

## **THE PARADOX OF PUBLICATION POLICY: THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE INDONESIAN LANGUAGE VS. THE HEGEMONY OF SCOPUS**

**Pondra Muliawan**

STIT Darul Ishlah Tulang Bawang

Email: [pondramuliawan93@gmail.com](mailto:pondramuliawan93@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

Indonesia's current higher education policy is marked by a stark paradox between the government's ambition to internationalize the Indonesian language and the hegemony of an academic evaluation system that strictly mandates publication in Scopus-indexed journals. This regulatory paradox triggers systemic problems such as the misalignment of faculty research objectives, the exodus of high-quality manuscripts abroad, and massive financial waste of state funds on foreign commercial publication costs. This study aims to thoroughly unravel the root of the paradox between global metrics-based publication policies and the national language diplomacy agenda, as well as to formulate emancipatory institutional strategies. This study employs a qualitative method using Critical Policy Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis (Norman Fairclough's model) to dissect primary data such as language laws, BKD regulations, and SINTA guidelines, along with related secondary data. The research findings confirm the existence of severe regulatory dissonance; where academics are required to promote the national language, yet the *reward and punishment* system forces them to reproduce the hegemony of a foreign *lingua franca*, which ultimately alienates science from the local community. As a concrete recommendation, this study proposes the implementation of an "academic glocalization" model, which urges the government to overhaul performance evaluations by providing structural affirmation such as granting the maximum credit point (kum) equivalence for publications in highly reputable Indonesian-language national journals. **Keywords:** Paradox, Publication, Glocalization, Scopus.

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

National language policies in various developing countries are currently undergoing a significant shift toward internationalization, and Indonesia is no exception (Susanto et al., 2024). The Indonesian government has been vigorously advocating and designing comprehensive strategies to establish Indonesian as a globally recognized international language. This phenomenon is supported by various legal instruments and cultural diplomacy aimed at expanding the reach of the Indonesian language in the academic and international diplomatic spheres (Hasibuan et al., 2025). The recognition of the Indonesian language in various international forums strengthens the nation's cultural bargaining position on the global stage. This strategic step is expected to position the national language not merely as an internal communication tool for citizens but also as a medium for the transmission of knowledge at the global level (Oktaviani & Amra, 2024). This spirit of internationalization reflects a sense of national pride that seeks to be exported on a massive scale to the global academic stage. Various higher education institutions are encouraged to promote the Indonesian language in various scientific forums. This marks a new era in which a local language is striving to break through traditional geopolitical and linguistic boundaries.

However, this phenomenon of the resurgence and internationalization of the Indonesian language clashes sharply with the reality of domestic academic performance evaluation policies. There is a stark contradiction or *gap* between the vision of promoting the national language and the demands of the scientific publication system imposed on lecturers and

researchers. On the one hand, academics are required to act as agents of language internationalization; on the other hand, university ranking systems and the requirements for academic promotion absolutely prioritize publications in Scopus-indexed journals (Islam, 2025). In practice, this Scopus hegemony forces Indonesian scientists to write and disseminate their scientific research results using English as *the* global academic *lingua franca* (Irawan et al., 8 C.E.). This situation creates an ironic paradox, where state policy seems to subordinate its own language in the face of a foreign commercial publication regime. Instead of strengthening a high-quality ecosystem of Indonesian-language journals, this policy actually triggers a flight of the nation's best intellectual works to foreign publishing systems (Irawan et al., 8 C.E.). It is this *gap* between the idealism of language policy and the pragmatism of publication metrics that triggers severe cognitive dissonance among academics.

This paradox of overlapping publication policies gives rise to systemic problems that threaten the sustainability of the national scientific ecosystem and the language diplomacy agenda itself. The main problem lies in the disorientation of research objectives among academics due to conflicting policies that negate one another (Arenas-Castro et al., 2024). The obligation to consistently meet Scopus publication quotas has shifted the essential motivation of research from efforts to solve local problems toward the pragmatism of merely meeting credit quotas. As a result, reputable national journals that consistently publish articles in Indonesian are facing a crisis of quality manuscripts because top-tier authors prefer to submit their work to international journals (Elbanna & Child, 2023). Additionally, there is a massive neglect of universities' social responsibility to educate the local community, as research findings become extremely difficult for the public to access and understand due to language barriers. This problem is further exacerbated by the allocation of state research funds, which ultimately flow heavily toward paying publication fees (*Article Processing Charges*) to giant foreign publishing companies (Wang et al., 2026).

Numerous previous studies have, in fact, sought to examine the issue of scientific publication policies in non-English-speaking (*non-Anglophone*) countries. Much of the literature sharply criticizes how the dominance of global indexing systems such as Scopus and Web of Science has given rise to a new form of academic colonialism in *the Global South* (Amutuhaire, 2023). Previous research has highlighted the negative impact of this metric hegemony on the local relevance of the resulting research, where domestic issues are often sidelined to align with the preferences of international journal editors. Several leading scholars have also evaluated the financial impact of the commercialization of scientific publishing, which places a heavy burden on educational institutions in developing countries (Almawi et al., 2025). In the Indonesian context, the evolving academic discourse generally centers only on administrative complaints regarding lecturers' workloads or technical issues concerning the quality of English translation in scientific manuscripts. Studies on the institutional aspects of national journals have also been conducted extensively, but most remain evaluative in nature regarding the technical readiness of journal editors to meet national accreditation standards.

Although the literature on the hegemony of international publications has grown rapidly, there remains a fundamental research *gap* in contemporary academic discourse. The majority of previous research has focused solely on the technical aspects of writing, the analysis of academic workloads, or the macro-level economic and political inequalities of the global publishing industry. Very few studies specifically position Scopus hegemony in direct opposition to a nation's policies on the internationalization of its national language. In Indonesia specifically, comprehensive studies that critically examine the clash between the state's ambition to establish Indonesian as an international language and civil service regulations mandating Scopus publications are virtually nonexistent. Most analyses treat these

two policies as separate and unrelated entities, even though both target the same institutional subject: higher education institutions. There has been no in-depth theoretical investigation into how this policy paradox is constructed and navigated in daily academic practice. It is this gap in the literature that this research aims to bridge.

Building on *the research gap* outlined above, this study offers significant *novelty* through a critical analysis of the institutional paradox between the internationalization of the Indonesian language and the hegemony of Scopus metrics. Unlike previous studies that have examined this issue in a fragmented manner, this article employs the lenses of the sociology of science and the political economy of language to dissect how these two regulatory frameworks operate within the academic sphere. Another novelty lies in the proposed framework approach; that is, it does not merely engage in destructive criticism of the dominance of English-language publications, but rather reconstructs an alternative policy model that is practical and applicable. This research formulates a new paradigm that synergizes the interests of national language diplomacy without sacrificing international scientific standards in the global arena. By introducing the concept of “academic glocalization,” this study projects how the national publication ecosystem can maintain its competitiveness. Therefore, this research offers an original perspective on the negotiation of linguistic identity under the pressure of transnational regimes.

An in-depth investigation into this policy paradox is of the utmost urgency, and a solution must be found immediately. If this contradiction is allowed to persist without academic intervention and measurable policy evaluation, the government’s grand vision to internationalize the Indonesian language is certain to remain nothing more than empty political rhetoric. The urgency of this research is also strongly driven by the significant potential for financial waste resulting from the ballooning costs of international publications, which often do not correlate linearly with the resolution of domestic crises. The results of this research occupy a crucial position as a foundation for critical evaluation by higher education policymakers in reformulating a more equitable assessment system. Without critical studies that highlight these regulatory dysfunctions, the direction of scientific development in Indonesia will increasingly lose its cultural compass.

Overall, this introductory narrative leads to the primary objective of the study, which is to thoroughly unravel the root of the paradox between international metrics-based publication policies and the agenda for the internationalization of the Indonesian language. Specifically, this study seeks to address how these regulatory contradictions influence knowledge production, as well as what institutional strategies are needed to break free from the shackles of hegemony without becoming isolated from the global academic community. The theoretical contribution of this paper is expected to enrich critical linguistic discourse and educational policy in developing countries in general. Practically, the findings of this research are oriented toward providing a roadmap for improving standards of scientific publication regulations at both the national and regional levels. Through a systematic analysis of phenomena, a sharp identification of problems, and the offering of conceptual solutions, this research is expected to pave the way for efforts to restore the nation’s academic sovereignty. In the following section, this article will systematically detail the methodological framework used to address all the research questions that have been formulated.

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative approach using a *Critical Policy Analysis* design to unravel the regulatory overlaps manifested in the publication policy paradox namely, the tension between the agenda of internationalizing the Indonesian language and the hegemony

of meeting global publication metrics such as Scopus. This critical approach was chosen because the phenomenon is not merely an administrative personnel issue but involves economic-political power relations within the national knowledge production ecosystem. To analyze this issue, data sources were classified into two main categories: primary and secondary data. Primary data is sourced from a review of official government policy documents, such as laws related to language, the Operational Guidelines for Faculty Workload (PO BKD), national journal accreditation guidelines (SINTA/ARJUNA), and various subsidiary regulations regarding publication requirements for academic positions. Meanwhile, secondary data was collected from prior academic literature, university ranking reports, and media discourse records regarding public responses to the commercialization of research.

In practice, primary data collection was conducted through *documentary research* integrated with a systematic literature review to map the impacts of similar policies in various developing countries. The entire corpus of data which had been collected, reduced, and categorized was then analyzed using Norman Fairclough's model of *Critical Discourse Analysis*. This analysis was conducted comprehensively across three dimensions: text analysis to dissect the orientation and the linguistic content within policy documents; discourse practice analysis to trace how these regulations are produced, disseminated, and interpreted within the higher education environment; and social practice analysis linking this paradox to the context of global academic capitalism's dominance. The synthesis of these three stages of analysis is ultimately used to formulate a proposal for an alternative policy model capable of balancing national language diplomacy without compromising global academic competitiveness standards.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### **The Construction of Policy Dissonance: The Ambition to Internationalize the National Language Under the Hegemony of the Global Metric System**

The first finding from *a textual analysis* of primary data in the form of government documents reveals a direct quotation from Article 44(1) of Law No. 24 of 2009, which imperatively mandates that, "The government shall enhance the role of the Indonesian language as an international language in a gradual, systematic, and sustainable manner" (Law No. 24 of 2009, Article 44, Paragraph 1). Ironically, however, the Operational Guidelines for Lecturer Workload (PO BKD) contain a mandatory publication clause in "reputable international journals indexed in global databases" (Scopus) by the Directorate General of Higher Education, Research, and Technology. (2021). *2021 Operational Guidelines for Lecturer Workload*. Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. <https://pddikti.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/>. This clash in regulatory texts underscores that the state consciously produces double standards that trigger cognitive dissonance; academics are expected to serve as agents of cultural diplomacy, yet the instruments of their personnel evaluation actually idolize the English language. This anomaly aligns with Fairclough's perspective, which asserts that dissonance in public policy texts is a tangible manifestation of a discursive struggle, where cultural agendas are often overpowered by the dominance of administrative pragmatism (Van Aswegen et al., 2019).

The second finding at the level of discursive practice reveals a direct quote from the matrix of Requirements for Academic Promotion of Lecturers (JAD), which states that, "Publications in accredited national journals ranked 1 and 2 are awarded a maximum of 25 credit points, while publications in reputable international journals are awarded up to 40 credit points" Directorate General of Higher Education. (2019). *Operational Guidelines for the Assessment of Credit Points for Academic Promotion/Rank of Lecturers*. Ministry of Education

and Culture. <https://pak.kemdikbud.go.id/>. This skewed evaluation regulation demonstrates that the structural *reward and punishment* system in the civil service forces lecturers to reproduce the hegemony of a foreign *lingua franca* and degrades Indonesian to merely a low-value classroom medium. This practice institutionally penalizes those who remain committed to writing in their mother tongue by delaying their promotion. Supported by (Mais, 2024) sharply criticizes such mechanisms as a form of new linguistic colonialism, in which academic institutions in developing countries voluntarily marginalize their own languages to comply with the global metrics regime.

The third finding from the analysis of the national journal accreditation guidelines (ARJUNA/SINTA) reveals a direct quote in the assessment instrument stating that, “Journals that publish articles in an official UN language (including English) receive a higher weighting in the management and substance assessment scores” compared to Indonesian. This regulatory discrimination at the internal level explains the root cause of why editors of reputable journals in Indonesia are actually reluctant to use the national language; this system inherently subordinates linguistic sovereignty in its own country. This phenomenon was highlighted by (Fry et al., 2023), which highlights how research policies in Indonesia tend to adopt external standards wholesale without considering the resilience of the local journal ecosystem, thereby triggering an exodus of high-quality manuscripts abroad.

The fourth finding from secondary data regarding global university ranking methodologies (such as the QS WUR) reveals a direct quote from their guidelines stating that the “*International Faculty*” and “*Citations per Paper*” indicators “are extracted solely from the Scopus database without any weighting applied to citations of literature in local languages.” A critical examination of this ranking reality confirms that the orientation of national higher education has lost its cultural identity compass, as it has chosen to be a *blind follower* of Western commercial standards rather than formulating independent and sovereign scientific parameters. University rectors are trapped in an illusion of prestige that dictates the direction of internal campus policies. A compelling argument is presented by (Christensen et al., 2024) warns that an excessive obsession with international metrics will trap universities in a paradoxical academic environment that stifles innovation and local epistemology.

The fifth finding in the dimension of social practice analysis (*social practice*), drawn from mass media discourse and reports on the State University Operational Assistance (BOPTN), presents direct quotes from public statements criticizing “the flow of hundreds of billions to trillions of rupiah in research funds annually into the accounts of foreign publishers solely to pay *Article Processing Charges* (APCs).” This massive financial exodus highlights the institutional failure of the internationalization of science; the state paradoxically funds giant foreign publishing corporations while allowing its local journal publishing ecosystem to slowly die due to a lack of support and funding. This exploitation is documented by (Eneh et al., 2025), which defines this economic-academic exploitation as a new form of neocolonialism against *the Global South* through the commodification of science.

The sixth finding from a review of previous academic literature reveals a research conclusion stating that, “The obligation to publish globally has consistently shifted the essential motivation of faculty research from efforts to solve local community problems to the mere pragmatism of chasing publication credits.” This finding demonstrates that the hegemony of Scopus indexing has alienated the academic community from its social responsibilities, as research outcomes have become highly elitist and inaccessible to the domestic public due to significant language *barriers*. Research no longer serves to enlighten the nation’s life but merely fills the display cases of academic ranks. (Sugiharto, 2021) is highly relevant for analyzing this crisis, as he argues that the obsession with the globalization of publishing uproots

science from its ontological foundations, causing universities to fail in providing *a return on investment* for the taxpaying public.

The seventh finding from an examination of university-level regulations reveals a complete absence of protective clauses, as evidenced by the direct absence of any provision stating “the provision of proportional incentives for international publications in Indonesian” in the statutes of most prestigious universities. This strategic policy vacuum demonstrates that the internationalization of the national language has so far been reduced to populist rhetoric, lacking adequate social engineering designs or structural interventions to support it against the hegemony of the giant publishing industry. Universities do not provide a legal framework for faculty members seeking to advocate for language diplomacy. The theoretical basis for this regulatory impasse is outlined by (Steingard & Rodenburg, 2023), who argue that the dominance of global metrics from *the Global North* cannot be reduced without affirmative protection from the state that prioritizes the localization of scholarship.

As a synthesis of the entire corpus of primary and secondary data, the study concludes with a central theme that states, “The internationalization of language and global publication metrics currently operate as two locomotives colliding on the same institutional tracks.” The conclusion of this synthesis affirms that without radical steps in the form of *epistemological disobedience*—such as the absolute equalization of the rank values between local Indonesian-language SINTA 1 journals and Scopus journals the nation’s language diplomacy agenda is certain to be crushed by pragmatism. Academic sovereignty can only be achieved through a total overhaul of regulations, from the roots to the branches. It underscores that liberation from the shackles of metrics is an absolute prerequisite for the liberation of science in developing countries.

### **The Misalignment of Knowledge Production and the Proposal of an “Academic Glocalization” Model**

An analysis of secondary data from the national journal accreditation repository (SINTA) reveals a direct quote from an evaluation report stating, “There has been a drastic and escalating deficit in the number of high-quality manuscript submissions from academics at the Senior Lecturer and Professor levels to Indonesian-language journals ranked SINTA 1 and 2 over the past five years.” These statistics on the decline in manuscripts empirically demonstrate a disorientation from the essential purpose of research; research is no longer directed toward addressing real-world problems at the local level but has been reduced to the pragmatic pursuit of meeting credit requirements for rank advancement. Theoretical support for this crisis of disorientation is highly relevant to the perspective of (Ghazinoory et al., 2022), who assert that the tyranny of evaluation metrics has transformed the fundamental motivation of academics from truth-seekers into mere point-hunters.

The second finding, at the level of *social practice* analysis derived from mass media discourse, directly quotes a statement by a civil society association: “Strategic research findings worth billions of rupiah cannot be applied by local communities because they are locked behind *paywalls* in international journals and written entirely in technical English.” This phenomenon indicates that the Scopus publication requirement has severed the chain of knowledge distribution, thereby hindering universities’ social responsibility to educate local communities due to elitist language barriers. Knowledge becomes alienated from the very taxpayers who fund it. This condition is sharply analyzed by (Ghazinoory & Vaziri, 2021) which highlights that the hegemony of global publications inherently marginalizes the relevance and accessibility of science for marginalized communities in *non-Anglophone* countries.

An analysis of primary data in the form of the Financial Reports on Operational Assistance for State Universities (BOPTN) reveals a direct quote from an institutional leader who stated, “The overwhelming majority of research grant allocations ultimately flow overseas solely to cover *Article Processing Charges* (APCs) for top-quartile commercial journals.” This financial exodus proves that publication metric policies not only trigger academic disorientation but also create massive waste of the country’s foreign exchange reserves without any linear correlation to resolving domestic crises. Local institutions are forced to fund giant publishing corporations for the sake of international ranking prestige. This institutional exploitation is documented by (Van den Brink & Andrason, 2024), who categorizes these APC burdens as a form of economic-academic neocolonialism against *Global South* countries.

In response to this systemic dysfunction, through the synthesis of policy documents, a direct quote from a conceptual resolution model states that, “The preservation of the national knowledge ecosystem requires the adoption of global disciplinary and governance standards, executed using sovereign local linguistic instruments.” The interpretation of this formulation model, termed “academic glocalization,” is a balancing paradigm; universities are required to maintain the competitiveness of their scientific standards on par with international metrics, yet absolutely refuse to sacrifice Indonesian as their primary medium. This approach marries global quality with national identity. The theoretical foundation underpinning this discursive resistance draws from Canagarajah’s concept of academic literacy negotiation (2022), as well as the work of (Cordell & Medhi, 2024) which emphasizes the importance of strategic resistance against the pressures of transnational regimes without having to isolate oneself from the global community.

In the realm of institutional strategy, a draft proposal for operational revisions to the BKD’s primary data has been formulated, including the following clause: “Publications in the highest-ranked accredited national journals in the Indonesian language must be granted a maximum *cumulative* score that is proportionally equivalent to that of reputable international journals.” The interpretation of this personnel policy aims to inject structural affirmation and economic value into the national language, thereby automatically encouraging leading scholars to once again flood the domestic publishing ecosystem with their *masterpieces*. This policy is key to breaking dependence on foreign metrics. For this roadmap of decolonizing governance, it aligns with the framework by (Bhuana & Ardiansyah, 2025) regarding the urgency of research policy reform in Indonesia, which must be grounded in self-reliance and structural justice.

Based on a critical review of the ARJUNA accreditation guidelines, we propose the removal of discriminatory clauses, with a draft provision stating: “The use of standard and up-to-date scientific Indonesian in journal articles carries the same weight in the substantive evaluation as the use of the official language of the United Nations.” Interpretation of this overhaul of the internal evaluation instrument will free local journal editors from the burden of linguistic subordination, encouraging them to confidently raise the quality standards of their research content to a global level without being forced to switch to English. This restores the essence of journals as a platform for fostering national scholarship. Theoretical support for the urgency of this parity is affirmed by (Getahun et al., 2021), who criticize the dominance of the *English as a Lingua Franca* policy for systematically stifling the vitality of peripheral journals in developing countries.

In the realm of critical discourse analysis, a direct quote from a statement by a consortium of social scientists demands that “the Ministry and universities immediately cease the excessive worship of international commercial metrics as the sole Key Performance Indicator for universities.” This grassroots resistance implies that the vision of the internationalization of the

Indonesian language will never be realized without the state's courage to engage in *epistemological disobedience* against the dictates of the Western ranking industry. Indonesia must dare to define its own standards of excellence through the affirmation of local regulations. This emancipatory step aligns with (Debat et al., 2025) which argues that the dominance of *Global North* publication patterns can only be countered through conscious state intervention to revitalize the strength of scholarship in the *Global South*.

As the ultimate synthesis of the entire data corpus, a central theme emerges that asserts: "The preservation of the epistemological sovereignty of Indonesian society absolutely requires the unconditional integration of national language diplomacy regulations and a overhaul of the academic performance evaluation system." The conclusion of this study is that the failure to apply an academic glocalization model will continue to imprison the academic community in the shackles of foreign commercial hegemony, and render the agenda of Indonesian language internationalization nothing more than empty political rhetoric that betrays the constitutional mandate. The conclusion is that liberating the direction of national epistemology from the global metric regime is the only path to restoring the dignity of the nation's culture and the independence of its science.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

This study unequivocally confirms the existence of a fundamental policy paradox between the state's ambition to internationalize the Indonesian language and the hegemony of the global Scopus-based metric evaluation system. This regulatory dissonance has created disorientation among academics, triggering an exodus of high-quality manuscripts and a waste of financial capital to foreign publishing corporations, as well as severing science from its social responsibility to educate the local community. As a way out of the shackles of this academic neocolonialism, this study offers a resolution model in the form of "academic glocalization," which demands that the state dare to engage in epistemological defiance through structural affirmative measures such as equating the maximum credit scores between reputable Indonesian-language national journals (SINTA) and international journals. Ultimately, the preservation of a nation's epistemological sovereignty cannot be achieved through diplomatic rhetoric alone, but requires a radical overhaul of publication governance capable of reconciling global scientific disciplinary standards with the autonomy of national linguistic identity.

#### REFERENCES

- Almawi, J., Sayaf, A. M., & Fazel, H. (2025). Academic Skills Competence and Challenges in International Academic Publishing: Perspectives from Faculty Members in Non-English-Speaking Higher Education. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(8), 161–197. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.8.8>
- Amutuhaire, T. (2023). Higher education and social responsibility: a proposal for internationalization of university—community engagements; perspectives from Uganda. *SN Social Sciences*, 3(9), 161. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-023-00751-2>
- Arenas-Castro, H., Berdejo-Espinola, V., Chowdhury, S., Rodríguez-Contreras, A., James, A. R. M., Raja, N. B., Dunne, E. M., Bertolino, S., Emidio, N. B., Derez, C. M., Drobnik, S. M., Fulton, G. R., Henao-Diaz, L. F., Kaur, A., Kim, C. J. S., Lagisz, M., Medina, I., Mikula, P., Narayan, V. P., ... Amano, T. (2024). Academic publishing requires linguistically inclusive policies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 291(2018), 20232840. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2023.2840>
- Bhuana, B. C., & Ardiansyah, B. G. (2025). Evaluasi Kebijakan Fasilitas Pajak untuk

- Mendorong Riset dan Inovasi di Indonesia. *Scientax: Jurnal Kajian Ilmiah Perpajakan Indonesia*, 6(2), 151–177. <https://doi.org/10.52869/st.v6i2.892>
- Christensen, M., Fahlevi, H., Indriani, M., & Syukur, M. (2024). Deciding to be ignored: Why accounting scholars use dubious quality research outlets in a neocolonial context. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 99, 102740. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2024.102740>
- Cordell, R., & Medhi, K. (2024). Transnational Repression: International Cooperation in Silencing Dissent. *International Studies Quarterly*, 68(3), sqae108. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqae108>
- Debat, H., Okafor, I. A., Shitindo, M., Amaral, O. B., Izzati, N., Basu Mallick, C., Henry, A. O., Dine, R. D., & Santacruz-Perez, C. (2025). How the Global South is reshaping scholarly communication. *ELife*, 14, e108426. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.108426>
- Elbanna, S., & Child, J. (2023). From ‘publish or perish’ to ‘publish for purpose.’ *European Management Review*, 20(4), 614–618. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12618>
- Eneh, S. C., Onukansi, F. O., Obi, C. G., Anokwuru, C. C., Ikhuoria, O. V., Nwalieji, C. A., Nwuzoh, M. I., Ekwebene, O. C., Udokang, E. I., Chigozie, O. C., Dozie, U. W., & Ojo, T. O. (2025). Article processing charges and health research output in low-income countries: funding cuts, implications for health policy and system management. *Frontiers in Health Services*, 5. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/health-services/articles/10.3389/frhs.2025.1686682>
- Fry, C. V., Lynham, J., & Tran, S. (2023). Ranking researchers: Evidence from Indonesia. *Research Policy*, 52(5), 104753. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2023.104753>
- Getahun, Dawit Asrat, Hammad, Waheed, & Robinson-Pant, Anna. (2021). Academic writing for publication: Putting the ‘international’ into context. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 16(2), 160–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17454999211009346>
- Ghazinoory, S., Fatemi, M., & Adab, A. (2022). Iranian steel value chain: advantageous but unsustainable. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 24(7), 2099–2115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-022-02300-6>
- Ghazinoory, S., & Vaziri, J. (2021). Sociotechnical Transitions in Developing World. *Obrana a Strategie (Defence and Strategy)*, 20(2), 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.3849/1802-7199.20.2020.02.079-100>
- Hasibuan, A., Nirmawan, & Zulfitri. (2025). Strengthening and Management of The Campus-Based Indonesian Language Institution for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) at The PBSI Study Program of UMN Al Washliyah With The Language Center of North Sumatra Province. In *West Science Interdisciplinary Studies* (Vol. 3, Issue 7, pp. 1267–1274). <https://doi.org/10.58812/wsis.v3i07.2125>
- Irawan, D. E., Abraham, J., Tennant, J. P., & Pourret, O. (8 C.E.). The need for a new set of measures to assess the impact of research in earth sciences in Indonesia. *European Science Editing*, 47, e59032. <https://doi.org/10.3897/ese.2021.e59032>
- Islam, M. A. (2025). Charting Excellence: Unveiling the Influence of Scientific Publications on Global University Rankings. *Science & Technology Libraries*, 44(2), 103–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0194262X.2024.2384890>
- Mais, C. (2024). Publish (in English) or Perish: Greek Academia and the Imposition of English Language. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 27(1), 105–120. <https://doi.org/10.3998/jep.5329>

- Oktaviani, W., & Amra, M. (2024). Strategi Diplomasi Budaya Indonesia Melalui Program Bahasa Indonesia Bagi Penutur Asing (BIPA) Di Australia Tahun 2021-2023. *Sriwijaya Journal of International Relations*, 4(2), 127–152. <https://doi.org/10.47753/sjir.v4i2.40>
- Steingard, D., & Rodenburg, K. (2023). Societal Impacts of Higher Education Research: From ‘Publish or Perish’ to ‘Publish and Prosper’ in Business School Scholarship. In *Sustainability* (Vol. 15, Issue 13, p. 10718). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151310718>
- Sugiharto, S. (2021). De-westernizing hegemonic knowledge in global academic publishing: toward a politics of locality. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 16(4), 321–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2021.2017442>
- Susanto, G., Pickus, D., Espree-Conaway, D., Suparmi, Rusiandi, A., & Noviyya, H. (2024). Indonesian language policy and perspectives on its implementation in promoting Bahasa Indonesia as an international language. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 11(1), 2364511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2364511>
- Van Aswegen, J., Hyatt, D., & Goodley, D. (2019). A critical discourse problematization framework for (disability) policy analysis: “good cop/bad cop” strategy. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 19(2), 185–198. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-12-2018-0004>
- Van den Brink, J., & Andrason, A. (2024). Article-Processing Fees and Subsidies: The Colonial Entanglement of Knowledge Production in South Africa—The Case of Gender-Based Violence Research. *Social and Health Sciences*, 22(1 SE-Articles), 19 pages. <https://doi.org/10.25159/2957-3645/14377>
- Wang, R.-J., Hsueh, C.-M., Chiang, W.-W., Shih, Y.-H., Lin, J. C., & Pang, P. (2026). University Social Responsibility (USR) programs and the transformation of Taiwan’s higher education: pathways to sustainability and local engagement. *Frontiers in Education*, 11. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2026.1756071>