p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/index

p-ISSN 2252-7427 e-ISSN 2541-3635
Indonesian EFL Journal
AISEE
The Association of Indonesia Scholars of English Education

REPRESENTATION OF POVERTY IDEOLOGY IN TWITTER (X) POSTS: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS USING TEUN A. VAN DIJK'S MODEL

Kade Marlina[1], Ulinsa[2], Agustan[3], Syamsuddin[4], Juniati[5]
[1,2,3,4,5]*Universitas Tadulako, Palu, Indonesia*

Correspondent author's email: marlinakade9@gmail.com

APA Citation: Marlina, K., Ulinsa., Agustan., Syamsuddin, & Juniati. (2026). Representation of poverty ideology in Twitter (X) posts: A critical discourse analysis using Teun A. Van Dijk's model. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 12*(3), 905-916. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v12i3.201

Received: 01-01-2026 Accepted: 23-03-2026 Published: 30-09-2026

Abstract: Poverty in the digital era is not just an economic phenomenon, but a social construct that is massively produced through public discourse on social media Twitter (X). However, most of the previous research still focused on mass media reporting and political public opinion, without linking the ideology of digital poverty discourse with concrete language communication recommendations for institutions or media. To fill this gap, this study aims to describe the representation of poverty through text structure, analyze social cognition and the social context behind it, and formulate recommendations for non-stigmatic language communication. This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach with the Teun A. van Dijk Critical Discourse Analysis model, applied to 15 Twitter posts (X) for the 2026 period selected through purposive sampling techniques. The results of the analysis show three constructions of poverty, namely structural poverty (60%), absolute poverty (26.67%), and relative poverty (13.33%), with structural poverty dominating the discourse through criticism of regulations, policies, and economic-political systems. Based on these findings, this study formulates recommendations for *rights-based language* communication and the framing of empowered subjects *(agency)* as practical guidelines for the media and public institutions. This finding confirms that the discourse on poverty on Twitter (X) is full of ideological content that requires a transformation of diction and framing so as not to perpetuate stigma against vulnerable communities, as well as offering evidence-based communication references for the field of media discourse and social policy studies.
Keywords*: critical discourse analysis; poverty ideology; non-stigmatic communication; teun a. van dijk; twitter (x).*

INTRODUCTION

Poverty cannot be reduced solely to economic statistics, because poverty is a social construct that is constantly produced, reproduced, and contested through discourse (Putri, 2026). In the era of digital convergence, social media, especially Twitter, which has now transformed into X, has become the main arena where representations of poverty are produced and disseminated massively, instantly, and geographically (Triono & Sangaji, 2023). This platform allows its users to become producers as well as consumers of narratives about poverty, thus creating a discursive ecosystem that is full of ideological battles, class interests, and power relations (Febryanti et al., 2024).

Data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) shows that the percentage of poor people in Indonesia in March 2025 will reach 8.47% or around 23.85 million people. Although these figures show a downward trend, there is a paradox in the digital space: while the number of poor people is statistically decreasing, the narrative about poverty is increasingly proliferative on social media (Purwanti, 2024). As an initial illustration, it was found that one of the uploads from the @Sammi86Pilang account was written on June 30, 2026, which represented the social

assistance program (bansos) as a political instrument, not a structural solution to poverty, while implying that poverty and the low level of education of the community were deliberately maintained for the electoral interests of the rulers (Kasanova et al., 2025). This kind of representation shows that poverty in the digital space is not simply described in a neutral way, but framed through the choice of diction, images, and specific text structures that lead readers to a suspicious and cynical attitude towards state policies (Putri, 2026). Behind this framing, an ideology works that constructs the power relationship between the government and the poor, while negotiating the position of the poor as a party that is degraded and at the same time used politically (Nursanti et al., 2022). This phenomenon emphasizes the need for a systematic study of the representation and ideology of poverty in Twitter (X) posts, because such a meaning demands an analysis of the structure of the text, social cognition, and social context at the same time, as offered by Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis model (Shofa, 2026).

Previous research has examined the discourse on poverty through the Critical Discourse Analysis approach in various mediums: (Supriatno et al., 2026) in the poverty alleviation policy document in Banten using Foucault's power-knowledge theory, and (Syarofi & Saifudin, 2026) and (Yanti et al., 2024) who applied the Van Dijk model to the podcast "The Dark Side of the Poor!" and Kang Didi's stand-up comedy, respectively.

In common, all three view poverty as a discourse construct that is intertwined with power relations, and two of them use the same Van Dijk model as this study. The difference is that all three focus on a single unit of long narrative discourse produced by a single or limited actor (a single policy document, podcast, or comedy), rather than a collection of short posts from many actors such as X (Twitter); nor do they explicitly map the six categories of Van Dijk's ideology or classify poverty into absolute, relative, and structural constructions.

Based on the literature search of research that applied the Van Dijk model in a certain period, studies that specifically place poverty as an object of analysis on social media X are still relatively limited. This gap is the basis of this study, which focuses on post X (Twitter) as a multi-actor digital discourse space, by mapping six categories of Van Dijk's ideology and classifying the construction of absolute, relative, and structural poverty, in order to formulate recommendations for rights-based language communication for institutions and the media (Setyarahajoe & Fadeli, 2025).

Critical Discourse Analysis (AWK) has been developed through several approaches, including by Fairclough, Wodak, and Van Dijk. Fairclough places discourse in three dimensions, namely text, discursive practice, and social practice. This framework is still relevant and continues to be applied to contemporary objects, for example in the analysis of student demonstration slogans (Fairclough, 2010 in Rubbani et al., 2024). (Wodak's Discourse-Historical Approach focuses on the historical and political context of discourse (Wodak, 2015 in Rahma et al., 2025), as applied to the discourse analysis of digital activism in the era of online social movements (Harahap, 2023). Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model is distinctive because it bridges the structure of microtexts with macro social realities through an intermediate dimension in the form of social cognition, which is mental representation, knowledge, and beliefs shared by members of a social group (Khairiah & Prihatini, 2023).

This study chose the Van Dijk model because it is best suited to accommodate the three aspects that are the focus of the problem, namely how poverty is displayed through language (text structure), the social cognition behind its construction, and the social context that shapes and reproduces the ideology of poverty. Analytically, the Van Dijk model examines discourse through three interrelated dimensions (Salsabila & Maulana, 2026). The dimension of text includes three hierarchical levels, namely macrostructure (global meaning or theme of discourse), superstructure (organizational scheme for presenting information), and microstructure (semantic, syntactic, stylistic, and rhetorical aspects such as presumptions, sentence forms, diction, and rhetorical devices) (Van Dijk, 1989 in (Arifuddin et al., 2022). The dimension of social cognition is related to mental representations, knowledge, attitudes, and ideologies that are shared by a social group and affect the production and understanding of discourse (Mugni et al., 2024). The dimension of the social context connects discourse with the power structure and the social conditions behind it, referring to Gramsci's concept of hegemony to explain how the dominant group maintains power through discursive practices, including through the manipulation of discourse as a form of abuse of social power (Van Dijk, 2006 in (Dewi et al.,

2025).

These three dimensions are enriched by Van Dijk's theory of ideology, which identifies group identity, activities, goals, norms, positions, and resources as categories that form and reproduce ideology in discourse (Nagara, 2021); by Moscovici's concept of social representation, which explains how new phenomena are anchored to already known categories (*Anchoring*) and objectified into a concrete picture that is shared in society (*objectification*) (Herliana et al., 2026); as well as by Entman's framing theory, which is the *Treatment Recommendation*is relevant to identify diction that has the potential to strengthen or alleviate stigma against vulnerable groups such as the poor (Entman, R.M. 1993 in Hermawan et al., 2026).

Based on this framework, this study aims to (1) describe the representation of poverty in Twitter posts (X) through macro, superstructure, and microstructures; (2) describe the social cognition behind the construction of poverty discourse in Twitter posts (X); (3) describe and analyze the social context that influences the formation and reproduction of poverty ideologies in Twitter posts (X); and (4) formulate language communication recommendations for relevant institutions or media based on these findings, in order to support the preparation of non-stigmatic poverty discourse. Through these four objectives, this research is expected not only to expand the application of the Van Dijk Critical Discourse Analysis model, but also to make a real contribution to the practice of language communication that is more equitable to the issue of poverty in the digital public space (Mergianti et al., 2026).

METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach in the Van Dijk model Critical Discourse Analysis (AWK) study which was chosen because it was able to reveal the meaning, representation, and ideology contained in the discourse on poverty in Twitter posts (X), as well as interpret the relationship between text structure, social cognition, and social context in the formation of the discourse (Muhajirin et al., 2024). The formal object of this research is Teun A. van Dijk's AWK model, while the material object is in the form of a Twitter post (X) in Indonesian that discusses the issue of poverty. The main instrument of the research is the researcher himself (human instrument), which plays a role in data collection, selection, interpretation, and analysis, assisted by data collection sheets and analysis tables compiled based on Van Dijk's three dimensions (Rifa'i & Yuniarti, 2026) .

The research data is in the form of 15 Twitter posts (X) that contain the discourse on poverty in Indonesia, with subcategories that have been determined; absolute poverty, relative poverty and structural poverty (Wulansari et al., 2023). The data taken are Twitter (X) posts published in the 2026 period by media accounts, institutions, communities, and individual users. Data is collected through online searches on platform X by utilizing the *Advanced Search* and keywords that have been tested for relevance, namely "poor", "poverty", "small people", "social assistance", "underprivileged society", "desil" and "social gap".

Each selected post is documented through a high-resolution screenshot that includes text, visuals, and metadata (date, number of likes, retweets, and replies) (Iqbal, 2023).

Data collection using literature techniques with written data sources (Syafri, 2026), which is carried out through four combined techniques. First, structured digital documentation, namely the screening and archiving of posts according to the keywords above. Second, look at and take notes, namely the systematic recording of the linguistic, rhetorical, and ideological features of each post into an analysis sheet designed based on Van Dijk's three-dimensional operational instrument (Juliana et al., 2023). Third, the analysis of digital profile documents, namely the collection of public information of account owners (bio profiles, affiliations, related post history) as supporting data for social cognition analysis. Fourth, contextual literature studies, namely the collection of secondary data in the form of news, academic articles, and policy documents relevant to the socio-political context behind each discourse analyzed. The three dimensions of Van Dijk's analysis are operationalized as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. *Design of poverty discourse data analysis in Twitter posts (X)*

No.	Dimensions of Analysis	Focus of Analysis	Unit of Analysis	Data Collection Techniques
1	Text Structure	Representation of poverty through macro structures (main themes), superstructures (discourse schemes), and microstructures (diction, syntax, stylistics, rhetoric).	The text of a Twitter post (X) about poverty.	Documentation, watch-notes, literature studies.
2	Social Cognition	The mental model, way of view, and ideology of the author/user that underlies the discourse on poverty.	Author's cognition scheme: beliefs, knowledge, and attitudes towards poverty.	Documentation, literature study.
3	Social Context	The relationship between poverty discourse and power relations, social conditions, and socio-political situations of society.	Discourse on poverty in the context of social and power in Indonesia.	Documentation, literature study.

Data are analyzed following an interactive model (Hubberman, 2014) in Muftiah et al., 2026) which consists of three stages: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawn. In the data reduction stage, the researcher selects, focuses, and simplifies the data relevant to the focus of the research, then classifies them based on the categories of macrostructure, superstructure, and microstructure (Jufanny & Girsang, 2020). At the data presentation stage, the reduced data is organized into a table or analysis matrix based on Van Dijk's three dimensions to facilitate the identification of patterns of representation, discourse strategies, and ideologies behind the construction of meaning. At the conclusion drawing stage, the researcher interprets the relationship between the structure of the text, social cognition, and social context to explain how poverty is represented (Indriyawati & Yusak, 2023)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the overall data, the representation of poverty in Twitter posts (X) shows three main constructs, namely absolute poverty, relative poverty, and structural poverty (Ulinsa et al., 2022). These three constructions not only show how poverty is represented through language choices, but also show how user X interprets the causes, conditions, and position of the poor in social life (Tiara Artamefia et al., 2025). Of the 15 data analyzed, structural poverty was the most dominant construction, namely 9 data (60%), followed by absolute poverty as many as 4 data (26.67%), and relative poverty as many as 2 data (13.33%). The classification of these data is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Classification of poverty representation in post X*

Poverty Construction	Representation Subcategory	Amount of Data	Percentage
Absolute Poverty	Poverty as the inability to meet basic needs	2	13.33%
	Poverty as a condition measured based on poverty lines/standards	2	13.33%
Relative Poverty	Poverty as an inability to achieve a decent standard of living	1	6.67%
	Poverty as a gap in economic conditions between groups/countries	1	6.67%
Structural Poverty	Poverty as a result of limited access to education and opportunities	1	6.67%
	Poverty as a result of policies, social protection, and regulations	4	26.67%
	Poverty as a result of social, economic, and political structures	4	26.67%
Total Data		15	100%

Details of data per post (discourse focus, classification, representation, and ideological construction) are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. *Representation of poverty in post X*

Data	Post Focus	Classification	Poverty Representation	Ideological Construction
D1	Poverty is seen as a cycle that lasts between generations.	Structural	Limited education, skills, and social access are positioned as factors that perpetuate poverty.	Poverty is not solely a matter of income, but is related to opportunities and social conditions.
D2	Extreme poverty is associated with spending around US$3 per day.	Absolute	The spending line is used as a boundary to define poor conditions.	Poverty is represented through quantitative economic measures.
D3	The decile change has an impact on the loss of social assistance, health insurance, and scholarships.	Structural	Poverty is shown through the issue of access to social protection.	Policies and mechanisms for determining aid recipients are positioned to affect the sustainability of community welfare.
D4	The middle class is said to be between the rich group/government and the poor.	Structural	Poverty is built through inter-group relationships and the impact of government policies.	The discourse shows the existence of different social positions in the distribution of power and resources.
D5	Indonesia's poverty rate compared to other countries uses the line of US$8.30 per day.	Relative	Poverty is represented through a comparison of the level of welfare between countries.	The economic position of a group/country is understood based on the standards that apply to the comparative group.
D6	Poverty is associated with incompetent regimes, capitalism, and entrenched systems.	Structural	The causes of poverty are placed in the socio-political system and economic structure.	The discourse criticizes the power structure as a party that is considered to play a role in the reproduction of poverty.
D7	The number of poor people differs according to the standards of the World Bank and BPS.	Absolute	Poverty is determined based on differences in lines or measurement standards.	Statistical figures are used to build an understanding of the scale of poverty.
D8	The difference in workers' benefits and the DPR is used to show inequality.	Relative	Poverty is understood through the gap in economic conditions between groups.	The discourse highlights the inequality of income and facility distribution.
D9	The poor have difficulty accessing education and means of improving their self-quality.	Structural	Poverty is related to the inequality of access to education and opportunities.	Limited resources are seen as an obstacle that makes poverty continue.
D10	The cost of legality, changes in rules, difficulty in entering the formal sector, and government policies are questionable.	Structural	Regulatory and institutional barriers are positioned as a factor that narrows economic opportunities.	The discourse criticizes systems and policies that are considered insufficient to favor vulnerable communities.
D11	Rp670,000 per month is questioned as an unrealistic figure to meet the needs of life.	Absolute	Poverty is displayed through insufficient income to meet basic needs.	The poverty rate is contrasted with the needs of real life, so there is criticism of the measure of poverty.
D12	Students are encouraged to become entrepreneurs, but the business world is	Structural	Economic vulnerability is associated with policies, business	The responsibility for poverty is not entirely on the individual, but also

	said to be vulnerable to going out of business due to protection and tax issues.		protection, and economic environmental conditions.	on economic and policy structures.
D13	Social assistance is considered important, but it is problematic because it is considered to have not solved the root of poverty.	Structural	Poverty is understood as a problem that cannot be solved only through social assistance.	The discourse questions the function of social policy and its possible use as a political instrument.
D14	The number of poor people is said to be very large and solutions are directed towards the economy and job creation.	Absolute	Poverty is represented through the number of people who are categorized as poor.	The magnitude of the poverty rate is used to emphasize the urgency of long-term economic intervention.
D15	Structural poverty is said to have been formed since the New Order period and continues to this day.	Structural	Poverty is placed as a historical problem rooted in political and social structures.	The discourse builds on the idea that poverty is reproduced by a system that lasts for a long time.

Representation of absolute poverty (D2, D7, D11, D14)

The absolute construct places poverty on basic needs and certain economic limits, constructed through a numerical lexicon: the US$3 per day (D2) spending limit, standard comparisons *World Bank* and BPS (D7), nominal IDR 670,000 per month (D11), as well as the number of poor people in aggregate (D14). In the dimensions of text, figures, units of expenditure, and the term poverty line give an objective and factual impression, as if poverty can be measured precisely (Wahyudi et al., 2026). However, in D11, the numbers are actually opposed to the needs of life that are considered unrealistic, this tension is what distinguishes absolute construction from just a neutral statistical presentation.

In the dimension of social cognition, user X does not stop at accepting numbers as a single fact; these numbers are combined with the experience of daily needs, so that there is a contradiction between poverty as a statistical category and poverty as a real condition experienced by society. In the dimension of the social context, this discourse is related to the debate about poverty standards used by state institutions and international institutions, so that poverty is not only a problem of the number of people below a certain line, but also a question of who is called poor and what standards are used to determine these conditions (Fatimah et al., 2024).

In the six categories of Van Dijk's ideology (Table 4), the poor in this construction are identified by numbers; their activities are limited to the fulfillment of basic needs; the purpose of the discourse is to display the scale of poverty quantitatively; norms emphasize the objectivity of numbers; the position of the poor as objects of measurement, not subjects with complex life experiences; and resources are understood as the sum of income/expenditure (Kamalia & Hudiono, 2025). Process *Anchoring* Moscovici appears when poverty is anchored in the categories of numbers and standards that are already known, so that the position of the poor in this construction tends to be passive (Nafiyah et al., 2025).

Representation of relative poverty (D5, D8)

In contrast to absolute constructions that rely on fixed lines, relative constructions are constructed through comparative logic. D5 compares Indonesia's poverty position with that of other countries using the standard of US$8.30 per day; D8 contrasts workers' allowances with allowances for members of the House of Representatives. In the text dimension, the comparison of percentages, incomes, and facilities builds the meaning of poverty as a gap, with a rhetorical strategy in the form of intergroup opposition that highlights socio-economic distance (Yogantara et al., 2024)

In the dimension of social cognition, this comparison forms the understanding that poverty is not only a problem of lack of basic needs, but also a problem of relative position in the social hierarchy where a person can feel left behind when compared to other groups who are much higher in standard of living (Mugni et al., 2024). D8 specifically highlights the inequality of facilities between ordinary people and political elites, thus ideologically placing the poor in a

disadvantaged position in the distribution of state resources (Nissa et al., 2026). In the dimension of the social context, this construction highlights the distribution of resources and economic distance between groups.

In the category of Van Dijk's ideology, the identity of the group/state is constructed through its comparative position; activities are interpreted through access to economic facilities; the goal of highlighting inequality as a form of injustice; norms refer to distributive justice; the position places the poor lower on the comparative scale; and resources are understood as facilities that are unequal between groups (Table 4). In Entman's framing, the discourse defines the problem as a gap so that the solution is directed at equity, not just direct assistance (Ichwan, 2022)

Representation of structural poverty (D1, D3, D4, D6, D9, D10, D12, D13, D15)

Structural poverty was the most dominant construct, covering 9 out of 15 data (60%). The nine data linked poverty to social, economic, political, policy, limited access, and distribution of opportunities. The lexical pattern that consistently directs the causes of poverty to factors beyond the control of the individual is obvious: "intergenerational cycles" (D1), "loss of social assistance due to dessile changes" (D3), "policy-squeezed middle class" (D4), "incompetent regimes and capitalism" (D6), "limited access to education" (D9), "legality and regulatory costs" (D10), "business and tax protection" (D12), "social assistance that has not resolved the roots of poverty" (D13), to "structural legacy since the New Order" (D15). This choice of diction consistently shifts *Locus* causes of poverty pass from the individual to the system, so discourse tends to avoid the tendency to blame the victim (*Blaming the Victim*) and instead directs responsibility to actors who have the power over policy (Sitorus et al., 2026)

In the social cognition dimension, user X who produces structural discourse has a schema of understanding that poverty is the result of an unjust system, not an individual's choice or character. This is evident in D9 and D12, when limited access to education and barriers to business regulation are positioned as structural barriers that keep individuals trapped in poverty even though they have made an effort. In the social context dimension, almost all structural data contain elements of criticism of authority, both directly (D3, D4, D10, D13) and the economic-political system in general (D6, D15), which emphasizes that the discourse on poverty in X does not stop at the description of conditions, but rather becomes a space to question the legitimacy of policies that are considered to have failed to touch the root of the problem (Fahlevi & Nusa, 2026).

In Van Dijk's six ideological categories, the poor are identified as structurally affected parties, not the cause of their conditions; their activities relate to access to education, employment, and social protection; the purpose of the discourse is to criticize power structures and demand policy improvements; norms of upholding social justice and the right to access; positions position governments and systems as responsible actors; and resources are understood as access controlled by regulations and policies (Table 4).

Table 4. *Categories of Van Dijk's ideology on the three constructions of poverty representation*

Categories Ideology van Dijk	**Absolute Poverty**	**Relative Poverty**	**Structural Poverty**
Identity	The poor were identified by numbers and poverty lines (D2, D7, D11, D14).	Groups/countries are identified by their comparative position (D5, D8).	The poor are identified as victims of the structure, not the cause of the condition (D1, D9, D15).
Activities	Activities are limited to meeting basic needs (food, board).	Activities are interpreted through a comparison of access to economic facilities.	Activities are associated with efforts to access education, employment, and social protection (D9, D12).
Purpose	The purpose of the discourse: to display the scale of poverty quantitatively.	The purpose of the discourse: to highlight inequality as a form of injustice.	The purpose of the discourse is to criticize the power structure and demand policy improvements (D6, D10,

			D13).
Norms/Values	The norm of objectivity through numbers is considered a legitimate measure of poverty.	The norm of distributive justice is used as a benchmark for assessing inequality.	The norms of social justice and the right to access are values that are upheld.
Position	The poor are positioned as the object to be measured.	The poor group is positioned lower on the comparison scale.	Governments and systems are positioned as responsible actors (D3, D4).
Resources	Resources are interpreted as the amount of income/expenses.	Resources are interpreted as facilities that are unequal between groups.	Resources are defined as access that is controlled by regulations and policies (D3, D10).

The ideology of poverty, the dominance of structural constructions, and its implications for language communication

The three constructions above basically represent three different logics of responsibility in interpreting poverty . Absolute poverty interprets responsibility through the lens of poverty measurement as a matter of numbers and thresholds. Relative poverty interprets responsibility through the lens of poverty distribution as a problem of inequality between groups. Structural poverty interprets responsibility through the systemic lens of poverty as a product of power relations, policies, and a long history of inequality. The dominant third construction (60%) confirms that the discourse on poverty in X, based on the analyzed data, is more directed at systemic criticism than simply presenting individual economic conditions (Sofian et al., 2022), and shows the function of X as a critique space for narratives that simplify poverty on individual responsibility (Lidya et al., 2025).

These findings confirm that the representation of poverty in the data is not neutral: numbers, comparisons, word choices, and the prominence of certain actors shape the way we understand poverty as an economic, inequality, or structural issue (Sagala et al., 2026). In Entman's framing, because poverty is more often placed in the system, the solution is directed at improving policies, not just charitable assistance (Nisa et al., 2023)

These findings are the basis for language communication recommendations for institutions and the media. Rights-based language (*Rights-based language*) needs to replace diction that has the potential to blame the victim and perpetuate the social stigma of poverty (Darmawan, 2022). For example, an expression that places the poor as a mere recipient of aid can be shifted to an expression that highlights the condition of socio-economic vulnerability, so that the poor are positioned as subjects who have rights and agency, rather than passive objects of policy. In the social context, the dominance of structural poverty (60%) indicates the need for communication guidelines for public relations, journalists, and social media managers that contain non-stigmatic term choices and rhetorical evaluation indicators to reduce class prejudice and unequal power relations, a practical implication that flows directly from the pattern of structural dominance found in this study, and is a distinctive contribution that distinguishes it from similar CDA studies that stop at the descriptive stage (Mario, 2025).

CONCLUSION

Based on AWK Teun A. Van Dijk's analysis of 15 X posts, three constructions of poverty representation were found: structural (60%), absolute (26.67%), and relative (13.33%). The structure of the text shows that poverty is constructed through numbers, comparisons, and lexicons that direct attention to needs, inequality, and access and policies. In the dimensions of social cognition and social context, discourse shows a tendency to understand poverty as a problem related to inequality of opportunity, policies, resource distribution, and power relations. Van Dijk's six ideological categories show the prominence of positions and resources in this construction. These findings support the recommendations of rights-based communication, especially by avoiding victim-blaming language and placing the poor as principled empowered subjects relevant to journalism, public relations, and critical media literacy.

This study has three limitations that need to be observed in reading its findings. First, the data corpus only consists of 15 objectively selected (*purposive*) posts from the 2026 period alone; such a small sample cannot be generalized to represent the entire population of poverty

discourse in X, and the patterns of dominance of structural constructs found need to be retested on larger corpus and longer periods before being claimed as a general trend. Second, as is common in AWK research, this study relies on the researcher as a single instrument (*human instrument*) in the process of selection, coding, and interpretation of data; The absence of a second coder or an *intercoder reliability check procedure* means that the resulting ideological interpretation still has the potential to be influenced by the subjectivity of the researcher, so readers need to treat the ideological categorization in Table 4 as a well-reasoned reading, rather than a single reading that is free from the interpreter's perspective. Third, the limited coverage of the data period in 2026 makes these findings vulnerable to the dynamics of seasonal discourse or certain political events that happen to dominate the timeline in the data collection period. Subsequent research is suggested to expand the amount of data, time range, and platform (e.g. comparing X to TikTok or Instagram), as well as to involve a second coder to test the consistency of the findings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author expresses his gratitude to Tadulako University, the supervisors, and the parties who provided direction and support in the implementation of the research and preparation of this article.

REFERENCES

Arifuddin, Ruslan, H., & Haslinda. (2022). Struktur wacana mikro situs berita online Liputan6.com. *Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, *8*(1), 93–100. https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v8i1.1602

Darmawan, A. (2022). Analisis wacana kritis sosial dalam teks surat kabar pasca reformasi. *Journal of Education Research*, *3*(4), 208–219. https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v3i4.147

Dewi, L. L., Nurjaya, I. G., & Utama, I. D. G. B. (2025). Analisis wacana kritis model Teun A. Van Dijk pidato perdana Presiden RI 2024. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia Undiksha*, *15*(3), 336–347. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbsi.v15i3.102049

Efendi, E. (2025). Framing feminitas dan kekerasan: Analisis wacana kritis terhadap narasi media tentang korban pembunuhan perempuan di Palembang. *Jurnal Cendekia Ilmiah*, *3*(1), 107–137. https://doi.org/10.56799/jceki.v1i2.151

Fahlevi, F., & Nusa, M. Z. R. (2026). Analisis wacana kritis Van Dijk terhadap komunikasi politik pemerintah dalam podcast Bocor Alus Politik Tempo. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling*, *6*(1), 359–370. https://doi.org/10.54082/jupin.1699

Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical discourse analysis. In *Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 428. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203809068.ch1

Fatimah, S., Azmah, N., Ansoriyah, S., & Mayumi, I. (2024). Analisis wacana kritis Fairclough dalam wacana Pilpres 2024. *Jurnal Pendidikan, Bahasa, Sastra, Budaya, dan Agama*, *4*(2), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.51849/jp3k.v4i2.200

Febryanti, D. R., Hamad, I., & Rusadi, U. (2024). Pemetaan wacana berbasis korpus di media sosial. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kanderang Tingang*, *21*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.24002/jik.v21i1.6452

Harahap, N. (2023). Analisis framing netizen di X dalam pelaksanaan program makan bergizi gratis. *Sains Data*, *4*(1), 701–715. https://doi.org/10.52620/sainsdata.v4i1.339

Herliana, J., Wahyuni, I., & Mubarok, A. (2026). Representasi Israel dalam media massa daring CNN Indonesia: Analisis wacana kritis Theo Van Leeuwen. *Jurnal Budaya Nusantara*, *10*(2), 51–60. https://doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v10i2.22713

Hermawan, D., Zulkarnain, I., & Lubis, L. A. (2026). News framing of the free nutritious meal program in IDN Times and Kompas.id: A Robert Entman analysis. *Interaksi: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, *10*(2), 254–272. https://doi.org/10.30596/interaksi.v10i2.31182

Ichwan, B. F. (2022). Mengenal analisis framing: Tinjauan sejarah dan metodologi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan dan Keperawatan*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.62144/jikq.v1i2.14

Indriyawati, L., & Yusak, H. (2023). Analisis wacana kritis pada berita online pencucian. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, *3*(1), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.47709/jbsi.v3i1.2298

Iqbal, M. M. (2023). Kemiskinan struktural dan mekanisme survival tukang becak di Terminal Bratang. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, *12*(2), 212–221. https://doi.org/10.23887/jish.v12i2.49795

Jufanny, D., & Girsang, L. R. M. (2020). Toxic masculinity dalam sistem patriarki (Analisis wacana kritis Van Dijk dalam film "Posesif"). *Jurnal Komunikasi*, *14*(1), 8–23. https://doi.org/10.30813/s:jk.v14i1.2194.g1775

Juliana, A., Tarigan, B., Surif, M., Lubis, M., Ritonga, M. U., & Hadi, W. (2023). Analisis wacana kritis model Teun A. Van Dijk pada teks berita di buku Bahasa Indonesia kelas VII berbasis Kurikulum Merdeka terbitan Kemendikbud Ristek tahun 2021. *Bilingual: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, *12*(1), 17–34. https://doi.org/10.24114/bss.v12i1.40645

Kamalia, A. L., & Hudiono, Y. (2025). Analisis wacana kritis model Norman Fairclough pada teks berita online (ASN batal pindah ke IKN

Januari). *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Terpadu*, *4*(4), 472–478. https://doi.org/10.28926/jpip.v4i4.1861

Kasanova, D. R., Oktasari, A. F., & Sumaryanti, L. (2025). *Membongkar bahasa, membaca kuasa (Pengantar analisis wacana kritis)*. Satwika. https://doi.org/10.22219/satwika.v7i2.26549

Khairiah, I., & Prihatini, A. (2023). Kritik sosial dalam animasi Tekotok: Analisis wacana kritis Van Dijk. *Satwika: Kajian Ilmu Budaya dan Perubahan Sosial*, *7*(2). https://doi.org/10.22219/satwika.v7i2.26549

Lidya, S., Farawita, R., Hudiyono, Y., Mulawarman, W. G., & Mulawarman, U. (2025). Representasi kekuasaan negara dalam dokumen Kurikulum Merdeka: Analisis wacana kritis model van Dijk. *Tinta: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, *7*(1), 91–96. https://doi.org/10.35897/jurnaltinta.v7i1.1861

Mario, M. (2025). Dinamika wacana kemiskinan dan implementasi Program Keluarga Harapan di Kota Makassar: Perspektif sosial dan politik. *Tuturan: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajaran*, *3*(2), 150–164. https://doi.org/10.47861/tuturan.v3i2.1834

Mergianti, W. N., Khudin, N., Afandi, A., Shofah, N. A., Candra, D., & Novitasari, R. (2026). Analisis sentimen pengguna aplikasi X terhadap pelaksanaan makan bergizi gratis menggunakan metode Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System. *Sains Data*, *4*(1), 24–33. https://doi.org/10.52620/sainsdata.v4i1.339

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2014). *Analisis data kualitatif: Buku sumber tentang metode-metode baru*. UI Press. https://lib.fkm.ui.ac.id/detail?id=85631&lokasi=lokal

Muftiah, Ulinsa, Tyas, A. P., Yunidar, & Marfuah, J. (2026). Critical discourse analysis on Nadia Omara podcast. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, *14*(1), 2307–2328. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v14I1.10742

Mugni, A., Agustini, & Luthfie, M. (2024). Kognisi sosial dalam analisis wacana kritis Teun A. Van Dijk pada pemberitaan wacana difabel netra di media online Sukabumiupdate.com. *Karimah Tauhid*, *3*(6), 6352–6358. https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i6.13567

Muhajirin, Risnita, & Asrulla. (2024). Pendekatan penelitian kuantitatif dan kualitatif serta tahapan penelitian. *Journal Genta Mulia*, *15*(1), 82–92. https://ejournal.uncm.ac.id/index.php/gm/issue/view/82

Nafiyah, L., Aliyah, F., Lestari, M. I., Ummah, S., & Mustaqim, A. (2025). Menyinggung keterhubungan antara kemiskinan, ketidakadilan, radikalisme, gender, dan lingkungan yang menjadi persoalan multidimensi. *Menulis: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, *1*(12), 341–354. https://doi.org/10.59435/menulis.v1i12.787

Nagara, G. (2021). Peran kapital pada media sosial: Analisis jaringan sosial pertarungan kuasa wacana Tri Rismaharini di Twitter. *Jurnal Ilmu Politik dan Komunikasi*, *8*(1), 64–90. https://doi.org/10.22146/jps.v8i1.68244

Nisa, A., Haerussaleh, & Huda, N. (2023). Analisis wacana kritis pada lirik lagu "Hati-Hati di Jalan" karya Tulus. *Metafora: Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*, *10*(2), 65–72. https://doi.org/10.30595/mtf.v10i2.18566

Nissa, C., Alisa, I., Nasution, M. N., Ria, R., & Hasibuan, A. (2026). Ekonomi politik dalam program pengentasan kemiskinan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Global dan Kebijakan Publik*, *1*(1), 165–176. https://doi.org/10.65244/jgga.v1i2.253

Nursanti, R. R., Triyono, S., & Yogyakarta, U. N. (2022). Political-persuasive speech of Indonesian social affairs minister: Critical discourse analysis. *LITERA*, *21*(1), 9–22. https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v21i1.43273

Purwanti, E. (2024). Analisis deskriptif profil kemiskinan Indonesia berdasarkan data BPS tahun 2023. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Humaniora*, *4*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.37481/jmh.v4i1.653

Putri, S. Y. (2026). Representasi kemiskinan dalam novel Mata yang Enak. *Wacana Sastra*, *2*(1), 246–251. https://doi.org/10.63822/wsxaft87

Rahma, N., Amir, J., & Saleh, M. (2025). Ideologi dalam konten TikTok Gen Z (@Rianfahardhi). *Ideguru: Jurnal Karya Ilmiah Guru*, *10*(1), 825–829. https://doi.org/10.51169/ideguru.v10i1.1693

Rifa'i, A. M. Y. I., & Yuniarti, N. (2026). Analisis wacana kritis model Van Dijk pemberitaan kemiskinan. *Vox Edukasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, *17*(1), 57–71. https://doi.org/10.62281/voxedukasi

Rubbani, A., Bravo-Sotelo, K. P., & Manal. (2024). A critical discourse analysis of narrative discrepancies in Pakistani news channel headlines. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2380115

Sagala, L., Sitohang, N. J., Samosir, E., & Sirait, A. (2026). Analisis wacana kritis berita di surat kabar Waspada berdasarkan teori Teun A. Van Dijk. *Kopula: Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Pendidikan dan Agama Islam*, *8*(1), 11–29. https://doi.org/10.29303/kopula.v8i1.8944

Salsabila, H., & Maulana, I. R. (2026). Labeling dan efek jerat kemiskinan (poverty trap) dalam wacana kebijakan sosial: Analisis framing pemberitaan program bantuan sosial di media daring Indonesia. *Murabahah*, *2*(2), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.64365/murabah.v2i2.270

Setyarahajoe, R., & Fadeli, M. (2025). Framing media dalam membangun personal branding Gibran Rakabuming Raka sebagai cawapres pada Twitter (X) @Gibran_Tweet dalam pandangan followers. *Konsensus: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, *3*(4), 1818–1828. https://doi.org/10.62383/konsensus.v3i4.1906

Shofa, Z. Z. (2026). Kontestasi wacana dalam pemberitaan Ribka Tjiptaning: Analisis wacana kritis Teun A. Van Dijk. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Pembelajaran*, *4*(4). https://doi.org/10.29407/jbsp.v7i1.20307

Sitorus, N. D., Sinaga, C. F. H., & Sihombing, B. (2026). Analisis wacana kritis Teun A. Van Dijk atas konstruksi realitas pendidikan dalam media massa. *Pena: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *16*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.22437/pena.v16i1.52636

Sofian, M. Y., Dwijaya, R., & Rachmalija, S. (2022). Kebijakan anti kemiskinan program pemerintah dalam penanggulangan kemiskinan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Inovasi Penelitian*, *2*(10), 3209–3218. https://doi.org/10.47492/jip.v2i10.1347

Supriatno, E., Pahdepie, F., & Salam, R. (2026). Konstruksi kebenaran dalam evidence-based policy making: Analisis wacana kritis atas kebijakan penanggulangan kemiskinan di Provinsi Banten. *Takuana: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, *4*(4), 1814–1824. https://doi.org/10.56113/takuana.v4i4.346

Syafri, M. (2026). Kemiskinan struktural di Indonesia dalam perspektif Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, *4*(4). https://doi.org/10.23887/jish.v12i2.49795

Syarofi, M. I., & Saifudin, W. (2026). Wacana kemiskinan dalam podcast Sisi Gelap Orang Miskin di kanal YouTube Tretan Universe: Analisis wacana kritis Teun A. Van Dijk. *Jurnal Pelita*, *11*(3), 353–363. https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v11i03.61450

Tiara Artamefia, Yunidar, Y., Asrianti, A., Moh. Tahir, & Arum Pujiningtyas. (2025). Analisis wacana kritis dalam film Pattongko Siri sebagai representasi budaya suku Bugis Makassar. *Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, *11*(4), 4441–4449. https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v11i4.7065

Triono, T. A., & Sangaji, R. C. (2023). Faktor mempengaruhi tingkat kemiskinan di Indonesia: Studi literatur laporan data kemiskinan BPS tahun 2022. *Journal of Society Bridge*, *1*(1), 59–67. https://doi.org/10.59012/jsb.v1i1.5

Ulinsa, U., Golontalo, D., & Syahrul, N. (2022). Representasi nilai estetis dalam syair Karambangan suku Pamona (Aesthetic value representation in the Karambangan poem of the Pamona tribe). *Indonesian Language Education and Literature*, *7*(2), 401–413. https://doi.org/10.24235/ileal.v7i2.9404

Wahyudi, D., Nugraha, A. R., & Ismanto, D. T. (2026). Ketergantungan penerima bantuan sosial dan dampaknya terhadap kesejahteraan masyarakat Kota Malang. *Jurnal Sosial Humaniora*, *3*(1), 16–24. https://doi.org/10.70214/jwcm4c85

Wulansari, R. Y., Fadhilah, N., & Huda, M. (2023). Faktor yang mempengaruhi kemiskinan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Akuntansi, dan Teknologi*, *6*(1), 82–95. https://doi.org/10.32500/jematech.v6i1.3928

Yanti, V. D., Hariyanto, S., Pribadi, F., & Sosiologi, P. S. (2024). Mentertawakan keresahan: Analisis wacana kritis representasi kemiskinan dalam stand-up comedy. *Paradigma: Jurnal Sosiologi*, *13*(3), 31–40. https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/paradigma/issue/view/3158

Yogantara, A., Kusumaningsih, D., & Wicaksana, M. F. (2024). "Gemoy" campaign strategy: Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, *10*(1), 375–389. https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.10.1.9638.375-389