Critical Discourse Analysis of Media Power in Reporting the 19% US Tariff on Indonesian Exports: A Comparative Study of Indonesian and Middle East News Outlets

Hilmy Aqila Sukmono[1](✉) UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia[1]
220301110072@student.uin-malang.ac.id[1]
Abdul Basid[2] UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia [2]
abdulbasid@bsa.uin-malang.ac.id[2]

doi https://doi.org/10.58194/eloquence.v4i3.3028
Corresponding Author: ✉ Hilmy Aqila Sukmono

Article History	ABSTRACT
	Background: Media discourse on international trade is not neutral; it reflects ideological positions through language. **Purpose:** This study aims to analyze how Indonesian and Middle East media linguistically frame the 19% US tariff on Indonesian exports using Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). **Method:** The research applied a qualitative descriptive design with Van Dijk's CDA framework. Six online news articles published in July 2025 were purposively selected from major Indonesian (Tempo, Metro TV, The Jakarta Post) and Middle Eastern outlets (Al Jazeera, Sky News Arabia, Al Arabiya) based on relevance to the 19% tariff issue and narrative completeness. Articles were analyzed through Van Dijk's macro–super–micro structure. Coded independently by two researchers using a shared coding guide before reconciling discrepancies through consensus, ensuring analytic reliability. Cross-checking linguistic patterns, thematic structures, and translations of Arabic texts further strengthened the credibility of the findings. **Results and Discussion:** The findings show that the six outlets cannot be classified by region, as their ideological orientations diverge within and across Indonesia and the Middle East. Indonesian media emphasize domestic stakes—technocratic caution, economic vulnerability, or sovereignty-driven critique—while Middle Eastern outlets embed the tariff within global power dynamics, ranging from anti-hegemonic (Al Jazeera) to pro-U.S. (Al Arabiya) or semi-neutral (Sky News Arabia). Across macro, super, and micro levels, ideological positioning arises from institutional agendas rather than geography. Shared strategies—evaluative lexis, power metaphors, and selective sourcing—function as socio-cognitive cues. That shape mental models of hierarchy and inequality, ultimately legitimizing specific interpretations of U.S.–Indonesia trade relations. **Conclusions and Implications:** The study shows that ideological framing of the tariff stems from outlet-specific discursive choices rather than regional identity. Language thus helps reproduce global power asymmetries. Future research should expand datasets and integrate socio-cognitive approaches to deepen analysis.
Keywords:	*Critical Discourse Analysis; Media Framing; US Tariff; Global Hegemony; Indonesian Exports*
	ABSTRAK

Latar Belakang: Wacana media tentang perdagangan internasional tidak pernah netral, ia mencerminkan posisi ideologis melalui bahasa.

Tujuan: Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis bagaimana media Indonesia dan Timur Tengah membingkai secara linguistik tarif 19% Amerika Serikat terhadap ekspor Indonesia dengan menggunakan Analisis Wacana Kritis (AWK) model Van Dijk.

Metode: Penelitian ini menggunakan desain deskriptif kualitatif dengan kerangka Analisis Wacana Kritis Van Dijk. Enam artikel berita daring yang terbit pada Juli 2025 dipilih secara purposif dari media Indonesia (Tempo, Metro TV, The Jakarta Post) dan media Timur Tengah (Al Jazeera, Sky News Arabia, Al Arabiya) berdasarkan relevansinya dengan isu tarif 19% dan kelengkapan narasinya. Artikel dianalisis melalui struktur makro–super–mikro Van Dijk. Dikodekan secara independen oleh dua peneliti menggunakan panduan kode bersama sebelum didiskusikan untuk menyepakati perbedaan, sehingga meningkatkan reliabilitas analitis. Pemeriksaan silang terhadap pola linguistik, struktur tematik, dan terjemahan teks Arab turut memperkuat kredibilitas temuan.

Hasil dan Pembahasan: Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa keenam media tidak dapat diklasifikasikan berdasarkan wilayah, karena orientasi ideologisnya bervariasi baik di dalam maupun antar Indonesia dan Timur Tengah. Media Indonesia menonjolkan kepentingan domestik seperti kehati-hatian teknokratis, kerentanan ekonomi, dan kritik berbasis kedaulatan. Sementara itu, media Timur Tengah membingkai tarif tersebut dalam dinamika kekuasaan global, mulai dari anti-hegemonik (Al Jazeera), pro-AS (Al Arabiya), hingga semi-netral (Sky News Arabia). Pada level makro, super, dan mikro, posisi ideologis lebih dipengaruhi oleh agenda institusional daripada faktor geografis. Strategi seperti leksis evaluatif, metafora kekuasaan, dan seleksi sumber berfungsi sebagai penanda sosio-kognitif. Serta membentuk model mental tentang hierarki dan ketimpangan, sehingga pada akhirnya melegitimasi interpretasi tertentu mengenai relasi dagang AS–Indonesia.

Kesimpulan dan Implikasi: Penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa pembingkaian ideologis atas kebijakan tarif lebih banyak berasal dari pilihan diskursif masing-masing media dibandingkan identitas kewilayahan. Bahasa, dengan demikian, berperan dalam mereproduksi asimetri kekuatan global. Penelitian selanjutnya disarankan untuk memperluas himpunan data dan mengintegrasikan pendekatan sosio-kognitif guna memperdalam analisis.

| Kata Kunci | *Analisis Wacana Kritis; pembingkaian media; tarif AS; hegemoni global; ekspor Indonesia* |

INTRODUCTION

Trade tariffs have evolved beyond being mere economic instruments in international commerce; they now function as political tools shaping inter-state relations. The United States represents the most prominent example in this context. It consistently employs tariffs as a mechanism to protect its domestic industries. However, such measures are frequently criticized as unfair to developing countries and as potentially exacerbating structural inequalities within the global trading system.[1-3] A concrete example appeared in the 2024 United States–Indonesia trade agreement. Under this arrangement, Indonesian exports were subjected to a 19% tariff, whereas U.S. products entered the Indonesian market without any import duties.[4], [5] The Indonesian government presented the agreement as a diplomatic achievement. However, several domestic observers argued that it exposed Indonesia's weak bargaining position.[6], [7] Even American economists have warned that such protectionist measures may produce long-term negative effects, including higher prices and reduced consumer choice.[8]

In this context, the mass media plays a crucial role. Through framing practices, the media does not merely disseminate information but also constructs meaning and highlights particular actors.[9], [10] Indonesian outlets use the agreement as a lens to debate national economic policy and bargaining leverage, whereas Middle Eastern outlets more frequently situate it within broader critiques of U.S. influence in the global order. As a result, media coverage becomes a site where competing notions of justice, reciprocity, and sovereignty are articulated, positioning trade policy as a discursive issue as much as an economic one. Given this gap, this study employs Van Dijk's CDA to comparatively analyze how Indonesian and Middle East media linguistically construct economic asymmetry in US–Indonesia trade negotiations.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides a robust analytical framework for examining such contestations. CDA emphasizes that language is never neutral but is always embedded within social, political, and cultural contexts.[11] Van Dijk [12] divides discourse analysis into three levels. The macrostructure identifies the main themes. The superstructure examines how the narrative is organized. The microstructure analyzes linguistic features—such as diction, modality, and metaphor—that may carry ideological bias. These textual levels are linked to social cognition, the collective knowledge shaped through repeated discursive practices.[11]

Critical Discourse Analysis has been widely applied to study how media construct and frame economic issues. This includes analyses of pandemic-related economic reporting. It also covers research on taxation debates that shape public understandings of the economy.[13], [14] A substantial portion of this research focuses on the US–China trade war. Studies show how Chinese and Western outlets frame the conflict and construct national roles and identities. They also illustrate how media personalize leadership and assign responsibility in trade disputes.[15-22] Alongside this CDA-oriented scholarship, research in international political economy has examined tariffs and trade retaliation as instruments of statecraft, highlighting both their economic impact and their influence on public attitudes toward trade and foreign interference.[23-26]

Research shows that media discourse on trade, taxation, and economic governance is frequently analyzed to understand how international economic policies are framed. This includes studies on tariff arrangements and their political implications. By contrasting media from Indonesia and the Middle East. The current study builds on this body of work by concentrating on how tariff policies in US-Indonesia trade relations are framed from a cross-regional perspective. By doing this, it provides a comparative example that illustrates how various regional media contexts discursively portray US economic policies toward Indonesia.

Accordingly, the research aims to analyze how Indonesian and Middle East media frame the 19% tariff on Indonesian exports to the United States. The analysis applies Van Dijk's three levels of discourse. It also seeks to compare the similarities and differences in ideological positioning between the two regions. In addition, it examines how media discourse on tariff policies reflects power relations and dominance within the global economy.

This study contributes by offering a comparative discourse analysis between Indonesian and Middle East media regarding the United States' 19% tariff on Indonesian exports. By applying Van Dijk's framework, this study finds that the two regions sometimes frame issues in similar ways but often take sharply different ideological positions. It also shows that the language used in the media can reinforce existing global power structures. Accordingly, this study complements existing discussions of global political economy by situating the US–Indonesia tariff dispute within a comparative media-discourse framework.

LITERATURE REVIEW

CDA & Ideology

CDA can be understood as treating language not just as communication but as a social practice that often carries power and ideology.[27] Scholars such as Fairclough [28] and Van Dijk [12] stress that discourse is never neutral, since it emerges in specific political and cultural settings. In practice, CDA combines close attention to wording with an interest in broader relations of dominance, which helps show how texts cast certain actors in particular roles and make some viewpoints appear legitimate.

Van Dijk's [29] three-level model is especially useful for this analysis. The macrostructure identifies overarching themes and shows which issues the media choose to foreground. The superstructure examines textual organization, including headlines, leads, and conclusions that guide readers toward certain evaluations. The microstructure focuses on linguistic features such as word choice, metaphor, nominalization, and quotation patterns that subtly reinforce ideological positions..

In empirical research, CDA has been widely used to show how ideology, identity, and power circulate in media discourse. Studies cover political interviewing and media bias.[30-32] They also examine human-rights and conflict reporting in the Middle East [33-35], as well as representations of Islam and Muslims.[36], [37] Additional work analyzes domestic ideological polarization, including the Rempang Island conflict, Hindu reform movements in Bali, racism in COVID-19 discourse, and topic-modeling of Al-Jazeera coverage [38-42]. Across these contexts, the studies consistently show that CDA is effective in revealing ideological positioning. It uncovers patterns in lexical choice, source selection, evaluative framing, and the implicit power relations embedded in news texts.

Media Framing of International Trade

Research on the US–China trade dispute shows that Western and state-aligned media construct conflicting narratives about national interest, legitimacy, and blame [15-20]. These narratives differ sharply across outlets. They also transform trade policies into symbols of vulnerability, strength, or resistance. These reports assign states different roles, such as aggressor, victim, or responsible negotiator. They do so through choices in headline focus, thematic emphasis, and evaluative language.

In addition to trade wars, research on corporate taxation and economic news related to pandemics demonstrates that media framing influences public perceptions of economic policy, crisis management, and burden-sharing equity.[13], [14] When considered collectively, this literature shows that international economic policies are not presented as neutral technical matters. Instead, they are discursively constructed through specific framing choices. Media use national identity, economic indicators, and ideological cues to shape how audiences interpret policy outcomes. These strategies position certain arrangements as legitimate, controversial, or unfair.

Comparative Media and Power

Media systems engage in power relations negotiations among states in addition to reporting economic policy, according to research on international communication. Research on trade policies shows that tariffs and retaliatory measures serve as both economic and symbolic tools of statecraft, influencing perceptions of power, justice, and influence in international politics.[23], [24] The way that trade and foreign interference are portrayed in the media also affects public opinion, suggesting that discourse is crucial in supporting or challenging economic activity.[25], [26]

Comparative media research supports this notion. It demonstrates that regulatory rules, institutional pressures, and geopolitical alignments shape how outlets present the same event.[10], [43], [44] These dynamics turn the media from a neutral information channel into a space where state authority, legitimacy, and economic power are constantly negotiated across national and regional contexts.

Research Gap and Theoretical Positioning

Research on media discourse has already shown that coverage of trade, taxation, and economic governance is frequently analyzed to understand international economic policies, including tariff arrangements. Building on this body of work, the present study examines tariff policies in U.S.–Indonesia trade relations. It focuses on how these policies are framed in Indonesian and Middle East media from a cross-regional perspective. By placing these two media environments side by side, the study provides a comparative view. It shows how different regional outlets discursively construct U.S. economic policies toward Indonesia. Within this frame, Van Dijk's macro-, super-, and micro-structural CDA model is used to complement existing approaches. It provides a more fine-grained account of how linguistic and structural choices shape these representations.

METHOD

1. Research Design

This study employs a qualitative descriptive design with a critical approach using Teun A. van Dijk's [29] Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) model. A qualitative descriptive design is appropriate because it allows the researcher to portray media discourse in its natural form without relying on experimental control or inferential statistics. Van Dijk's [45] CDA was chosen because it links media texts to their socio-political contexts and uncovers the ideological constructions embedded within news coverage. Consequently, this approach enables the researcher to study news content as well as the power relations and ideologies embedded in its linguistic and narrative structures. Following qualitative content-analytic practice, linguistic categories like voice and nominalization are tabulated to highlight recurring patterns. These small counts merely support the CDA interpretation and do not aim at statistical generalization..

2. Data Source and Sampling Procedure

The data for this study consist of six online news articles published by mainstream media outlets from two regions. The selected Indonesian media are thejakartapost.com, tempo.co, and metrotvnews.com, while the Middle East media include aljazeera.net, skynewsarabia.com, and alarabiya.net. These outlets were purposively selected due to their credibility, wide readership, and representativeness of dominant discourses in their respective regions. Purposive sampling was chosen as it allows the researcher to identify cases most relevant and information-rich for answering the research questions.

Articles were selected based on three criteria. They must: (1) explicitly discuss the 19% tariff issue or the Indonesia–United States trade agreement; (2) be published in July 2025; and (3) fall between 500 and 1,500 words to ensure adequate narrative complexity. The articles were systematically collected through Google News and the internal search features of each platform using keywords such as اتفاق تجارة إندونيسيا أمريكا and "tarif ekspor Indonesia." This procedure ensured both the relevance and comparability of the texts.

3. Validation and Reability

To enhance the credibility of the analysis, a consensus-based intercoder procedure was implemented. Two researchers independently coded all six articles using a shared coding guide derived from Van Dijk's [29] macro, super, and micro analytical levels. After the first coding round,

the coders compared their results and resolved all differences through discussion.. A second round of coding was then carried out using the refined coding guide, so that the final coding matrix reflected jointly agreed analytical decisions rather than the subjective view of a single researcher. The coding sheets and comparison notes were organized using Microsoft Excel to document revisions and maintain transparency in the decision-making process.

Credibility was further strengthened through analytical triangulation. First, framing patterns were compared across the two regional media groups (Indonesian and Middle East) to identify both convergences and divergences in how the 19% tariff issue was represented. Second, emergent themes were cross-checked against existing CDA and media-framing literature on trade, tariffs, and economic inequality to situate the findings within relevant scholarly debates. Third, micro-level linguistic features, such as voice, evaluative lexis, and nominalization, were repeatedly examined in relation to macro-level themes to ensure internal consistency across levels of analysis.

Ethical precautions were taken in handling the multilingual corpus. Indonesian articles were analyzed directly in Indonesian, while Arabic articles were first examined in their original language and then translated into working English versions for cross-regional comparison. The English translations of the Arabic texts were reviewed by a bilingual Arabic–English university lecturer. This ensured that semantic nuance, tone, and evaluative stance were preserved and reduced the risk of distortion in the comparative interpretation.

4. Data Analysis

The data analysis process was conducted in several stages using Van Dijk's [46] three-dimensional CDA model. First, all articles were compiled in digital format and assigned identity codes to facilitate traceability (e.g., IDN1, ME1). Second, a preliminary reading was performed to grasp the general context and record dominant keywords or topics. Third, the articles were analyzed at the macrostructure level by formulating the main themes emerging from the texts, such as "economic losses" or "global hegemony." Fourth, the superstructure was mapped by identifying the title, lead, development paragraphs, and conclusion. This helped examine how the organization of information shaped reader interpretation. Fifth, we analyzed the microstructure, focusing on the specific linguistic choices shaping the discourse. We examined how the texts used active or passive voice, evaluative language, euphemisms, hedging devices, historical references, intertextual links, dysphemisms, and nominalization. We also paid close attention to directives, causal markers, emphatic expressions, and the way authority was assigned to particular sources.

We documented each step in a coding matrix that listed the analytical level: macro, super, or micro along with relevant indicators, examples from the texts, and preliminary interpretations. To keep the analysis consistent, we reviewed the data several times, refining the notes so that every finding could be clearly linked back to the source material.

After each article was analyzed individually, we compared two sets of media outlets: Indonesian sources (Tempo [47], Metro TV [48], The Jakarta Post [49]) and Middle East sources (Al Jazeera [50], Sky News Arabic [51], Al Arabiya [52]). We analyzed each group separately, then identified points of overlap and difference in how they framed the issue. Using Van Dijk's [29] Critical Discourse Analysis framework helped us interpret the results in a way that stayed theoretically grounded. This process clarified recurring framing patterns and revealed how the 19% tariff debate reflected deeper dynamics of power, dominance, and ideology in global discourse.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

This study examines how media outlets in different regions framed the United States' 19% export tariff on Indonesian products. The findings reveal how language shaped the narratives

around trade policy and uncovered the global power relations and ideological dynamics behind them.

1. Macrostructure

The macrostructure analysis examines the main themes shaping the news texts.[53], [54] At this stage, we analyze the information the media emphasizes for readers. Through this analysis, it becomes evident how Indonesian and Middle East media alike directed their reporting focus toward the 19% tariff issue imposed on Indonesia's exports to the United States.

Tabel 1. Themes in Indonesian and Middle East online news

Media	Theme	Description
The Jakarta Post	Outcome of bilateral diplomacy	Portrays the reduction of tariffs to 19% as the result of successful diplomatic negotiations, with emphasis on Indonesia's purchase commitments and Trump's trade strategy.
Metro TV	Negative economic impacts	Emphasizes projected GDP contraction and reduced purchasing power caused by the 19% tariff, based on analysis from INDEF economists.
Tempo	Ideological and historical critique	Criticizes the agreement as unequal, compares Prabowo's stance with Sukarno's anti-imperialist spirit, and uses symbolic and historical narratives.
Al Jazeera	U.S. global trade pressure	Frames the 19% trade policy as part of the U.S.'s broader economic domination of non-Western countries, stressing unequal trade relations.
Al Arabiya	Major U.S. success	Depicts the agreement as a U.S. victory in opening Indonesia's market for industrial, agricultural, and digital products.
Sky News Arabia	Trump's personal diplomacy	Constructs the deal as the outcome of Trump's direct diplomacy that prevented higher tariffs, expanded U.S. export access, and affected Indonesia–Europe relations.

Across the six outlets, the macro-level patterns are clear. Indonesian media interpreted the 19% tariff mainly through domestic lenses—whether as a diplomatic achievement (The Jakarta Post), an economic burden (Metro TV), or an ideological inequality (Tempo). Middle Eastern media, by contrast, placed the tariff within broader structures of U.S. power. Al Jazeera framed it as part of systemic American dominance, Al Arabiya echoed pro-U.S. narratives that cast the agreement as Washington's success, and Sky News Arabia took a semi-neutral stance that highlights Trump's personal diplomacy.

When considered collectively, these superstructural patterns show that ideological orientation has a greater influence on information organization than geographic location. Arab outlets employed structural cues to place the issue within global power dynamics, while Indonesian outlets organized their narratives to make the tariff comprehensible through domestic stakes. Because of this, the news structure itself functions as an ideological instrument. It directs readers toward particular interpretations of dominance, agency, and the tariff's significance within the wider international trade system.

2. Superstructure

The superstructure analysis examines how the media organize the flow and structure of their news reporting. This stage identifies how the introduction, body, and conclusion of the news texts are arranged to construct a particular narrative. These organizational patterns help uncover the strategies employed by the media to shape readers' understanding of the U.S.–Indonesia trade tariff issue.

Table 2. Superstructure Elements in Middle East and Indonesian online news

Media	Headline / Lead	Situation	Comments	Conclusion
The Jakarta Post	"Trump says Indonesia to face 19 percent tariff under trade deal" (IDN1). Focus on tariff and purchase commitments	Trump announces 19% tariff (reduced from 32%); Indonesia agrees to purchase energy, agriculture, Boeing.	Notes uncertainty in implementation timeline and purchase period; mentions Trump's global pressure.	Neutral narrative emphasizing commitments and tariff, while stressing uncertainty in details.
Tempo	"Tarif Impor 19 Persen: Make America Great Again" (IDN2). Compares Prabowo with Sukarno	17-minute phone negotiation with Trump; outcome: 19% tariff for Indonesia, zero for U.S.	Historical framing; strong criticism: deal described as "kalah 0–19"; highlights removal of local content, certification, and data clauses.	Ideological narrative; portrays Prabowo as supporting Trump's slogan, contrasted with Sukarno.
Metro TV	"Tarif Trump 19% Bikin PDB Indonesia Bakal Minus 0,113%" (IDN3). Emphasizes macroeconomic impact	INDEF projects GDP decline of 0.113%; household purchasing power decline of 0.091%.	Emphasizes unfair tariff scheme; highlights U.S. gains vs Indonesia's losses.	Government urged to formulate a national strategy to remain competitive.
Al Jazeera	**"ترامب يفرض رسوما** جمركية بنسبة ٪۱۹ على إندونيسيا"(ME1). *Trump yafriḍ rusūman ğumrūkīyatan bi-nisbati 19% 'alā Indūnīsiyā.* "Trump imposes a 19% tariff on Indonesia". Stresses tariff & Trump's pressure	Trump announces 19% tariff; Indonesia to purchase energy, agriculture, Boeing.	Frames deal as part of U.S. global tariff strategy; mentions threats to EU and trade war.	Deal viewed as part of global pressure; Indonesia considered a minor case.
Al Arabiya	"أميركا تتوصل إلى اتفاق تجاري مع إندونيسيا"(ME2) *Amīrkā tatawaṣṣal ilā ittifāq tiğārī ma'a Indūnīsiyā.* "America reaches a trade agreement with Indonesia". Emphasizes U.S. breakthrough	19% tariff for Indonesia; Indonesia removes tariffs & barriers for >99% of U.S. products.	Focuses on U.S. economic benefits (industry, agriculture, digital); stresses removal of non-tariff barriers.	Deal framed as a major breakthrough, granting U.S. producers full access.
Sky News Arabia	"ترامب يعلن عن اتفاق تجاري مع إندونيسيا" (ME3)	Trump announces deal on Truth Social;	Neutral straight-news style; highlights prior	Deal framed as the result of U.S. pressure; Indonesia

Trump yu'lin 'an ittifāq tiǧārī ma'a Indūnīsiyā. "Trump announces a trade agreement with Indonesia". Focuses on Trump's official announcement	19% tariff for Indonesia; purchases include Boeing and energy.	32% tariff threat and August 1 deadline.	agrees to major purchases to avoid higher tariffs.

The superstructure of the six outlets shows distinct variations in the narrative organization of the tariff. The Jakarta Post adopted a technocratic sequence focused on official commitments and uncertainties. Metro TV centered its structure on economic projections to stress domestic losses. Tempo used a more rhetorical structure, beginning with ideological critique and ending with historical reflection, to cast the deal as part of a long-standing unequal relationship. These media outlets consistently anchored their stories in domestic concerns, but with different structural orientations.

Middle Eastern outlets, by contrast, structured their reports around the global role of the United States. Al Jazeera organized the story as an extension of U.S. economic pressure worldwide, embedding Indonesia's case within broader geopolitical strategies. Al Arabiya used a celebratory structure emphasizing the U.S. gains produced by the agreement, while Sky News Arabia adopted a procedural, straight-news sequence that nonetheless framed the deal as the result of U.S. leverage.

Taken together, these superstructural patterns demonstrate that the organization of information is shaped less by region than by ideological orientation. Indonesian outlets structured their narratives to make the tariff legible through domestic stakes, whereas Arab outlets used structural cues to position the issue within global power dynamics. Thus, news structure itself functions as an ideological tool, guiding readers toward particular interpretations of agency, dominance, and the meaning of the tariff in the broader international trade system.

3. Microstructure

The microstructure analysis focuses on the linguistic elements that shape meaning at a more detailed level, such as word choice, the use of quotations, metaphors, and other rhetorical devices. These elements often serve as implicit means of embedding ideology or bias within news reporting.

Table 3. Microstructure elements in Middle East and Indonesian online news

Media	Microstructure	Quotation Example	Ideological Function
The Jakarta Post	Active Voice	"Trump said Tuesday that he had struck a trade pact with Indonesia"	Positions Trump as the main actor, highlighting U.S. dominance in negotiations.
	Evaluative Language	"great deal, for everybody" (Trump)	Cites Trump's evaluative language without critique, creating a positive and mutually beneficial impression.
	Euphemism	"goods that have been transshipped to avoid higher duties"	Uses technical terms that soften trade

			practices, avoiding the word "illegal."
	Hedging / Skepticism	"It remains unclear when the lower tariff level announced Tuesday will take effect"	Introduces uncertainty, reflecting skepticism about the agreement's certainty.
Tempo	Historical Analogy	"Sukarno berteriak 'Go to hell with your aid!', Prabowo seperti mendukung Make America Great Again"	Frames the issue through historical parallels, highlighting Sukarno–Prabowo continuity.
	Intertextuality	Quotations from Sukarno's 1965 speech & Trump's campaign slogan	Injects cross-discourse narratives (domestic politics + international politics) to strengthen critique.
	Dysphemism	"kesepakatan itu sebagai kekalahan Indonesia 0–19"	Harsh framing, emphasizing Indonesia's loss and inferior position.
Metro TV	Nominalization	"Penurunan Produk Domestik Bruto (PDB) sebesar minus 0,113 persen"	Focus on macroeconomic figures, framing the issue as technical-economic.
	Evaluative Language	"Indonesia menjadi salah satu negara yang paling dirugikan"	Highlights national losses, framing Indonesia as the most disadvantaged party.
	Directive / Call to Action	"Pemerintah kudu kerja keras jaga daya tarik investasi"	Directs responsibility toward the government, normatively framing the need for immediate action.
Al Jazeera	Active Voice	قال الرئيس الأميركي دونالد ترامب الثلاثاء إن الولايات المتحدة ستفرض رسوما جمركية بنسبة ١٩٪ على السلع الواردة من إندونيسيا بموجب اتفاق جديد مع الدولة الواقعة في جنوب شرق آسيا *Qāla al-ra'īs al-amīrīkī Donald Trump ath-thulāthā' inna al-wilāyāt al-muttaḥidah satafriḍ rusūman ǧumrūkīyatan bi-nisbati 19% 'alā as-sula' al-wāridah min Indūnīsiyā bi-mūǧib ittifāq ǧadīd ma'a ad-dawlah al-wāqi'ah fī ǧanūb šarq Āsiyā.* "US President Donald Trump said on Tuesday that the United States	Places Trump as the main actor, emphasizing U.S. unilateral power in the agreement.

		will impose a 19% tariff on goods imported from Indonesia under a new agreement with the Southeast Asian nation".	
	Evaluative Language	سيدفعون ٪١٩ ولن ندفع شيئا سيكون لدينا وصول كامل إلى إندونيسيا *Sayadfa'ūna 19% wa-lan nadfa'a šay'an, sa-yakūnu ladaynā wuṣūl kāmil ilā Indūnīsiyā.* They will pay 19% and we will pay nothing, we will have full access to Indonesia.	Competitive-contrastive language: U.S. fully benefits while Indonesia remains passive.
	Causality	يواصل ترامب الضغط من أجل ما يعتبرها شروطا أفضل مع الشركاء التجاريين وسبيلا لتقليص العجز التجاري الأميركي الكبير *Yuwaṣil Trump aḍ-ḍaghṭ min ağli mā ya'tabiruhā šurūṭan afḍal ma'a aš-šurakā' at-tiğārīyīn wa sabīlan li-taqlīṣ al-'ağz at-tiğārī al-amīrikī al-kabīr.* Trump continues to push for what he considers better terms with trade partners and a way to reduce the large US trade deficit.	Frames Trump's action as part of a broader economic strategy rather than mere coercion.
Al Arabiya	Strong Language	يمثل اختراقًا كبيرًا بالنسبة لقطاعات التصنيع والزراعة والتكنولوجيا الرقمية الأميركية. *Yumaththilu ikhtirāqan kabīran bi-nisbati li-qiṭā'āt at-taṣnī' wa-z-ẓirā'ah wa-t-tiknūlūğiyā ar-raqamīyah al-amīrikīyah.* It represents a major breakthrough for the American manufacturing, agriculture, and digital technology sectors.	Depicts the deal as a major U.S. victory, reinforcing a pro-American frame.
	Nominalization	تشمل الشروط الرئيسية لاتفاقية التجارة المتبادلة بين الولايات المتحدة وإندونيسيا إزالة الحواجز الجمركية، وتقليص الحواجز غير الجمركية أمام الصادرات الصناعية والزراعية الأميركية، وتحسين معايير العمل. *Tašmul aš-šurūṭ ar-ra'īsīyah li-ttifāqīyat at-tiğārah al-mutabādalah bayna al-wilāyāt al-muttaḥidah wa-Indūnīsiyā izālat al-ḥawāğiz al-ğumrūkīyah, wa-taqlīṣ al-ḥawāğiz ghayr al-ğumrūkīyah amāma aṣ-ṣādirāt aṣ-ṣinā'īyah wa-z-ẓirā'īyah al-amīrikīyah, wa-taḥsīn ma'āyīr al-'amal.* The main conditions of the mutual trade agreement between the United States and Indonesia include the removal of tariffs, the reduction of non-tariff barriers to American industrial and agricultural exports, and the improvement of labor standards.	Abstracts political actions into technical terms, masking power relations.

	Evaluative Language	وصول غير مسبوق إلى السوق الإندونيسية *Wuṣūl ghayr masbūq ilā as-sūq al-Indūnīsīyah.* "Unprecedented access to the Indonesian market."	Emphasizes U.S. exclusive advantages, reinforcing American economic dominance.
Sky News Arabia	Active Voice	أعلن الرئيس الأميركي دونالد ترامب عبر منصته تروث سوشال الثلاثاء أنه توصل إلى اتفاق تجاري مع إندونيسيا *A'lana ar-ra'īs al-amīrīkī Donald Trump 'abra manṣṣatih Truth Social ath-thulāthā' annahu tawaṣṣala ilā ittifāq tiğārī ma'a Indūnīsiyā.* US President Donald Trump announced on Tuesday via his platform Truth Social that he had reached a trade agreement with Indonesia.	Centers Trump as the main figure, reinforcing U.S. dominance.
	Evaluative Language	(Trump) ''اتفاق رائع للجميع'' *"Ittifāq rā'i' li-l-ğami'"* A great deal for everyone	Cites Trump's claim, conveying a positive impression without critique.
	Attribution	''قال الوزير يومها إنّ الشركات الإندونيسية ستلتزم بإنفاق ما مجموعه ٣٤ مليار دولار'' *Qāla al-wazīr yawma-hā inna aš-šarikāt al-Indūnīsīyah sataltazimu bi-infāq mā mağmū'uhu 34 milyār dūlār.* The minister said that day that Indonesian companies would commit to spending a total of 34 billion dollars	Provides Indonesian government voice, but within the framework of meeting U.S. demands.

The narrative following the table shows that each outlet deploys microstructural choices to advance particular ideological orientations toward the U.S.–Indonesia tariff issue. The Jakarta Post adopts a restrained and technocratic tone, selectively employing hedging and neutral descriptors that keep the report cautious and non-confrontational. By presenting U.S. statements without interpretive challenge, the outlet maintains a balanced posture while avoiding overtly political interpretations.

Tempo, in contrast, embeds the issue within a broader historical and ideological framework. Through the use of analogy, intertextual references, and emotionally charged framing, it positions the agreement as a symbolic setback for Indonesian sovereignty. These linguistic strategies amplify a narrative of resistance and connect contemporary politics to a longer nationalistic tradition.

Metro TV shifts attention from political contention to economic technicalities. Nominalization and quantitative language construct the issue as a matter of macroeconomic management rather than geopolitical asymmetry. Nevertheless, evaluative cues and prescriptive statements direct responsibility toward the government, giving the coverage a normative edge despite its technical façade.

The Middle Eastern outlets, although diverse, generally situate the story within the broader dynamics of U.S. global power. Al Jazeera underscores structural inequality through assertive evaluative language and causal explanations that frame the tariff policy as part of a larger hegemonic strategy. Al Arabiya normalizes U.S. advantage by employing highly positive, technocratic terminology that presents American gains as routine and legitimate. Sky News Arabia adopts a

more moderate tone, yet continues to center U.S. agency while offering limited inclusion of Indonesia's perspective.

When combined, these results demonstrate that while Arab media contextualize the agreement within global power relations, Indonesian media prioritize issues of sovereignty and domestic impact. Microstructural choices, including active voice, nominalization, evaluative phrasing, and historical allusion, are subtle ways to express ideological positions and influence how the audience interprets the trade agreement across all platforms.

Discussion

The comparative patterns show that the six outlets cannot be classified by region because their ideological orientations cut across geographical boundaries. Indonesian media organize their coverage around domestic stakes—whether through technocratic caution (The Jakarta Post), economic vulnerability (Metro TV), or sovereignty-driven critique (Tempo). Middle Eastern outlets, by contrast, situate the tariff within global power dynamics. Al Jazeera adopts a Global South–oriented critique of U.S. dominance, Al Arabiya aligns with U.S. interests, and Sky News Arabia maintains a semi-neutral, U.S.-centered framing.

Table 4. Comparative Summary: Indonesian vs Middle East Media Coverage

Region / Media	Orientation	Ideological Position	Linguistic Realization
Indonesia – The Jakarta Post	Technocratic Diplomacy; Policy Implications	Moderate–Cautious; Pragmatic Tendency	Neutral verbs ("said," "struck a deal"); euphemism; hedging ("remains unclear").
Indonesia – Metro TV	Domestic Economic Impact	National-Economic; Critical of Inequality	Nominalization (GDP decline); evaluative terms ("paling dirugikan"); normative directives.
Indonesia – Tempo	Political-Ideological; History and National Identity	Critical–Anti-Hegemonic; Pro-Sovereignty	Dysphemism ("0–19 defeat"); intertextuality (Sukarno vs MAGA); emotive framing.
Middle East – Al Jazeera	Al Jazeera,Critique of U.S. Hegemony; Global Structures	Anti-Hegemonic; Pro–Global South	Strong evaluatives ("full access," "pressure"); causality linking to U.S. dominance.
Middle East – Al Arabiya	Economic Gain; Pro-Trade Narrative	Pro-U.S.; Affirmative of U.S. Policy	Positive framing ("major breakthrough"); technocratic nominalization; promotional tone.
Middle East – Sky News Arabia	Trump's Diplomacy; Global Trade Relations	Semi-Neutral; Leaning towards U.S.-centric Narrative	Active voice foregrounding Trump; mild evaluation; contextual expansion (EU trade angle).

1. Macrostructure

At the macrostructural level, the data reveal three thematic clusters that cut across Indonesian and Middle Eastern outlets, indicating that regional location does not predict macrostructural orientation. The first cluster foregrounds domestic economic loss and unequal exchange—most visible in Tempo and Metro TV—which frame the tariff as a threat to Indonesia's economic sovereignty. This aligns with studies showing that trade disputes are often framed through economic nationalism and anxieties over national interest.[16] Socio-cognitively, these macro-topics activate mental models of national vulnerability, guiding audiences to interpret the tariff through schemata of precarity and historical dependency.

The tariff is embedded within a broader narrative of U.S. structural dominance by a second cluster, which is prominent in Al Jazeera and appears in parts of Tempo and Jakarta Post. Echoing analyses that contend trade wars reinforce systemic power imbalances, this pattern emphasizes entrenched global asymmetries rather than local impacts.[14] According to Van Dijk's sociocognitive theory, this macrostructure positions American actions as part of a broader pattern of coercive economic behavior. It does so by prompting viewers to activate mental frameworks of hegemony and North–South inequality.

By portraying the tariff as logical changes within international trade governance, the third cluster—found in the Jakarta Post, Al Arabiya, and Sky News Arabia—normalizes U.S. agency. This supports cognitive models that make American decision-making seem normal, expected, and structurally essential.

The socio-cognitive effects are consistent across these clusters: media outlets replicate U.S. centrality in audience mental models whether they highlight systemic hegemony, national vulnerability, or policy routine. Therefore, media perceptions of the tariff and the wider allocation of power in the global economic system are shaped in large part by macrostructure.

2. **Superstructure**

At the superstructural level, the data reveal three organizational patterns that cut across regional boundaries, showing that the six outlets cannot be grouped meaningfully by geography. The first pattern—dominant in Tempo and Metro TV and partly in Jakarta Post—uses a front-loaded evaluative structure that opens with projected losses or policy criticism. This mirrors the tendencies noted by Liu et al. [22],where economic and trade-war reporting foregrounds judgments in top-level positions to guide interpretation. Socio-cognitively, this structure prompts readers to activate mental models of domestic vulnerability before processing event details.

A second trend, which is more prevalent in Al Jazeera and sporadically present in Tempo, starts with historical or contextual framing that connects the tariff to more general accounts of structural imbalance and U.S. influence. This reflects organizational characteristics noted by Wu and Rungrojsuwan [17], who demonstrate how trade-war coverage frequently scaffolds events onto established global narratives. Readers are led to see the tariff as a component of a long-lasting hierarchy rather than a singular policy event by this sequencing, which activates audience schemas of hegemonic power and structural inequality.

The third pattern follows a procedural structure that starts with factual summaries and progresses to quotes and institutional responses. It can be found in Al Arabiya, Sky News Arabia, and portions of Jakarta Post. By portraying its trade actions as commonplace, this sequencing normalizes U.S. agency. According to Van Dijk, this superstructure frames U.S. policy actions as expected and institutionally legitimate, helping to cognitively normalize the country's centrality.

All things considered, these three patterns transcend regional boundaries and are more a reflection of the editorial practices and ideological stance of each outlet than of geographic location. However, all three have the same sociocognitive effect. They guide readers to conceptual frameworks where American actions continue to play a major role in interpreting economic results, thus promoting specific distributions of power and agency in the discourse surrounding global economics.

3. **Microstructure**

Three linguistic strategies that are common in both Indonesian and Middle Eastern media at the microstructural level attest to the fact that ideological positioning cannot be boiled down to regional classifications. The tariff is moralized and cast as structurally unequal through evaluative terms like "dominance" and ketidakadilan (injustice), found in Tempo, Metro TV, and sections of Al Jazeera. Such a lexis, according to earlier research [18], emphasizes vulnerability or resistance

and, sociocognitively, activates mental models of unfairness that lead readers to perceive the tariff as ethically asymmetrical rather than administrative.

Second, the United States is portrayed as dominant and Indonesia as constrained through the use of metaphors and relational power language. Similar patterns can be seen in Tempo and the Jakarta Post, although they are more noticeable in Al Jazeera and Sky News Arabia. This indicates that this strategy is not limited to any one region. According to Steinberg & Tan [25], this type of framing reinforces mental images of geopolitical hierarchy by portraying countries as either aggressors or victims.

Third, the assignment of agency and blame is consistently influenced by the choice of sources. While Indonesian outlets prioritize local economists and political critics, Middle Eastern outlets frequently cite analysts who place the tariff within the framework of systemic inequality. However, these tendencies are not purely regional; Al Arabiya adopts more procedural, state-aligned voices, while the Jakarta Post offers structural commentary. Previous studies have confirmed that source patterns influence readers' perceptions of harm and responsibility.[42]

When combined, these tactics—power metaphors, evaluative language, and source selection—function as ideological cues that direct the thinking of the audience. Their distribution across regions suggests that institutional ideology has a greater influence on microstructure than geographic location. These decisions can be viewed as instruments that mold mental models of dominance, agency, and injustice using van Dijk's socio-cognitive framework. This helps to subtly reproduce power in the discourse surrounding international trade.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclussion

This study shows that Indonesian and Middle Eastern media do not form regional ideological blocs when framing the 19% U.S. tariff. Instead, each outlet uses distinct macro-, super-, and microstructural strategies shaped by its own institutional interests. Indonesian outlets emphasize domestic economic stakes and sovereignty, whereas Middle Eastern outlets link the tariff to broader geopolitical power dynamics with divergent ideological stances. Linguistic choices—such as evaluative lexis, voice, and nominalization—function as socio-cognitive cues that guide audience interpretation of U.S.–Indonesia trade relations. The study's main contribution is to show that ideological framing in global economic news comes from outlet-specific discursive practices rather than regional identity. This offers a clearer comparative model for CDA research on international economic policy.

Limitation and Implication

The study offers practical implications for journalists, media educators, and regulators. Journalists may benefit from heightened awareness of how linguistic choices and structural composition shape ideological meaning in economic reporting. Media literacy educators can use the comparative framing patterns identified here to teach audiences to critically interpret narratives about international trade. Regulators and policy institutions may also consider encouraging transparent sourcing and balanced representation to reduce the reproduction of geopolitical inequality in news coverage.

However, the study has several limitations. The corpus is relatively small, consisting of only six articles, and focuses on a single trade policy episode. In addition, the analysis compares only two media regions, which limits the generalizability of the findings to the broader international media landscape. Future research could expand the temporal scope, examine different economic policies, or include additional regions—such as ASEAN, Africa, or Latin America—to evaluate whether similar framing patterns persist. Integrating CDA with interviews, political–economic

analysis, or audience reception would also deepen understanding of how media frame, disseminate, and contest ideology in global economic discourse.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] Y. Bonaparte, "Tariffs and the Unequal Burden: How Trade Policy Deepens Income Inequality," SSRN, 2025. doi: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5219949

[2] A. Chryssogelos, "Contesting international economic governance: the 'people' and trade in the Trump and Brexit rhetoric," in *Contestation and Polarization in Global Governance*, Edward Elgar Publishing, 2023, pp. 108–123. doi: https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800887268.00012

[3] K. Siddiqui, "Donald Trump's Tariffs: A Prelude to Global Trade Wars?," *World Financ. Rev.*, 2025, [Online]. Available: https://worldfinancialreview.com/donald-trumps-tariffs-a-prelude-to-global-trade-wars/

[4] "Indonesia Strikes Deal to Reduce US Tariff to 19%," Sekretariat Kabinet Republik Indonesia. Accessed: Aug. 05, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://setkab.go.id/en/indonesia-strikes-deal-to-reduce-us-tariff-to-19/

[5] "Joint Statement on Framework for United States-Indonesia Agreement on Reciprocal Trade," The White House. Accessed: Aug. 05, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/2025/07/joint-statement-on-framework-for-united-states-indonesia-agreement-on-reciprocal-trade/

[6] B. Fernandez, "Uncharted Territory? U.S.-China Power Dynamics in Trump's Second Presidency." 2025. doi: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5141226

[7] E. Tower, T. D. Willett, and J. Gilbert, "Mr. Trump's Tariff War." 2025. doi: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5351653

[8] K. A. Clausing and M. E. Lovely, "Why Trump's Tariff Proposals Would Harm Working Americans," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4834397

[9] R. M. Entman, "Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm," *J. Commun.*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 51–58, 1993. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

[10] E. K. G. Mensah, "Assessing the Role of Media Influence and Public Perception in Legal Decision-Making," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4811277

[11] T. A. Van Dijk, "Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis," in *Language & Peace*, Routledge, 2005. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203984994

[12] T. A. Van Dijk, "Principles of critical discourse analysis," *Discourse Soc.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 249–283, 1993. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006

[13] L. Li and F. Gao, "Contrasting semantic and sentimental features between Chinese and American economic news discourse in the epidemic era: A corpus-based critical discourse analysis," *Soc. Sci. Humanit. Open*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 100435, 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100435

[14] C. Graham and B. K. O'Rourke, "Ideological Presuppositions in Media Coverage of Corporation Tax Policy in the UK and Ireland: A Critical Discourse Analysis," *Am. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 68, no. 14, pp. 1862–1893, Dec. 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642221144830

[15] C. Linjing, "A Study on the Theoretical Framework of Discourse Analysis of China's Response to Sino-US Trade Frictions," *Sage Open*, vol. 12, no. 1, Jan. 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221086656

[16] F. Chen and G. Wang, "A war or merely friction? Examining news reports on the current Sino-U.S. trade dispute in The New York Times and China Daily," *Crit. Discourse Stud.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–18, Jan. 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2020.1844252

[17] S. Wu and S. Rungrojsuwan, "A Discourse Analysis of the Wall Street Journal 's and China Daily 's News Reports on the Trade War Between the United States and China," in *Proceedings of the 2022 8th International Conference on Humanities and Social Science Research (ICHSSR 2022)*, Atlantis Press SARL, 2022. doi: https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220504.184

[18] X. Tongkai, "A Corpus-Based Critical Discourse Analysis of Reuters' News Coverage of the 2025 Sino-U.S. Trade War," *Int. Linguist. Res.*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. p30, May 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.30560/ilr.v8n2p30

[19] L. Zhu, "Framing the political conflict discourse in Chinese media," *J. Lang. Polit.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 867–889, Oct. 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.21005.zhu

[20] L. Tang, "Othering as mediated soft-power practice: Chinese diplomatic communication of discourse about China-US trade war through the British press," *Discourse, Context Media*, vol. 51, p. 100669, Feb. 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2023.100669

[21] S. Liu, "Personalization of Trump and Xi in the U.S.–China trade conflict news: Comparison between the U.S. and China," *Int. Commun. Gaz.*, vol. 86, no. 8, pp. 672–692, Dec. 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/17480485231206364

[22] S. Liu, M. Boukes, and K. De Swert, "Strategy framing in the international arena: A cross-national comparative content analysis on the China-US trade conflict coverage," *Journalism*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 976–998, May 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849211052438

[23] M. Kasim, "Strategic statecraft or symbolic coercion? A comparative study of trump's tariff doctrine in China and India," *Pacific Rev.*, pp. 1–31, Nov. 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09512748.2025.2584182

[24] K. Zeng, R. Wells, J. Gu, and A. Wilkins, "Bilateral Tensions, the Trade War, and US–China Trade Relations," *Bus. Polit.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 399–429, Dec. 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/bap.2022.8

[25] D. A. Steinberg and Y. Tan, "Public responses to foreign protectionism: Evidence from the US-China trade war," *Rev. Int. Organ.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 145–167, Jan. 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-022-09468-y

[26] R. Brutger, S. Chaudoin, and M. Kagan, "Trade Wars and Election Interference," *Rev. Int. Organ.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–25, Jan. 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-022-09464-2

[27] R. Wodak, "Mediation between discourse and society: assessing cognitive approaches in CDA," *Discourse Stud.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 179–190, Feb. 2006, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059566

[28] N. Fairclough, S. Pardoe, and B. Szerszynski, "Critical Discourse Analysis and Citizenship," in *Analysing Citizenship Talk: Social positioning in political and legal decision-making processes*, H. Hausendorf and A. Bora, Eds., John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006, pp. 98–123. doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.19.09fai

[29] T. A. Van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Analysis," in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Wiley, 2015, pp. 466–485. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch22

[30] A. U. Abdulkadir, "A critical discourse analysis of selected political interviews in Nigerian

news media," *J. Lang. Linguist. Lit. Stud.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 47–61, May 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.57040/jllls.v3i2.432

[31] D. Humaira and A. Basid, "Yahya Sinwar's Murder in Arabic International Media Platforms: A Norman Fairclough Critical Discourse Analysis," *Eralingua J. Pendidik. Bhs. Asing dan Sastra*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 163, Apr. 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.26858/eralingua.v9i1.70496

[32] A. P. Imani and R. Wahyudi, "A critical discourse analysis of media political bias on Marvel's Sabra controversy," *Englisia J. Lang. Educ. Humanit.*, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 16, May 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v12i2.23446

[33] H. A. Amaireh, "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Al Jazeera's Reporting of the 2021 Israel-Palestine Crisis," *Int. J. Arab. Stud.*, Oct. 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes.v24i1.559

[34] M. M. A. Amer, "BBC and New York Times' Coverage of the May 2021 Israeli Onslaught on Gaza: A Critical Discourse Analysis," *Int. J. English Linguist.*, vol. 12, no. 5, p. 1, Jul. 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v12n5p1

[35] R. J. Malkawi, S. I. Fareh, and G. Rabab'ah, "Framing the shooting of Al Jazeera journalist Shireen Abu Akleh in English and Arabic news headlines: a critical discourse study," *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 1276, Sep. 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03784-x

[36] T. X. Lan and G. S. Navera, "The slanted beam: A critical discourse analysis of anti-Islam and anti-Muslim discourse in China," *Discourse Soc.*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 107–125, Jan. 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265211048704

[37] K. Li and Q. Zhang, "A corpus-based study of representation of Islam and Muslims in American media: Critical Discourse Analysis Approach," *Int. Commun. Gaz.*, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 157–180, Mar. 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048520987440

[38] D. Fatinova, W. Gunawan, A. R. Saifullah, E. Risnawati, R. J. Emha, and Y. Mubarok, "The Representation of the Indonesian Government in Media: A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Rempang Island Conflict," *J. Lang. Lang. Teach.*, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 645, Apr. 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i2.10926

[39] I. W. Numertayasa, A. Santoso, M. Syahri, and P. Agus Adiwijaya, "A Battle on Social Media: Critical Discourse Analysis of the Sampradaya in Bali," *MANUSYA J. Humanit.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1–28, Oct. 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/26659077-20242711

[40] T. Ran and Z. Liu, "'The Russia-Ukraine War' or 'The US-Russia War'? Thematic analysis of Global Times ' coverage of the Russia-Ukraine War," *Media Asia*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 3–32, Jan. 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01296612.2023.2246721

[41] B. Ranji and C. Archetti, "The details that matter: Racism in Norwegian media during the Covid-19 pandemic," *Media, Cult. Soc.*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 1397–1413, Oct. 2024, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437241241482

[42] T. Rouhana, "Critical discourse analysis guided topic modeling: the case of Al-Jazeera Arabic," *Information, Commun. Soc.*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 904–922, Apr. 2023, doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2023.2166364

[43] T. Neilson and K. Heylen, "Journalism unions and digital platform regulation: a critical discourse analysis of submissions to Australia's News Media Bargaining Code," *Media Int. Aust.*, vol. 195, no. 1, pp. 106–119, May 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X231176583

[44] X. Yu and H. Zheng, "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Different News Reports on the

Same Event: Illustrated with Examples from China Daily and The Guardian," *Open J. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 10, no. 11, pp. 348–363, 2022, doi: https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2022.1011023

[45] T. A. Van Dijk, "Structures of news in the press," in *Discourse and communication: New Approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media Discourse and Communication*, T. A. Van Dijk, Ed., De Gruyter, 1985, pp. 69–93. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110852141.69

[46] T. A. van Dijk, "Discourse, Cognition and Society," *Discourse Soc.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 5–6, Jan. 1996, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926596007001001

[47] B. Hidayat, "Tarif Impor 19 Persen: Make America Great Again," Tempo. Accessed: Aug. 25, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.tempo.co/prelude/sampul-tempo-negosiasi-tarif-impor-2051463

[48] I. N. Jelita, "Tarif Trump 19% bikin PDB Indonesia bakal minus 0,113%," MetroTVNews. Accessed: Aug. 01, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.metrotvnews.com/read/NQACYz7x-tarif-trump-19-bikin-pdb-indonesia-bakal-minus-0-113

[49] B. Seow, "Trump says Indonesia to face 19 percent tariff under trade deal," The Jakarta Post. Accessed: Aug. 01, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.thejakartapost.com/business/2025/07/16/trump-says-indonesia-to-face-19-percent-tariff-under-trade-deal.html

[50] Al Jazeera, "ترامب يفرض رسوما جمركية بنسبة ١٩٪ على إندونيسيا". Accessed: Aug. 01, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.aljazeera.net/ebusiness/2025/7/16/trump-tariffs-indonesia

[51] SNA Business, "ترامب يعلن عن اتفاق تجاري مع إندونيسيا". Accessed: Aug. 01, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.snabusiness.com/article/1808914-ترامب-يعلن-اتفاق-تجاري-إندونيسيا

[52] Al Arabiya, "أميركا تتوصل إلى اتفاق تجاري مع إندونيسيا". Accessed: Aug. 01, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.alarabiya.net/aswaq/economy/2025/07/23/-اتفاق-الى-تتوصل-اميركا-تجاري-مع-اندونيسيا

[53] T. A. Van Dijk, "On Macrostructures, Mental Models, and Other Inventions: A Brief Personal History of the Kintsch-van Dijk Theory," in *Discourse comprehension: Essays in honor of Walter Kintsch*, C. A. Weaver, S. Mannes, and C. R. Fletcher, Eds., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1995, pp. 383–410.

[54] T. A. Van Dijk, *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. London: Routledge, 2019. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429025532