

## Literature Analysis of the Theory of Liberative Democracy

Hari Zamharir<sup>1</sup>✉ and Sahrudin Lubis<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Faculty of Social and Politics Science, Universitas Nasional, Indonesia

✉ **Corresponding Author:** Hari Zamharir, **E-mail:** [zulkarnain@civitas.unas.ac.id](mailto:zulkarnain@civitas.unas.ac.id)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

**Received:** 02 October 2021

**Accepted:** 16 November 2021

**Published:** 09 December 2021

**DOI:** 10.32996/ijahs.2021.1.1.16

---

### KEYWORDS

TDD, literature, substance, procedures

---

### ABSTRACT

During the political liberalization of the reform era (1998 – present), various groups have complained about the evil practices of democratic politics. One of the shooting targets is that we have made the wrong choice, namely adopting a majoritarian or liberal democracy model. 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, in general, makes corrections or improvements to the procedures and substance of democracy that have been poorly practised in Indonesia today. This research is based on qualitative research using the descriptive-analytical method to provide a clear picture of the object of the problem. The conclusion of this study shows evidence that there is a model of democracy—both in substance and in procedures. They are different from the mechanism of representation initially derived from the theory of representative democracy.

---

### 1. Introduction

Democracy means a government carried out by making the people (demos) the highest power holder (Kratos). In this sense, formally, *democracy* can be defined as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Of course, in countries with small populations, democracy can work directly, where the people directly determine what is suitable for themselves through the mechanism of public discussion. However, in countries with large populations, such as Indonesia, the people are represented by people who sit in the people's representatives. They are the ones who ensure that all government work refers to the interests of the people. From this point of view, in my opinion, democracy presupposes specific moral values in practice, such as honesty, justice, representation, and partiality to the higher interests of the people, and not to the interests of a small group 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 system of government that is 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 there is much confusion hidden behind the adage of freedom of expression, concrete efforts to build justice and prosperity in Indonesia are hampered. At the ontological level, namely in itself, the concept of 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 have 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, in general, makes corrections or improvements to the procedures and substance of democracy that have been poorly practised in Indonesia today.

This paper is a UNAS research report at the expense of UNAS in the 2014 UNAS Stimulus Research scheme. 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, the substance of TDD will be described, its elaboration, and discussion. Second, the issue of rationality and procedural aspects. The third is about some writings on TDD practices in several countries.

## 2. Literature Reviews

The term democracy means the people in power or government by the people. In Greek, demos mean people, Kratos/kratein means 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 took place in austere conditions. Meanwhile, the democratic system used is a representative democracy in this modern era.

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 with a democratic view. The three criteria referred to are inclusion, participation opportunities, and enlightened understanding.

The emphasis on inclusion criteria is that adults in a group must be involved in decision-making. 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 understand and attitude towards a particular issue. Meanwhile, groups other than adults are children who are 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 has the opportunity to 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 have the opportunity to reflect on their values and get sufficient information.

In the beginning, 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 solve problems.
4. The public carries out a process of weighing 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 framework of political science 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. The function of education, in this case, 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 they are discussing a common issue. There will be a battle of interests and values that they must decide together in the discussion. In this way, citizens are trained to accept that there must be good decisions for a few people and the common good.

Third, public deliberation is 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 considered different.

### **3. 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, situational background and does not answer the question "why something happened." 11 Therefore, it needs to be equipped with analytical methods. This study's analytical methods are 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 is intended 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.<sup>15</sup>

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 then given meaning logically. 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, then retesting activities is needed by looking for more data in the field and interpreting them with a more focused focus. Thus, the analysis activity with data collection is a cyclical process until the research is completed.

### **4. Results and Discussion**

The theorizing of deliberative democracy elaboratively and discursively can be described as follows. 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." 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 center of collective decision-making. It is not to be confused with a simple discussion on the condition of and 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 would 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: 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".

In this connection, Pablo de Greiff (2000) of the State University of New York, Buffalo—citing critiques of liberal democracy by Anne Phillips (1996), 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 differences such as gender, race, and culture.

Meanwhile, T. Christy, in a book review, made an analysis of 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 exchanging 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; Cowan continues Habermas' idea that the coffeehouse functions as a place for the actual exchange of information that partially obscures the origin 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 would 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 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 to have the qualifications to perform deliberative. Democracy—and that in today's Taiwan, the process may indeed 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". Rosenberg gives us an understanding of the basic assumptions of deliberative democracy, namely the nature of the qualities of deliberative discourse; Also with that assumption, the question is asked whether people or the wider community can take part in an in-depth discussion which Rosenberg characterized as "in the rational, other-oriented, self-reflective, and just manner"?

In this connection, Pablo de Greiff (2000) of the State University of New York, Buffalo—citing critiques of liberal democracy by Anne Phillips (1996), 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 validity of decisions is measured by the involvement of citizens and representatives of citizens,
2. citizens can access reason or reasons for cases,
3. the process is not just talked without 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 is 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 were resistant to the emergence of popular opinion. Only in the 19th century, the concept of 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) theories, namely 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.

For city government continues to be developed. 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) Archon (2003) trace several important contributions made by the actions of voluntary associations in society (NGOs/Ormas) for improving the quality of democracy. The process of improving democracy and citizens' democratic behaviour (civil socialization and political educations (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).

Experts formulate TDD (in the Western worldview) from a rationalist perspective. The community in deliberative conversations essentially emphasizes rationality (not influenced by feelings and emotions). There are constructive criticisms regarding this mainstream rational model, which seek 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 looks pretty 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. I 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 to read 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 are provided with 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 itself, 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 both 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. Second, the participants' attitudes improved in terms of acceptance of 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 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 cases of contemporary American political life. These two authors a 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, the principle of publicity, and the principle of 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".<sup>18</sup>

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 obtain the results of the conversations made by liberal actors, there are obstacles in terms of 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.

## 5. Conclusion

There appears to be evidence that there is a model of democracy—both in substance and in procedures that are different from the mechanism of representation which was initially derived from the theory of representative democracy. What is different includes the substance of deliberation in the spirit of equality, deep conversations, and the spirit is not competition for interests or egoism, but what is called public-spiritedness or oriented to the benefit of the people, or what in the phrase in the fourth precept of Pancasila we are the wisdom of wisdom.

As a correction or reinforcement of the theory of representative democracy, TDD seems to be trying to revitalize the theory and practice of democratic politics. From a culturalist perspective, the existence of TDD can also be the basis for views that support the need for developing democratic models that utilize the nation's cultural wealth.

## References

- [1] Chang, P. (2011). Confucian China and Jeffersonian America: Beyond Liberal Democracy in. *Abstract Asian Studies Review*. March 2011 Vol 35 43-59
- [2] Chen, D & Chun-Yeh D. (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
- [3] Cohen & Joel (2013) *Power & Reason* Archon Fung & Erik Olin Wright. *Deepening Democracy Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. New York: Verso 237-255
- [4] Dahl, R. A. (2001). On Democracy: Exploring Theory and Practice. *Democracy, in Brief, Translation of A Rahman Zainuddin*, Jakarta: YOI, p. 158-163
- [5] Dryzek, J. (2009). (2010). Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building. *Comparative Political Studies* 42 (11): 1379-1402.
- [6] Dryzek, John. (2017). The Forum, the System, and the Polity: Three Varieties of Democratic Theory. *Political Theory Journal* 45 (5): 610- 636
- [7] Harnecker, C. P. (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
- [8] Purwoko. (2013). Indonesian Political and Government System after Reformation. *ejournal undip.ac.id*.
- [9] Fishkin, J. S. (2011). Deliberative Democracy and Constitutions. in *Publication Abstract (Social Philosophy and Policy*. Oxford. Jan 2011 Vol 28 (1)
- [10] Lin, K. (2009). State, Civil Society, and Deliberative Democracy: The Practices of Consensus Conference in Taiwan in *Abstract*. *Taiwanese Sociology* No 17 (June 2009), 161-217.
- [11] Liu, S. (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, 435-455.
- [12] Lin, K. M. & Dung S. C. (2003). Consensus Conference and Deliberative Democracy: Citizen Participation in Taiwan's National Health Insurance Policy, in "Abstract", *Taiwanese Sociology* No 6. 61-118
- [13] Rosenberg, S. (2005). The Empirical Study of Deliberative Democracy: Setting a Research Agenda in *Acta Politica* Vol 40 2005. g 212-224.
- [14] 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>
- [15] 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>
- [16] 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>
- [17] 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>

- [18] Siregar, I. (2021). Verbal Communication of Schizophrenic Patients Due to Neurotransmitter Distortion. *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, 13(2), 543-556.
- [19] 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>
- [20] 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>
- [21] Siregar, I. (2020). Geografi Leksikon Betawi. Jakarta: LPU Unas
- [22] 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>
- [23] 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>
- [24] 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>
- [25] Young, I. M. (1997). Difference is a Resource for Democratic Communication, in *Deliberative Democracy*, ed. James F. Bohman and William Rehg. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 383-406.
- [26] Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.