

## Democratic Liberal Theory Based on Literature Review

Iskandarsyah Siregar<sup>1</sup>, Sahrudin Lubis<sup>2</sup>, Hari Zamharir<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Nasional

[regaranggi@presidency.com](mailto:regaranggi@presidency.com)

### Abstract

*Since the emergence of the application of the idea of democracy as the system of choice, various groups have complained about the evil practices of democratic politics. One of the shooting targets is that we choose the wrong one, namely adopting the model of the majority or liberal democracy. In the literature on democratic theory, one of the relevant theories for improving democratic practice is TDD (Theory of Deliberative Democracy). Although still using the principle of representation, TDD in general makes corrections or improvements to the procedures and substance of democracy which have so far been poorly practiced in Indonesia. This research is qualitative research using a descriptive-analytic method to provide a clear picture of the object of the problem. The conclusion of this study shows evidence of the existence of a democratic model both in substance and procedure. In contrast to the representative mechanism which was originally derived from the theory of representative democracy. There is visible hypocrisy and inconsistency in the implementation of democracy, which has never been considered a complete system.*

### Keywords

democratic; liberal; TDD;  
literature; review



### I. Introduction

In theory, democracy is an idea in which the government makes the people (demos) the highest authority (Kratos). In this sense, formally democracy can be interpreted as government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Of course, in countries with small populations, democracy can be direct, where the people directly determine what is suitable for themselves through public discussion. However, in countries with a large population, such as Indonesia, the people are represented by people who sit as representatives of the people, and they are the ones who ensure that all government work refers to the interests of the people. From this point of view, according to current opinion, democracy presupposes certain moral values in practice, such as honesty, fairness, representation and alignment, to the interests of the people who are higher and not to the interests of small groups or groups in society.

As far as experience in Indonesia after the 1998 reformation, democracy is seen with a double heart. On the one hand, many people adore democracy as the only government system most suitable to lead the Indonesian people to justice and prosperity. On the other hand, many people also condemn democracy for allowing chaos to occur in the name of freedom of expression. Because much confusion is hidden behind the adage of freedom of expression, concrete efforts to build justice and prosperity in Indonesia must be improved. At the ontological level, namely, democracy has also invited pros and cons. Many people support fundamental democratic values, such as freedom and equality between people. However, many also argue that these values undermine the social order that has supported human society for centuries.

One thing that distinguishes democracy from other government systems, such as theocracy, oligarchy, or monarchy, is its treatment which sees all its citizens as equal legal subjects who have the same dignity and worth. After all, as Harrison puts it, democracy is "government by all, as opposed to rule by one (monarchy), or government by a few (oligarchy)."

During the political liberalization of the reform era (1998 – present), various groups complained about the evil practices of democratic politics. One of the shooting targets is that we have made the wrong choice of adopting a majoritarian democracy model or "50 + 1 democracy" or, simply put, "liberal democracy." In the literature on democracy theory, one of the theories relevant to improving democratic practice is TDD (Theory of Deliberative Democracy). Although still using the principle of representation, TDD generally makes corrections or improvements to the procedures and substance of democracy that have been poorly practised in Indonesia today.

This research was conducted to strengthen the theoretical basis of our efforts to conduct empirical studies in the field in the field of local politics and democracy: "The Intensity of Deliberation in Political Democracy" 2014 in two ( 2) regions, namely Jembrana Regency and Bogor Regency in 2014 by TB Massa, Firdaus Syam, and Hari Zamharir. This presentation tries to create an overview of TDD, which results from a literature survey in this field. First will be described, the substance of TDD, its elaboration, and discussion. Second, the issue of rationality and procedural aspects. The third is about some writings on TDD practices in several countries.

## II. Review of Literature

The term democracy means the people in power or government by the people. In Greek, *demos* mean people, and *Kratos* mean power or power. (Budiarjo, 2008:105) In ancient Greece, the prevailing democratic system was a direct democracy. At that time, such a system could be implemented because it occurred in austere conditions. Meanwhile, in this modern era, the democratic system is a representative democracy.

The two democratic systems mentioned above share the same premise that a democratic system cannot involve citizens. Citizens themselves are the basis and purpose of democracy, created as a system chosen to be lived by a country. Based on the writings of Gastil (2008:5-7), there are three specific criteria of the democratic process expressed by political scientist Robert Dahl. The criteria mentioned are criteria that apply and work for social groups that have a democratic view. The three criteria are inclusion, participation opportunities, and enlightened understanding. The economic condition of the population is a condition that describes human life that has economic score (Shah et al, 2020). Economic growth is still an important goal in a country's economy, especially for developing countries like Indonesia (Magdalena and Suhatman, 2020).

The emphasis on inclusion criteria is that adults in a group must be involved in the decision-making process. When a group restricts all adults from being involved, the system adopted by that group cannot be said to be democratic. Adults in this criterion are interpreted as citizens who have an understanding and attitude towards a particular issue. Meanwhile, groups other than adults are children considered not to have the capacity to form their government and people outside the group who are not related to the group.

In the participation opportunities criteria, the emphasis lies on how members of the democratic system use their participation opportunities. Everyone in a democratic system has the same opportunity to participate in three related ways: putting an issue on the public agenda, expressing views, and voting on the issue either directly or indirectly.

The third criterion, enlightened understanding, is cognitive. Each member of a democratic system can think about which issues they want to put on the agenda, what they think about those issues, and how they should vote when allowed to do so. Granting the right for everyone to vote is not enough. To do that, everyone should be able to reflect on their values and get sufficient information.

Initially, it was written that the word deliberation comes from deliberation, which means consultation, considering, or deliberation. Gastil (2008, p. 9) wrote several descriptions of the word deliberation.

1. Deliberation begins when the public forms in-depth and accurate basic information to ensure that all citizens understand the problem clearly.
2. The public identifies and sets priorities regarding what values are related to an issue being discussed.
3. The public identifies solutions on a broad scale that may be able to solve problems.
4. The public weighs the pros and cons of support by applying knowledge systematically to reach several alternative solutions to problems.

These four points show that the deliberation process is a public decision-making process based on a deep understanding and a lengthy discussion process. Thus, deliberation is not only placed within the political science framework regarding decision-making but is also related to social communication.

The public carries out this social communication. That is why the word deliberation is also associated with the word public in its development. Cook, Carpini, and Jacobs (2007:28) write down three principles regarding public deliberation described in the following paragraphs. First, public deliberation is a tool to educate and train citizens. In this case, education's function is to shape citizens into citizens who are well-informed, enlightened, and have attitudes that are not easily manipulated. In addition, the deliberation system trains citizens to generate trust in political institutions and their fellow citizens.

Second, participation in public deliberation is seen as a tool to build citizens' morale. The morale of these citizens is built and tested, especially when discussing a common issue. In the discussion, there will be a battle of interests and values they must decide together. In this way, citizens are trained to accept that decisions must be suitable for a few people and the common good.

Third, public deliberation is seen as a unique mechanism for producing a collective decision. Public deliberations are used to discuss and negotiate issues to produce decisions. This method is considered capable of breaking traditions, so it is different.

### **III. Research Method**

This study relies on qualitative research using descriptive-analytical methods. Bogdan and Taylor define qualitative methods as research procedures that produce descriptive data in written or spoken words from people and observable behaviour. The weakness of descriptive writing is that it does not explain causality and situational background and does not answer the question about why something happened. Therefore, it needs to be equipped with analytical methods. This study's use of analytical methods is based on the belief that every socio-political and legal phenomenon has a complex root situation and is interrelated in a

unified system. This study uses a collection technique through literature study, in-depth interviews, and observations. The literature study intends to understand some of the main concepts in this research, such as democracy and its variants, democratization, local political culture, and political actors. In addition, this study is also intended to obtain information about previous studies that discuss the same topic. In this study, data analysis was carried out both in the field and after the data was collected using an inductive approach. The data analysis process used in this study uses an interactive analysis model.

This analysis model is based on field research through the following process: the collected data is reduced to the main research findings relevant to the writing material and then presented narratively. Data reduction and presentation are two components of the analysis carried out simultaneously with the data collection process. The following process is drawing conclusions, which is carried out after the data collection process is presented, described, and logically given meaning. In this way, the ultimate goal of the analysis is to gain some understanding of meaning.

The analysis in these components interacts until the correct conclusion is obtained. If the conclusions are inadequate, retesting activities are needed by looking for more data in the field and trying to interpret them with a more focused focus. Thus, the analysis activity with data collection is a cyclical process until the research is completed.

#### **IV. Results and Discussion**

First, it should be clarified at the beginning of the presentation about TDD that, in a simple concept, there is a difference between the concept of "participatory democracy" and "deliberative democracy." The theorizing of deliberative democracy in an elaborative and discursive manner can be described as follows. Simone Chambers (2003), in her article on TDD, considers that "it is now commonplace to talk about the deliberative turn." 1 The theoretical concept of deliberative democracy (as an extension of representative/participatory democracy). The theoretical concept of a so-called "deliberative democracy" is essentially a spirit to talk about public affairs in a good way that is not overly driven by the will to win for the sake of the group, and the focus is on "what is said" not "who is speaking." In the editorial of Cohan and Rogers, "Briefly to deliberate means debate alternative based on considerations that all take to be relevant. It is a matter of offering a reason for alternatives rather than merely stating a preference for one another, with the rule of aggregation on submitted to bargaining the exchange of reasons that deliberative democracy puts at the centre of collective decision-making. It is not to be confused with a simple discussion on the condition of an exchange of private information ".

Furthermore, when discussing Fung and Wright's concept of EPG (Empowered Participatory Governance) as a variant of the idea of institutional arrangements for deliberative democracy, Baiochi (in Wright, 2003) describes TDD as follows: "Deliberative democratic theory refers to a body of political thought that seeks to develop a substantive version of democracy based on public justifications, more discourse-based democracy. It calls for the deliberations of the citizen as good equals ...."

In this case, some explanations need to be presented. Fishkin (2011), in his writing, "Deliberative Democracy and Constitutions," defines it as "the combination of political equality and deliberation, and situates this form of democracy in the context of a range of alternatives." 2009) as a form of the government-sponsored consensus conference, which is Taiwan's model of citizen participation (although, again, studies of the "outside" of political life do not explore the "inside" that gave rise to that model). Concerning society-state

relations, Farrelly from Queens University, Canada, explains Zurn's theoretical concept of deliberative democracy according to Zurn's explanation (in Farrelly, 2009). Deliberative democracy adheres to the critical position of reasons-responsiveness from the State: In contrast to the liberal democracy model with deliberative democracy, Farrelly explains that "Rather than reducing legitimacy to the aggregation of individual's preferences, deliberative democrats insist that state action be responsive to good reasons. As Zurn puts it, 'reasons responsiveness' is at the core of deliberative conceptions. Zurn believes that Jurgen Habermas's account of deliberative democratic constitutionalism is the most promising normative account of the co-constitutive character of constitutionalism and democracy".

In this connection, Pablo de Greiff (2000) of the State University of New York, Buffalo—cited critiques of liberal democracy by Anne Phillips (1996) and Amy Gutmann (1983). Richard B Miller (1996)—lists the following criticisms:

1. The community level is reduced to representatives consisting of atomized individuals.
2. Democracy relies on representation with the result of citizen apathy.
3. Problematic because they cannot deal with issues of differences such as gender, race, and culture.

Meanwhile, T. Christy, in a book review, T. Christy analyzed DD in coffee shops in England. This is related to the tradition of the elite class in England, fond of strange items from the East (Turkish-Islamic civilization), including coffee. The urban masses imitate drinking coffee in coffee shops; coffee shops become "markets for exchange of information and public discussion." Christy reviews this book in agreement with Cowan, who uses the lens of deliberative democracy theory. "Cowan provides an interesting overview of the growing public political participation in urban communities. There is a tendency; for Cowan to continue Habermas' idea that the coffeehouse functions as a place for the actual exchange of information that partially obscures the original sex-changing of people when they enter the coffee shop. In the end, Christy notes: "... Cowan explains in a Habermas style that 'fluid' and 'cool' public participation, which can involve all social strata, needs to; Cowanewed, and 'shuffled' continuously produce a revolution, coffee shops have an important role in building civil society, he said."

The theory of deliberative democracy as a theory of democracy contains concepts aimed at deepening and straightening representative democracy. The theoretical concept of what is called "deliberative democracy" can be said to be driven by the spirit to revitalize democratic politics by discussing public affairs in a good way without being overly motivated by the will to win for the sake of the group; Also the focus is on "what is said" not "who is speaking." In this case, some explanations need to be presented. Fishkin (2011), in his writing, "Deliberative Democracy and Constitutions," defines it as "the combination of political equality and deliberation, and situates this form of democracy in the context of a range of alternatives."

Farrelly from Queens University, Canada, concerning society-state relations, explained Zurn's theoretical concept of deliberating democracy. That is according to Zurn's explanation (in Farrelly, 2009), deliberative democracy adheres to the critical position of reasons-responsiveness from the State by making In contrast to the liberal democracy model with deliberative democracy, Farrelly explains that "Rather than reducing legitimacy to the aggregation of individual's preferences, deliberative democrats insist that state action be responsive to good reasons. As Zurn puts it, the notion of 'reasons-responsiveness is at the core of deliberative conceptions. Zurn believes that Jurgen Habermas's account of deliberative democratic constitutionalism is the most promising normative account of the co-constitutive character of constitutionalism and democracy".

One of the democratic practices that go hand in hand with TDD is the democratic modality in the recent Taiwan Dharmic Democracy. The deliberative democracy characteristic of Dharma Democracy is shown by Lin (2009) as a form of the government-sponsored consensus conference, which is Taiwan's model of citizen participation (although, again, studies of the "outside" of political life do not explore the "inside" that gave rise to that model).

The ability to discuss socio-political affairs patiently and such in-depth study determine whether various societal segments are at that level. From the field findings of a researcher from the University of California, Rosenberg (2005) that there are only a few people with such abilities, it can be noted here that it seems that certain stages of development or a process of transformation from a "low" level of ability to a higher level are needed in order to have the qualifications to perform deliberative. Democracy and that in today's Taiwan, the process may have been exceeded. Rosenberg writes, "In a manner consistent with most research in social and developmental psychology. It is suggested that only a small minority of individuals demonstrates deliberative rationality, that is, the requisite capacity to reflect on their preferences and organize them concerning higher-order goals or over-arching life plans".

In this connection, Pablo de Greiff (2000) of the State University of New York, Buffalo cited critiques of liberal democracy by Anne Phillips (1996) and Amy Gutmann (1983). Richard B Miller (1996)—lists the following criticisms: (1) the community level is reduced to representatives consisting of atomized individuals; (2) democracy that relies on representation with the result of citizen apathy; (3) problematic because they are unable to deal with issues of differences such as gender, race, and culture. Gutmann and Thompson (2004) "Why Deliberative Democracy?". In the sub-heading What is DD, four descriptions of the characteristics of DD are presented, namely:

1. the involvement of citizens and representatives of citizens measures the validity of decisions,
2. citizens can access reasons or reasons for cases,
3. the process is not just talked about without being limited by time, but there is a time frame.

Meanwhile, Dryzek and List (2003) wrote an article, "Social Choice Theory and Deliberative Democracy: A Reconciliation." Deliberation itself has been used in different contexts from classical times to the present. In the classical period, deliberation became an exclusive group monopoly in the 18th century AD in Western Europe. Deliberation was also relatively elitist, namely by political representatives who resisted the emergence of popular opinion. Only in the 19th-century deliberation has a more modern, broad involvement of citizens in deliberation, with the figure of J.S. Mills (and now J. Habermas).

Dryzek and List argue that the theoretical foundations of two (2) social choice theory and DD theory can be brought together. More specifically, deliberative democracy and community involvement are closely related to urban politics. During the ongoing debate around Deliberative Democracy Theory (TDD) applied in cities—that is, related to the efficiency "dilemma" (which requires an effective and fast government process) on the one hand and accountability for legitimacy and discussion with city residents, so slower) on the other hand—the agenda for using TDD.

One of them is the development of the idea that the deliberation model, which was initially small in scope (local areas of decision-making referred to in Fung's work (2003, 2004), has now been expanded to a city-scale: "Cities have been the privileged loci for deliberative experiments. In this urban political context, three (3) levels of locus deliberation have been practised: (1) the city level and the most widely publicized is the Porto Alegre

experiment in Brazil – which was then replicated in 170 municipal cities throughout Brazil (2) the level of community association (such as in the NRP (or Village Revitalization Program in Minneapolis in the US; and (3) practice in sectoral development, namely the health sector in Brazil by forming a health sector council to plan health development.

The push for direct involvement in local government was again fueled by disappointment with the poor performance of local governance mechanisms. In Canada, reformist peasants from several provinces adopted a procedure for drafting citizen-based legislation: "popular dialogue' helped shift institutional settlements in favour of more direct control."

The importance of CSOs or NGOs/ORMAS or the third sector for the democratization and efficiency of local governments has been discussed, among others, by Jan Bucak and Brian Smith (2000). The third sector is the "structure of non-supramental organizations on the part of local governance, the so-called third sector of voluntary bodies, not-for-profit organizations, community groups, and other local associations."

Dryzek (2000) and Archon (2003) trace several essential contributions made by the actions of voluntary associations in society (NGOs/Ormas) to improve the quality of democracy. The process of improving democracy and citizens' democratic behaviour (civil socialization and political education (b) strengthening the bargaining power of the community to fight for the public interest ((interest representation function)) (c) becoming a bridge for the realization of deliberation and the growth of an adequate public space (public deliberations and the public sphere, and (d) more open and democratic governance and citizen participation is in the mainstream (direct governance).

TDD is formulated by experts (in the Western worldview) from a rationalist perspective. That the community in deliberative conversations emphasizes rationality (not influenced by feelings and emotions). There are constructive criticisms regarding this mainstream rational model, which seeks to close the gap between ratio and emotion. Such criticism, among others, comes from the findings of a scholar in the Eastern worldview, Shih-Diing Liu (2008). This finding is reasonable considering the object of the study is the conversation of Taiwanese people with their relatives in mainland China via the Internet. Liu wrote, "By examining a range of emotional practices observed in Internet forums and chat rooms. The argue that although the rationalist perspective is a good approach to thinking about what democracy is to be like, it cannot adequately account for the political energy of online discussions that do not fit the normative criteria set for an idealized public sphere. This study attempts to fill this gap by examining the emotionally charged conversations and interactions in Internet chat rooms concerning cross-strait relations between mainland China and Taiwan."

The TDD procedure is also described by Chen & Deng (2007). The two authors started with the pre-deliberation stage by reading relevant readings for the participants. This initial stage is the preparation stage: "Concisely described, the procedure follows the principles of a deliberative demo. The conference consists of preparatory and formal sessions. All of the participants in the conference are lay citizens, considered to be moral and political equals. Participants receive balanced, comprehensive, and understandable background readings from experts."

The next stage is called the official stage. This stage is a democratic process that relies on the public and the adequacy of information—including involving experts. Referring to the works of Zurita (2006), Fischer (2003), and Guston (1999), Chen and Deng describe as follows: "During the conference, participants are the major actors. They set the agenda of the

public discussion, choose the experts with whom they seek to talk, and finally make policy recommendations" .17

In Taiwan, as Chen and Deng explain, the context of the problem is unique. In the two cases conducted in Taiwan—one related to the surrogate motherhood project and the other regarding parental testing and screening—the preparation stage took two (2) days for participants to listen to explanations from experts regarding the substance of the topics they would discuss. After two weeks (for deposition and reflection and access to own information), a formal democratic process was started. The discussion process at this formal stage lasts three (3) days, taking weekends. Meanwhile, with the consent of the participants, the process was recorded on video.

The final stage is the in-depth interview stage. Two experienced research assistants carried out this stage. The results of the in-depth interviews were transcribed; Data analysis was carried out quantitatively and qualitatively.

From Cheng and Deng's study, several things were found: first, there was an increase in participants' understanding of science and technology after this deliberative democratic discussion took place. Second, the participants' attitudes improved regarding accepting technology (projects). Third, some dimensions enrich the perspectives that participants contribute to the experts' perspectives. The participants and participants increasingly absorb the four technical language styles and can express their ideas in their vocabulary.

Bohman reviews Guttman & Thompson's (1996) *Democracy & Disagreement*. He notes that these authors have offered a comprehensive package of DD procedures and substance and their application to various contemporary American political life cases. These two authors Bohman as scholars who highly rate DD with three (3) main characteristics of resolving differences and conflicts of view in society—the principle of reciprocity, publicity, and accountability. As Bohman wrote, these two authors see that "..... but its *raison d'etre* deliberation is indeed superior to other methods and principles in resolving conflicts”.

As an essential component of DD, public reasons (public reasons) are even more robust, as noted in Cohen's (1996) work, *Procedure & Substance in Deliberative democracy*. To achieve the results of the conversations made by liberal actors, there are obstacles regarding what makes sense, given society's different aspirations and perceptions. Cohen also noted that he had supported his DD principle with the need for a broader guarantee of freedom.

## V. Conclusion

This research shows that there is evidence of the existence of a democratic model, both in terms of substance and procedure, which is different from the representative mechanism which was originally based on democratic theory which was considered an ideal. What is different is the substance of deliberation in the spirit of equality and in-depth discussion, and the spirit is not a competition of interests or egoism, but what is called societal or oriented towards the benefit of the people, or what is stated in the expression of our four Pancasila precepts is wisdom.

As a correction or strengthening of the theory of representative democracy, TDD seems to be trying to revitalize the theory and practice of democratic politics. From a cultural point of view, TDD can also become a cornerstone of views that support the need to develop a democratic model that takes advantage of the nation's cultural wealth.

In principle, democracy shows a system that is far from ideal, where hypocrisy and injustice become inseparable components. The spirit of representation has become just a fake discourse, even though it continues to be touted.

### References

- Chang, Peter. (2011). "Confucian China and Jeffersonian America: Beyond Liberal Democracy" in "Abstract" (Asian Studies Review. March 2011 Vol 35 (1), pp. 43-59
- Chen, Dong-Sheng & Chun-Yeh Deng. (2007). "Interaction between Citizen and Experts in Public Deliberation: A Case Study of Consensus Conference in Taiwan," East Asian Science, Technology and Society: An International Journal. 1:77-97
- Cohen & Joel "Power & Reason" Archon Fung & Erik Olin Wright. (2013). Deepening Democracy Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance. New York: Verso, pp. 237-255
- Dahl, Robert A. (2001). On Democracy: Exploring Theory and Practice. Democracy in Brief, Translation of A Rahman Zainuddin, Jakarta: YOI, p. 158-163
- Dryzek, John. 2009. "Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building. Comparative Political Studies 42 (11): 1379-1402.
- Dryzek, John. 2017. "The Forum, the System, and the Polity: Three Varieties of Democratic Theory." Political Theory Journal 45 (5): 610- 636
- Fishkin, James S. (2011). "Deliberative Democracy and Constitutions" in Publication Abstract (Social Philosophy and Policy. Oxford. Jan 2011 Vol 28 (1)
- Harnecker, Camila Pineiro. (2007). "Workplace Democracy and Collective Consciousness: An Empirical Study of Venezuelan Cooperatives," in Monthly Review New York, November 2007, Vol 59 (6). Proquest.umi.com/pqdweb. Access 11/12/2010
- Lin, Kuo Ming & Dung Sheng Chen. (2003). "Consensus Conference and Deliberative Democracy: Citizen Participation in Taiwan's National Health Insurance Policy", in "Abstract", Taiwanese Sociology No 6 (Dec 2003), p. 61-118
- Lin, Kuo-ming. (2009)." State, Civil Society, and Deliberative Democracy: the Practices of Consensus Conference in Taiwan" in "Abstract", Taiwanese Sociology No 17 (June 2009), p. 161-217.
- Liu, Shih-Dining. (2008). "Undomesticated Hostilities: The Affective Space of Internet Chat Rooms across the Taiwan Strait, in Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique, Vol 16 (2), Fall 2008, pp. 435-455.
- Magdalena, S., Suhatman, R. (2020). The Effect of Government Expenditures, Domestic Investment, Foreign Investment to the Economic Growth of Primary Sector in Central Kalimantan. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. Volume 3, No 3, Page: 1692-1703.
- Purwoko. (2013). "Indonesian Political and Government System after Reformation" ejournal undip.ac.id.
- Rosenberg, Shawn. (2005). "The Empirical Study of Deliberative Democracy: Setting a Research Agenda" in Acta Politica Vol 40 2005. g 212-224.
- Sabrina, A., Siregar, I., & Sosrohadi, S. (2021). Lingual Dominance and Symbolic Power in the Discourse of Using the PeduliLindungi Application as a Digital Payment Tool. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 1(2), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2021.1.2.8>

- Salsabila, Siregar, I., & Sosrohadi, S. (2021). Analysis of Code Mixing in Jerome Polin Youtube Content "Nihongo Mantappu". *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 4(12), 01–08. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.12.1>
- Shah, M. M., et al. (2020). The Development Impact of PT. Medco E & P Malaka on Economic Aspects in East Aceh Regency. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. Volume 3, No 1, Page: 276-286
- Siregar, I. & Sabrina, A. (2021). Representation of Religious Values in Gurindam Twelve and Their Relevances with Modern Era. *International Journal of Cultural and Religious Studies*, 1(1), 50–57. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijcrs.2021.1.1.7>
- Siregar, I. & Salsabila. (2021). Acts of Illocutionary Speech by Ganjar Pranowo in the "One Hour Closer" Talkshow. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities Studies*, 1(1), 95–100. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijahs.2021.1.1.14>
- Siregar, I. & Siregar, R. (2021). The Relevances between Poda Na Lima Philosophy with Islamic Perspective. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i4.3240>
- Siregar, I. (2020). Exploration and Implementation of the Cultural System as a Solution to National and State Problems. <http://repository.unas.ac.id/id/eprint/811>
- Siregar, I. (2020). *Geografi Leksikon Betawi*. Jakarta: LPU Unas
- Siregar, I. (2021). Analysis of Betawi Language Interference on the Morphology of Adolescent Speech in Jakarta. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 3(8), 54-60. <http://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2021.3.8.7>
- Siregar, I. (2021). Epistemological Challenges Against Sociolinguistics. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 1(2), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2021.1.2.6>
- Siregar, I. (2021). The Existence of Culture in its Relevance to the Dynamics of Globalization: Bahasa Indonesia Case Study. *International Journal of Cultural and Religious Studies*, 1(1), 33–38. Retrieved from <https://www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijcrs/article/view/2285>
- Siregar, I. (2021). Verbal Communication of Schizophrenic Patients Due to Neurotransmitter Distortion. *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, 13(2), 543-556.
- Siregar, I. (2022). Criticism of Philosophical Approaches to Sociolinguistics. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i1.4233>
- Siregar, I. (2022). Cyber Library Auditorium Acoustic Evaluation in Acoustic Phonetic Perspective. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i1.4234>
- Siregar, I. (2022). Effective and Efficient Treatment of Regional Language Preservation Strategies in the Nusantara. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 4(2), 16–22. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2022.4.2.3>
- Siregar, I. (2022). Implications of Learning Methods Based on Multisensory Stimulation Therapy in Patients with Transcortical Aphasia. *I T A L I E N I S C H*, 12(1), 809–818. <https://doi.org/10.1115/italienisch.v12i1.252>
- Siregar, I. (2022). Islamic Values in Palang Pintu Procession in Semiotic Perspective. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i1.4239>
- Siregar, I. (2022). Language Response as a Cultural Element to Globalization. *Lakhomi Journal Scientific Journal of Culture*, 3(1), 8-18. <https://doi.org/10.33258/lakhomi.v3i1.619>

- Siregar, I. (2022). Papuan Tabla Language Preservation Strategy. *LingLit Journal Scientific Journal for Linguistics and Literature*, 3(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.33258/linglit.v3i1.620>
- Siregar, I. (2022). Semiotic Touch in Interpreting Poetry. *Britain International of Linguistics, Arts, and Education (BIO LAE-Journal)*, 4(1), 19-27. <https://doi.org/10.33258/biolae.v4i1.618>
- Siregar, I. (2022). Semiotics Analysis in The Betawi Traditional Wedding "Palang Pintu": The Study of Semiotics Roland Barthes. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 2(1), 01–07. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2022.2.1.1>
- Siregar, I. (2022). The Effectiveness of Linguistics in Studying Fiscal and Monetary Policy Issues. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i1.4235>
- Siregar, I. (2022). The Effectiveness of Multisensory Stimulation Therapy in People with Specific Language Disorder. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i1.4238>
- Siregar, I., & Yahaya, S. R. (2022). Betawi Speech Shift in Internal Family Communication. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i4.7511>
- Siregar, I., & Yahaya, S. R. (2022). Semiotic Exploration of Roti Buaya as a Cultural Ornament. *British Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 06–13. <https://doi.org/10.32996/bjal.2022.2.1.2>
- Siregar, I., & Zulkarnain. (2021). CSR-Based Corporate Environmental Policy Implementation. *British Journal of Environmental Studies*, 1(1), 51–57. Retrieved
- Siregar, I., & Zulkarnain. (2022). The Relationship between Conflict and Social Change in the Perspective of Expert Theory: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities Studies*, 2(1), 09–16. <https://doi.org/10.32996/bjajs.2022.2.1.2>
- Siregar, I., (2021). *Research Methodology*. Jakarta: Uwais Inspirasi Indonesia
- Siregar, I., Anjani, S. D., & Yahaya, S. R. (2023). Projection of the Vitality of the Betawi Language in the Future Time in Jakarta. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 6(3), 39–46. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.3.4>
- Siregar, I., Rahmadiyah, F., & Siregar, A. F. Q. (2021). Auditorium Model Assessment with Corrected Acoustic Function. *British Journal of Physics Studies*, 1(1), 01–06. Retrieved from <https://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/bjps/article/view/2610>
- Siregar, I., Rahmadiyah, F., & Siregar, A. F. Q. (2021). Linguistic Intervention in Making Fiscal and Monetary Policy. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities Studies*, 1(1), 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijahs.2021.1.1.8>
- Siregar, I., Rahmadiyah, F., & Siregar, A. F. Q. (2021). The Impact of Multisensory Stimulation of Biological Organs in Dysarthria Patients as Articulation Skills Rehabilitation. *British Journal of Nursing Studies*, 1(1), 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.32996/bjns.2021.1.1.3z>
- Siregar, I., Rahmadiyah, F., & Siregar, A. F. Q. (2021). Therapeutic Communication Strategies in Nursing Process of Angry, Anxious, and Fearful Schizophrenic Patients. *British Journal of Nursing Studies*, 1(1), 13–19. <https://doi.org/10.32996/bjns.2021.1.1.3>
- Siregar, Iskandarsyah. (2016). *Eksposisi General Psikolinguistik*. Jakarta: LPU Unas
- Stiglitz, Joseph, "The Way Ahead" in *Globalization and Its Discontents* (New York: Norton & Company, 2002), p. 214-252.

- Young, Iris Marion. (1997). "Difference as a Resource for Democratic Communication" , in *Deliberative Democracy*, ed. James F. Bohman and William Rehg. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 383-406.
- Young, Iris Marion. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.