Aksara: Scientific Journal of Indonesian Language and Literature Education,* *9*(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.33087/aksara.v9i1.1000

Huda, M. (2021). Mapping literary content in Indonesian language textbooks for junior high school. *KREDO: Scientific Journal of Language and Literature,* *4*(2), 293–310.

Kurniawan, A., Ngalim, A., & Prayitno, H. J. (2017). Javanese interference in Indonesian as a strategy for achieving politeness in language use. *Edukasi: Journal of Educational Research and Articles,* *9*(2), 27–34.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A*

methods sourcebook (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ninsi, R. A., & Rahim, R. A. (2020). Code-switching and code-mixing in the speech acts of teachers and 10th-grade students at Insan Cendekia Syech Yusuf High School. *Jurnal Idiomatik: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 3*(1), 35–46.

Ovie, A. N., Pratiwi, A. S., & Nurfitriani, M. (2021). Interference of regional languages into Indonesian in students' narrative essays. *Cendekiawan, 3*(2), 65–70.

Suandewi, P. M., Putrayasa, I. B., & Gunatama, G. (2019). The relationship between literacy culture (reading and writing) and Indonesian language learning outcomes among 10th-grade students at Denpasar State High School 7. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 9*(2). https://doi.org/10.23887/jjpbs.v9i2.20453

Trisdiantoro, H., Hanye, P., & Susilo, F. (2013). Synonyms in the Kapuas Hulu dialect of Malay. *Khatulistiwa Journal of Education and Learning, 2*(5), 1–18.

Wedasuwari, I. A. M., Erawan, D. G. B., & Putra, I. K. W. (2022). Literary literacy in the 4.0 era. *WIDYABHAKTI: Jurnal Ilmiah Populer, 4*(2), 25–29.