

Discourse Construction on the Impacts of Nickel Mining in Greenpeace Indonesia's Social Media Campaign Using Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis

Sitti Aglitasia Merdekawati^{1*}, Aris Munandar²

¹Master Program of Linguistics, University of Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

²Department of Intercultural Studies, University of Gadjah Mada, City, Indonesia

sittiaglitasiamerdekawati@mail.ugm.ac.id^{*}, arismunandar@ugm.ac.id²

Article History:

Submission
May 7th, 2026

Accepted
July 27th, 2026

Published
July 30th, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines how Greenpeace Indonesia constructs the discourse of nickel mining impacts through its Instagram campaign using Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Employing a qualitative descriptive approach, the study analyzed 27 textual excerpts from 15 Instagram posts published between March and June 2025. The data were selected through purposive sampling and analyzed using thematic coding and Fairclough's three-dimensional framework. The findings reveal four discourse categories comprising recurring linguistic forms, including metaphors, evaluative expressions, rhetorical questions, irony, intensification, and authoritative references. These linguistic forms represent nickel mining as an ecological and social crisis, a threat to health, a contradiction within the energy transition, and a moral-humanitarian concern. Beyond the textual dimension, the analysis demonstrates how these representations are produced through Greenpeace's digital campaign and embedded within broader socio-cultural debates on extractivism, environmental justice, and sustainability. Rather than merely identifying linguistic strategies, the study explains how textual choices interact with discursive practices and socio-cultural contexts to legitimize environmental advocacy, negotiate ideological meanings, and reshape public understandings of nickel mining. The study extends the application of Fairclough's CDA to environmental communication by demonstrating how language functions as a discursive and ideological resource in constructing environmental advocacy through social media.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis; environmental communication; Greenpeace Indonesia; Instagram; nickel mining.

INTRODUCTION

Nickel has become a strategic commodity in the global energy transition, driven by growing demand for electric vehicle batteries and renewable energy technologies (IEA, 2021). As one of the world's leading nickel producers, Indonesia plays a central role in this supply chain (USGS, 2024; Syahputra et al., 2025). The country possesses approximately 20.57% of global nickel reserves, concentrated mainly in Central Sulawesi, South Sulawesi, Southeast Sulawesi, and North Maluku (Syarifuddin, 2022). The expansion of nickel mining has generated not only economic benefits but also significant environmental and social consequences. Mining activities contribute to deforestation, coastal ecosystem degradation from tailings disposal, water pollution, and conflicts involving farmers and indigenous communities (WALHI, 2022;

Mongabay Indonesia, 2023, as cited in (Nuh & Prawira, 2023; Rahmad, 2025; H. Syahputra et al., 2025). Despite corporate claims of environmental compliance and CSR commitments, evidence suggests that short-term economic interests often outweigh environmental sustainability and community welfare (Nurhidayanti et al., 2025; R. Setiawan & Fadlhia, 2025). Systematically, these impacts have become the subject of increasing public debate, particularly across digital media.

Social media functions not only as a channel for information sharing but also as a space where environmental issues are discursively constructed. Greenpeace Indonesia actively uses Instagram to communicate the impacts of nickel mining through concise visual-textual narratives that shape public understanding (Andini, 2025; Leleang, 2025).

Although campaign discourse often appears factual and objective, meaning is constructed through linguistic strategies. Metaphors and evaluative language shape how audiences interpret environmental issues and position themselves toward them (Kusnadi, 2026; Nasution & Nurdin Kosasih, 2025; Utami & Fadly, 2025). To examine how linguistic strategies construct meaning, this study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Van Dijk (1993) argues that CDA examines how discourse reproduces social dominance, inequality, and ideological power through language. Similarly, Wodak & Meyer (2016) view CDA as an approach that uncover often implicit relationships between language, power, and society. Building on these perspective, Fairclough (2001) conceptualizes discourse as a social practice embedded in broader relations of power and ideology. This study adopts Fairclough's three-dimensional framework comprising text, discursive practice, and socio-cultural practice. The textual dimension examines linguistic features, the discursive practice dimension concerns how texts are produced, distributed, and interpreted, and the socio-cultural dimension situates discourse to broader ideological and social contexts (Lopez-Deflory et al., 2023).

Within the scope of prior studies, scholars have explored environmental communication, digital activism, Greenpeace Indonesia, and the application of critical discourse analysis to media narratives. Studies on environmental communication have consistently demonstrated the important role of digital media in facilitating environmental advocacy, public engagement, and collective action. Previous studies have primarily examined communication strategies, media relations, persuasive communication, and digital activism in environmental and mining-related contexts (Aliyan & Anshar, 2025; Elysia & Junaidi, 2025; Herlina, 2024; Lampe, 2006; Leleang, 2025; J. D. Setiawan & Arviani, 2024; I. Syahputra, 2018). Predominantly, these studies show that digital platforms function as strategic spaces for mobilizing public participation, shaping legitimacy, and strengthening environmental advocacy. However, they predominantly conceptualize language as a vehicle for message delivery rather than examining how specific linguistic choices construct environmental meanings, ideological positions, and representations of mining impacts. Therefore, the discursive mechanisms through which environmental organizations shape public understanding of mining issues remain insufficiently explored.

Previous studies on environmental communication have primarily examined communication strategies, media use, audience engagement, and digital activism, paying limited attention to the linguistic construction of environmental meanings. Likewise, CDA research has largely focused on political discourse, mainstream media, and digital public communication, demonstrating how discourse constructs political legitimacy, reproduces hegemonic narratives, and shape public opinion (Ismawati & Anindito, 2025; Rosadha et al., 2025; Siahaan et al., 2025; Sidabutar, 2025). Predominantly, environmental NGO discourse on social media remains relatively underexplored. In particular, despite the growing significance of nickel mining within Indonesia's energy transition, little is known about how Greenpeace Indonesia constructs representations of its impacts across textual, discursive, and socio-cultural

dimensions. As a result, the ideological processes through which environmental advocacy challenges extractive development remain insufficiently understood.

Addressing these gaps, this study employs Fairclough's CDA to examine how Greenpeace Indonesia constructs the discourse of nickel mining on Instagram through textual, discursive, and socio-cultural dimensions. By doing so, it contributes to environmental communication and digital activism studies through a linguistically informed analysis of environmental advocacy.

The findings are expected to advance CDA by demonstrating how environmental advocacy is discursively constructed in social media campaigns. They also enrich environmental communication and digital activism scholarship by providing a linguistically informed explanation of how Greenpeace Indonesia constructs the discourse of nickel mining within Indonesia's energy transition debate.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a qualitative descriptive design using Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The dataset consisted of 15 Instagram posts published on Greenpeace Indonesia's official Instagram account (@greenpeaceid) between March and June 2025. The posts were selected because they coincided with Greenpeace's intensified campaign on nickel mining and increasing public debate on downstream industrialization and the energy transition, providing a suitable corpus for examining the discursive construction of nickel mining.

Data were collected through documentation by compiling textual excerpts from captions and visual texts in the selected Instagram posts. Using purposive sampling, excerpts were selected if they (1) originated from Greenpeace Indonesia's official Instagram account (@greenpeaceid), (2) were published between March and June 2025, (3) explicitly addressed the impacts of nickel mining, and (4) provided sufficient linguistic material for critical discourse analysis. Repetitive, irrelevant, promotional, and non-substantive texts were excluded. Following data reduction, 73 initial excerpts were refined into 27 textual excerpts, which constituted the unit of analysis in this study. The textual excerpts were iteratively coded and grouped into thematic categories based on recurring discourse patterns. The coding process was informed by Braun & Clarke (2006) principles of thematic analysis. A similar coding procedure has also been applied by Adimasu & Debela (2025). These categories subsequently served as the analytical framework for the CDA. Data analysis followed Miles and Huberman's (1994) interactive model, involving data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing (Ahmad & Muslimah, 2021; Qomaruddin & Sa'diyah, 2024).

To ensure the trustworthiness, an audit trail documented each stage of data collection, sampling, coding, categorization, and interpretation. Peer checking with researchers experienced and familiar in CDA was conducted to assess the consistency of coding, thematic categorization, and interpretation. credibility was further enhanced through repeated reading and constant comparison until stable discursive patterns were established.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the coding process, four recurring discourse categories were identified in Greenpeace Indonesia's representation of the impacts of nickel mining: (1) ecological and social impacts, (2) body, health, and toxic exposure, (3) critique of the energy transition, and (4) moral, religious, and ethical concerns. Each category begins with a table summarizing the relevant textual data and identified linguistic forms, followed by a detailed discussion of how these

linguistic strategies construct particular representations of nickel mining across the textual, discursive, and socio-cultural dimensions of CDA.

TABLE 1. Ecological and Social Impact Category

No.	Textual Excerpt	Linguistic Evidence	Linguistic Forms
1	"Ini Harga yang Harus Dibayar: Banjir di Dampak hilirisasi nikel terhadap lingkungan"	(harga yang harus dibayar), (hilirisasi nikel) and (banjir)	Evaluative phrases, causal framing
2	"kerusakan ini bukan tak terlihat. Tapi, regulasi tetap memihak industri... Semua atas nama 'pembangunan'."	(kerusakan), (memihak), "pembangunan".	Evaluative language, lexical opposition, irony
3	"Hutan Dibabat, Sungai Rusak"	(Hutan dibabat, sungai dirusak), (dibabat, rusak).	Syntactic parallelism, destructive lexical choices
4	"Nikel Datang Membawa Sengsara."	(nikel datang), (membawa sengsara).	Personification, metaphorical expression of suffering
5	"industri nikel telah mengubah hutan jadi gersang, sungai jadi penuh lumpur ..., laut jadi tempat pembuangan limbah."	(industri nikel), (gersang, lumpur, limbah).	A metaphor of transformation, causal clause, the material expression
6	"Limbah tambang nikel dari daratan mengalir ke laut, membunuh karang, meracuni ikan,..."	(mengalir), (membunuh, meracuni), (dari daratan ke laut).	Active verb, destructive expression, causality
7	"Industrialisasi nikel yang makin masif ... telah menghancurkan hutan, tanah, sungai, dan laut ... Kini tambang nikel juga mengancam Raja Ampat ..., tempat dengan keanekaragaman hayati yang amat kaya."	(hutan, tanah, sungai, laut), (makin masif, amat kaya), (menghancurkan, mengancam).	Ecosystem enumeration, intensifying phrase, evaluative lexical choices
8	"Izin tambang cuma bakal merusak hutan, sumber air, sungai, dan laut; menghilangkan keanekaragaman hayati; merampas hak-hak masyarakat; dan menghancurkan masa depan pariwisata"	(merusak, menghilangkan, merampas, menghancurkan), (air, sungai, laut), (Izin tambang).	Evaluative lexical choices, ecosystem enumeration, causal structure, progression position

The ecological and social impact category comprises eight textual excerpts that collectively represent nickel mining as an extractive practice producing environmental degradation and social vulnerability. This finding supports Atkinson's (1996) argument that large-scale mining frequently generates ecological damage alongside unequal social consequences. Rather than reproducing development-oriented narratives, Greenpeace Indonesia foregrounds the environmental costs of mining through recurring linguistic strategies, including evaluative language, causal constructions, intensification, and ecosystem enumeration.

One of the dominant linguistic features in this category is the use of evaluative language. As seen in data (1), the evaluative phrase "*Harga yang Harus Dibayar*", frames the consequences of nickel down-streaming as a moral and social burden rather than a neutral environmental change. Combined with the causal relation between nickel down-streaming and flooding, the excerpt positions mining as the direct source of ecological degradation and portrays environmental damage as the inevitable cost of extractive development. This linguistic construction shifts attention from the economic benefits of downstream industrialization to its ecological consequences.

By framing environmental degradation as the "*Dibayar*" of nickel down-streaming, Greenpeace strategically simplifies complex environmental conflicts into emotionally resonant narratives that are easily circulated through Instagram and capable of mobilizing public concern. The finding aligns with Fairclough's (2001) view that discourse both mirrors and

actively constructs social reality. Greenpeace redefines the legitimacy of development by foregrounding ecological costs and community vulnerability that are marginalized within dominant state narratives. Consequently, environmental justice becomes the primary framework for evaluating nickel development, challenging the extractivist logic underpinning Indonesia's mining policies.

In data (2), the discourse is constructed through the interplay of evaluative language, lexical opposition, and irony, which collectively assemble mining as a politically sustained source of environmental destruction. The evaluative lexical choices "*kerusakan*" and "*memihak*" portray environmental degradation as the consequence of regulatory bias rather than an unintended effect of development. This interpretation is reinforced by the opposition between "*kerusakan ini bukan tak terlihat*" and "*regulasi tetap memihak industri*," which contrasts the visibility of ecological damage with the state's continued support for industrial interests. The ironic use of "*pembangunan*" destabilizes its conventional association with progress, recasting it as a rhetorical justification that legitimizes environmental sacrifice. The reinterpretation of *pembangunan* shifts its ideological meaning from economic progress to environmental accountability. In this discourse, the legitimacy of nickel down-streaming is no longer measured by industrial growth or the energy transition, but by its ecological and social consequences for affected communities, exposing the unequal distribution of environmental costs embedded in extractive development (Nurul & Romadhonia, 2025).

In data (3), The syntactic parallelism in "*Hutan Dibabat, Sungai Rusak*" constructs environmental destruction as a cumulative and interconnected process rather than isolated ecological incidents. The parallel structure links multiple ecosystem components within a single sequence, while the destructive lexical choices *dibabat* and *rusak* attribute environmental degradation to deliberate human intervention instead of natural processes. Collectively, these linguistic patterns represent nickel mining as a systemic ecological crisis that extends across forests, rivers, and surrounding environments.

Greenpeace foregrounds visible ecological destruction to shift public attention from the economic promises of nickel industrialization to its environmental consequences. This narrative reflects the ideological struggle through which competing discourses seek to define the social meaning of development (Fairclough, 2019). Instead of reproducing state narratives that associate mining with economic growth and the energy transition, the campaign reconstructs development through environmental justice by exposing ecological loss as evidence of the unequal costs of extractive policies. Such an interpretation is consistent with Dryzek's (2013) (in Bachmann-vargas & Koppen, 2020) view that environmental discourse challenges dominant development paradigms by bringing marginalized ecological concerns to the forefront of public debate.

In the data (4) The personification "*Nikel Datang*" and the metaphorical expression "*Membawa Sengsara*" redefine nickel as a symbol of ecological destruction and social hardship rather than a neutral economic commodity. Personification attributes agency to nickel, while the metaphor associates its arrival with suffering instead of prosperity. Together, these linguistic choices transform nickel from a strategic development resource into a representation of the unequal environmental and social consequences experienced by mining-affected communities.

This framing simplifies the complex impacts of extractive industries into an emotionally accessible narrative suited to digital environmental advocacy. Rather than reinforcing state narratives that associate nickel with industrial progress and the energy transition, the discourse redefines its legitimacy through environmental justice, exposing how extractive development distributes ecological and social burdens unevenly across affected communities. Such an interpretation reflects the ideological struggle over the meaning of development (Fairclough, 2010) and is consistent with findings that development-oriented

narratives frequently obscure the disproportionate environmental and social costs of nickel extraction (Lo et al., 2024).

In the data (5), the transformation pattern “*hutan jadi gersang, sungai jadi penuh lumpur, ... laut jadi tempat pembuangan limbah*” represents ecological degradation as a continuous process that systematically converts productive ecosystems into damaged environments. This progression is reinforced by the implicit causal attribution to *industri nikel* and ecological lexical choices such as *gersang*, *lumpur*, and *limbah*, which foreground the visible material consequences of extractive activities. Thus, these linguistic patterns portray mining as a process of ecological transformation rather than isolated environmental incidents.

This narrative reconstructs environmental change as tangible evidence of the ecological costs of extractive development, making environmental degradation more immediate and recognizable to public audiences. Such representations function to challenge development narratives that prioritize industrial expansion while marginalizing ecological sustainability, consistent with the role of environmental discourse in redefining how environmental problems are understood and evaluated (Dryzek, 2013 in Bachmann-vargas & Koppen, 2020). From an ecolinguistic perspective, this narrative also reinforces ecological values by presenting environmental degradation as the consequence of unsustainable human activities rather than an inevitable outcome of economic development (Stibbe, 2022).

In the data (6), “*Limbah tambang nikel dari daratan mengalir ke laut, membunuh karang, meracuni ikan, ...*”, the excerpt represents mining waste as a systemic ecological threat through active verbs, destructive actions, and a chain of causality. Textually, the verb “*mengalir*” shows pollution as a continuous process extending from land to sea, while “*membunuh*” and “*meracuni*”, intensify the severity of its ecological consequences. The causal sequence links mining activities with the degradation of marine ecosystems, presenting environmental damage as interconnected rather than isolated events.

Greenpeace strategically frames pollution as a structural consequence of extractive development rather than a technical environmental issue. This framing shifts public attention from individual pollution events to the broader environmental risks associated with nickel mining. Such representations resonate with studies documenting the large volume of tailings generated by Indonesia's nickel industry, including approximately 25.6 million tons of slurry annually in Morowali that has been proposed for deep-sea tailings placement (DSTP), with similar concerns reported on Obi Island (Gunarto & Mokodompit, 2024). Within this socio-environmental context, the campaign recontextualizes scientific evidence into an accessible public narrative, reinforcing ecological destruction as evidence of the unequal environmental costs embedded in extractive development.

The narrative in data (7) is constructed through ecological enumeration and spatial intensification to illustrate the extent of mining impacts. The ecological enumeration “*hutan, tanah, sungai, dan laut*” represents mining impacts as interconnected across multiple ecosystems rather than confined to a single environmental component. The intensifying phrases “*makin masif*” and “*amat kaya*” emphasize both the increasing scale of nickel industrialization and the ecological significance of Raja Ampat. Meanwhile, the evaluative verbs “*menghancurkan*” and “*mengancam*” portray mining as an expanding ecological threat rather than a neutral development activity. This framing broadens Greenpeace's campaign from local environmental damage to the protection of biodiversity and ecologically important areas.

In the data (8), the representation of mining impacts is constructed through a series of active verbs that depict progressive damage. The sequential verbs “*merusak, menghilangkan*”, “*merampas*”, and “*menghancurkan*” construct mining impacts as an escalating process that extends from environmental degradation to biodiversity loss, community rights, and local livelihoods. This progression positions “*izin tambang*” not as a neutral administrative instrument but as a mechanism that legitimizes extractive activities and their ecological and

social consequences. Greenpeace shifts responsibility from mining practices alone to the governance structures that authorize them. This framing challenges development narratives that portray mining permits as instruments of economic progress by exposing their role in institutionalizing environmental injustice and community vulnerability. Various media outlets and civil society groups have highlighted the socio-cultural and environmental consequences of nickel down-streaming, including deforestation, pollution, and conflicts over living spaces (Diphda et al., 2026; Nurul & Romadhonia, 2025). Consequently, environmental degradation is represented not as an unintended side effect of development but as a predictable outcome of extractive policies.

TABLE 2. Category: Body, Health, and Toxic Exposure

No.	Textual Excerpt	Linguistic Evidence	Linguistic Forms
1	"Harita Nickel telah mencemari sumber air di Pulau Obi dengan kromium heksavalen (kromium-6), zat kimia yang sangat beracun"	(mencemari), (sangat beracun).	Evaluative expression, intensifying adjectives
2	"Paparan terhadap kromium-6 dapat merusak tubuh: mulai dari kerusakan hati dan ginjal, erosi gigi, iritasi kulit, dan berpotensi kanker."	(hati, ginjal, gigi, kulit), (kromium-6), (merusak)	Medical /scientific terminology, evaluative verb
3	"Nexus3 Foundation dan Universitas Tadulako menemukan ikan-ikan dari perairan di Teluk Weda mengandung merkuri dan arsenik-logam berat yang sangat berbahaya bila dikonsumsi manusia."	(merkuri, arsenic)	Lexical/ terminology Scientific
4	"Penelitian tersebut juga mengungkap bahwa darah warga sekitar IWIP (Indonesia Weda Bay Industrial Park) telah terpapar logam berat"	(darah warga), (telah terpapar), (logam berat)	Biological lexical, evaluative, toxicological/scientific terminology
5	"Racun di Setiap Ombak ikan ... diuji mengandung merkuri dan arsenik-logam berat ... 47% warga sekitar IWIP terpapar merkuri dalam darah melebihi ambang aman WHO. Masyarakat yang beraktivitas di laut serta mengonsumsi kerang dan ikan yang tercemar mengalami penyakit kulit, gangguan ginjal, hati, bahkan kanker."	(merkuri, arsenic, 47%), (Racun di Setiap Ombak...), (konsumsi ...tercemar, munculnya penyakit,)	Lexical factual-scientific, metaphor, biological progression
6	"Setelah rumah dan lautnya dihancurkan, kini tubuh masyarakat Kabena yang juga 'dirusak' oleh industri nickel."	(Setelah rumah dan lautnya dihancurkan, kini tubuh masyarakat ... juga 'dirusak')	Destructive parallelism
7	"Ancaman paling besar datang untuk anak-anak. Hasil tes urin yang Satya Bumi lakukan menunjukkan bahwa konsentrasi kadmium yang tidak wajar ditemukan Paparan kadmium bersifat kumulatif dan akumulasi yang lebih tinggi biasanya ditemukan di kelompok lansia dan perempuan."	(ancaman paling besar...), (hasil tes urin, konsentrasi kadmium, paparan cadmium)	Intensification, medical- scientific terminology

The narrative constructed in data (1) through mining pollution as a scientifically verified health threat through evaluative language, scientific terminology, and intensifying adjectives. The evaluative verb "*mencemari*" and the scientific term "*kromium heksavalen (kromium-6)*" construct mining pollution as a scientifically verifiable health threat rather than a general environmental issue. The intensifying expression "*sangat beracun*", further amplifies the severity of contamination, representing polluted water as a direct risk to human health instead of a passive environmental consequence.

Greenpeace combines scientific terminology with evaluative language to strengthen the credibility of its environmental claims while making toxic contamination accessible to wider audiences. This discourse also demonstrates intertextuality by recontextualizing investigative findings documenting hexavalent chromium contamination around Harita's mining operations, where Cr6 concentrations exceeded Indonesia's legal threshold and mining activities were identified as the source of pollution (Kadera, 2025; Darmayanti et al., 2025). Situated within this broader socio-environmental context, the campaign reframes water contamination as a public health issue.

In the data (2), The discourse is formed through medical terminology, biological enumeration, and evaluative language. The evaluative verb "*merusak*" frames chromium exposure as an active source of bodily harm, while the sequence "*kerusakan hati dan ginjal, erosi gigi, iritasi kulit, dan berpotensi kanker*", portray toxic effects as cumulative and systemic rather than isolated. This biological escalation positions the human body as the site where the consequences of mining become materially visible. Similar findings are reported by Candeias et al. (2017), who argue that particulate matter released from surface mining may contain toxic elements capable of causing chronic diseases and entering the human body through inhalation, ingestion, or dermal absorption. By foregrounding the body as evidence of environmental contamination, Greenpeace shifts the discourse from ecosystem degradation to human vulnerability, reinforcing the view that the impacts of nickel mining constitute a public health and environmental justice issue.

The data (3), The toxicological terms "*merkuri*" and "*arsenic*" construct contamination as a scientifically verified health risk rather than a speculative environmental concern. Referring to findings from Nexus3 Foundation and Tadulako University (2025) strengthens the evidential basis of the narrative, while the expression "*sangat berbahaya bila dikonsumsi manusia*" shifts the discourse from marine pollution to risks transmitted through the food chain. The discourse demonstrates intertextuality by recontextualizing scientific findings into Greenpeace's campaign narrative. Environmental monitoring and human biomonitoring conducted around the Indonesia Weda Bay Industrial Park (IWIP) identified arsenic, cadmium, lead, and mercury in environmental samples and local residents, providing empirical support for the health risks highlighted in the campaign (Jaringnusa.id, 2025). Integrating scientific evidence into environmental advocacy strengthens the legitimacy of Greenpeace's claims while framing toxic exposure as a structural consequence of extractive development.

In data (4) of this study, the "*darah warga ... telah terpapar logam berat*" constructs pollution as a biologically verified consequence of mining rather than a potential environmental risk. The lexical choice "*darah*" represents the body as the ultimate site of contamination, while "*telah terpapar*" indicates that toxic exposure has already occurred, transforming environmental pollution into measurable biological evidence.

The biomonitoring findings reported by Nexus3 Foundation and Tadulako University (2025) provide empirical confirmation that heavy metal exposure has moved beyond environmental contamination into measurable human health impacts. By foregrounding contamination detected in residents' blood, Greenpeace shifts the discourse from potential exposure to demonstrated biological consequences, transforming pollution into tangible evidence of the human costs of extractive development. This framing challenges development narratives that prioritize industrial benefits by demonstrating that environmental degradation is materially embodied within affected communities.

In data (5), the discourse is constructed through toxic metaphor, factual-scientific lexical choices, and biological progression, collectively representing pollution as a threat that transcends ecological and human boundaries. The metaphor "*Racun di Setiap Ombak*" reconstructs contamination as an omnipresent condition embedded in everyday coastal life

rather than a localized mining impact. This representation is reinforced by scientific references to “*merkuri*”, “*arsenic*”, “*47% warga*”, and “*ambang aman WHO*”, which transform environmental risk into evidence based on systematic study. The progression from contaminated seawater and seafood to skin disorders, organ damage, and cancer further depicts pollution as a continuous pathway linking ecosystem degradation with human health. Greenpeace combines metaphorical language with scientific evidence to make the invisible movement of toxic substances tangible and socially meaningful. The campaign draws on findings documenting elevated heavy metal concentrations in seafood from mining-affected areas and established evidence linking prolonged arsenic exposure to chronic diseases (Boamponsem et al., 2010). This discourse positions toxicity as a systemic consequence of extractive development that circulates across ecosystems, food sources, and human bodies, challenging development narratives that separate economic growth from its ecological and public health consequences.

In the data (6), the discourse is constructed through destructive parallelism and bodily metaphor, representing mining impacts as a process from environmental destruction. The parallel structure “*Setelah rumah dan lautnya dihancurkan, kini tubuh masyarakat Kabena yang juga ‘dirusak’*” creates a cumulative sequence in which damage progressively moves from domestic and ecological spaces to the human body. The destructive verbs “*dihancurkan*” and “*dirusak*” strengthens this progression, positioning the body as the final site where the consequences of extractive activities become materially visible. The progression from home and sea to the human body expands the scope of environmental harm beyond damaged ecosystems to the lived experiences of affected communities. This discursive strategy dissolves the conventional boundary between nature and society by presenting ecological destruction as inseparable from human existence. Accordingly, mining is represented not simply as an environmental issue but as a development model that reshapes the conditions of everyday life for communities living in extractive regions.

In data (7), the discourse is constructed through medical terminology and threat intensification, representing pollution as a clinically verifiable health risk. Expressions such as “*hasil tes urin*” and “*konsentrasi kadmium yang tidak wajar*”, which employs medical-scientific terminology to provide factual legitimacy to claims of contamination. Meanwhile, the phrase “*paparan kadmium bersifat kumulatif*” signifies that toxins are portrayed as a threat that acts cumulatively and over the long term within the body. The use of biomedical terminology draws on the epistemic authority of scientific discourse, transforming Greenpeace's environmental claims into medically grounded evidence. This interdiscursive strategy shifts the debate from environmental allegations to measurable health impacts, strengthening the campaign's critique of extractive development.

TABLE 3. Category: Critique of the Energy Transition / The Irony of “Green Energy”

No.	Textual Excerpt	Linguistic Evidence	Linguistic Forms
1	“Apakah layak diklaim sebagai energi bersih, kalau faktanya merusak lingkungan dan merampas ruang hidup masyarakat?”	(<i>energi bersih vs merusak</i>).	Rhetorical question, semantic opposition
2	“Apakah ini harga yang harus dibayar demi demam kendaraan listrik yang diklaim ramah lingkungan?”	(<i>demam kendaraan listrik</i>)	Rhetorical question, metaphor
3	“Transisi energi tak boleh dibayar dengan kerusakan laut dan lenyapnya pulau-pulau kecil”	(<i>tak boleh dibayar</i>), (<i>tak boleh</i>).	Metaphor, normative negation
4	“#TransisiEnergi harus adil. Tidak boleh menggantikan satu krisis dengan krisis baru”	(<i>harus adil</i>), (<i>tidak boleh</i>).	Normative clause

5	"Saat ini, Raja Ampat, tempat yang dijuluki Surga Terakhir di dunia, berada dalam ancaman kehancuran oleh tambang nikel. Hilirisasi nikel yang digadang sebagai jalan menuju transisi energi bersih, ironisnya telah meninggalkan jejak kehancuran ..."	(Surga Terakhir di dunia), (ancaman kehancuran).	Metaphor, antithesis, irony, intensification
6	"Industri nikel yang katanya demi transisi energi hijau justru menghadirkan ironi: eksploitasi alam dan pengabaian hak-hak masyarakat lokal."	(transisi energi), (eksploitasi alam), and (pengabaian).	Irony, evaluative opposition

In data (1), the discourse is constructed through a rhetorical question and semantic opposition that challenge the legitimacy of the 'clean energy' narrative. The phrase "*layak diklaim sebagai energi bersih*" contrasts the positive image of nickel with the evaluative verbs "*merusak*" and "*merampas*", exposing a contradiction between sustainability claims and the ecological and social consequences of extraction. This tension reframes clean energy as a contested discourse rather than an unquestioned environmental ideal. As Siregar & Shu'Udin (2026) argue, evaluating green development requires examining not only its environmental goals but also how its costs and benefits are distributed across policy process. Greenpeace therefore redirects attention from the promise of energy transition to the unequal burdens imposed on mining-affected communities.

Data (2), the discourse employs a rhetorical question alongside economic and metaphorical expressions to problematize the normalization of ecological sacrifice within the energy transition. The phrases "*harga yang harus dibayar*" and "*demam kendaraan listrik*" reconstruct environmental degradation as the hidden cost of technological progress, exposing the contradiction between sustainability claims and the extractive practices that sustain them. This discourse contests the assumption that energy transition is inherently sustainable by revealing the extractive logic underpinning low-carbon technologies. It aligns with broader debates on green extractivism, which argue that decarbonization often redistributes ecological burdens to resource-producing regions rather than eliminating them (Basuhi et al., 2024).

In data (3), the discourse is constructed through normative negation and an economic metaphor to establish the ethical limits of the energy transition. The expression "*tak boleh dibayar*" rejects the idea that environmental degradation can be treated as an acceptable cost of development, positioning the destruction of marine ecosystems and small islands as morally non-negotiable. This interpretation is consistent with CREA & CELIOS (2024), which reports that the long-term economic benefits of nickel smelters decline while environmental degradation continues to affect agriculture, fisheries, and coastal ecosystems. Rather than presenting ecological damage as a temporary trade-off, the discourse questions the legitimacy of an energy transition that generates irreversible environmental losses.

In data (4), the discourse is constructed through normative clauses and crisis-based opposition to emphasize demands for justice within the energy transition narrative. The phrase "*harus adil*" functions as a normative marker that establishes justice as the primary condition for the legitimacy of the energy transition. Meanwhile, the phrase "*tidak boleh menggantikan satu krisis dengan krisis baru*" forms an opposition that rejects the logic of substitution, that is, resolving the climate crisis by creating new ecological and social crises. Through this structure, data (4) presents the energy transition as a discourse that must be critically examined, because without justice, it risks reproducing new forms of harm in the name of a solution.

In data (5), the discourse is constructed through ecological metaphor, threat intensification, and irony to question the coherence of the clean energy narrative. The ecological metaphor "*Surga Terakhir di dunia*" attributes exceptional ecological significance to Raja Ampat, while "*dalam ancaman kehancuran*" amplifies the perceived severity of mining expansion. The contrast between "*transisi energi bersih*" and "*jejak kehancuran*"

creates irony by exposing an incompatibility between environmental promises and material outcomes. As Partington (2007) argues, irony functions as an implicit form of criticism that invites audiences to recognize contradictions without stating them directly. From a CDA perspective, this contradiction destabilizes the taken-for-granted meaning of sustainability by revealing that its legitimacy depends on excluding the ecological costs of mineral extraction from the dominant narrative.

In data (6), the discourse is built through irony and evaluative opposition to question the legitimacy of the “*energi hijau*”. The expression “*katanya demi transisi energi hijau*” functions as a skepticism toward official sustainability claims, while “*justru*” creates a contrast that highlights the tension between an ideal narrative and the reality of its impact. This contrast is reinforced through evaluative language “*eksploitasi alam*” and “*pengabaian hak-hak masyarakat lokal*”, which portrays the energy with ecological degradation and social exclusion rather than sustainability. From a CDA perspective, the discourse exposes how *green energy* operates as an ideological resource that legitimizes continued mineral extraction while marginalizing its environmental and social costs. This interpretation reflects Bridge's (2004) concept of the *green resource paradox*, whereby decarbonization remains dependent on intensified resource extraction, a contradiction likely to deepen as demand for EV battery minerals continues to grow (IEA, 2021; Maspul, 2025).

TABLE. 4 Moral, Religious, and Ethical Categories

No.	Textual Excerpt	Linguistic Evidence	Linguistic Forms
1	“ <i>tak ada ‘kemajuan’ yang layak dirayakan jika ia dibangun di atas tubuh-tubuh yang sakit, sungai-sungai yang tercemar, dan udara yang dirampas dari mereka yang paling tidak berdaya untuk membela diri.</i> ”	(<i>dibangun ... tubuh-tubuh yang sakit</i>), (<i>tak ada ‘kemajuan’ yang layak dirayakan</i>), (<i>dirampas, tidak berdaya</i>).	Material metaphors, irony, moral intensification
2	“ <i>Jika bernapas saja harus diperjuangkan, maka jelas: ada yang salah dengan arah pembangunan kita</i> ”	(<i>bernapas... harus diperjuangkan</i>), (<i>ada yang salah</i>).	Hyperbole, evaluative judgement
3	“ <i>Tambang Nikel Halmahera: Krisis Iman, Lingkungan, dan Kemanusiaan</i> ”	(<i>krisis iman</i>), (<i>krisis iman, lingkungan, kemanusiaan</i>).	Moral intensification, rhetoric
4	“ <i>Di balik gemerlap tambang nikel yang menjanjikan ‘kemajuan’, ada luka yang menganga di Halmahera, menyisakan kehancuran bagi bumi dan manusia. Krisis ini bukan hanya soal lingkungan, tapi juga soal iman, nilai, dan tanggung jawab kita terhadap ciptaan Tuhan.</i> ”	(<i>dibalik gemerlap ...</i>), (<i>luka yang menganga</i>).	Symbolic opposition, metaphore of suffering
5	“ <i>PBNU pun pernah menegaskan, eksploitasi yang merusak alam adalah haram.</i> ”	(<i>PBNU</i>), (<i>merusak</i>), (<i>haram</i>).	Diction of authoritative legitimacy, evaluative expressions
6	“ <i>Jangan biarkan ‘Surga Terakhir’ Indonesia hancur oleh keserakahan.</i> ”	(<i>Surga Terakhir</i>), (<i>hancur oleh keserakahan</i>).	Ecological metaphors, lexical moral

In data (1), the discourse is constructed through irony, material metaphors, and moral intensification to reject the legitimacy of the idea of progress in the development narrative. The phrase “*tak ada ‘kemajuan’ yang layak dirayakan*” creates irony by placing quotation marks around the word “*kemajuan*”. The term is positioned as a claim that deserves to be questioned. This structure is reinforced by a series of material metaphors in the phrase “*dibangun di atas tubuh-tubuh yang sakit, sungai-sungai yang tercemar, dan udara yang dirampas*”, that represents development as a project built upon biological suffering, ecological destruction, and social inequality. Rather than evaluating development through economic achievement, the discourse reconstructs progress as an ethical category whose legitimacy depends on its

consequences for human wellbeing and ecological integrity. This moral redefinition challenges development narratives that separate economic success from environmental responsibility.

In data (2), biological hyperbole and evaluative judgment redefine development through the lens of everyday survival rather than economic growth. The phrase “*bernapas saja harus diperjuangkan*” forms a hyperbole related to a biological activity (breathing) that must be fought for. The clause “*ada yang salah dengan arah pembangunan kita*”, then functions as a direct evaluation that identifies development as the source of structural dysfunction. Data (2) represents ‘*Pembangunan*’ as a system that has failed to guarantee the most basic living conditions for society. By presenting clean air as something that must be fought for, the discourse questions development models that prioritize industrial expansion while externalizing environmental costs. This critique resonates with debates on green extractivism, which argue that low-carbon development often reproduces unequal environmental burdens instead of resolving them (Dunlap & Jakobsen, 2020 in Basuhi et al., 2024).

In data (3), Greenpeace Indonesia constructs the discourse through a tripartite rhetorical structure and moral intensification. The rhetoric refers to three interrelated global environmental crises. The phrase “*Krisis Iman, Lingkungan, dan Kemanusiaan*” forms a tripartite structure that organizes the impacts of mining into three domains simultaneously: spiritual, ecological, and social. The choice of the term “*krisis iman*” extends the critique into the moral and ethical realms, while “*lingkungan*” and “*kemanusiaan*” emphasize that the impacts of mining touch upon human relationships with nature and with one another. This data represents nickel mining not merely as an industrial issue, but as a multidimensional crisis that simultaneously undermines ecological, moral, and humanitarian order.

In data (4), a narrative is formed through symbolic opposition, metaphors of suffering, and moral extrapolation to portray mining as a multidimensional crisis. The phrase “*di balik gemerlap tambang nickel*” creates an opposition between the image of progress that appears profitable and the hidden reality of destruction. This opposition is reinforced by the metaphor “*luka yang menganga*”, which represents the impact of the mine as open, deep, and ongoing damage. The narrative is then expanded through the phrase “*bukan hanya soal lingkungan, tapi juga soal iman, nilai, dan tanggung jawab*”, which shifts the mining issue from an ecological problem toward a moral and ethical crisis. The discourse relocates environmental degradation from the domain of technical governance to that of moral responsibility, inviting audiences to evaluate mining through ethical rather than economic criteria.

In data (5), the discourse combines religious authority with moral evaluation to redefine environmental exploitation as an ethical transgression. Referring to PBNU, the statement “*eksploitasi yang merusak alam adalah haram*” shifts environmental degradation from a policy issue to a moral judgment, where “*haram*” signifies conduct that is religiously unacceptable rather than merely environmentally harmful. This interpretation is consistent with PBNU's ruling, which links the prohibition of mining activities to the environmental destruction they produce (Ishom, 2024). By incorporating this religious position, Greenpeace extends the legitimacy of its environmental advocacy beyond scientific and legal reasoning, encouraging extractive practices to be assessed through shared ethical and religious values.

In data (6), the combines ecological metaphor and moral evaluation to attribute environmental destruction to ethical failure rather than technical or economic necessity. The metaphor “*Surga Terakhir*” constructs Raja Ampat as an ecologically irreplaceable space whose value exceeds economic calculation, while the lexical choice “*keserakahan*” identifies greed as the underlying motive driving environmental degradation. Rather than portraying ecological loss as an inevitable consequence of development, the discourse assigns moral responsibility to human agency, encouraging audiences to evaluate extractive practices through ethical accountability. From a Fairclough's CDA perspective, this moral attribution challenges narratives that normalize resource exploitation by exposing the value systems that sustain them.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the analysis, Greenpeace Indonesia construct the impacts of nickel mining through systematic linguistic strategies rather than through factual reporting alone. By the four discourse categories, the campaign consistently represents mining as an ecological, social, ethical, and political issue. This representation is built through metaphors, evaluative language, rhetorical questions, irony, scientific terminology, and moral authority. These linguistic choices do not simply describe environmental damage. They guide audiences to question the legitimacy of extractive development and the narrative that nickel mining is an inevitable pathway to a green energy transition. From Fairclough's perspective, the findings demonstrate how discourse operates across three interconnected dimensions. At the textual level, linguistic features construct particular evaluations of mining and sustainability. At the level of discursive practice, Greenpeace combines scientific evidence with ecological, humanitarian, and religious narratives to challenge institutional claims surrounding downstream industrialization and green energy. At the socio-cultural level, this discourse reflects broader ideological struggles between economic development, environmental justice, and extractivism. The campaign therefore positions the energy transition as a contested social issue rather than a universally accepted environmental solution. The study contributes to the application of Fairclough's CDA within environmental communication and digital activism by showing how social media campaigns construct environmental advocacy through the interaction of language, ideology, and power. Environmental organizations may strengthen campaign credibility by integrating scientific evidence with persuasive linguistic strategies that remain accessible to public audiences. Likewise, policy communication should present the energy transition in a more transparent and balanced manner by acknowledging its environmental and social consequences alongside its economic benefits. Future research could be developed by expanding the analysis may compare how environmental organizations, governments, industries, and news media construct competing discourses on nickel mining and the energy transition. Comparative studies across different social media platforms would also reveal how platform characteristics shape environmental communication. In addition, integrating Critical Discourse Analysis with multimodal analysis or audience reception studies would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how environmental campaigns are produced, interpreted, and negotiated in digital spaces.

REFERENCES

- Adimasu, N., & Debela, K. (2025). *A critical review of qualitative research methods by Monique Hennink*, Inge Hutter, and Ajay Bailey. *Advances*, 6(3), 100–104. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.advances.20250603.13>
- Ahmad, & Muslimah. (2021). *Memahami teknik pengolahan dan analisis data kualitatif*. Proceedings of the Palangka Raya International and National Conference on Islamic Studies (PICIS), 1, 173–186. <https://e-proceedings.iain-palangkaraya.ac.id/index.php/PICIS/article/view/605>
- Aliyan, L. S., & Anshar, M. (2025). *Peran media digital mengadvokasi masyarakat dalam konflik tambang di Kabupaten Bantaeng*. *JOTIKA*, 5(1), 24–30. <https://journal.jotika.co.id/index.php/JME/article/view/248>
- Andini, L. A. (2025). *Media sosial sebagai ruang digital activism generasi muda dalam memperjuangkan isu lingkungan*. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, 8, 127–137.
- Atkinson, K. (1996). *Mine-Derived Metal Pollution on the Isle of Man (Great Britain): Process and Effects*.
- Bachmann-Vargas, P., & Van Koppen, C. S. A. K. (2020). *Disentangling environmental and development discourses in a peripheral spatial context: The case of the Aysén Region, Patagonia, Chile*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1070496520937041>
- Basuhi, R., Bhuwalka, K., Moore, E. A., Diersen, I., Malik, R. H., Young, E., Billy, R. G., Stoner, R., Ceder, G., Mu, D. B., & Roth, R. (2024). *Clean energy demand must secure sustainable nickel supply*. *Joule*, 2960–

2973. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2024.10.008>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology*. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Boamponsem, L. K., Adam, J. I., Dampare, S. B., Owusu-Ansah, E., & Addae, G. (2010). *Heavy metals level in streams of Tarkwa gold mining area of Ghana*. *Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Research*, 2(3), 504–527.
- Candeias, C., Avila, P., & Teixeira, P. (2017). *Mining Activities: Health Impacts*.
- CREA, & CELIOS. (2024). *Membantah Mitos Nilai Tambah: Menilik Ulang Industri Hilirisasi Nikel*.
- Darmayanti, P. I., Paramesvari, M. A. G., Setiari, P. R. A., Pratiwi, P. I., & Maharani, P. B. (2025). *Analisis penerapan akuntansi lingkungan pada kasus pencemaran air oleh Harita Group di Pulau Obi*.
- Diphda, B. C. (2026). *Unraveling green extractivism: The case of nickel downstreaming in the Indonesia Morowali Industrial Park*. *Karsa*, 34(1). <https://doi.org/10.19105/karsa.v34i1.23862>
- Elysia, & Junaidi, A. (2025). *Peran media sosial Instagram dalam meningkatkan kesadaran generasi muda terhadap isu lingkungan*. *Prologia*, 9(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.24912/pr.v9i1.27668>
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power (2nd ed.)*. Pearson Education.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language (2nd ed.)*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2019). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language (3rd ed.)*. Routledge.
- Gunarto, E., & Mokodompit, E. (2024). *Dampak pencemaran limbah tambang nikel terhadap kehidupan masyarakat pesisir*. *Jurnal Cakrawala Ilmiah*, 4(4), 269–274.
- Herlina, O. (2024). *Kampanye meningkatkan awareness dampak krisis lingkungan di Instagram Greenpeaceid*. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi AKRAB*. <https://www.ojs.akrb.ac.id/index.php/AKRAB/article/view/90>
- International Energy Agency. (2021). *Global energy review 2021*. <https://www.iea.org/reports/global-energy-review-2021>
- Ismawati, E., & Anindito, K. A. (2025). *Peran ko-teks dan konteks dalam memahami pesan politik di media sosial*. *Prosiding Kongres Internasional Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia*. <https://doi.org/10.51817/kimli.v2025i.151>
- Jaring Nusa Kawasan Timur Indonesia. (n.d.). *Temuan Nexus3 dan Universitas Tadulako di Weda Bay: 47% responden memiliki kadar merkuri yang melebihi batas aman*. <https://jaringnusa.id>
- Kusnadi, G. (2026). *Conceptual metaphors in perfume product reviews on the TikTok online platform*. *Allure*, 6(1), 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.26877/allure.v6i1.26144>
- Kadera Tempat Bertutur. (n.d.). *Investigasi: Lebih dari satu dekade, Harita Group racuni sumber air warga Kawasi*. <https://kadera.id>
- Lampe, I. (2006). *Pola komunikasi gerakan sosial komunitas sekitar tambang migas Tiaka: Refleksi identitas etnik lokal*. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 3(5), 860–873. <https://doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v3i5.334>
- Leleang, A. I. T. (2025). *Strategi komunikasi media relations untuk membangun reputasi dan kepercayaan publik: Studi pada Greenpeace dan Kitabisa.com*. SENAKOM: Prosiding Seminar Nasional Komunikasi, 3(1), 1–15.
- Lo, M. G. Y., Morgans, C. L., Santika, T., Voigt, M., Davies, Z. G., & Struebig, M. J. (2024). *Nickel mining reduced forest cover in Indonesia but had mixed outcomes for well-being*. *One Earth*, 7(11), 2019–2033. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2024.10.010>
- Lopez-Deflory, C., Perron, A., & Miro-Bonet, M. (2023). *Linguistic characteristics of texts: Methodological notes on a missed step in critical discourse analysis*. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231156343>
- Magpul, K. A. (2025). *Sacrificing paradise: Indonesia's green energy ambitions and the future of Raja Ampat*, 2(3), 1–22.
- Nasution, A. K., & Kosasih, N. (2025). *Analisis naratif kampanye Jerhemy Owen tentang pengelolaan sampah Banyumas di media sosial*. *Journal Publish (Basic and Applied Research Publication on Communications)*, 4(1), 90–104. <https://doi.org/10.35814/njqv4z74>
- Nexus3 Foundation, & Universitas Tadulako. (2025). *The extension impact of nickel industry activities in Weda Bay, Central Halmahera, North Maluku, Indonesia*.
- Nuh, S. K., & Prawira, I. (2023). *An ecolinguistic analysis of climate change news in Indonesia: The case of Mongabay*. *E3S Web of Conferences (ICOBAR)*. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202342602119>
- Nurhidayanti, H., Haeruddin, M. I. M., Aslam, A. P., Anwar, & Nurman. (2025). *Pengaruh corporate social responsibility (CSR) dan likuiditas terhadap kinerja keuangan perusahaan pertambangan yang terdaftar LQ45 di Bursa Efek Indonesia periode 2020–2024*. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business (RIGGS)*, 4(3), 8596–8609. <https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i3.3310>
- Nurul, F., & Romadhonia, L. (2025). *Hegemony and counter-hegemony in the narrative of nickel downstreaming in Indonesia: A critical theory study*. 2(2), 129–146.
- Partington, A. (2007). *Irony and reversal of evaluation*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 1547–1569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.009>

- Qomaruddin, & Sa'diyah, H. (2024). *Kajian teoritis tentang teknik analisis data dalam penelitian kualitatif: Perspektif Spradley, Miles dan Huberman*. Journal of Management, Accounting and Administration, 1(2), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.52620/jomaa.v1i2.93>
- Rahmad, R. (2025). *Analisis wacana kritis kerusakan lingkungan dalam perspektif Islam di media Mongabay Indonesia*. In S. Said, M. M. Amran, Z. B. Aini, & H. A. Khafidz (Eds.), *Prosiding Kolokium Risalah Islam* (pp. 113–124). Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. <https://dakwahkepimpinan.my/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Kolokium-Risalah-Islam-prosiding-v3.pdf#page=113>
- Rosadha, S. A., Putri, R. D. M., Putri, T. A., & Ahmad, N. (2025). *Representasi isu lingkungan dalam media arus utama Indonesia: Sebuah analisis wacana kritis*. Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research, 5(2), 3731–3738. <https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v5i2.18838>
- Setiawan, J. D., & Arviani, H. (2024). *Analisis strategi komunikasi persuasif Pandawara Group dalam meningkatkan kesadaran masyarakat Indonesia terhadap kebersihan lingkungan melalui media sosial*. JIIP (Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan), 7, 6229–6239. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v7i7.5191>
- Setiawan, R., & Fadlhia, M. N. (2025). *Green but extractive: Diplomasi hilirisasi nikel Indonesia dan politik eksklusif sosial di Weda Bay*. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Politik, 5(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.51622/jispol.v5i1.2721>
- Siahaan, E. M., Sinulingga, S. Y., Damanik, B. A., & Ritonga, M. U. (2025). *Analisis wacana kritis Norman Fairclough terhadap tagar #KaburAjaDulu dalam berita media daring Kompas.com dan Detik.com*. Inovasi Pendidikan Nusantara, 6(2), 517–531. <https://ejournals.com/ojs/index.php/ipn/article/view/1787>
- Sidabutar, T. (2025). *Analisis wacana politik pada media sosial: Strategi persuasi dan pembentukan opini publik*. Sinonim: Journal of Language and Literature, 3(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.54209/sinonim.v3i01.446>
- Siregar, M., & Shu'Udin, A. (2026). *Narasi green development dalam kebijakan hilirisasi nikel Indonesia: Analisis wacana kritis atas kebijakan dan kontestasi makna*. Soshumdik, 5(1), 161–181. <https://doi.org/10.56444/soshumdik.v3i1.3464>
- Stibbe, A. (2022). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Syahputra, H., Pinem, W., & Ramadhan, T. (2025). *Tambang nikel dan janji "ekonomi hijau": Investigasi politik kewarganegaraan dalam narasi pembangunan berkelanjutan*. Journal of Government, Social and Politics, 11(1), 137–144. [https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2025.vol11\(2\).24223](https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2025.vol11(2).24223)
- Syahputra, I. (2018). *Strategi media relations perusahaan pertambangan timah dan agenda setting media di Bangka Belitung*. Jurnal ASPIKOM, 6(1), 91–105.
- Syarifuddin, N. (2022). *Pengaruh industri pertambangan nikel terhadap kondisi lingkungan maritim di Kabupaten Morowali*. Jurnal Riset & Teknologi Terapan Kemaritiman, 1, 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.25042/jrt2k.122022.03>
- Utami, M. R., & Fadly, A. (2025). *Bahasa evaluatif dalam pidato calon presiden 2024 dan implikasinya dalam pembelajaran bahasa*. PRATYAKSA: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora, 1(3), 48–54.
- United States Geological Survey. (n.d.). Nickel statistics and information. <https://www.usgs.gov/centers/national-minerals-information-center/nickel-statistics-and-information>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Principles of critical discourse analysis*. Discourse & Society, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.