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ABSTRACT
This study investigates the hybridity across linguistic studies from 2017 to 2019. It specifically attempts to figure out the trends of hybrid linguistic areas. To have a clear insight into the issue, a qualitative text analysis was adopted as the design of study. As the data sources, 304 research articles in linguistics were successfully retrieved from the digital data bases of internationally reputable linguistic journals. From each year, the newest released articles were purposively selected as the data sources. To have the clear insight into the hybrid areas across linguistic studies, the initial analysis was carried out on the titles of research articles. Further, the analysis was also conducted on the abstracts and research questions. Based on the analysis on the titles, abstracts and research questions, it was found that there were 16 types of hybridity across linguistic studies from 2017 to 2019. The two most frequent hybrid linguistic fields in sequence encompass ‘critical discourse analysis + multimodality’ and ‘critical discourse analysis + systemic functional linguistics’. It is expected that the results of this study contributes to provide the insight into the possibility of mixing different areas of linguistic studies as a way of solving human’s growing complex humanistic problems.
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Introduction
Fundamentally, the field of linguistics is generally divided into two camps, namely the rationalist based on the philosophy of the Descartes school and the empiricist oriented to the Aristotelian school. The rationalist linguistic camp, to illustrate, is represented by the well-known proponent like Chomsky, while the empirical school, for example, is underpinned by Halliday. The rationalist camp tend to see language as something abstract in the human mind (Comrie, 1989) with truth parameters that tend to be mono-perspective in a deductive frame of mind. On the other hand, the empirical school tends to see language as a process of experience with multi-perspective truth parameters in an inductive frame of mind. Briefly speaking, rationalist linguistics is mind-oriented, while empirical linguistics is data-driven (Purwoko, 2013).

Despite their different orientations, both rationalist and empirical linguistic fields can be complementary in terms of their contribution. The study of Bavali & Sadighi (2008), for example, evaluated Chomsky's Universal Grammar (UG) theory and Halliday's systemic functional linguistics (SFL). It has found that although these two theories are different, they both have complementary properties. UG Chomsky's theory contributes to the process of language acquisition while Halliday's SFL theory plays a role in the use of language in social contexts. While UG theory tends to be contributive in the early stages (language acquisition including language learning), SFL theory has a contribution at an advanced stage (language use as social functions). Further, the research of Purwoko (2013) reviewing the object of modern linguistic research shows that even Chomsky's very influential language theory is not free from weaknesses or criticisms. However, this study emphasizes that each language theory has its own area.
Until now, both rationalist and empirical linguistics are still a reference in linguistic studies, although the latter has tended to be more influential in recent years. The rationalist school has firstly experienced its heyday and is followed by the empirical trend. Some evidence of the ‘triumph’ of rationalist linguistics is the standardization of languages in the world, including the prescriptive English based on the Latin parameters. The most concrete example is the existence of phonetic symbols or linguistic speech sound system that are used globally where these symbols are codified based on the Latin alphabet. On the other hand, some evidence for the contribution of empirical linguistics is the emergence of new linguistic studies such as pragmatics (implied meaning of language), sociolinguistics (language in social aspects), systemic functional linguistics (SFL), and others. These fields see language as a system of meaning.

At the present time, rationalist linguistics can be still adopted especially for mapping the languages that have not been coded in a structured and standardized forms. In the context of a country with various indigenous languages, the rationalist basis is still used as a parameter. This means that researchers still use a structure or form-based framework as a reference in codifying regional languages. However, in general, during the last two decades, empirical linguistics has been more influential than mentalist linguistics. This is because of its contribution to the needs of the 21st century where language is viewed as a tool to achieve social, political, legal, media, business, clinical, and even environmental goals.

The field of linguistics is further specifically divided into two, namely formal linguistics and functional linguistics. The former focuses on the physical form of language while the latter deals with the function of language. The branches derived from formal linguistics revolve around the study of sound (phonology), the study of word structure (morphology), and the study of sentence structure (syntax) while the branch of functional linguistics refers to the study of meaning based on the users’ mind (pragmatics), the study of language in relation to social factors (sociolinguistics), systemic functional linguistics, etc.

The studies of formal linguistics employ language frameworks which from time to time remain the same but with different types of language and data. Formal linguistic studies as stated before are still contributing to the 21st century linguistic field, especially for the codification of regional languages that have not been arranged in organized ways, especially for languages that are on the verge of extinction. Therefore, the study of formal linguistics that is still functional today is language typology or language classification based on the framework of phonology (the study of the sound structure of language), morphology (the study of word structure), syntax (the study of sentence structure), etc.

Some of the latest formal linguistic studies contributing to today’s needs and context, for example, are the research of Perwitasari et al. (2016), Pujiati (2017), and Sawaki (2018). In terms of phonology, based on the findings of Perwitasari (2016), Javanese has 6 vowels (i, e, a , u, o) and Sundanese has 7 vowels (I, a, ə, ɨ, ε, ʊ, ɔ). Besides, Papuan tend to have five types of vowels (i, u, o, e, a) especially languages around the Memberamo river such as the Obokuitui language (Sawaki, 2018). In terms of morphology, the study of Sawaki (2018) found that non-Austronesian Papuan languages tend to have a word structure of ‘adjective + noun’ which is similar to English patterns such as nin-opase (our father). At the syntactic level, the research conducted by Sawaki (2018) has reported that a number of Papuan languages in the middle to the east such as Yali, Marind, Wooi Biak, Maybrat, and Hatam have a SOV (Subject-Object-Verb) structure. On the other hand, Indonesian Austronesian languages (mostly in all parts of...
Indonesia except half of Papua) have a SVO (Subject-Verb-Object) structure. From another syntactic issue, Pujiati’s research (2017) has found that there is the universality of comparative structures in Indonesian, Javanese, and Sundanese such as ‘lebih + adjective + daripada’ in Indonesian, ‘luweh + adjective + soko’ in Javanese, and ‘leuwih + adjective + ti’ in Sundanese.

Again, apart from the contribution of formal linguistics to the codification of regional languages, the branch of functional linguistics is more developed and is becoming the centre of linguistic studies for recent decades. Formal linguistics does contribute to the codification of new languages but does not have the capacity to see the real function of language in society where this role can be undertaken by the function-based linguistics. One of the influential branches of functional linguistics is systemic functional linguistics (SFL) which sees language as a tool to achieve goals that are tied to a particular context. Based on SFL, each context of text has its own relative grammar according to the objectives to be achieved through language. In the discourse of media, for example, the functional-based linguistic studies have shown that the same information tends to be represented by different language strategies according to the goals or ideology of a media (Ahangar, 2014; Al Fajri, 2018; Manar, 2016; Matu, 2008; Seo, 2013; Shokouhi & Amin, 2010; Yaghoobi, 2009). Manar’s study (2016) on online news headlines discussing the cases of politician corruption from two media with different ideologies, for example, has reported that political opponents (out-groups) tended to be represented as ‘weak’ participants in a sentence.

On the other hand, in the academic discourse especially the genre of research articles, functional linguistic studies have shown that the most dominant verbs in the introduction of research articles in sequence are material, relational, mental, and verbal processes (Choura, 2013; Kazemian et al., 2013; Martínez, 2001; Shahab & Asl, 2015; Sucipto, A., Mahdi, A., & Sujatna, 2014; Zheng et al., 2014). Material and relational processes were used to present scientific phenomena objectively while mental and verbal processes were used rather subjectively to build interaction with the readers (Martínez, 2001). In addition, in the genre of research articles, functional linguistic research has also shown that the form of passive sentences without actors (researchers) was dominantly used to create objectivity (Martínez, 2001). Up to this point, the branch of functional linguistics plays a major contribution in various types of discourse. The discourse of media and academic above is only two of the many contexts that can be studied by functional linguistics.

Another derived field of linguistics apart from the form-based and function-based branches refers to applied linguistics that sees language as a way how to solve practical problems from the view of linguistics. In the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, applied linguistics is defined as “the study of language and linguistics in relation to practical problem solving” or it can also be interpreted as “the study of teaching and learning foreign or second languages” (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p. 28).

Some of the applied linguistics that are still quite contributive to today’s context are educational linguistics, clinical linguistics, forensic linguistics, and eco-linguistics. Educational linguistics plays a role in solving language education problems, for example, how linguistic features can be empowered in helping language learners to master certain languages more easily, especially languages outside their mother tongue. Clinical linguistics contributes to the treatment of clinical disorders that affect a person’s communication skills such as stroke, cerebral palsy (brain paralysis), slurred speech,
In the legal context, Forensic linguistics which is also classified as a new study of language helps in resolving legal cases. The last one, eco-linguistics or ecological linguistics (which has received the most attention in the linguistic ‘school’ for the past decade) contributes to solving environmental problems from the humanities point of view.

In the field of teaching and learning one aspect of applied linguistics, there have been many linguistic studies examining the language skills of language learners, such as in the research carried out by (Emilia, 2010), Ignatieva (2008), Ko (2010), Lee (2016), Moore (2007), Sari (2013), Seah et al. (2011), Schulze (2011), Senjawati (2016), Xuan (2018). Xuan’s research (2018), for example, has reported that high school language learners tended to use less specific verbs in their essays. Meanwhile, Senjawati’s study (2016) on the recount texts for year-ten language learners has shown that students’ writing lacked mental processes or verbs that can be used to provide an evaluation from the point of view of the author or character in the story.

In the field of clinical linguistics, the study conducted by Ballard et al. (2019) has found that a tablet or android-based language application that contains word games with a combination of images, audio, and video has been proven to improve the language skills of people with aphasia caused by stroke. In another context, the legal case for example, Subyantoro’s literature research (2019) has reported that there are three objects of forensic linguistics, namely, (1) language as a legal product; (2) language in the judicial process; and (3) language as evidence. In the field of ecological linguistics, the research of Astawa et al. (2019) on the representation of Tri Hita Karana on the customary law of Awig-Awig in Tenganan Village Pegringsingan Bali has reported that verbal traits in the customary law of Awik-awik in the midst of the exploitative tourism industry tend to promote ecology between humans and nature, humans and humans, and humans and God. The study, on the other hand, has also claimed that in certain cases some verbal phenomena in customary law are still not in line with ecological principles in nature due to human interests.

To the present time, as humans’ problems have been growing towards complexity, the solution to them has recently involved multi-discipline approaches. The complex growing challenges of human life in the 21st century require more holistic, contextual and in-depth problem solving. This phenomenon needs hybrid approaches or theories. The growing environmental problems to illustrate have not only been the focus of ecological discipline but also other fields even linguistics. The hybridity between ecology and linguistics is known as eco-linguistics.

To date, as a response to the growing fields of linguistics, library-based study has become one of the scientific approaches to examine the tendency of theories of a current linguistic research. This phenomenon can be seen, for example, in the studies carried out by Hongwei (2017), Lei & Liu (2019), Richards (2009), and Sa-ngiamwibool (2014). Lei & Liu (2019) have investigated the trends of applied linguistic research for the period of 2005-2016. Prior to that, Hongwei (2017) had also researched the spread of linguistics research in China.

Some studies have even tended to review not only the aspects of language but also hybridity across linguistics and across various disciplines (Guo & Zhang, 2017; He, 2019; Zou, 2018). The studies of He (2019) and Guo & Zhang (2017) have reviewed the hybridity between discourse analysis and SFL while Zou (2018) has tried to bring philosophy and SFL together. In the midst of increasingly complex and intersecting scientific advances, the search for hybridity both within a discipline and across disciplines.
is expected to provide a holistic insight into the possibilities of addressing humans’ social problems.

Until now, unfortunately the literature studies related to the trend of linguistic studies have not represented the hybridity of linguistic research holistically. In other words, studies on the trends of linguistic issues have tended to examine the hybridity separately without mapping the areas. This current text-analysis literature study hence complements this limitation by disclosing the hybridity trends of linguistic research for three years (2017, 2018, & 2019). It addresses the following question: what trends of hybridity were found in the linguistic studies from 2017 to 2019?

**Research Method**

The method adopted by the current study refers to the qualitative text analysis scrutinising the titles, abstracts, and research questions as an attempt to figure out the hybridity areas of linguistic studies from 2017 to 2019. In the initial phase, data sources were collected from the *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, International Journal of English Linguistics, International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, and *Journal of Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, and other language journals published for the period of 2017, 2018, & 2019. Sources of data were collected from the latest publications from each year.

In the second phase, the collected data were analysed by categorizing their research areas. The areas were further divided into linguistic and non-linguistic research such as language teaching/learning, teacher development programs, literature, and so on. Then areas of linguistic studies were classified based on their specific hybrid fields by analysing the titles. If the hybridity cannot be traced through the title, the scrutiny was carried out by analysing the abstracts of the research article. If the abstracts do not explicitly represent the clear description of the hybrid research area, the last technique was by analysing the research questions of the papers. The initial process of analysing the trend categories of hybrid linguistic research in this text analysis study was executed with the excel table as provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Online Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Table 1. The Classification of Linguistic Research Area*

**Result and Discussion**

The current text-analysis review study aims to provide the trends of hybrid linguistic studies from 2017 to 2019. Below are provided the sixteen blended areas of linguistic fields found in selected journals in those three years.
Figure 1. The areas of hybridity in linguistic fields from 2017 to 2019

As portrayed in the chart above, the tendency of linguistic studies to intersect with the same or different disciplines predominantly refers to CDA and multimodality, followed by CDA and SFL in the second position. In the third rank, there is pragmatics plus semantics and morphology plus phonology. Both are in the same frequency. Other areas of hybridity are in more limited numbers. They encompass semantics + ethics, pragmatics + semantics, pragmatics + sociolinguistics, sociolinguistics + syntax, SFL + semiotics, SFL + multimodality, SFL + philosophy, SFL + psychoanalysis, SFL + sociology, pragmatics + semantics + sociolinguistics, SFL + semantics + multimodality, and SFL + philosophy + sociology. Some examples of hybrid linguistic studies combining CDA and multimodality can be seen below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Online Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2. Linguistic Research Area in CDA and Multimodality

The dominant area of CDA accompanying another linguistic field as show above can be linked to nature of discourse analysis that is more compatible with the needs of linguistic studies for the recent decades. From the discourse analysis alone, for instance, the study of Hamdani et al. (2022) has investigated the meaning in Bog-Bog Bali cartoon magazine by only relying on the texts. The study has found that the texts were constructed...
Further, being little bit different with discourse analysis, CDA can be viewed as “a form of DISCOURSE ANALYSIS that takes a critical stance towards how language is used and analyses texts and other discourse types in order to identify the ideology and values underlying them” (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p. 133). This indicates that critical discourse analysis deals with how to cogently and critically evaluate certain discursive texts as an attempt to dismantle any goals or ideologies even those implicitly embedded in the texts.

On the other hand, multimodality as another frequent area that accompanies CDA above has been associated with how to interpret meanings brought by other mode of communication especially visual representation such as pictures, videos, graphics, emoticons, and many others that also involves verbal or textual phenomena. Being different with CDA and multimodality, SFL or systemic functional linguistics as another dominant linguistic field shown above refers to the Hallidayan linguistic theory that views language “as a resource used for communication and not as a set of rules” (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p. 536). Based on the functional view, distinct goals or contexts of texts require typical ‘grammar’ (lexico-grammatical features) that is not necessarily to be the same with others. The present study views SFL as a strategy for achieving certain goals embedded in texts with certain contexts.

Again, as depicted by the chart above, the most frequent hybrid field of linguistics is addressed to the blend between CDA and modality. The combination between CDA and multi-modality is commonly adopted to critically analyse and interpret texts in certain contexts accompanied with other modes of meaning making apart from language such as emoticons, images, videos, etc. One of studies that combine both CDA and modality, to illustrate, refers to that carried out by Ma & Stahl (2017) analysing the issue of anti-vaccination information on Facebook. The study employed both textual and graphic information to address the issue of anti-vaccine. Another study blending both fields of CDA and multimodality is the one scrutinizing the representation of teachers as criminals in the news that also employed visual representation apart from verbal mode (Catalano & Gatti, 2017).

Amidst the fast-growing virtual social media in the cyber world for the past decade, information and ideology have been packed within texts and visual objects without the border of space and time. Even colours in an image of objects collaborate with grammatical features of discursive texts in making meaning. Text and non-verbal symbols as stated earlier are nowadays employed in one package to achieve or spread certain goals even hidden ideologies especially in the context of politics. The effect is that text-based linguistics in recent years needs multi-modal approach to disclose any ideologies brought by humans’ symbol of meaning making.

Another highest frequent phenomenon of hybrid linguistics, CDA combined with SFL, contributes to answering problems of humanities with macro and micro perspectives. CDA plays a role in disclosing the tendentious values, goals as well as the stance brought by certain texts while SFL serves to specifically reveal the meanings by analysing the linguistic features ‘into pieces’. SFL takes its role in clause levels while CDA functions as providing the broad framework of packing the meaning. Here, both SFL and CDA are complementary in addressing the real meanings or goals brought by certain texts. Despite their complementary contribution, both CDA and SFL ideally have similarities in that both start from the linguistic data especially those available in the natural setting. This is called by Wong (2017) “a corpus-linguistic perspective”.

---

**Journey**

Journal of English Language and Pedagogy

(2022), 5 (2): 281–292
Further, two studies that evaluate the hybridity between SFL and discourse among others refer to those carried out by He (2019) and Guo & Zhang (2017). The former even not only evaluates the past achievement of SFL and discourse but also poses the future possibilities for the combination of both. The other, on the other hand, lays its focus on combining grammar, text, and discursive context.

CDA alone by nature is derived from the discourse analysis. In contrast to other linguistic research that has linguistic features to be analysed, discourse analysis research focuses more on the content carried and the macro structure of certain texts in certain issues. The issues recently have encompassed academic, political, media, and literary contexts. This phenomenon indicates that research on discourse has focused on producing applied benefits such as examining aspects of teaching and learning, dismantling political goals and media using language strategies, and examining language strategies in literary products.

The tendency of CDA to focus on academic, media, and political contexts to be studied can be related to the needs for rapid development of the humanities sciences in these three fields. The discourse study approach is expected to be able to provide input to the pedagogical practices, especially applied-based teaching and learning. In addition, discourse studies are also expected to be able to dismantle linguistic practices and manoeuvres carried out by political and media stakeholders in the 21st century. This is in accordance with the principle of discourse analysis which was originally intended to break down the inequality and discrimination in social practice and to prompt the target audience to be more critical.

Apart from the discourse analysis or CDA, SFL alone recently has tended to lay it emphasis on experiential meaning or transitivity systems. The tendency of SFL studies towards transitivity systems can be explained by the transitivity function as the basic resources of meaning-making by employing certain types of processes, participants, and circumstances that fits the context. As a representation of human experience, the transitivity system has become the most principal aspect to be studied compared to the mood and theme/rheme aspects and other aspects. Due to its function as a meaning ‘maker’, the transitivity system functions as a framework not only for linguistic research but also for disciplines outside language field. This indicates that the transitivity system is open to become a cross-disciplinary tool in solving problems of humanities. Other aspects of SFL include transitivity-mood, theme/rheme system, grammatical metaphor, cohesion, register, transitivity-theme/rheme, text complexity, lexical density and grammatical intricacy, and complex clauses.

Until this point, the combination between CDA and SFL can cogently and holistically reveal the meanings such as values, goals, stance brought by texts in certain contexts even across various fields of disciplines. This might explain why SFL and CDA were frequently blended by linguistics studies from 2017 to 2019.

The other two most frequent hybrid linguistic fields, phonology + morphology and semantics + pragmatics are also in line with the needs for more holistic ways of understanding linguistic phenomena. In relation to phonology, there is phoneme while in terms of morphology, there is morpheme. Whereas the former refers to the smallest unit of sounds that can differentiate words in language, the latter is associated with the smallest unit of meaning of language (see Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Hence, both play complementary roles in disclosing the phenomena of language from its very basic forms. The complementary roles also apply in the hybridity between semantics and pragmatics. Whereas semantics focuses on the meaning of utterances, pragmatics gives its emphasis...
on the meaning of utterances in relation with its situational context (see Richards & Schmidt, 2002). The adoption of both will result in more cogent and holistic ways of understanding the meaning brought by language.

Other hybridity phenomena found in linguistic studies as elaborated earlier include phonology-morphology, semantics-pragmatics, SFL-multimodality, SFL-semiotic, SFL-philosophy, SFL-psychoanalysis, SFL-sociology, SFL-philosophy-sociology, SFL-semantics-multimodality, pragmatics-sociolinguistics, pragmatics-multimodality, pragmatics-semantics-sociolinguistics, sociolinguistics-syntax, semantics-ethics. However, the hybridity of those areas was found not as frequently as CDA-multimodality and CDA-SFL. This hints two different types of interpretation. First, those aspects of hybridity might have been saturated to study so that they do not generate a new insight into the knowledge about humanities problems. Second, these sub-fields of research might have been less investigated. This implies that there is still great opportunities for blending the research fields to solve the increasingly complex humanities problems. If this is the case, the present study interprets that this especially occurs in the hybridity across different disciplines, for example, linguistics (SFL) and sociology, linguistics (SFL) and philosophy, etc.

The phenomenon of hybridity across linguistic studies and across different disciplines indicates that linguistic fields have been more developed to figure out more cogent and holistic solutions to humans’ complex ‘social’ problems. In other words, hybrid theories within the linguistic field even across different disciplines are needed for responding to the growing problems of human’s civilization.

Conclusion

Based on the current text-analysis study on the trends of linguistic hybridity from 2017 to 2019, the tendency of CDA + multimodality and CDA + SFL among other fields can be a response to the growing human’s complex social problems. In addition, compared to other linguistic disciplines that have linguistic features to be studied, discourse analysis research focuses more on the carried message and its macro structure. Therefore, discourse research is considered more valid if it involves other linguistic frameworks that have more measurable linguistic features to be analysed. Besides, multimodality or SFL is most often combined with CDA because these two linguistic studies focus on the function of language to obtain certain goals bound in context. Like CDA, multimodality and SFL serve to solve problems across humanities disciplines.

Further, from the sixteen formations of hybrid linguistic studies above, SFL was mixed most frequently with other linguistic fields compared to other aspects, reaching eight types of hybridity. Once again, these findings reflect that SFL is still the most flexible field of linguistics, either within linguistics alone or even across disciplines. Therefore, the development of SFL combined with other studies provides a great opportunity for addressing social issues from a linguistic perspective.

Finally, it is expected that the results of the current research contribute to providing the insight into the possibility of mixing different fields of linguistic study as a way to address problems of humanities. Despite its findings, this study only scrutinized a limited set of data sources from selected journals published in 2017, 2018, and 2019. More data sources especially from the latest publications are needed for developing the current research.
Acknowledgements (if any)

The current study has no conflict of interest. Besides, it was self-funded. There are no third parties contributing to this text-analysis study.

References


https://latinjournal.org/index.php/gist/article/view/600