

Reading the Direction of United States Policy through President Donald Trump's Statements

Iskandarsyah Siregar

Universitas Nasional, Indonesia

Email: regarangi@presidency.com

Abstract:

This study critically examines the trajectory of United States policy during the presidency of Donald J. Trump (2017–2021) by analyzing his public statements through the lens of critical discourse analysis (CDA). Unlike traditional studies that focus on institutional outputs such as legislation or executive orders, this research foregrounds presidential rhetoric as a key instrument for articulating and shaping national policy. Drawing from 50 selected speeches, interviews, and tweets, the analysis reveals consistent rhetorical patterns reflecting themes of nationalism, protectionism, securitization, and polarization. The study categorizes Trump's discourse into five policy domains: foreign policy, economic policy, immigration, national security, and crisis communication. Within each domain, the research identifies how language was strategically employed to frame threats, mobilize support, delegitimize opposition, and justify controversial policy moves. The findings underscore the centrality of language in governance, demonstrating how presidential discourse acts as both a symbolic and operational force in shaping public perception and political direction. This article contributes to interdisciplinary conversations in political communication, discourse studies, and policy analysis, while offering a model for understanding how populist rhetoric redefines leadership and democratic norms in the digital age.

Keywords:

Policy, United states, Direction, Statements, CDA

I. Introduction

The articulation of foreign and domestic policy by heads of state serves as a crucial reflection of a nation's political direction and strategic interests. In the case of the United States, presidential rhetoric not only carries symbolic power but also functions as a performative act that shapes public perception, mobilizes political bases, and signals intentions to both allies and adversaries. This paper seeks to explore the direction of U.S. policy during the administration of President Donald J. Trump (2017–2021) by examining his public statements, particularly those delivered through speeches, interviews, and social media platforms such as Twitter.

Donald Trump represented a significant departure from the political orthodoxy traditionally associated with American presidential discourse. His unfiltered communication style, often bypassing institutional channels and political decorum, provides a unique lens through which to analyze the formulation and projection of national policy. Numerous scholars (Lakoff, 2017; Mercieca, 2020) have argued that Trump's rhetoric reflects a shift toward populist, protectionist, and unilateral tendencies in both foreign and domestic policy arenas. However, a systematic study of his statements allows for a deeper understanding of how language constructs the ideological foundation and strategic rationale of his administration's actions.

The significance of this research lies in its interdisciplinary nature, combining elements of political communication, discourse analysis, and policy studies. While political scientists often focus on institutional outputs—such as executive orders, legislation, or diplomatic treaties—this study contends that rhetorical artifacts can serve as primary texts for policy analysis. Statements made by a president are not mere commentary; they are indicative of intention, priority, and value systems. In this context, Trump's speeches and tweets are not simply verbal performances but strategic instruments used to legitimize policy choices, define enemies and allies, and reframe historical and international narratives.

Furthermore, this article is situated within the broader tradition of critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2006), which emphasizes the role of language in the exercise of power. By employing a qualitative content analysis of selected statements made by Trump during key moments of his presidency—such as the U.S.–China trade war, NATO negotiations, immigration policies, and COVID-19 responses—this study aims to trace consistent themes and ideological orientations that define the trajectory of U.S. policy under his leadership. Particular attention is given to the strategic use of polarization, nationalism, and crisis framing.

This research is timely and relevant not only for understanding a singular presidency but also for grasping broader shifts in American political culture and its implications for global governance. As nations worldwide grapple with the consequences of populism and rhetorical radicalism, Trump's discourse represents a case study in how language can both reflect and produce structural transformations in governance.

In summary, this paper investigates how President Donald Trump's public statements functioned as a vehicle for expressing, reinforcing, and redirecting United States policy. Through a systematic and critical analysis of these utterances, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on political rhetoric, presidential communication, and policy semiotics in the contemporary era.

II. Review of Literature

The study of political rhetoric as a medium for understanding policy orientation has garnered significant scholarly attention, particularly in the context of populist leadership and presidential communication. Presidential discourse is often viewed not only as a reflection of political ideology but also as a mechanism of governance, persuasion, and agenda-setting (Zarefsky, 2004). The administration of Donald J. Trump, characterized by an unconventional rhetorical style and prolific use of social media, has intensified the academic interest in analyzing the interplay between language and policy direction.

Foundational theories in political discourse analysis emphasize the performative nature of political language. Austin's (1962) speech act theory and Searle's (1969) elaboration on illocutionary acts offer a conceptual foundation for understanding how presidential statements function beyond mere expression—they serve to enact policy intents and mobilize sociopolitical action. Fairclough (1995) advances this perspective through critical discourse analysis (CDA), arguing that language in political contexts is deeply interwoven with ideology and power structures. Van Dijk (2006) similarly highlights the cognitive dimension of discourse, emphasizing how elites, through language, manipulate public knowledge and control policy framing.

In the Trump era, scholars have noted a dramatic shift in political communication strategies. Lakoff (2017) contends that Trump's use of “strict father” metaphors and nationalist moral frames significantly reshaped the public's understanding of issues such as immigration, trade, and national security. Mercieca (2020) explores Trump's rhetorical style as “demagogic,” marked by simplicity, repetition, polarization, and emotional appeal. Such rhetorical strategies, while often criticized as divisive, proved effective in aligning public opinion with policy directions that deviated from prior bipartisan norms.

Twitter has emerged as a particularly salient medium for Trump's political messaging. Ott (2017) refers to Trump's Twitter usage as “rhetorical velocity”—a means of injecting ideological narratives directly into the media cycle, thereby circumventing traditional journalistic filters. This direct communication style aligns with populist communication, which thrives on anti-elitism, emotional resonance, and the construction of a binary worldview (Moffitt, 2016). The tweet, as a micro-rhetorical form, becomes a tool for signaling policy shifts, such as threats to withdraw from NATO or to impose tariffs, often preceding formal policy statements.

Studies of Trump's foreign policy rhetoric indicate a pattern of nationalist exceptionalism, economic protectionism, and transactional diplomacy (Dueck, 2019). Through speeches at the United Nations and press briefings on trade relations, Trump recurrently framed U.S. interests in opposition to multilateralism. His rhetorical emphasis on “America First” reoriented traditional alliances and strategic commitments in ways that echo the realist school of international relations. Similarly, his domestic policy statements—particularly on immigration and law enforcement—reflect securitization discourse (Wæver, 1995), framing social issues as existential threats requiring exceptional measures.

Despite the abundance of work on Trump's communication, gaps remain in systematically connecting his statements to an evolving policy trajectory. Most studies focus on rhetorical style, media effects, or isolated events rather than the longitudinal impact of discourse on policymaking. This research, therefore, aims to bridge that gap by analyzing Trump's public statements as a semiotic system that constructs and reflects U.S. policy direction across his presidency.

III. Research Methods

This study employs a qualitative research design grounded in the principles of critical discourse analysis (CDA) to examine the direction of United States policy as reflected in the public statements of President Donald J. Trump. Recognizing the performative and ideological functions of political language, this methodology enables an in-depth exploration of how Trump's rhetoric constructs, reinforces, or redirects national policy narratives across various domains.

The qualitative approach was chosen to uncover the latent meanings, ideological positions, and strategic intentions embedded in Trump's discourse. This study does not merely seek to classify statements based on content but to interpret how language functions as a tool of governance and policy articulation. The framework of CDA, as advanced by Fairclough (1995) and van Dijk (2006), is particularly suited for this purpose. CDA views discourse as both shaped by and shaping social practices, institutions, and power relations—making it ideal for analyzing presidential communication.

The primary data sources for this research include a purposive selection of Trump's official speeches, press briefings, and Twitter posts between January 2017 and January 2021. These texts were retrieved from reputable public archives such as the White House official website, the Trump Twitter Archive, and news transcripts from major outlets (e.g., CNN, The Washington Post). The corpus comprises 50 key statements, chosen based on their thematic relevance to major policy areas including foreign affairs, trade, immigration, security, and public health (particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic).

The inclusion criteria for textual selection were:

1. Statements that explicitly mention U.S. policy objectives or critiques.
2. High-impact moments that generated domestic or international response.
3. Texts that exemplify rhetorical patterns (e.g., framing devices, populist appeals, crisis discourse).

The analysis proceeded through three main stages:

1. **Textual Analysis:** Each statement was subjected to micro-level linguistic scrutiny, identifying key lexical choices, metaphors, repetition, modality, and pronoun use. This step reveals the persuasive strategies and linguistic markers of authority or division.
2. **Discursive Practice Analysis:** This stage examined the production and dissemination of the statements—such as whether they were delivered via formal press conferences or social media. The context of delivery, intended audience, and media framing were analyzed to assess the strategic function of each utterance.
3. **Socio-Cultural Analysis:** Drawing from Fairclough's third dimension of CDA, this phase investigated how Trump's discourse reflects or challenges prevailing ideological structures, institutional norms, and global power dynamics. Here, Trump's rhetoric was mapped against historical patterns in U.S. presidential communication and foreign policy postures.

To enhance the trustworthiness of the analysis, researcher triangulation was applied by involving multiple coders in validating discourse themes. Inter-coder agreement was maintained through iterative discussions and consensus-building. Additionally, peer debriefing with political communication scholars ensured theoretical alignment and minimized interpretive bias.

In conclusion, this methodological design provides a robust framework for interpreting the semiotic and political significance of Donald Trump's rhetoric, allowing for a systematic exploration of how language operates as an instrument of policymaking in contemporary presidential leadership.

IV. Results and Discussion

This chapter presents the findings from the discourse analysis of President Donald J. Trump's public statements between 2017 and 2021, organized around five core policy themes: foreign policy, economic policy, immigration, national security, and crisis communication. Each theme is discussed in relation to the rhetorical devices used, the ideological framing identified, and the policy direction inferred from these statements. The results are analyzed through the lens of critical discourse analysis, referencing key theories and previous studies introduced in the literature review.

4.1 Foreign Policy: “America First” and Strategic Unilateralism

Trump’s foreign policy discourse was overwhelmingly dominated by the “America First” slogan, which signified a nationalist reorientation of U.S. international engagement. A frequent feature of his statements was the delegitimization of multilateral institutions such as the United Nations and NATO. For instance, during a speech at the 2018 UN General Assembly, Trump declared, “We reject the ideology of globalism and embrace the doctrine of patriotism.”

This rhetoric aligns with realist approaches in international relations, emphasizing state sovereignty, self-interest, and the limitation of international constraints on national power. The consistent framing of allies as exploiters of American generosity was evident in his repeated accusations that NATO members were “not paying their fair share.” Linguistically, Trump employed adversarial pronouns (“they,” “us”) and transactional metaphors (“we’re not the world’s piggy bank anymore”), constructing an antagonistic narrative that justified a withdrawal from established alliances.

Compared to previous administrations that prioritized diplomacy and coalition-building, Trump’s discourse represented a shift toward strategic unilateralism. His statements before the withdrawal from the Iran nuclear deal (JCPOA) further illustrate this point. By referring to the deal as a “disaster” and “an embarrassment to the United States,” he prepared the public and international audience for the shift, using emotional loading and evaluative adjectives to legitimize unilateral action.

4.2 Economic Policy: Protectionism and Trade War Rhetoric

A significant portion of Trump’s rhetoric was devoted to framing economic policy through nationalist and populist lenses. His trade war with China, in particular, was narrated as a battle for American dignity and industrial sovereignty. Trump frequently described the U.S. as a “loser” in global trade and vowed to “bring jobs back” to American soil. For instance, in a 2019 tweet, he stated, “We have lost \$500 billion a year to China for many years. We can’t let that happen anymore.”

This language, though simplistic, was effective in crystallizing a sense of victimhood and urgency. Through repetition of numerical exaggeration and binary contrasts (“win/lose,” “strong/weak”), Trump constructed an economic worldview centered around protectionist values. The metaphor of the “trade war” was not incidental but served as a deliberate rhetorical framing strategy to evoke national struggle and economic patriotism. In policy terms, this discourse supported aggressive tariff impositions and a decoupling rhetoric that reshaped trade negotiations. It also mirrored populist economic narratives found in other global right-wing movements, which combine economic nationalism with cultural protectionism.

4.3 Immigration: Securitization and Dehumanization

One of the most striking aspects of Trump’s rhetorical legacy is found in his discourse on immigration. Trump routinely framed immigration—particularly from Latin America—as a national security threat. His 2015 campaign announcement set the tone: “When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.”

This narrative continued into his presidency, where terms like “invasion,” “infestation,” and “criminals” were used with notable frequency. Discourse analysis of tweets

and speeches revealed a systematic use of dehumanizing metaphors and categorical generalizations. The construction of immigrants as threats facilitated the implementation of restrictive policies such as the Muslim Ban and family separation at the border.

The use of securitization, as theorized by Wæver (1995), was evident in how Trump defined immigration not as a social or humanitarian issue but as a military emergency. This framing legitimized the deployment of National Guard troops to the border and the construction of a border wall, recast in his discourse not merely as a physical structure but as a “great barrier for the protection of our country.”

Unlike previous administrations that employed humanitarian or integrationist narratives, Trump’s statements polarized immigration discourse into dichotomies of legal/illegal, safe/dangerous, and American/alien. This not only reshaped immigration policy but also intensified cultural divisions within the U.S.

4.4 National Security: Militarization of Rhetoric

Trump’s national security rhetoric often conflated external threats with internal dissent. In response to protests or political opposition, he frequently used military metaphors. For example, during the George Floyd protests, Trump stated: “When the looting starts, the shooting starts,” echoing language from segregationist police discourse of the 1960s.

This militarization of domestic discourse was a departure from traditional U.S. presidential norms. It reflected an authoritarian populist strategy wherein law and order rhetoric served to justify the erosion of civil liberties and the suppression of dissent. The recurring use of “dominate,” “fight,” and “crackdown” illustrated a punitive policy orientation rooted in force over deliberation.

On international issues, such as North Korea, Trump’s rhetoric oscillated between threats (“fire and fury like the world has never seen”) and performative diplomacy (e.g., calling Kim Jong-un “a friend”). This ambiguity in tone was strategically useful—demonstrating power while keeping policy options open—but it also created instability and mixed signals in diplomatic channels.

Linguistically, this pattern of aggressive followed by conciliatory language can be categorized as a form of rhetorical pivoting—a method used to assert dominance while retaining flexibility. The strategic ambiguity of Trump’s rhetoric enabled him to frame any outcome as a win, thereby reinforcing his image as a dealmaker, regardless of policy results.

4.5 Crisis Communication: COVID-19 and Blame Attribution

Trump’s handling of the COVID-19 pandemic revealed significant patterns in blame-shifting rhetoric and crisis reframing. In early 2020, Trump consistently referred to the virus as the “China virus” or “Kung Flu,” assigning responsibility to an external scapegoat. This naming strategy not only externalized blame but also served domestic political purposes, redirecting public frustration away from federal policy failures.

Discourse analysis of his COVID-19 briefings reveals a reluctance to use terms such as “pandemic,” “deadly,” or “crisis” in early stages. Instead, Trump employed downplaying rhetoric: “We have it totally under control” (January 22, 2020), and “It will go away. Just stay calm” (March 10, 2020). These statements reflected a crisis minimization strategy aimed at maintaining economic optimism.

However, as the crisis deepened, Trump’s rhetoric shifted toward blame attribution—not only to China, but to the World Health Organization (WHO), Democratic governors, and the media. This reflects Benoit’s Image Repair Theory (1995), particularly the use of denial, evasion of responsibility, and attacking the accuser. Trump’s inconsistent messaging—alternating between self-congratulation and external blaming—contributed to public confusion and undermined coordinated responses.

While crisis communication typically demands clarity, consistency, and empathy, Trump’s style substituted these with confrontation and personal projection. The discourse constructed a reality in which the president was both victim and hero—a figure besieged by global and domestic enemies yet undefeated.

Policy Area	Dominant Rhetorical Strategy	Key Linguistic Features	Inferred Policy Direction
Foreign Policy	Nationalism, antagonism toward alliances	America First, unfair, globalist	Strategic unilateralism, withdrawal from multilateralism
Economic Policy	Populist protectionism	Jobs stolen, trade war, losing billions	Tariffs, reshoring, renegotiation of trade deals
Immigration	Securitization and dehumanization	Invasion, criminals, infestation	Border militarization, travel bans, deportation policies
National Security	Militarized domestic framing	Dominate, crackdown, law and order	Aggressive policing, delegitimization of dissent
Crisis Communication	Blame-shifting and self-promotion	China virus, doing a great job, hoax	Delayed action, polarized public health messaging

4.6 Theoretical Implications and Comparative Perspectives

The findings from this study underscore the theoretical utility of critical discourse analysis in understanding presidential policy direction. Trump’s statements demonstrate how political language functions simultaneously as performance, persuasion, and policy signaling. While traditional policy studies prioritize material outputs (laws, budgets, military actions), this research supports the argument that language is itself a form of action—what Austin (1962) termed a performative speech act.

The polarization and personalization evident in Trump’s rhetoric align with Moffitt’s (2016) model of populist political style, where leaders present themselves as embodiments of “the people” in conflict with corrupt elites and external threats. Trump’s frequent self-reference (“I alone can fix it”) and vilification of opponents reflect a leadership model where charisma replaces institutional continuity.

Comparatively, Trump’s rhetorical patterns resemble those of other contemporary populists such as Jair Bolsonaro (Brazil), Viktor Orbán (Hungary), and Narendra Modi (India), who similarly employ divisive language, nationalism, and direct communication channels to bypass traditional media and institutional filters.

However, Trump's integration of digital media, especially Twitter, amplifies the velocity and impact of his rhetoric. His tweets served as instantaneous policy cues, bypassing inter-agency processes and creating a new model of real-time presidential discourse. This phenomenon marks a paradigm shift in how presidential communication is both disseminated and interpreted.

4.7 Discussion of Impacts and Consequences

The consequences of Trump's rhetorical style on American policy and society are multifaceted. Internationally, it disrupted alliances, encouraged adversarial posturing, and introduced unpredictability into diplomatic relations. Domestically, it normalized inflammatory rhetoric, intensified social polarization, and eroded trust in democratic institutions.

Policy-wise, Trump's language did not always translate into coherent action. For example, his threats to withdraw from NATO were never fully realized, but the rhetorical damage—through delegitimization of allies—had long-term implications. Similarly, his economic and immigration discourses spurred executive actions, but often faced judicial and legislative pushback.

Crucially, this research illustrates that even when policy outcomes are contested, presidential discourse shapes the perceived reality of governance. In Trump's case, language was used to define success, justify failure, and maintain symbolic control of political narratives.

The points of this chapter is President Donald Trump's public statements functioned as more than just expressions of opinion; they were strategic tools that framed national identity, justified policy shifts, and redefined political norms. Through discourse analysis, this chapter has demonstrated how Trump's rhetoric reflected a broader transformation in American political culture—one where language became a battleground for power, identity, and governance.

The implications of this study extend beyond the Trump presidency, offering a framework for future research into how political discourse signals and shapes policy in the age of populism, social media, and global uncertainty.

V. Conclusion

This research set out to explore the direction of United States policy during the administration of President Donald J. Trump by analyzing his public statements through the lens of critical discourse analysis. By examining a selected corpus of Trump's speeches, press briefings, and tweets, the research aimed to identify how language functioned not merely as commentary, but as a strategic instrument to articulate, justify, and implement national policy priorities across multiple domains.

The findings confirm that Trump's discourse was deeply entwined with his policy approach and political identity. His rhetoric consistently promoted a populist, nationalist, and often antagonistic worldview, captured succinctly in the slogan "America First." Across key thematic areas—foreign policy, economic protectionism, immigration, national security, and crisis communication—Trump utilized rhetorical strategies that included binary oppositions, adversarial metaphors, dehumanizing language, and blame attribution. These linguistic

patterns were not isolated stylistic choices but rather indicators of a broader ideological orientation that influenced policy actions and public perception.

In foreign policy, Trump's statements revealed a retreat from multilateralism and an embrace of unilateral, transactional diplomacy. His economic rhetoric painted the United States as a victim of global exploitation, thereby justifying trade wars and protectionist tariffs. Immigration was framed through a securitized and dehumanizing lens, constructing migrants as existential threats to national integrity. On national security, Trump militarized political discourse, often equating dissent with disorder. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, he employed rhetorical strategies aimed at externalizing blame and preserving his political image rather than fostering clarity and coordination.

The broader implications of this study underscore the centrality of discourse in contemporary governance. As language becomes increasingly performative and strategic in shaping policy environments, the analytical tools of critical discourse analysis provide a valuable framework for interpreting political intent and action. Trump's presidency exemplifies how discourse can serve as both a reflection and a mechanism of power, constructing realities that justify radical shifts in policy and political norms.

Furthermore, this research contributes to the literature by bridging the gap between rhetorical analysis and policy studies. While existing scholarship often separates speech from substance, this study demonstrates that in the context of populist leadership, speech is substance. Trump's language not only framed debates and directed attention but also functioned as a quasi-legislative act, signaling priorities and shaping the political climate in which decisions were made.

In conclusion, President Donald Trump's public statements offer more than a record of opinion—they serve as a semiotic system that reveals the architecture of his administration's policy direction. Understanding such rhetoric is essential not only for assessing past governance but also for anticipating future political trends in an era where populism, digital communication, and strategic language continue to redefine democratic leadership. As future administrations confront new global and domestic challenges, the lessons from Trump's rhetorical presidency will remain critical to the study of political communication, policy formulation, and democratic resilience.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Benoit, W. L. (1995). *Accounts, excuses, and apologies: A theory of image restoration strategies*. State University of New York Press.
- Dueck, C. (2019). *Age of Iron: On conservative nationalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Ghaisani, A., Siregar, I., & Susanto, A. (2024). The existence and Meaning of Betawi dance in Setu Babakan: a Social Semiotic study. Ghaisani | Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i1.7805>
- Korompot, C., Siregar, I., Khursanov, N., Abdullaev, D., & Mohamed, K. (2024). Investigating Gender DIF in the Reading Comprehension Section of the B2 First Exam. *International Journal of Language Testing*, (), 57-66. doi: 10.22034/ijlt.2023.421011.1301

- Lakoff, G. (2017). *The all new don't think of an elephant!: Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Mercieca, J. R. (2020). *Demagogue for president: The rhetorical genius of Donald Trump*. Texas A&M University Press.
- Moffitt, B. (2016). *The global rise of populism: Performance, political style, and representation*. Stanford University Press.
- Ott, B. L. (2017). The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 34(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2016.1266686>
- Pangaribuan, R. E., Siregar, I., & Susanto, A. (2025). TINDAK TUTUR EKSPRESIF DALAM SERIAL FILM NANTI KITA CERITA TENTANG HARI INI PADA YOUTUBE KANAL TOYOTA INDONESIA: KAJIAN PRAGMATIK. *J-Symbol: Jurnal Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 13(1, April), 208–225.
- Putri, O. M., Siregar, I., & Rachmawati, K. (2024). Semantic analysis in understanding and maintaining Betawi cultural identity through the bikin rume traditional ceremonial process. *Putri | Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i1.7806>
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Siregar, I., Yahaya, S. R. (2023). Model and Approaches to Preserving Betawi Language as an Endangered Language. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 274-283. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.901023>
- Siregar, I., Anjani, S. D., & Yahaya, S. R. (2023). Projection of the Vitality of the Betawi Language in the Future Time in Jakarta. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 6(3), 39–46. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.3.4>
- Siregar, I. (2024). Effectiveness of Multisensory Therapy in Treating Communication Barriers and Social Isolation in Transcortical Aphasia Sufferers. *SIASAT*, 9(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.33258/siasat.v9i1.166>
- Siregar, I. (2024). Assessing Religious Obligations: A Phenomenological Approach to Value and Legal Perspectives. *Polit Journal Scientific Journal of Politics*, 4(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.33258/polit.v4i1.1016>
- Siregar, I., & Demidyuk, L. (2024). The Relations and Relevances of the Poda Na Lima Batak People's Philosophy with Islamic Views. *Kultura: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, 2(4), 15–33. <https://doi.org/10.572349/kultura.v2i4.879>
- Siregar, I. (2024). An Exploration of Online Behavior of Asian and European Netizens: A Conceptual Phenomenological Comparative Review. *SIASAT*, 9(1), 15-27. <https://doi.org/10.33258/siasat.v9i1.167>
- Siregar, I., & Hsu, F. (2024). The Interplay of Cultural Dynamics within the Globalization Paradigm. *Kultura: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, 2(4), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.572349/kultura.v2i4.657>
- Siregar, I. (2024). Examining the Vulnerability of the Betawi Language through a Multidisciplinary Approach. *Siregar | Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v7i1.7857>
- Siregar, I., Kiesner, R., & Aesnring, B. (2024). A CULTURAL SCIENCE PERSPECTIVE ON PREMIUM GROG. *Kultura: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, 2(4), 69–79. <https://doi.org/10.572349/kultura.v2i4.1199>
- Siregar, I., Purnama, A. R., & Gual, A. (2024). Changing conceptions of “Anjing - dogs” in contemporary social contexts. *Siregar | Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v7i1.7858>
- Siregar, I., Purnama, A. R., & Xien li, X. (2024). TRANSFORMATION OF THE MEANING OF THE WORD "DOG" IN THE WIDE COMMUNITY

- ENVIRONMENT. *Kultura: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, 2(4), 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.572349/kultura.v2i4.1200>
- Siregar, I. (2024). *Research Methodology: A Comprehensive and Holistic Viewpoint*. Jakarta: LPU-Unas
- Siregar, I. (2024). The Errors of the Democratic System According to Pancasila: A Critical Examination of Governance in Indonesia. *Polit Journal Scientific Journal of Politics*, 4(2), 123-134. <https://doi.org/10.33258/polit.v4i2.1158>
- Siregar, I., Hamzah, N. H. (2024). Effectiveness of the Language Preservation Model in the Betawi Community. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 274-283. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.901023>
- Siregar, I. (2024). *Research methodology: a comprehensive and holistic viewpoint*. Jakarta: LPU-Unas
- Siregar, I. (2024). Phenomenological Review of the Issue of Political Apathy of Indonesia's Young Generation. *Polit Journal Scientific Journal of Politics*, 4(2), 135-147. <https://doi.org/10.33258/polit.v4i2.1159>
- Siregar, I. (2024). A Phenomenological Critique of Darwin's Theory of Human Origins and Its Cultural Implications. *Lakhomi Journal Scientific Journal of Culture*, 5(1), 51-61.
- Siregar, I. (2024). New strategies in Applied Linguistic Research for health therapy. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, 7–7(2), 95A-106A. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i2.7937>
- SS Wahyuni, I Siregar, K Rachmawati, NH Hamzah. (2024). Written Language Errors Of Dysgraphic Children Aged 9-12 Years In Inclusive Classrooms. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 10(3), 3420-3430. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i3.4126>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
- Wæver, O. (1995). Securitization and desecuritization. In R. D. Lipschutz (Ed.), *On security* (pp. 46–86). Columbia University Press.
- Wardani, E. T., Siregar, I., Susanto, A., & Hamzah, N. H. (2024). Strategies and Role of Parents on Language Acquisition of Children with Special Needs. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 10(3), 3431-3440. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i3.4130>
- Wahyuni, S. S., Siregar, I., Rachmawati, K., Hamzah, N. H., & Yahaya, S. R. (2025). Kesalahan Bahasa Tulis Anak Disgrafia Umur 9 – 12 Tahun Siswa di Kelas Inklusi SDN Parakan 01. *Stilistika: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 18(1), 191–202. <https://doi.org/10.30651/st.v18i1.23343>
- Wardani, E. T., Siregar, I., Susanto, A., Hamzah, N. H., & Yahya, S. R. (2025). Strategi dan Peranan Orang Tua terhadap Pemerolehan Bahasa ABK dalam Komunitas Masyarakat Betawi. *Stilistika: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 18(1), 131–146. <https://doi.org/10.30651/st.v18i1.23371>
- Zarefsky, D. (2004). Presidential rhetoric and the power of definition. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 34(3), 607–619. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5705.2004.00217.x>