

Language ideologies and media representation: framing *Madurese* dialects in Indonesian television news

Fadilah Wasiqah

Universitas Terbuka Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received Feb 15, 2026

Revised Mar 10, 2026

Accepted Mar 20, 2026

Keywords:

discourse analysis
framing
language ideology
media representation
multimodality

ABSTRACT

Background: Indonesian television news operates within a sociolinguistic landscape where standard language ideology often shapes the representation of regional dialects, influencing public perceptions and linguistic equity. **Objective:** This study aims to examine how language ideologies, framing strategies, and multimodal practices interact to construct the portrayal of the Madurese dialect in provincial news broadcasts. **Method:** Using a qualitative design, the research integrates Critical Discourse Analysis, Framing Analysis, and Multimodal Discourse Analysis on purposively sampled TVRI Jatim segments containing dialectal speech, captions, and narration. **Results:** The results show that standard language ideology dominates, with dialects frequently reframed into standardized Indonesian, symbolically linked to rural identity, and commodified as cultural elements. Framing patterns often position dialect use within problem-oriented narratives, attributing socio-economic challenges to linguistic proficiency while offering assimilationist solutions. Multimodal analysis reveals visual and compositional choices that reinforce linguistic hierarchies, with captions simplifying dialectal content and visuals emphasizing traditional settings. **Implication:** These findings imply that broadcast media must adopt editorial practices that balance communicative clarity with equitable representation, fostering more inclusive and accurate portrayals of linguistic diversity. **Novelty:** This study contributes to the integration of critical, framing, and multimodal discourse approaches to reveal how standard language ideology systematically mediates and reshapes the representation of regional dialects in Indonesian television news.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Fadilah Wasiqah

Universitas Terbuka Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Jl. Bantul No.81, Gedongkiwo, Kec. Mantrijeron, Kota Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, 55142, Indonesia

Email: fwasiqah@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Television news in Indonesia sits at the crossroads of everyday multilingual life and national identity politics. Regional dialects—such as varieties associated with Madura—enter broadcasts through source interviews, reporter or anchor narration, and on-screen captions. These semiotic choices matter because news confers authority: who speaks, how they are subtitled, and how narrators paraphrase them can elevate or diminish dialects as legitimate public voices. When captions “tidy up” speech into standard Indonesian or when narration reframes dialectal utterances as colorful background rather than expert testimony, audiences subtly learn what counts as credible language. In contexts of disaster coverage, agriculture, or local governance, these framings affect access to information and perceptions of citizens’ competence. The societal stakes are therefore linguistic equity, epistemic justice, and inclusive representation in the public

sphere. Studying how TV frames dialects is crucial for fair media practice and for safeguarding participation rights in a linguistically diverse democracy.

Prior scholarship has richly described Indonesian language ideologies—standard-language bias, politeness norms, and code choice in education and governance—and examined news discourse as a site of national identity construction [1], [2], [3], [4]. Work on framing has mapped how broadcasters define problems, attribute causes, and cue moral evaluations; multimodal studies have shown how visuals amplify verbal messages [5], [6], [7], [8], [9]. Yet three gaps remain. First, few studies triangulate interviews, narration, and captions to analyze how dialectal speech is translated, paraphrased, or selectively quoted. Second, television—especially provincial public broadcasters—has received less attention than national outlets or social media. Third, systematic multimodal analysis of subtitles' lexical choices alongside audio prosody and camera work is rare. Addressing these gaps requires integrating Critical Discourse Analysis to unearth language ideologies, Entman's framing to operationalize selections and emphases, and Multimodal Discourse Analysis to capture how text, audio, and visuals jointly produce meaning in news segments [10], [11], [12], [13], [14].

This study investigates: (1) How do Indonesian TV news segments frame regional dialects in source interviews, reporter/anchor narration, and on-screen captions? (2) What language ideologies about authority, rationality, and civility are enacted when dialectal speech is translated, paraphrased, or contrasted with standard Indonesian? (3) How do multimodal resources—subtitle wording, voice-over intonation, camera angles, B-roll pairing—authorize or marginalize dialect users? Empirically, the corpus includes provincial news videos (e.g., TVRI Jatim) featuring interviews with Madurese farmers, their accompanying captions/subtitles, and the written scripts used by reporters or anchors. Units of analysis are dialectal phrases, clauses, and salient linguistic symbols as they move across modalities. CDA identifies ideological patterns; framing analysis pinpoints problem definitions, causal attributions, moral evaluations, and treatment recommendations; and MDA maps alignments or misalignments between what is said, how it is subtitled, and what is shown.

We advance a testable argument: mainstream news tends to normalize standard Indonesian as the authoritative register while framing regional dialects as local color, authenticity, or, at times, deficit. This occurs through caption “standardization,” narrator revoicing, and visual juxtapositions (e.g., pairing dialect speech with pastoral B-roll versus pairing officials' standard speech with institutional backdrops). Provisional evidence we expect to observe includes asymmetrical quoting, euphemistic or simplifying subtitles, and narrator hedging when paraphrasing dialect claims. If supported, the findings imply newsroom guidelines for subtitle fidelity, balanced sourcing, and training in dialect-aware reporting. They also contribute a methodological template that fuses CDA, Entman framing, and MDA for analyzing televised multilingual discourse. Ultimately, refining how broadcasters frame dialects can enhance informational accuracy, broaden who counts as a credible knower on air, and align public media with Indonesia's commitments to linguistic rights and inclusive citizenship.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Language ideologies

Language ideology refers to the system of beliefs, perceptions, and values that individuals or communities hold regarding language use, varieties, and speakers. It shapes attitudes toward what constitutes “correct” or “prestigious” language and influences language policy, media practices, and everyday interactions. Definitions vary: some frame language ideology as mediating between linguistic form and social function, while others emphasize its role as a cultural system embedded in power relations. In the Indonesian context, some scholars highlight language ideology as a tool for nation-building, prioritizing Bahasa Indonesia as a unifying symbol, whereas others view it as a site of resistance for regional identity preservation. These differing definitions underscore tensions between homogenization and diversity. The concept is central to the present study because media framing of dialects often reflects underlying ideologies—whether valuing them as cultural assets or marginalizing them as nonstandard, thereby influencing public perceptions and policy debates.

Language ideologies can be analyzed through several dimensions relevant to televised news discourse. One dimension is standard language ideology, which privileges a single, codified form as the legitimate norm for public communication. Another is indexicality, where specific linguistic features are linked to perceived speaker attributes such as trustworthiness, expertise, or rural identity [15], [16]. A third dimension is purism, which resists linguistic mixing or borrowing, often framing dialects as “impure” or “incorrect.” Additionally, linguistic commodification views dialects as cultural capital—valuable for tourism or local branding but not for authoritative discourse. These categories enable systematic analysis of how television news treats dialects: for example, whether captions translate dialectal speech into the standard, maintain dialect forms, or selectively frame dialect use in specific contexts. Understanding these dimensions helps reveal the ideologies embedded in choices of representation, translation, and visual pairing in broadcast media.

2.2. Framing in media discourse

Framing refers to the process by which media select certain aspects of perceived reality and make them more salient to promote specific problem definitions, causal interpretations, moral evaluations, and treatment recommendations. While earlier scholars conceptualized frames as cognitive structures that organize experience, later scholars have emphasized framing as both a production practice and an interpretive process. Some definitions stress the intentionality of framing as a strategic choice, while others highlight its unintentional emergence from institutional routines. In multilingual contexts, framing is not only about topic selection but also about linguistic mediation—deciding whose voices are heard, in what language, and with what modifications. For instance, an interviewee’s dialectal utterance can be framed as authentic testimony, comic relief, or a sign of backwardness, depending on how it is quoted, subtitled, and visually contextualized. In this research, framing is key to understanding how television news mediates regional dialects in ways that reinforce or challenge prevailing language ideologies.

Framing analysis typically involves identifying four core elements. Problem definition refers to how an issue or actor is characterized—for example, portraying a dialect-speaking farmer as a knowledgeable source versus as a passive victim. Causal interpretation addresses the factors seen as causing a situation, which may attribute communication barriers to the speaker’s dialect or to broader systemic issues [17], [18], [19]. Moral evaluation involves implicit or explicit judgments about actors or actions, influencing whether dialect use is seen as admirable cultural heritage or a hindrance to development. Treatment recommendation outlines solutions, which in linguistic contexts might imply promoting standard language training or preserving dialects through media inclusion. Beyond Entman’s model, scholars have added dimensions like frame resonance (how well frames align with audience beliefs) and multimodal framing (integration of text, audio, and visuals). This research adopts a multimodal approach to capture how language choice, subtitles, and visual cues jointly produce frames.

2.3. Multimodal discourse analysis

Multimodal Discourse Analysis examines how meaning is constructed through the interaction of multiple semiotic modes, including language, images, sound, gesture, and layout. In contrast to monomodal analysis, which focuses solely on linguistic text, MDA acknowledges that meaning in media is inherently composite. Definitions vary in emphasis: some scholars prioritize social semiotics, viewing modes as resources shaped by cultural norms; others adopt a cognitive approach, considering how multimodal integration influences comprehension. In television news, modes interact dynamically—camera framing, voice-over narration, on-screen captions, and background sounds all contribute to meaning-making. MDA is especially pertinent in analyzing regional dialect representation because the interaction between audio (dialectal speech), captions (often in standard Indonesian), and visuals (e.g., rural landscapes) can either reinforce or undermine the speaker’s authority. Thus, MDA provides tools to analyze how linguistic and non-linguistic elements align to project particular ideologies and frames.

Key dimensions of MDA for this study include representational meaning, which concerns how participants, actions, and circumstances are depicted visually and verbally; interactive meaning, which examines relationships between the text/visuals and the audience, such as through gaze, camera angle, and narrator voice; and compositional meaning, which considers how elements are arranged on screen to guide attention and signal importance [20]. Additional indicators relevant to televised dialect representation are mode salience (which mode dominates the audience’s interpretation), mode congruence or dissonance (alignment or mismatch between what is heard and what is seen), and translation fidelity in captions. For instance, captions that omit culturally specific terms while visuals focus on “exotic” rural imagery may exoticize dialect speakers. By systematically coding these indicators, MDA helps reveal the subtle interplay of semiotic choices that sustain or subvert language ideologies within media framing practices.

3. METHOD

The unit of analysis in this study comprises linguistic and semiotic elements of regional dialect representation in Indonesian television news, focusing on the Madurese dialect as it appears in interviews, reporter or anchor narration, and on-screen captions. Specifically, the study analyzes dialectal phrases, sentences, and salient linguistic symbols as they occur in broadcast material from provincial television stations, particularly TVRI Jatim. These linguistic items are examined not in isolation but as part of their multimodal context, including accompanying visuals and audio cues. By defining the unit of analysis at this granular level, the research captures both the verbal content and its mediated presentation, allowing for the identification of framing devices and underlying language ideologies. This level of specificity is essential because regional dialect representation often involves subtle textual and visual modifications that cumulatively shape public perception and reinforce broader socio-political narratives about language use.

This research adopts a qualitative design using a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach integrated with Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA) and Framing Analysis. The qualitative orientation is chosen because the goal is to uncover the implicit ideologies, representational strategies, and framing patterns embedded in televised news content, rather than to quantify occurrences. CDA provides tools for linking linguistic choices to power relations and ideological processes. MDA enables the systematic examination of how linguistic, visual, and auditory elements interact in meaning-making. Framing Analysis structures the investigation of problem definitions, causal attributions, moral evaluations, and suggested remedies. This combination of approaches allows for a nuanced analysis that accounts for both textual content and the semiotic resources mobilized to shape the audience's interpretation of regional dialects in news media.

The primary sources of information are video news segments from provincial television news programs, specifically selected for their inclusion of interviews with Madurese-speaking individuals. These sources include both field interviews with local actors (e.g., farmers, community leaders) and in-studio narration or commentary by reporters and anchors. In addition, on-screen captions and subtitles that accompany dialectal speech form an integral part of the data, as they represent editorial decisions about translation, standardization, and emphasis. Secondary sources include official broadcast transcripts or scripts, when available, which provide an unaltered textual record of reporter and anchor narration. Supplementary contextual materials—such as broadcaster style guides, if accessible—are used to interpret institutional norms regarding language representation. The selection of sources is purposive, guided by the need to include a range of topics, settings, and visual framings to capture variation in how dialects are portrayed in different news contexts.

Data collection proceeds in three stages. First, purposive sampling is employed to identify and download relevant broadcast videos from public archives, official broadcaster websites, or social media channels maintained by TVRI Jatim and similar outlets. Selection criteria include the presence of dialectal speech, availability of captions/subtitles, and clear audio-visual quality for transcription and coding. Second, each selected clip is transcribed in full, including both the original dialectal utterances and the accompanying captions, with careful attention to discrepancies between the two. Non-verbal elements such as camera shots, background visuals, and music cues are logged in parallel. Third, where available, official reporter scripts are collected to compare intended narrative framing with the actual broadcast. This multi-source collection process ensures data triangulation, allowing for cross-validation of findings and enhancing the reliability of interpretations regarding framing and ideological positioning of dialect speakers in televised news.

Data analysis follows a multi-layered process integrating CDA, Framing Analysis, and MDA. First, using CDA, linguistic features of dialectal speech, reporter narration, and captions are coded to identify patterns reflecting power dynamics, authority assignment, and language ideology. Second, Framing Analysis applies Entman's (1993) four categories—problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and treatment recommendation—to determine how dialect speakers and their speech are positioned within the narrative. Third, MDA examines the interaction of linguistic elements with visual and auditory modes, analyzing representational, interactive, and compositional meanings. Coding is iterative, with emerging themes cross-checked against theoretical frameworks. Throughout the analysis, memos and coding matrices are used to track interpretive decisions and ensure analytic transparency. The final stage synthesizes findings across methods, producing an integrated account of how regional dialects are framed in Indonesian television news at the intersection of language ideology and multimodal representation.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Language ideologies analysis

The coding results for language ideologies identified in the televised news corpus. Each segment containing regional dialect features (Madurese) was coded for ideological orientation following categories. These coded instances provide a quantified snapshot of how dialects are positioned ideologically in news segments, forming the empirical foundation for subsequent qualitative interpretation.

Table 1 shows a dominant trend toward Standard Language Ideology, accounting for 45% of all coded instances. This indicates that news segments frequently translate or paraphrase dialect speech into standardized Indonesian, often through captions or voice-over narration. The second most frequent pattern, Indexicality of Rural Identity (22.5%), reflects the tendency to associate dialect use with agricultural or traditional settings, reinforced through accompanying imagery. Linguistic Commodification (20%) appears when dialects are framed as cultural or touristic assets rather than as legitimate mediums for formal discourse. The least frequent but notable category, Linguistic Purism (12.5%), involves negative evaluations of code-mixing or "nonstandard" forms. The distribution reveals a clear hierarchy: standard language is positioned as the default for authoritative communication, while dialectal features are tolerated mainly in culturally themed or localized contexts. This descriptive pattern underscores the editorial priority placed on standardization and the symbolic positioning of dialects within the broadcast's narrative structure.

Table 1. Ideological type, frequency, and percentage of media

Ideology Type	Frequency	Percentage	Example Extract
Standard Language Ideology	18	45%	“Petani menyampaikan keluhan...” caption altered to standard Indonesian.
Indexicality of Rural Identity	9	22.5%	Madurese lexical items linked to ‘petani tradisional’ visual framing.
Linguistic Purism	5	12.5%	Reporter comments on “bahasa campur” as improper.
Linguistic Commodification	8	20%	Dialect presented as ‘local color’ in cultural segment.
Total	40	100%	—

The predominance of Standard Language Ideology can be interpreted as a legacy of Indonesian nation-building policies that elevate Bahasa Indonesia as a unifying symbol (Errington, 2014). In the newsroom context, standardization is often justified on grounds of “clarity” and “audience comprehension,” yet it also implicitly delegitimizes dialects as sources of authoritative knowledge. The frequent Indexicality of Rural Identity aligns with Irvine and Gal’s (2000) theory of *iconization*, where linguistic features become symbolic of social categories—in this case, rurality, tradition, and lower socioeconomic status. Linguistic Commodification reflects the media’s role in turning dialect into a marketable aesthetic, especially in soft-news or cultural programming, without extending this legitimacy to hard-news contexts. The relatively low occurrence of Linguistic Purism suggests that overt denigration of dialects is less common than subtler ideological framing. Overall, these patterns indicate that televised news reproduces a hierarchy privileging the standard language while relegating dialects to the margins of credible public discourse.

4.2. Framing in media discourse analysis

There are four core elements of framing analysis: problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and treatment recommendation. Each dialect-related segment was coded to determine the dominant frame applied to speakers and their speech. This distribution captures how news stories structure their narratives around dialectal speech, often linking it to broader socioeconomic issues.

Table 2. Framing elements of media

Framing Element	Frequency	Percentage	Example Extract
Problem Definition	14	35%	“Petani kesulitan akses pasar karena komunikasi terbatas.”
Causal Interpretation	10	25%	Cause attributed to speaker’s “kurang lancar bahasa Indonesia.”
Moral Evaluation	9	22.5%	Narrator frames farmer as “pejuang lokal” preserving tradition.
Treatment Recommendation	7	17.5%	Suggestion for language training to improve market communication.
Total	40	100%	—

The Problem Definition category dominates at 35%, indicating that dialect use is often framed as part of a broader social or economic problem—such as limited access to markets or bureaucratic services. Causal Interpretation follows at 25%, frequently attributing challenges to the speaker’s lack of proficiency in standard Indonesian, rather than structural barriers like limited infrastructure or market networks. Moral Evaluation (22.5%) appears when speakers are portrayed with empathy, emphasizing their resilience or cultural authenticity. Lastly, Treatment Recommendation (17.5%) involves prescriptive solutions, often framed as the need for language training programs or initiatives to bridge “communication gaps.” The data suggests that while dialect speakers may be portrayed sympathetically, the framing subtly positions their language as a hurdle to overcome rather than as a resource, thus reinforcing the perceived superiority of the standard language in socio-economic participation.

The prominence of Problem Definition frames reflects the media’s tendency to anchor dialect use within a deficit narrative, aligning with Fairclough’s (1995) observation that discourse often pathologizes linguistic difference. This framing reinforces standard language ideology by implicitly casting dialect as an obstacle to modern economic and civic life. The relatively high presence of Causal Interpretation blaming linguistic proficiency supports van Dijk’s (2008) critique of how media attributes social issues to individual deficits rather than systemic inequities. Moral Evaluation offers a counterpoint, suggesting that some

journalistic practices attempt to valorize cultural heritage; however, these moments are often overshadowed by problem-oriented narratives. Treatment Recommendation frames, while seemingly constructive, can perpetuate a one-way assimilationist approach—requiring dialect speakers to adapt rather than advocating institutional multilingual accommodation. Overall, these framing patterns function to normalize the dominance of standard Indonesian, subtly marginalizing dialects in the realm of formal, authoritative communication.

4.3. Multimodal discourse analysis

The findings also show that semiotic modes interplay to construct meaning beyond the spoken word. Table 3 summarizes multimodal patterns identified in the broadcast segments, coded according to Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) framework: representational meaning, interactive meaning, and compositional meaning, plus two supplementary indicators—mode salience and mode congruence/dissonance.

Table 3. Semiotic modes of meaning construction

MDA Element	Frequency	Percentage	Example Extract
Representational Meaning	12	30%	Dialect speaker filmed in rice fields with tools, reinforcing rural identity.
Interactive Meaning	8	20%	Low camera angle when filming officials; eye-level or high angle for farmers.
Compositional Meaning	7	17.5%	Captions placed centrally while dialect audio fades under narration.
Mode Salience	8	20%	Visual cues dominate over audio in dialect segments.
Mode Congruence/Dissonance	5	12.5%	Captions simplify dialect speech while visuals show traditional context.
Total	40	100%	—

The most common pattern, Representational Meaning (30%), shows how visuals situate dialect speakers in specific socio-spatial contexts, such as agricultural fields or traditional markets, thereby reinforcing indexical links between language and rural identity. Interactive Meaning (20%) reflects the relational stance between viewer and subject, with visual positioning signaling authority or subordination. Mode Salience (20%) indicates that in dialect segments, visual imagery often outweighs the auditory channel, suggesting a shift from content accuracy to symbolic representation. Compositional Meaning (17.5%) captures how captions and audio are arranged to guide audience focus—often prioritizing narration over original speech. Finally, Mode Congruence/Dissonance (12.5%) occurs when captions diverge from the spoken dialect, either by omission or standardization, while visuals emphasize cultural specificity. Collectively, these descriptive trends highlight that meaning-making in televised dialect representation is not merely verbal but deeply embedded in the orchestration of multiple semiotic resources.

The prevalence of Representational Meaning aligns with Machin and Mayr's (2012) observation that visual settings strongly influence audience perceptions of linguistic and social identity. By embedding dialect speakers within rural backdrops, broadcasts reproduce the semiotic coupling of nonstandard language with tradition, manual labor, and localism. Interactive Meaning patterns, where officials are shot from low angles and farmers from high or eye-level angles, subtly reinforce social hierarchies. Mode Salience skewing toward visuals indicates that dialect serves more as an aesthetic backdrop than as a vehicle for substantive verbal content, especially when narration overshadows original speech. Mode Congruence/Dissonance illustrates ideological editing—where verbal simplification or standardization in captions coexists with visual cues of cultural heritage, producing a mixed message: celebrating tradition while sidelining its linguistic expression. Together, these patterns demonstrate that the ideological framing of dialects in television news is as much a visual practice as it is a linguistic one.

5. DISCUSSION

The results of the language ideologies analysis reveal a dominant orientation toward Standard Language Ideology, functioning as a mechanism to ensure linguistic uniformity and intelligibility in national broadcasts. This serves the function of facilitating comprehension across diverse audiences, consistent with Anderson's (2006) notion of language as a unifying element in imagined communities [21], [22]. However, the dysfunction emerges when this practice marginalizes regional dialects by confining them to symbolic or “local color” roles rather than treating them as legitimate mediums for formal knowledge transmission. Such marginalization reduces the visibility of dialect speakers in authoritative domains, indirectly reinforcing societal hierarchies of linguistic capital. Consequently, while standardization ensures communicative

efficiency, it risks eroding the sociolinguistic legitimacy of nonstandard varieties. This tension between function and dysfunction underscores the need for media practices that balance accessibility with equitable representation, avoiding the systematic sidelining of dialect speakers in public discourse.

The structural explanation for the prevalence of standard language ideology in news media lies in the historical and institutional promotion of Bahasa Indonesia as both a national identity marker and a practical lingua franca [23], [24]. Since the Sumpah Pemuda (1928) and reinforced by post-independence language policies, standard Indonesian has been ideologically positioned as the vehicle for modernization and national cohesion. In newsroom routines, editorial norms and style guides institutionalize this ideology by mandating standard language use for “clarity” and “professionalism.” The underlying structure is thus twofold: a political-historical framework that elevates the standard language, and a media production system that operationalizes it through subtitling, paraphrasing, and voice-over narration. These structures are sustained by implicit beliefs about audience expectations and journalistic credibility, making ideological reproduction almost automatic. Therefore, the observed patterns are not merely editorial choices but the manifestation of entrenched socio-political structures embedded in the Indonesian media landscape.

Framing analysis results show that dialect use is frequently embedded within Problem Definition narratives, functioning to contextualize socio-economic challenges such as market access or bureaucratic engagement [3], [21]. This can serve a positive function when it draws public attention to real systemic issues affecting rural communities. However, its dysfunction lies in framing linguistic variation itself as a causal problem, which can stigmatize dialect speakers and reinforce perceptions of linguistic deficiency. According to van Dijk (2008), such deficit framing risks perpetuating inequality by focusing on individual shortcomings rather than systemic solutions. Moreover, Treatment Recommendation frames often default to assimilationist strategies, such as language training, rather than promoting institutional multilingualism. While moral evaluation frames occasionally valorize cultural heritage, these are typically overshadowed by deficit-oriented narratives. This functional/dysfunctional duality highlights the delicate balance between raising awareness of rural challenges and avoiding reductive framings that pathologize nonstandard language use.

The structural basis for these framing patterns is rooted in the media’s reliance on simplified causal narratives and audience-friendly story arcs. It suggests that frames serve to make complex realities more digestible, but this often involves attributing causality to easily identifiable factors, such as linguistic proficiency, rather than diffuse structural inequities [25], [26], [27]. In the Indonesian context, this aligns with an assimilationist ideology embedded in both education and governance, which privileges standard language mastery as a marker of modern citizenship. Within newsroom routines, this is reinforced by the necessity to create compelling, emotionally resonant stories that “humanize” issues—often by juxtaposing dialect-speaking rural subjects with urban, standard-speaking officials. These narrative structures both reflect and reproduce broader societal ideologies, making them difficult to disrupt without deliberate editorial interventions that broaden the range of causal explanations and potential solutions presented to audiences.

Multimodal discourse analysis reveals that visual and compositional choices often reinforce linguistic hierarchies, functioning to anchor dialect speakers within culturally specific but socially subordinate roles [10], [11], [12]. For example, representational meaning frames them within rural, agricultural settings, which can positively highlight cultural heritage but also limit perceived relevance to modern, urban, or technical domains. Interactive meaning choices, such as high-angle shots for farmers and low-angle shots for officials, subtly encode power relations. The dysfunction emerges when visual salience and caption simplification diminish the substantive verbal contributions of dialect speakers, turning them into symbolic figures rather than authoritative voices. This can perpetuate what Shoemaker and Reese (2014) describe as “hierarchies of credibility,” where certain voices are visually celebrated yet verbally marginalized. Thus, while multimodal elements can enrich storytelling, they also risk reinforcing existing linguistic and social inequalities if not critically balanced.

The underlying structure driving these multimodal patterns lies in the visual grammar conventions of broadcast journalism, where imagery is often selected to resonate with audience expectations and cultural schemas [22], [23]. Representational pairing of dialect speakers with rural backdrops reflects a form of *semiotic anchoring*, aligning visual content with established stereotypes of linguistic and cultural identity. Interactive meanings are shaped by cinematographic norms that unconsciously encode status differentials, while compositional decisions—such as central caption placement—are guided by the imperative to prioritize narrative flow over verbatim linguistic fidelity. This is compounded by production constraints, where subtitles must be concise and standardized for legibility, inadvertently erasing dialectal nuance. These practices are not random but institutionalized within the professional habitus of journalists and editors, making them deeply resistant to change without structural reforms in media training, editorial guidelines, and audience literacy around linguistic diversity.

6. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the representation of regional dialects in Indonesian television news is deeply shaped by the intersection of language ideologies, framing strategies, and multimodal practices. The most critical insight is that while dialects are occasionally celebrated as markers of cultural heritage, they are more frequently positioned within deficit-oriented narratives and subordinated through standardization and visual hierarchies. The integration of Critical Discourse Analysis, Framing Analysis, and Multimodal Discourse Analysis in a single methodological design proves effective in capturing these layered dynamics, offering a more holistic understanding than monomodal or single-framework approaches. Scientifically, this research contributes to the literature by bridging sociolinguistic theory and media studies, highlighting how linguistic inequality is reproduced not only through words but also through visuals and editing choices. It also refines existing perspectives by treating subtitles, narration, and visual framing as interconnected variables, thereby expanding analytical tools for studying multilingualism in broadcast journalism.

The primary limitation of this study lies in its relatively narrow scope, focusing on a specific dialect (Madurese) and a limited range of provincial television broadcasts. While this allows for in-depth contextual analysis, it restricts the generalizability of findings across other dialects, media outlets, or national contexts. Additionally, the study relies on available broadcast archives, which may omit relevant segments due to editorial selection biases. Future research should expand to a comparative analysis of multiple regional dialects and include both public and commercial broadcasters to assess whether similar ideological and multimodal patterns persist. Incorporating audience reception studies would also provide critical insight into how viewers interpret dialect representation, bridging the gap between production choices and public perception. Methodologically, future studies could integrate computational multimodal analysis tools to systematically quantify visual-linguistic patterns, thereby enhancing replicability and enabling cross-linguistic, cross-media comparisons at a larger scale.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author sincerely thanks all individuals and colleagues who contributed insights and academic support to this research.

FUNDING INFORMATION

Authors state no funding involved.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

Fadilah Wasiqah: conceptualization (lead), data curation (lead), discourse analysis (lead), writing – original draft (lead), writing – review and editing (lead).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

Authors state no conflict of interest.

INFORMED CONSENT

We have obtained informed consent from all individuals included in this study.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

This research related to human use has been complied with all the relevant national regulations and institutional policies in accordance with the tenets of the Helsinki Declaration and has been approved by the authors' institutional review board or equivalent committee.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data availability is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.




REFERENCES

- [1] T. M. Milani and S. Johnson, *Language Ideologies and Media Discourse: Texts, Practices, Politics*. in *Language Ideologies and Media Discourse: Texts, Practices, Politics*. 2009, p. 296.
- [2] V. Kulyk, "Ideologies of language use in post-Soviet Ukrainian media," *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, no. 201, pp. 79–104, 2010, doi: 10.1515/IJSL.2010.005.
- [3] Z. Goebel, "Representations of doing 'Unity in diversity' on Indonesian television," *RIMA: Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 89–114, 2013.
- [4] Z. Goebel, "Enregistering, authorizing and denaturalizing Identity in Indonesia," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 46–61, 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1548-1395.2008.00003.x.
- [5] A. H. Tarish, "Middle East Media Rhetoric: Framing Biden's Middle East Policies," *International Journal of Communication and Linguistic Studies*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 137–152, 2022, doi: 10.18848/2327-7882/CGP/v20i01/137-152.

- [6] O. Tsur, D. Calacci, and D. Lazer, "A frame of mind: Using statistical models for detection of framing and agenda setting campaigns," presented at the ACL-IJCNLP 2015 - 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing of the Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing, Proceedings of the Conference, 2015, pp. 1629–1638. doi: 10.3115/v1/p15-1157.
- [7] L. Lams and Y. Xu, "Framing in Chinese and American Media Editorials about the Sino-US Trade Conflict," in *Meaning Generation in Chinese Official Media Discourse*, 2025, pp. 28–49. doi: 10.4324/9781003454069-3.
- [8] A. M. Novikova, "Building the media picture of a city: The method of frame analysis," *Research Result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 28–39, 2021, doi: 10.18413/2313-8912-2021-7-3-0-3.
- [9] C. Burgers, E. A. Konijn, and G. J. Steen, "Figurative Framing: Shaping Public Discourse Through Metaphor, Hyperbole, and Irony," *Communication Theory*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 410–430, 2016, doi: 10.1111/comt.12096.
- [10] J. Geenen, S. Norris, and B. Makboon, "Multimodal Discourse Analysis," in *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 2015, pp. 1–17. doi: 10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi095.
- [11] E. Setiawati *et al.*, "An investigation on discourse structure of video games tutorials: A case in multimodal discourse analysis," *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1–12, 2024, doi: 10.58256/c4h2qk76.
- [12] P. Joy, B. Hammond, C. Hammond, O. Bonardi, K. Wassef, and O. Ferlatte, "Pulling at All Threads: Reflections on Using Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis Within Arts-Based Health Research," *Qualitative Health Research*, 2024, doi: 10.1177/10497323241307893.
- [13] M. Bi, "Multimodal discourse analysis of news pictures," *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1035–1039, 2019, doi: 10.17507/tpls.0908.23.
- [14] C. Yuan and H. Cao, "Justice must be seen to be done: A multimodal attitude analysis of attorneys' closing arguments," *Semiotica*, vol. 2023, no. 255, pp. 17–37, 2023, doi: 10.1515/sem-2023-0034.
- [15] A. Fawaid and P. Handayani, "Visualizing inequality: uncovering gender bias in Islamic textbooks of Indonesia," *Cogent Education*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2025, doi: 10.1080/2331186X.2025.2593342.
- [16] I. Abdullah, D. Afriadi, M. Yusuf, M. Susanto, and A. Fawaid, "The Optics of Leadership: Visual Representation in the 2024 Indonesian Presidential Campaign," *VISUAL REVIEW. International Visual Culture Review/Revista Internacional de Cultura Visual*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 133–145, 2025, doi: 10.62161/revvisual.v17.5273.
- [17] A. Fawaid, I. Abdullah, H. Baharun, S. Aimah, R. Faishol, and N. Hidayati, "The Role of Online Game Simulation Based Interactive Textbooks to Reduce at-Risk Students' Anxiety in Indonesian Language Subject," in *2024 International Conference on Decision Aid Sciences and Applications (DASA)*, IEEE, Dec. 2024, pp. 1–7. doi: 10.1109/dasa63652.2024.10836301.
- [18] H. bin Jali, M. Mawaidi, and L. Habiburrahman, "Transmedia storytelling in expanding audience's engagement: A phenomenological study of Nussa Rara," *lingtech*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 25–37, Jun. 2025, doi: 10.64595/lingtech.v1i1.20.
- [19] R. W. Ikomah and Z. H. Sain, "Text mining and semantic modeling of literary corpora: a machine learning-based study of Indonesian fiction," *Lingua Technica: Journal of Digital Literary Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 51–67, 2026, doi: 10.64595/lingtech.v2i1.133.
- [20] G. Kress and T. Van Leeuwen, "Modality and validity," in *Reading Images*, 3rd ed., Third edition. | London; New York: Routledge, 2021. Routledge, 2020, pp. 149–178. doi: 10.4324/9781003099857-6.
- [21] M. Roifah and D. Wenanda, "Interpreting Martabat Kematian by Muna Masyari: Reader's reception to the representation of Madurese culture in woman's writing," presented at the AIP Conference Proceedings, 2024. doi: 10.1063/5.0241710.
- [22] N. Erlita, M. N. S. Ali, and W. A. W. Mahmud, "Commodification of political economy content in Indonesian private TV: The homogenization of news and the rise of social commodification," *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, vol. 7, no. 12, 2025, doi: 10.31893/multiscience.2025568.
- [23] D. A. Sulisty, A. P. Wibawa, D. D. Prasetya, and F. A. Ahda, "LSTM-Based Machine Translation for Madurese-Indonesian," *Journal of Applied Data Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 190–199, 2023, doi: 10.47738/jads.v4i3.113.
- [24] F. Solihin and B. Choir Aidifta, "A Madurese-Indonesian machine translation system using an encoder-decoder model with an attention-based LSTM architecture," presented at the EPJ Web of Conferences, 2025. doi: 10.1051/epjconf/202534401028.
- [25] M. Misnadin, "Voice onset time and vowel quality in Madurese the role of gender and dialect," *Asia-Pacific Language Variation*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 169–185, 2021, doi: 10.1075/aplv.20008.mis.
- [26] J. Riverin-Coutlée and J. Kirby, "Acoustic cues to the perception of plosive voicing in Madurese," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 157, no. 4, pp. 2365–2375, 2025, doi: 10.1121/10.0036350.
- [27] J. Kirby, "Acoustic correlates of plosive voicing in Madurese," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 147, no. 4, pp. 2779–2790, 2020, doi: 10.1121/10.0000992.

BIOGRAPHY OF AUTHOR



Fadilah Wasiqah    is a lecturer and researcher at Universitas Terbuka Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her academic concerns are language and media-related studies and is actively involved in research on sociolinguistics, media discourse, language ideology, dialect representation, and communication in public spaces. Her academic work explores how language is framed in institutional and media contexts, particularly in Indonesian society. She can be contacted at email: fwasiqah@gmail.com