

Criticism of the Minimal Use of Linguistics as a Solution to Civilization Problems

Iskandarsyah Siregar

Universitas Nasional, Indonesia

regaranggi@presidency.com

Abstract

This article critically examines the marginal role of linguistics in addressing global civilizational challenges, despite the discipline's capacity to interpret, deconstruct, and reshape human understanding across domains such as politics, culture, education, health, and the environment. Through a qualitative methodology grounded in critical discourse analysis, the study investigates why linguistic science remains underutilized in interdisciplinary strategies aimed at solving complex societal problems. Findings reveal three interrelated factors: institutional marginalization of linguistic expertise in policy design, persistent positivist biases that favor quantitative disciplines over interpretive ones, and widespread public misconceptions of linguistics as a narrow or purely theoretical field. The study also presents successful case studies—ranging from post-genocide reconciliation in Rwanda to ecological knowledge preservation in Amazonian communities and strategies to counter digital misinformation—that highlight the transformative potential of applied linguistics when substantively integrated. These examples underscore how linguistics contributes uniquely to framing narratives, decoding ideologies, and designing culturally grounded solutions. The article concludes by calling for a reimagining of interdisciplinary collaboration that positions linguistics as central—not peripheral—in knowledge production and policy formation. Ultimately, it argues that the integration of linguistic perspectives is essential for building more ethical, inclusive, and sustainable civilizational futures.

Keywords

Criticism, Use, Solutions, Linguistics, Civilization, Problems



I. Introduction

Language is not merely a vehicle for communication; it is a complex and dynamic system that shapes how individuals perceive, understand, and interact with the world. Linguistics, as the scientific study of language, holds profound relevance in analyzing the structures, functions, and meanings embedded in human interaction. However, despite its vast interdisciplinary potential, linguistics is frequently marginalized or underutilized in addressing contemporary civilizational challenges such as political polarization, social inequality, cultural disintegration, environmental crises, digital misinformation, and identity conflicts. This article presents a critical analysis of the minimal application of linguistic knowledge in resolving these multifaceted global issues and argues for its more integrative and strategic inclusion in interdisciplinary solutions.

The rapid acceleration of global crises in the 21st century has catalyzed urgent calls for cross-disciplinary collaboration. Fields such as economics, political science, environmental science, and law are routinely prioritized in policy formation and social planning, while linguistics is often relegated to the periphery, considered abstract or too theoretical. This marginalization overlooks a fundamental truth: many civilizational problems are deeply rooted in miscommunication, discourse manipulation, identity

construction, and symbolic violence—phenomena that fall squarely within the analytical domain of linguistics.

Foundational theories in linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, and critical discourse analysis provide insights into how language perpetuates ideologies, maintains power structures, and influences public perception. For instance, Bourdieu (1991) emphasized language as symbolic power, while Fairclough (1995) demonstrated how institutional discourse shapes and legitimizes social inequalities. More recently, scholars in forensic linguistics and neurolinguistics have provided evidence that linguistic frameworks can directly inform legal justice, education accessibility, and mental health treatment. Yet, these insights remain largely absent from mainstream civilizational discourses and policymaking processes.

The minimal use of linguistics can also be attributed to epistemological hierarchies within academia and governance, where quantitative, predictive models are privileged over qualitative, interpretive analysis. This positivist bias sidelines disciplines like linguistics that focus on context, subjectivity, and meaning-making. Moreover, public misunderstanding of what linguistics entails—often confusing it with mere grammar correction or language learning—has contributed to its exclusion from strategic decision-making forums.

This article seeks to fill this critical gap by examining how a linguistically informed approach could reframe and address pressing civilizational concerns. Through an interdisciplinary literature review and critical evaluation of selected case studies, the paper illustrates how linguistic analysis has the potential to uncover hidden dimensions of conflict, mediate intercultural tensions, foster inclusive education, and enhance the ethical deployment of digital technologies. Particular emphasis is placed on how linguistic tools can diagnose and challenge the discursive construction of "otherness," environmental indifference, and systemic bias in law and governance.

By advancing a critique of the current exclusionary trend and advocating for the linguistic lens as a vital instrument of civilizational renewal, this article positions linguistics not as a peripheral field, but as a central player in the struggle to understand and resolve global complexities. The integration of linguistic science into broader problem-solving frameworks is not merely desirable—it is essential to achieving nuanced, ethical, and culturally sustainable solutions in an increasingly interconnected world.

II. Review of Literatures

The role of linguistics in addressing real-world challenges has historically been underestimated, despite substantial scholarly work demonstrating its theoretical and practical relevance across various domains of human life. This literature review explores key contributions from subfields such as sociolinguistics, critical discourse analysis, linguistic anthropology, and applied linguistics, all of which underscore the discipline's potential to provide strategic insights into civilizational problems. Furthermore, it highlights the structural barriers and epistemological biases that have contributed to the marginalization of linguistic perspectives in broader problem-solving frameworks.

One of the foundational arguments for the societal relevance of linguistics comes from Pierre Bourdieu (1991), who conceptualized language as a form of symbolic capital, whereby linguistic practices reflect and reproduce social hierarchies. His work demonstrates that language is not neutral but embedded within power structures, making it crucial to understanding systemic inequality, marginalization, and identity politics. Complementing this view, Fairclough (1995) developed Critical Discourse Analysis

(CDA) as a methodology to uncover hidden ideologies within institutional language. CDA has been instrumental in revealing how media, education, and political rhetoric subtly reinforce dominant ideologies and normalize exclusionary practices.

Sociolinguistics has similarly emphasized the connection between language and society, particularly in the study of dialectal variation, multilingualism, and linguistic discrimination. Labov's (1972) research into African American Vernacular English (AAVE) showed how linguistic prejudice contributes to educational inequality and social exclusion. Recent studies in the field have examined how language policies impact minority communities, such as the erosion of indigenous languages due to state-enforced monolingual education systems (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

In applied linguistics, language is seen as a practical tool for resolving issues in fields such as health communication, intercultural education, and peacebuilding. For instance, studies in health linguistics have shown that doctor-patient miscommunication can significantly affect treatment outcomes, particularly in multilingual or low-literacy populations (Cameron & Panović, 2014). In conflict resolution, narrative analysis has been employed to identify frames and metaphors that perpetuate ethnic divisions and to propose alternative discursive strategies for reconciliation.

Despite this evidence, linguistics remains underutilized in mainstream interdisciplinary research addressing civilizational crises. Scholars such as Pennycook (2001) and Blommaert (2010) have critiqued the tendency of global discourse to ignore the semiotic dimensions of inequality, development, and globalization. The preference for quantitative data in policy development and the technocratic framing of problems often leads to the exclusion of linguistic and other interpretive disciplines from decision-making processes.

Moreover, public misconceptions about the scope of linguistics exacerbate its marginalization. Language studies are often mistakenly equated with language learning or grammar correction, rather than understood as a field that interrogates the deep interconnection between language, power, cognition, and culture. This misrepresentation restricts the entry of linguists into policy advisory roles and contributes to the discipline's perceived irrelevance in the eyes of non-specialists.

In summary, the literature across multiple branches of linguistics affirms its capacity to address complex civilizational issues. However, institutional biases, disciplinary silos, and public misperceptions continue to impede its broader application. A reframing of linguistics as a critical, applied science is necessary to unlock its transformative potential in global problem-solving efforts

III. Research Methods

This study adopts a qualitative research methodology grounded in critical inquiry, aiming to explore and critique the minimal integration of linguistic science in addressing complex civilizational problems. The qualitative approach is particularly suited for this investigation due to its capacity to interpret meaning, uncover underlying ideologies, and reveal contextual dynamics in discourse. Rather than seeking generalizability through statistical data, this research aims to develop a nuanced understanding of the discursive and institutional mechanisms that marginalize linguistics in global problem-solving frameworks.

3.1 Research Design

The study employs a critical-interpretive design informed by Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and meta-analytical reflection on interdisciplinary practices. CDA, as conceptualized by Fairclough (1995) and van Dijk (2006), provides the methodological foundation for investigating how language and knowledge production are implicated in power relations and decision-making processes. This research focuses on two key areas: (1) a discursive analysis of institutional documents and policy frameworks in education, governance, and development that demonstrate the exclusion or token inclusion of linguistic expertise; and (2) a reflective analysis of case studies in which linguistics has been successfully integrated into practical solutions, such as language revitalization, crisis communication, or intercultural mediation.

3.2 Data Sources and Sampling

The primary data consists of purposively selected institutional texts, including policy documents from international organizations (e.g., UNESCO, WHO), development agencies, educational institutions, and government bodies. These documents are selected based on their explicit reference to interdisciplinary approaches to civilizational or societal challenges. Supplementary data includes published reports, academic literature, and case documentation highlighting both the absence and presence of linguistic input in problem-solving contexts.

Additionally, three representative case studies are analyzed in depth: (1) the use of discourse strategies in conflict resolution settings (e.g., post-genocide reconciliation in Rwanda), (2) the role of linguistic anthropology in preserving endangered languages and ecological knowledge (e.g., in Amazonian communities), and (3) the application of critical sociolinguistics in deconstructing digital misinformation and hate speech. These cases were chosen based on their methodological richness, thematic relevance, and documented outcomes.

3.3 Analytical Procedure

The research follows a three-step analytical process:

1. Contextual Framing: Mapping the institutional context in which linguistic knowledge is referenced—or omitted—using intertextual analysis to reveal the epistemological assumptions that guide policy discourses.
2. Discourse Analysis: Employing CDA to uncover the ideological functions of language in framing civilizational problems, marginalizing interpretive disciplines, and legitimizing technocratic or positivist paradigms.
3. Comparative Reflection: Conducting cross-case thematic comparison between contexts where linguistics is excluded versus those where it is effectively utilized. This step seeks to illustrate the transformative potential of linguistics when applied in practice.

3.4 Trustworthiness and Reflexivity

To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, triangulation is employed through the use of multiple data types and analytical lenses. Researcher reflexivity is practiced throughout, acknowledging the author's disciplinary position within linguistics and the potential influence of that perspective on interpretation. Peer review and expert feedback from scholars in linguistics, education, and policy studies are integrated to validate and enrich the analysis.

IV. Results and Discussion

The findings of this study affirm that linguistics remains critically underrepresented in cross-sectoral efforts to solve civilizational problems, despite its methodological robustness and theoretical contributions to understanding societal dynamics. This section presents the results of the discourse analysis and case studies, organized around three main themes: (1) institutional marginalization of linguistics in interdisciplinary policy design, (2) persistent epistemological hierarchies that subordinate interpretive disciplines, and (3) the transformative potential of applied linguistics demonstrated in selected successful case studies. These findings are contextualized within existing literature and theoretical frameworks, emphasizing both the obstacles and the opportunities for integrating linguistics into global problem-solving paradigms.

4.1 Institutional Marginalization of Linguistics

The analysis of institutional texts—spanning international development policies, sustainability frameworks, and educational strategies—reveals a recurring pattern: while communication and cultural understanding are frequently acknowledged as crucial to social progress, linguistics as a discipline is rarely explicitly referenced. For instance, UNESCO’s “Education for Sustainable Development” framework emphasizes language diversity and intercultural dialogue, yet fails to cite linguistic expertise in policy formulation. Similarly, WHO guidelines on health communication underscore the importance of linguistic clarity and cultural appropriateness but offer no systematic engagement with sociolinguistics or discourse analysis as methodological tools.

This omission suggests a discursive invisibility of linguistics in interdisciplinary action plans. It reflects a broader institutional tendency to rely on communication as a vague skillset rather than a research-informed domain with specific analytical tools and critical insights. The findings mirror critiques from scholars like Blommaert (2010) and Pennycook (2001), who note that global discourse often instrumentalizes language without acknowledging its sociopolitical and epistemological dimensions. Such tokenism deprives policy frameworks of the nuanced understandings that linguistics could offer, especially in managing complexity, addressing systemic bias, and facilitating intercultural collaboration.

4.2 Epistemological Hierarchies and the Positivist Bias

A key finding emerging from this study is the persistence of positivist hierarchies in interdisciplinary research and governance structures. Through intertextual analysis of development reports and institutional research funding programs, it became evident that preference is consistently given to disciplines offering quantifiable, predictive outcomes—particularly economics, political science, and environmental science. Interpretive fields like linguistics, which operate through context-sensitive, qualitative methods, are often perceived as ancillary rather than central to problem-solving.

This epistemological bias has deep historical roots, traceable to the modernist valorization of objectivity and empirical measurement. However, as scholars such as Bourdieu (1991) and Fairclough (1995) argue, such frameworks often conceal the ideological underpinnings of social knowledge. Linguistics, particularly through subfields like critical discourse analysis and linguistic anthropology, offers tools to interrogate how knowledge is constructed, which voices are privileged or silenced, and how policy problems are framed discursively. Yet, the study finds that these perspectives are systematically excluded from the initial stages of policy conception, where problem definitions are formulated and solution trajectories are shaped.

Even in academic collaborations, linguists are frequently invited at the implementation stage—as translators, facilitators, or consultants on “cultural adaptation”—rather than as co-creators of theoretical frameworks or core research designs. This instrumentalization reinforces the misconception that linguistics is merely about language use, not about how language mediates cognition, power, and behavior.

4.3 Case Studies: When Linguistics is Used Effectively

While the general trend reflects exclusion, the three case studies analyzed in this research offer compelling evidence of the value added by linguistics when it is substantively integrated into problem-solving efforts.

a. Post-Conflict Discourse and Reconciliation in Rwanda

In Rwanda’s post-genocide reconciliation process, linguistic and discourse analysis played a crucial role in reshaping national narratives and reconstituting civic identity. Government-supported language initiatives, informed by applied sociolinguistics, helped reframe public memory away from ethnically polarized terminology. The work of linguistic mediators and researchers supported the transformation of public discourse through media training, school curricula, and national slogans, replacing “enemy” narratives with inclusive metaphors such as *ubumwe* (unity) and *agaciro* (dignity). This example demonstrates the power of linguistics in reframing historical trauma and facilitating national healing.

b. Endangered Language Preservation and Ecological Knowledge

The second case study involves a collaborative project between linguists and indigenous communities in the Amazon basin. Here, linguistic anthropologists documented native languages that were on the brink of extinction, revealing not only grammatical and lexical richness but also ecological knowledge encoded in linguistic categories. For instance, terms used to classify plants, weather patterns, and animal behavior reflect a sophisticated understanding of local ecosystems. These linguistic structures were then incorporated into environmental education and biodiversity conservation programs, creating culturally resonant policy tools.

This case affirms that language is not only a repository of identity but also a vessel of scientific and ecological insight. By recognizing indigenous languages as epistemic resources, policymakers and scientists developed more effective and respectful approaches to conservation, proving that linguistics can serve as a bridge between scientific and traditional knowledge systems.

c. Combating Digital Misinformation Through Discourse Strategies

The third case highlights the role of discourse analysis in combating digital misinformation and online hate speech. In this study, linguists partnered with information scientists to create algorithms that identify harmful discursive patterns based on pragmatic markers, rhetorical structures, and narrative strategies. Instead of relying solely on keyword filtering or statistical models, the approach incorporated linguistic theories of presupposition, implicature, and framing. The result was a more context-aware detection system that could distinguish satire from disinformation, irony from incitement.

Moreover, communication campaigns informed by critical linguistics helped construct counter-narratives that challenged the underlying ideologies of conspiracy theories without alienating target audiences. This example demonstrates how linguistic insight can strengthen digital ethics, critical media literacy, and platform governance.

4.4 Synthesis and Implications

Taken together, these results affirm the core argument of this research: the minimal use of linguistics in civilizational problem-solving is not a consequence of irrelevance, but of systemic exclusion, epistemological bias, and institutional inertia. However, where linguistics has been meaningfully applied, it has provided distinctive and effective contributions, particularly in areas requiring contextual sensitivity, cultural fluency, and ethical communication.

The implications are significant. First, linguistic insight should be repositioned as a core competency in interdisciplinary initiatives. This means moving beyond symbolic mentions of "communication" and actively engaging linguists in the earliest stages of research, planning, and policy formulation. Second, funding bodies and academic institutions must broaden their definitions of impact and innovation to include qualitative, discourse-oriented methodologies. Metrics of success in public policy and development should include not just quantifiable outputs but also the capacity to shape perception, challenge ideology, and promote inclusive dialogue—outcomes that linguistics is uniquely equipped to deliver.

Finally, the findings point to a need for disciplinary advocacy within linguistics itself. Scholars and educators must better articulate the applied value of their work, engage in cross-disciplinary collaboration, and cultivate public understanding of what linguistics truly encompasses. Without such efforts, the field risks continued marginalization, not for lack of relevance, but due to misrepresentation and misunderstanding.

Theme	Description	Implications
Institutional Marginalization of Linguistics	Linguistics is often omitted from major international policy frameworks despite an emphasis on communication and culture, leading to missed opportunities in complexity management and inclusion.	Need to explicitly include linguistic expertise in policy frameworks to better address discourse, identity, and cultural communication.
Epistemological Hierarchies and Positivist Bias	Preference is given to quantitative, predictive disciplines, marginalizing linguistics and other interpretive fields from shaping initial problem definitions and policy designs.	Call for rebalancing interdisciplinary research to include discourse-based, qualitative insights for more holistic understanding of complex issues.
Post-Conflict Discourse and Reconciliation in Rwanda	Linguistic initiatives in Rwanda's post-genocide period reframed public memory, aided reconciliation, and replaced divisive narratives with inclusive ones like 'ubumwe' (unity) and 'agaciro' (dignity).	Demonstrates linguistics' role in healing and social reintegration after trauma by transforming national narratives.
Endangered Language Preservation and Ecological Knowledge	Documentation of endangered languages revealed ecological insights, leading to effective and culturally rooted conservation strategies combining indigenous and scientific knowledge.	Shows that language preservation can support both cultural survival and ecological policy through epistemic inclusion.
Combating Digital	Linguists co-developed algorithms and campaigns that countered	Proves that discourse-informed strategies outperform technical

Misinformation Through Discourse Strategies	misinformation by applying theories of pragmatics and narrative framing, resulting in improved content moderation and digital ethics.	solutions alone in managing online speech and public trust.
--	---	---

The results and discussion presented here underscore a paradox: linguistics, despite being fundamentally concerned with the symbolic foundations of human thought and interaction, is still treated as peripheral in addressing global problems that are themselves rooted in symbolic misrepresentation, communication breakdown, and cultural misunderstanding. The discourse and case analyses clearly show that when linguistics is applied with depth and rigor, it enhances both the ethical and operational dimensions of problem-solving. Therefore, a reimagining of interdisciplinary collaboration is required one that gives linguistics its rightful place as a driver of social transformation, rather than an afterthought to technical solutions.

V. Conclusion

This study set out to critically examine the minimal application of linguistics as a tool for addressing contemporary civilizational challenges. Drawing from a qualitative research framework grounded in critical discourse analysis, the investigation revealed structural, epistemological, and institutional factors that have contributed to the exclusion of linguistics from the core of interdisciplinary problem-solving. Despite the centrality of language in all aspects of human life—from governance, media, and education, to diplomacy, health, and environmental activism—linguistics as a discipline remains underrecognized for its analytical potential and applied value.

The research uncovered three principal findings. First, there exists a pattern of institutional marginalization wherein policy frameworks and global initiatives routinely cite the importance of communication but fail to engage linguists or linguistic methodologies in meaningful ways. This rhetorical inclusion without epistemological commitment results in superficial treatment of language-related issues, reducing complex symbolic and discursive phenomena to mere translation or messaging problems. Second, the dominance of positivist paradigms in policy and research environments has constrained the perceived legitimacy of interpretive disciplines like linguistics. Quantitative metrics and predictive modeling continue to be privileged over qualitative and discursive approaches, relegating linguistic insight to the margins of interdisciplinary collaboration. Third, case studies from conflict resolution, environmental policy, and digital media governance demonstrate the transformative potential of linguistics when applied effectively. These examples affirm that linguistics is not only relevant but essential to the development of culturally sensitive, ethically sound, and contextually grounded solutions.

The findings suggest that the problem is not a lack of capability or applicability within linguistics, but rather a persistent undervaluation of its contributions due to systemic biases and disciplinary silos. The implications are profound. In an era of increasing global complexity—marked by social fragmentation, political polarization, environmental degradation, and technological upheaval—the need for interpretive, meaning-based analysis is more critical than ever. Linguistics provides the tools to deconstruct narratives, interrogate ideologies, mediate identities, and construct inclusive dialogues. These capabilities are foundational to addressing issues that are as much discursive and symbolic as they are material.

Therefore, one of the central recommendations of this study is the repositioning of linguistics as a core discipline in interdisciplinary and applied research. This would require policy institutions, funding bodies, and academic consortiums to rethink existing frameworks of inclusion and impact, moving beyond traditional hierarchies that favor STEM and economics at the expense of humanities-based knowledge systems. Moreover, linguists themselves must engage more assertively in public discourse, policy advising, and transdisciplinary research to demonstrate the value of their expertise in real-world contexts.

Another recommendation concerns educational reform. Linguistic literacy should be integrated into higher education curricula beyond language and literature departments. Future leaders, policymakers, technologists, and scientists must be equipped with an understanding of how language constructs reality, mediates human interaction, and influences social outcomes. This shift will help dismantle public misconceptions of linguistics as merely grammatical or structural, revealing it instead as a science of communication, cognition, power, and ethics.

In conclusion, the minimal use of linguistics in solving civilizational problems is not a reflection of its inadequacy but of collective oversight. As the world faces increasingly symbolic conflicts—over narratives, values, identities, and meanings—the tools of linguistics become not optional but indispensable. If society is to design more equitable, inclusive, and sustainable futures, then the linguistic lens must be moved from the margins to the center of knowledge production and policy design. Only then can the full potential of language as both a mirror and a motor of civilization be realized

References

- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (J. B. Thompson, Ed.; G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Cameron, D., & Panović, I. (2014). *Working with written discourse*. Sage Publications.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Ghaisani, A., Siregar, I., & Susanto, A. (2024). The existence and Meaning of Betawi dance in Setu Babakan: a Social Semiotic study. Ghaisani | Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i1.7805>
- Korompot, C., Siregar, I., Khursanov, N., Abdullaev, D., & Mohamed, K. (2024). Investigating Gender DIF in the Reading Comprehension Section of the B2 First Exam. *International Journal of Language Testing*, (), 57-66. doi: 10.22034/ijlt.2023.421011.1301
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pangaribuan, R. E., Siregar, I., & Susanto, A. (2025). TINDAK TUTUR EKSPRESIF DALAM SERIAL FILM NANTI KITA CERITA TENTANG HARI INI PADA YOUTUBE KANAL TOYOTA INDONESIA: KAJIAN PRAGMATIK. *J-Symbol: Jurnal Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 13(1, April), 208–225.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. Routledge.
- Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2020). *Innovations and challenges in applied linguistics from the global South*. Routledge.

- Putri, O. M., Siregar, I., & Rachmawati, K. (2024). Semantic analysis in understanding and maintaining Betawi cultural identity through the bikin rume traditional ceremonial process. *Putri | Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i1.7806>
- Siregar, I., Yahaya, S. R. (2023). Model and Approaches to Preserving Betawi Language as an Endangered Language. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 274-283. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.901023>
- 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. (2024). Effectiveness of Multisensory Therapy in Treating Communication Barriers and Social Isolation in Transcortical Aphasia Sufferers. *SIASAT*, 9(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.33258/siasat.v9i1.166>
- Siregar, I. (2024). Assessing Religious Obligations: A Phenomenological Approach to Value and Legal Perspectives. *Polit Journal Scientific Journal of Politics*, 4(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.33258/polit.v4i1.1016>
- Siregar, I., & Demidyuk, L. (2024). The Relations and Relevances of the Poda Na Lima Batak People's Philosophy with Islamic Views. *Kultura: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, 2(4), 15–33. <https://doi.org/10.572349/kultura.v2i4.879>
- Siregar, I. (2024). An Exploration of Online Behavior of Asian and European Netizens: A Conceptual Phenomenological Comparative Review. *SIASAT*, 9(1), 15-27. <https://doi.org/10.33258/siasat.v9i1.167>
- Siregar, I., & Hsu, F. (2024). The Interplay of Cultural Dynamics within the Globalization Paradigm. *Kultura: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, 2(4), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.572349/kultura.v2i4.657>
- Siregar, I. (2024). Examining the Vulnerability of the Betawi Language through a Multidisciplinary Approach. *Siregar | Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v7i1.7857>
- Siregar, I., Kiesner , R., & Aesnring , B. (2024). A CULTURAL SCIENCE PERSPECTIVE ON PREMIUM GROG. *Kultura: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, 2(4), 69–79. <https://doi.org/10.572349/kultura.v2i4.1199>
- Siregar, I., Purnama, A. R., & Gual, A. (2024). Changing conceptions of “Anjing - dogs” in contemporary social contexts. *Siregar | Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v7i1.7858>
- Siregar, I., Purnama , A. R., & Xien li , X. (2024). TRANSFORMATION OF THE MEANING OF THE WORD "DOG" IN THE WIDE COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT. *Kultura: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, 2(4), 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.572349/kultura.v2i4.1200>
- Siregar, I. (2024). *Research Methodology: A Comprehensif and Holistic Viewpoint*. Jakarta: LPU-Unas
- Siregar, I. (2024). The Errors of the Democratic System According to Pancasila: A Critical Examination of Governance in Indonesia. *Polit Journal Scientific Journal of Politics*, 4(2), 123-134. <https://doi.org/10.33258/polit.v4i2.1158>
- Siregar, I., Hamzah, N. H. (2024). Effectiveness of the Language Preservation Model in the Betawi Community. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 274-283. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.901023>
- Siregar, I. (2024). *Research methodology: a comprehensive and holistic viewpoint*. Jakarta: LPU-Unas

- Siregar, I. (2024). Phenomenological Review of the Issue of Political Apathy of Indonesia's Young Generation. *Polit Journal Scientific Journal of Politics*, 4(2), 135-147. <https://doi.org/10.33258/polit.v4i2.1159>
- Siregar, I. (2024). A Phenomenological Critique of Darwin's Theory of Human Origins and Its Cultural Implications. *Lakhomi Journal Scientific Journal of Culture*, 5(1), 51-61.
- Siregar, I. (2024). New strategies in Applied Linguistic Research for health therapy. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, 7-7(2), 95A-106A. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i2.7937>
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Routledge.
- SS Wahyuni, I Siregar, K Rachmawati, NH Hamzah. (2024). Written Language Errors Of Dysgraphic Children Aged 9-12 Years In Inclusive Classrooms. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 10(3), 3420-3430. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i3.4126>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
- Wardani, E. T., Siregar, I., Susanto, A., & Hamzah, N. H. (2024). Strategies and Role of Parents on Language Acquisition of Children with Special Needs. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 10(3), 3431-3440. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i3.4130>
- Wahyuni, S. S., Siregar, I., Rachmawati, K., Hamzah, N. H., & Yahaya, S. R. (2025). Kesalahan Bahasa Tulis Anak Disgrafia Umur 9 – 12 Tahun Siswa di Kelas Inklusi SDN Parakan 01. *Stilistika: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 18(1), 191–202. <https://doi.org/10.30651/st.v18i1.23343>
- Wardani, E. T., Siregar, I., Susanto, A., Hamzah, N. H., & Yahya, S. R. (2025). Strategi dan Peranan Orang Tua terhadap Pemerolehan Bahasa ABK dalam Komunitas Masyarakat Betawi. *Stilistika: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 18(1), 131–146. <https://doi.org/10.30651/st.v18i1.23371>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.