
FRAMING THE HORMUZ STRAIT CRISIS: A SOCIO-COGNITIVE APPROACH TO HEADLINE DISCOURSE IN KOMPAS AND TEMPO

Ummi Hanin¹, Ena Luthfiah², Delfiana Tukka Tandirerung³, Nurharsya Khaer Hanafie⁴

¹²³English Education Program, Post Graduate Program, Universitas Negeri Makassar,
Indonesia

⁴Civil Education and Law Department, Faculty of Social Science and Law,
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

u.haninnn27@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates how ideological orientations influence the construction of reality in media headlines during global energy crises. Specifically, it examines the framing of the 2026 Strait of Hormuz crisis in two prominent Indonesian news portals, Kompas.com and Tempo.co. Using Teun A. van Dijk's three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework, comprising textual structure, social cognition, and social analysis. The research analyzes ten pairs of headlines published on 4 – 22 April 2026. The results reveal a significant divergence in discursive strategies: Kompas prioritizes a "Transcendental Humanism" ideology, utilizing a hope-oriented lexicon and interrogative syntax to emphasize global stability, economic recovery, and national resilience. In contrast, Tempo employs an investigative approach characterized by sharp, confrontational language and active voice to highlight political agency, conflict dynamics, and accountability. These findings demonstrate that Kompas constructs mental models of social harmony to mitigate public anxiety, while Tempo positions readers as critical observers of power relations. The study concludes that news headlines are not neutral summaries but strategic "architectures of belief" shaped by institutional traditions. This research contributes to the field by extending CDA into the realm of international energy geopolitics and highlighting the role of media framing in managing public perception of external risks.

Keywords: *Critical Discourse Analysis, media framing, Strait of Hormuz, Kompas, Tempo*

Introduction

The Strait of Hormuz is one of the world's most strategic maritime routes, serving as a vital artery for global energy supplies, with around a fifth of the world's oil passing through these narrow waters every day, as explained by Kober et al. (2020). Tensions in the region, which often involve military manoeuvres between Iran and the United States (US), are not merely a regional issue but a geopolitical crisis with systemic implications for international economic stability, including that of Indonesia, as further emphasized by Kober et al. (2020). In this context, the mass media act not

only as conveyors of information but also as actors who construct reality through the framing of discourse, as argued by van Dijk (2014) and Entman (1993).

This study uses two major press institutions in Indonesia as its subjects: Kompas and Tempo. These two media outlets were selected because they represent contrasting traditions of journalism and ideology within the history of the Indonesian press, as outlined by Shoemaker, et al (2013). The daily newspaper Kompas was founded in 1965 by P.K. Ojong and Jakob Oetama. Kompas carries the mission of ‘Amanat Hati Nurani Rakyat’ (The Mandate of the People’s Conscience) with the philosophical foundation of ‘Transcendental Humanism’. This ideology emphasises social harmony, humanistic values, and objectivity that tends to avoid sharp confrontation in order to maintain national stability, as discussed by Phelan, et al (2019). In its international coverage, Kompas often focuses on the wider impact of crises on society and what needs to be done collectively to achieve solutions, as also noted by Shoemaker, et al (2013).

Meanwhile, Tempo was founded in 1971 under the leadership of Goenawan Mohamad. Tempo is renowned for its tradition of investigative journalism and its critical independence, as highlighted by Carson (2025). Tempo’s history is marked by resistance to authority, including experiences of being banned by the New Order regime in 1982 and 1994. Tempo’s ideology emphasises accountability, transparency, and the pursuit of the ‘main subject’ or the party responsible behind a political event, as explained by Kovach, et al (2021). This reflects the role of the press as a watchdog in democratic societies, a role further elaborated by Kovach, et al (2021) as well as Steele (2018).

Several previous studies have highlighted how Indonesian media, particularly Tempo and Kompas, frame political and social issues. Fahlevi, et al (2026), through a Van Dijk-style critical discourse analysis of Tempo’s *Bocor Alus Politik* podcast, demonstrated that the media can function as a channel for social criticism of the government’s communication style; however, its focus remains limited to domestic issues concerning the Prabowo-Gibran administration. Zaeni’s (2016) research on the representation of the Mount Slamet disaster in Tempo and Time underscores the differing levels of concern between local and international media, though the context was a natural disaster, not a global energy crisis. Meanwhile, Effendy (2022) compared the framing of Tempo and Kompas regarding the postponement of the 2024 general election, finding that Tempo tended to be critical whilst Kompas was more pragmatic, though both remained within the realm of national politics. Aisyah et al. (2024) also emphasise Tempo’s role as a watchdog of democracy through the satirical critique “Nawadosa Jokowi”, which highlights the contradiction between the Nawacita pledges and the reality of Jokowi’s administration.

Beyond the Indonesian context, numerous CDA studies have examined international conflicts and media framing. Degaf, et al (2025) compared coverage of the 2021 Israel–Palestine escalation in *The Guardian* and *The Jakarta Post*, revealing ideological differences shaped by geography and culture. Malkawi, et al (2024) analysed 200 headlines about the killing of Al Jazeera journalist Shireen Abu Akleh, showing how Arabic and English outlets constructed victim and perpetrator identities through distinct syntactic and lexical choices. Dessie et al. (2026) investigated global media framing of conflicts in Ethiopia, finding selective attention to the Tigray war while marginalising Amhara and Oromia. Ononiwu (2024) explored Russian and Ukrainian media portrayals of the Russia–Ukraine war, highlighting ideologies of militarism and nationalism. Betari et al. (2025) examined *Tempo* English headlines, identifying discursive strategies such as intensification and nationalistic framing, but within domestic and economic contexts.

However, despite the expanding literature, research on media framing in the context of global energy crises remains limited. Existing studies have not specifically addressed how Indonesian media construct narratives around international energy disruptions such as the 2026 Strait of Hormuz crisis, nor how such representations may influence public trust in the face of external threats to national stability. Moreover, the intersection between global geopolitics, energy security, and media discourse has yet to be sufficiently explored within the Indonesian context. Based on these gaps, this study aims to provide a comparative analysis of *Kompas* and *Tempo* by examining how their differing ideological orientations of transcendental humanism and investigative journalism, shape the framing of the Strait of Hormuz crisis. Using Van Dijk’s triadic model (discourse–cognition–society), this study seeks to analyse the linguistic strategies employed in media discourse and their role in constructing public perceptions of global risk. Therefore, this study aims to examine how *Kompas* and *Tempo* frame the 2026 Strait of Hormuz crisis in their news headlines and to analyze how their discursive strategies reflect underlying ideological orientations while shaping public perceptions of global risk.

Research Methodology

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach using Teun A. van Dijk’s model of Critical Discourse Analysis. This design was chosen for its ability to unpack the relationship between the structure of media texts and social cognition (mental models) and the context of power. This is a comparative study, which aims to compare how two media organisations with different ideological backgrounds, namely *Kompas* and *Tempo*, construct the same geopolitical reality through their headlines. This approach goes beyond traditional content analysis by exploring

how subtle linguistic choices can influence readers' perceptions through the formation of interpretative frameworks.

The data of this study consist of headlines from online news articles published on Kompas.com and Tempo.co. The data samples were selected using purposive sampling, focusing on news articles published during the Strait of Hormuz crisis between 4 – 22 April 2026. The selection criteria included direct relevance to the United States blockade, Iranian military threats, and global economic impacts. In total, the dataset consists of ten pairs of headlines covering similar events, allowing for a comparative analysis of the lexical and syntactic strategies employed by each media outlet.

Data collection was conducted through documentation and digital observation using a note-taking technique. The researchers collected screenshots and textual copies of headlines from the digital archives of both media platforms. In this study, the researchers act as the primary instrument (human instrument), supported by data cards used to identify, classify, and organize units of discourse. Data monitoring parameters included specific keywords such as “Strait of Hormuz”, “Iran”, “Trump”, “Blockade”, and “Oil”, as well as metadata such as publication time and cited sources.

Data analysis follows Van Dijk's three-dimensional framework, consisting of text analysis, social cognition, and social context. At the textual level, analysis is conducted through three structural dimensions: (1) macrostructure to identify overarching themes; (2) Superstructure to dissect the scheme of information placement; and (3) Microstructure to analyze semantic elements (background, detail, intent), syntax (active/passive sentence forms), lexicon (word choice such as ‘threat’ vs ‘bluff’), and rhetoric (metaphors and imagery). Furthermore, the dimension of social cognition is analyzed by linking these textual structures to the formation of the reader's mental model. Finally, social context analysis examines how institutional ideologies (Transcendental Humanism vs. Investigative Journalism) reproduce power and influence public opinion at a broader scale.

Results and Discussion

Results

This section presents the findings of a comparative analysis of Kompas.com and Tempo.co headlines on the 2026 Strait of Hormuz crisis. The analysis follows Van Dijk's (2014) three-dimensional framework: text analysis, social cognition, and social analysis.

1. Textual Structure Analysis

Based on the 10 pairs of headlines analyzed, distinct linguistic strategies were identified across the three structural levels.

A. Macrostructure (Thematic Level)

- 1) Kompas predominantly constructs themes around global stability, economic solutions, and national impact, such as the fluctuations in oil prices and Pertamina's operations.
- 2) Tempo focuses on themes of power conflict, investigative details of military maneuvers (blockades, specific vessel types), and diplomatic friction.

B. Superstructure (Schematic Level)

- 1) Kompas frequently utilizes a structure that prioritizes domestic relevance or humanitarian outcomes at the beginning of the headline to foster public calm.
- 2) Tempo employs a cause-effect or chronological schema that highlights the direct actions of political actors, emphasizing accountability and the "main subject" behind the event.

C. Microstructure (Semantic, Syntactic, Lexical, and Rhetorical Levels)

Table 1. Microstructure Analysis

Element	Findings in <i>Kompas.com</i>	Findings in <i>Tempo.co</i>
Lexicon (Word Choice)	Uses neutral or "hope-oriented" terms: " <i>Starting to Recover</i> ," " <i>Reopened</i> ," or " <i>Can they pass?</i> ".	Employs sharp, confrontational, and descriptive terms: " <i>Broken Promise</i> ," " <i>Fire at Ships</i> ," " <i>Turn Around</i> ," or " <i>Threatens to Attack</i> ".
Syntax (Sentence Form)	Frequent use of interrogative forms (questions) to build empathy and passive forms to de-emphasize direct aggression.	Dominance of active voice to highlight the agency and responsibility of global actors: " <i>Trump Again Threatens</i> ," " <i>Iran Closes Again</i> ".
Rhetoric (Metaphor & Imagery)	Rhetoric of "Transcendental Humanism," using metaphors of social harmony and collective solutions.	Rhetoric of "Critical Independence," utilizing metaphors of resistance and investigative transparency.

2. Social Cognition Dimension

The analysis of social cognition explores how these textual structures influence the formation of the reader's mental model:

- 1) Kompas Mental Model: Readers are guided to perceive the crisis as a disruption to global harmony that requires collective stability. It fosters optimism by highlighting paths to recovery.
- 2) Tempo Mental Model: Readers are positioned as critical observers of power dynamics. The mental model focuses on the inconsistency of global leaders and the tactical reality of the conflict.

3. Social Context Analysis

At the social level, the framing choices reproduce the institutional ideologies of each media organization:

- 1) Kompas reproduces power through the lens of Transcendental Humanism, seeking to maintain national stability and avoid sharp social confrontation during an external energy threat.
- 2) Tempo exercises its role of Critical Independence and investigative tradition, emphasizing transparency and holding global actors accountable for the crisis.

Table 2. Comparative Analysis of 10 Headline Pairs

Event Context	<i>Kompas.com</i> Headline	<i>Tempo.co</i> Headline	Key Discursive Difference
Oil Price Surge	Trump Kembali Ancam Serang Iran, Harga Minyak Dunia Naik ke 113 Dollar AS per Barrel	Harga Minyak Naik Jelang Tenggat Trump kepada Iran	<i>Kompas</i> emphasizes "Threat," <i>Tempo</i> emphasizes "Deadline."
Vessel Passage	20 Kapal Berhasil Lewat Selat Hormuz di Tengah Blokade AS, Lalu Lintas Mulai Pulih?	Lebih dari 20 Kapal Lewati Selat Hormuz Meski Ada Blokade AS	<i>Kompas</i> builds optimism ("Recovering?"); <i>Tempo</i> highlights the obstacle ("Despite Blockade").
Military Action	Belum Sehari Gencatan Senjata Diperpanjang, Iran Tembaki Kapal di Dekat Selat Hormuz	Kapal Iran Kirim Tembakan ke Kapal Kontainer di Pantai Oman	<i>Kompas</i> focuses on the timing violation; <i>Tempo</i> provides a direct tactical description.

Reopening the Strait	Iran Resmi Buka Selat Hormuz Usai Gencatan Senjata Israel-Lebanon	Selat Hormuz Dibuka Selama Gencatan Senjata Israel-Libanon	<i>Kompas</i> uses formal/legalistic "Official"; <i>Tempo</i> focuses on the conditional duration "During."
Re-closure of Route	Iran Tutup Lagi Selat Hormuz, Sebut AS Ingkar Janji soal Blokade	Iran Kembali Tutup Selat Hormuz karena Blokade AS	<i>Kompas</i> includes subjective intent ("Broken Promise"); <i>Tempo</i> remains causally factual.
Blockade Effects	Negosiasi Gagal, AS Umumkan Blokade Selat Hormuz, Kapal Berbalik Arah	Blokade AS di Selat Hormuz, 2 Kapal Tanker Balik Arah	<i>Kompas</i> provides background (Failed Negotiation); <i>Tempo</i> focuses on the immediate action.
Selective Passage	Negara-negara Ini Berhasil Lewati Selat Hormuz	Kapal Prancis, Oman dan Jepang Diizinkan Lintasi Hormuz	<i>Tempo</i> is more specific with actor identification (France, Oman, Japan).
National Interest	Bisakah 2 Kapal Tanker Pertamina Melintas Usai Selat Hormuz Dibuka?	2 Kapal Pertamina Siap Lintasi Selat Hormuz yang Dibuka Iran	<i>Kompas</i> uses a rhetorical question to evoke public concern; <i>Tempo</i> uses an affirmative "Ready."
Request for Navy	AS Kirim Kapal Perang ke Selat Hormuz, Trump Sindir Negara yang Butuh tapi Pelit	Trump Minta Negara-negara Kirim Kapal Perang ke Selat Hormuz	<i>Kompas</i> highlights the "Sarcasm" (Sindiran); <i>Tempo</i> highlights the "Request."
Economic Relief	Harga Minyak Turun Usai Iran Umumkan Selat Hormuz Dibuka Kembali	Harga Minyak Turun 10 Persen Setelah Selat Hormuz Dibuka	<i>Kompas</i> focuses on the causative announcement; <i>Tempo</i> focuses on quantitative data (10%).

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal a profound divergence in how *Kompas* and *Tempo* construct what can be described as an “architecture of belief” regarding the 2026 Strait of Hormuz crisis. By applying Van Dijk’s triadic model (discourse, cognition, and society), the results demonstrate that headlines are not neutral summaries but strategic discursive practices shaped by institutional ideology and journalistic tradition. This supports the broader argument in media sociology proposed by Pamela J. Shoemaker and Stephen D. Reese (2013) that news content is influenced by layered factors ranging from organizational routines to ideological orientations. Thus, the divergence between *Kompas* and *Tempo* reflects deeper structural forces rather than isolated editorial choices.

From a macrostructural perspective, both media outlets position the Strait of Hormuz as the central theme. However, the way this theme is constructed differs markedly. *Kompas* frames the issue through the lens of stability, economic consequences, and collective impact, whereas *Tempo* highlights conflict dynamics, agency, and political accountability. These differences are not merely stylistic but ideological. Drawing on Critical Discourse Analysis as developed by van Dijk (2014) and Fairclough (2013), discourse at the macrostructural level functions as a site where meaning is selectively organized to reflect particular interests and perspectives. In this case, *Kompas*’ emphasis on harmony can be understood as reinforcing a discourse of social stability, while *Tempo*’s focus on conflict serves to foreground power relations and responsibility.

The microstructure analysis, specifically the lexicon and syntax, provides the most granular evidence of this framing. *Kompas* frequently utilized a “hope-oriented” lexicon, using phrases like “Starting to Recover” or interrogative structures like “Can they pass?”, which aligns with what van Leeuwen (2005) describes as legitimation strategies that construct social harmony and reduce perceived threat. This linguistic choice is a direct reflection of its Transcendental Humanism ideology. By framing the crisis through questions and neutral terms, *Kompas* minimizes immediate panic, seeking to maintain national stability and avoid sharp social confrontation. In contrast, *Tempo*’s use of sharp, active syntactic forms such as “Broken Promise” or “*Ancam Serang*” positions the reader as a witness to political betrayal, which aligns with what Fowler (1986) identifies as the politicization of language, where grammatical structures assign agency and responsibility. This reflects *Tempo*’s investigative tradition, where the pursuit of the “main subject” or the party responsible for an event is paramount.

While these findings strongly reflect the principles of Critical Discourse Analysis, they can be further extended through the socio-cognitive dimension proposed by Van Dijk (2014). At this level, discourse is not only a reflection of ideology but also a mechanism for shaping mental

representations. Kompas constructs a context model that emphasizes systemic stability and collective impact, guiding readers to interpret the crisis as a shared global disruption. Conversely, Tempo activates more concrete event models that foreground specific actors and actions, encouraging attribution of responsibility. This process resonates with cognitive framing perspectives developed by Lakoff (2002), as well as decision-making insights from Kahneman (1981), which suggest that the way information is structured significantly influences perception and judgment.

These cognitive effects are further reinforced through framing mechanisms. As conceptualized by Entman (1993), framing involves selecting and emphasizing certain aspects of reality to shape interpretation. In this study, Kompas predominantly employs a consequence frame that highlights outcomes such as economic stability and recovery. This aligns with Iyengar (1991) notion of thematic framing, where issues are presented within broader contexts. In contrast, Tempo applies a conflict and responsibility frame, emphasizing actors and actions, consistent with Iyengar's episodic framing. These differences demonstrate how framing directs audience interpretation, influencing how responsibility and risk are perceived.

In addition, these patterns can also be understood through agenda-setting theory proposed by McCombs, et al (1972). Although both media outlets report on the same crisis, they prioritize different aspects, thereby shaping what audiences consider important. Kompas emphasizes economic consequences and national stability, whereas Tempo prioritizes political actions and conflict dynamics. This indicates that agenda-setting works in tandem with framing to guide both attention and interpretation.

Importantly, this study contributes to the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) by validating existing theories of Indonesian media behavior while breaking new ground in the realm of international energy geopolitics. The results align with the findings of Effendy (2022), who observed that *Tempo* tends to be critical and investigative, while *Kompas* remains pragmatic and focused on national harmony. However, while Effendy's work was confined to domestic election politics, this study proves that these ideological traits are deeply ingrained and consistently applied to global crises.

Furthermore, the data support the observations of Aisyah et al. (2024), who emphasized *Tempo*'s role as a democratic watchdog. By framing the Hormuz blockade through the lens of "Broken Promises" by the US, *Tempo* extends its watchdog function from the Indonesian administration to global superpowers. This research also mirrors international CDA trends, such as those by Malkawi et al. (2024), which showed how syntactic and lexical choices construct victim and perpetrator identities in conflict zones. While Malkawi analyzed the killing of a journalist, this

study shows that the same discursive strategies are used to frame "energy perpetrators" (those who block the strait) and "economic victims" (nations dependent on oil).

The novelty of this research lies in its focus on the 2026 energy crisis; a gap identified in previous literature which largely focused on political or humanitarian issues. Unlike Betari et al. (2025), who identified nationalistic framing in domestic economic contexts, this study shows how such framing is projected outward to manage public perceptions of external risks.

The theoretical implications of this study are twofold. First, it demonstrates the enduring relevance of Van Dijk's triadic model in unpacking the relationship between media structures, social cognition, and power. By linking textual structures to the formation of "mental models," this research provides a template for how media influence public opinion on a broader scale during international threats. It suggests that social cognition is not a passive process but a directed outcome of institutional ideology.

Practically, these findings have significant implications for media literacy in Indonesia. Readers of *Kompas* are provided with a framework that emphasizes stability, which may lead to a more tranquil public response but could potentially obscure the complexities of geopolitical culpability. Conversely, readers of *Tempo* are given a critical framework that demands accountability, which fosters a more informed and skeptical citizenry but may also heighten public anxiety during a crisis. For journalists and editorial teams, this research highlights the ethical weight of every word choice, terms like "threat" versus "bluff" are not just synonyms; they are tools that reproduce power and shape national resilience.

Acknowledging the limitations of this study is essential for its credibility. Methodologically, this study relies on a descriptive qualitative approach. While this allows for an in-depth unpacking of linguistic strategies, it is inherently interpretative. The primary instrument is the researcher, which brings a specific interpretational challenge regarding the nuances of "Transcendental Humanism" versus "Critical Independence".

The sample population is also a limitation. The study focused on ten pairs of headlines from *Kompas.com* and *Tempo.co* during 4 – 22 April 2026. While these were selected via purposive sampling for their direct relevance to the US blockade and Iranian military threats, they represent only a snapshot of the total discourse. The study does not account for long-term changes in framing as the crisis evolved, nor does it include a comparison with international media outlets, which might offer a different cultural or geographic perspective. Finally, the analysis of "social cognition" remains a theoretical inference based on textual structure rather than a direct measurement of reader reaction.

Based on the findings and limitations, several directions for future research are recommended. To broaden the scope of media framing analysis in Indonesia, future studies should employ a longitudinal approach to track how framing shifts as a crisis transitions from escalation to resolution. Methodologically, combining CDA with quantitative sentiment analysis could provide a more robust picture of how these headlines influence public discourse on digital platforms.

Additionally, future research should explore the "reception" side of Van Dijk's model. This could involve interviewing readers or conducting surveys to determine if the "mental models" intended by *Kompas* and *Tempo* are actually adopted by the public. Finally, a comparative study between Indonesian media and media from the primary actors in the conflict (the US and Iran) would provide valuable insights into how geographic and cultural positioning shapes the architecture of belief during global energy disruptions.

Conclusion

This study concludes that Kompas and Tempo's framing of the 2026 Strait of Hormuz crisis reflects deeply embedded ideological orientations rather than mere stylistic variation. Using Van Dijk's socio-cognitive framework, the research shows headline discourse operating across textual, cognitive, and social levels, producing distinct "architectures of belief." Kompas emphasizes stability, collective impact, and economic consequence, fostering harmony and national resilience, while Tempo foregrounds agency, conflict, and accountability, encouraging critical engagement with global power dynamics. These findings confirm that media discourse ideologically mediates public perception rather than neutrally reflecting reality.

These conclusions are context-specific, limited to the selected outlets, timeframe, and event, and should not be broadly generalized. The qualitative CDA approach, though enabling in-depth interpretation, introduces subjectivity, while the limited dataset of ten headline pairs restricts insight into longitudinal framing shifts or audience reception. The socio-cognitive dimension remains inferential, lacking empirical audience data.

Nonetheless, this study contributes meaningfully by extending Critical Discourse Analysis into global energy geopolitics within Indonesian media, empirically reinforcing Van Dijk's triadic model, and illuminating how differing journalistic traditions operationalize framing during international crises ultimately highlighting media's role in shaping not only what audiences think about, but how they think.

References

- Betari, A. W., Virginio, G. A., Mukminatun, S., & Sudartini, S. (2025). The Power of Headlines: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Tempo.Co English News. *Inspiring: English Education Journal*, 8(2), 329–346. <https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v8i2.14734>
- Carson, A. (2025). Investigative journalism. In *Elgar Encyclopedia of Political Communication*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035301447.vol2.00074>
- Degaf, A., Aziza, R., Fitria Anggrisia, N., & Id, A. (2025). *Analyzing the 2021 Israel-Palestinian Coverage: A Critical Discourse Study*.
- Dessie, B. A., Moges, M. A., Salemot, M. A., & Gessesse, K. B. (2026). Global media framing of conflicts in Ethiopia: a content analysis of war narratives and hegemonic interests. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2026.1731435>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Fahlevi, F., & Nusa, Moh. Z. R. (2026). Analisis Wacana Kritis Van Dijk Terhadap Komunikasi Politik Pemerintah Dalam Podcast Bocor Alus Politik Tempo. *Jurnal Penelitian Inovatif*, 6(1), 359–370. <https://doi.org/10.54082/jupin.1699>
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford University Press.
- Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kober, T., Schiffer, H.-W., Densing, M., & Panos, E. (2020). Global energy perspectives to 2060 – WEC's World Energy Scenarios 2019. *Energy Strategy Reviews*, 31, 100523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2020.100523>
- Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2021). *The Elements of Journalism* (4th ed.). Crown.
- Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Malkawi, R. J., Fareh, S. I., & Rabab'ah, G. (2024). Framing the shooting of Al Jazeera journalist Shireen Abu Akleh in English and Arabic news headlines: a critical discourse study. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03784-x>
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Ononiwu, C. (2024). Ideology and cognitive stereotypes in media representation of the Russia–Ukraine conflict. *Media, War and Conflict*, 17(2), 231–247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17506352231201743>

- Phelan, S., & Salter, L. A. (2019). The Journalistic Habitus, Neoliberal(Ized) Logics, and the Politics of Public Education. *Journalism Studies*, 20(2), 154–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2017.1370976>
- Sariwibawa, F., & Zaeni, A. (2016). *The Representation of Mount Slamet Disaster in The Online Media of Tempo and Time The Representation of Mount Slamet Disaster in The Online Media of Tempo and Time* (Vol. 4, Number 1).
- Septian, Y., Effendy, N., Sunan, U., & Yogyakarta, K. (2022). Analysis of Tempo and Kompas Online Media Framing towards Reporting the Issues of the 2024 Presidential Election Postponement. In *QAULAN* (Vol. 3, Number 2).
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (2013). *Mediating the Message in the 21st Century: A Media Sociology Perspective* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203930434>
- Steele, J. (2018). *Mediating Islam: Cosmopolitan Journalisms in Muslim Southeast Asia*. University of Washington Press.
- Tia Nur Aisyah, Alifah Jasmine Kallista Remanu, Kayla Salsabilla Farroza, Amalia Pratiwi, & Fatkhuri. (2024). The Analysis of Tempo Media Criticism of the Two Periods of Jokowi's Government (2014-2024): Nawadosa Jokowi Magazine. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(6), 668–678. <https://doi.org/10.35877/soshum3378>
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453–458.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2005). *Introducing Social Semiotics*. Routledge.