
Netizens' Views on the Theft of Artists' Works by AI on Social Media X Against the Midjourney Lawsuit Case

M. Jamaludin Ali Wafi¹, Afidaria², Achmad Danillah Y³, Salsabila Qurrotu'ain N.F⁴, Sastia Widiarisma⁵, Naila Tera Monadia R.⁶, Mochammad Ilham F⁷, Abdol Kodir⁸, Sri Wahyuningsih⁹

1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 Universitas Trunodjoyo Madura, Jawa Timur, Surabaya, Indonesia

Corresponding author: aliwafimuhammad34@gmail.com

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.56480/jln.v6i1.1606>

Received: October 01, 2025

Revised: October 19, 2025

Accepted: November 20, 2025

Abstract

This study examines online communities' views on the alleged art theft by artificial intelligence (AI) on social media platform X, focusing on the lawsuit between Disney and Midjourney. The purpose of this study is to analyze how the general public discusses and positions the issue of AI copyright, and how they construct meanings related to creativity, originality, and ownership of works today. This study uses a qualitative approach with a case study method and is based on a constructivist paradigm, and applies the Critical Discourse Analysis model developed by Teun A. Van Dijk. Data were obtained through in-depth interviews with selected informants and observations of netizen conversations on platform X. The results show two main opposing views: those who view the use of AI as a violation of ethics and copyright that is detrimental to human creativity, and those who consider AI to be a natural technological innovation that supports the creative process. This study concludes that social media plays a role in the formation of meaning, where people actively discuss, debate, and negotiate their understanding of AI, copyright, and creativity.

Keywords– Digital Discourse; Copyright; Netizen Perception; Social Media X



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) serves as a pivotal cornerstone in the current digital revolution, fundamentally altering how humans interact and construct messages. In the realms of communication and media, AI has moved beyond being a simple tool; it has transformed the way we perceive creativity, authenticity, and intellectual property. The rise of image-generating technologies such as Midjourney, DALL·E, and Stable Diffusion has provided social media users with an unprecedented creative experience, yet it has simultaneously ignited deep-seated anxieties regarding the disappearing boundaries between human artistry and machine-generated outputs. This tension reached a breaking point in June 2025, when Disney Enterprises and Universal Studios officially filed a lawsuit against Midjourney Inc., alleging copyright infringement and the unauthorized replication of their iconic characters. This landmark case has triggered a global firestorm of digital conversations on platforms like X (Twitter), where users express a spectrum of emotions ranging from awe to a profound fear for the future of human creators.

Current discourse views AI as an unavoidable creative assistant that is now permanently embedded in the evolution of modern technology. However, the debates surrounding the Disney vs. Midjourney case prove that social media platforms are no longer just information-sharing hubs; they have become digital courtrooms where ethics, originality, and copyright laws are collectively negotiated. Through comments, posts, and threads, social media users are forming a digital narrative that reflects their deep-seated concerns regarding "art theft" by AI. In this context, digital communication acts as a mirror, reflecting how society evaluates the increasingly complex relationship between human labor, technological advancement, and the sanctity of creative expression.

Based on primary interviews with university students who actively use X (Twitter), AI is perceived as a "creativity aid" that has become impossible to ignore. However, these students also noted that the "theft of work" debate frequently dominates their social media timelines. Within the case study of the

Disney and Midjourney legal battle, public debate reveals clashing perspectives: one side expresses outrage toward Midjourney for exploiting artistic labor, while another group frames these practices as an inevitable progression of technology. This collision of meanings suggests that in the digital era, the very definitions of creativity and ownership are being rewritten through the lens of those who either support the artists or champion the machines.

On platforms like X, the dominant narrative among concerned netizens is that AI models like Midjourney have "stolen" the soul of art by scraping millions of copyrighted images to mimic styles and designs without compensation. This anxiety is rooted in the technical reality of AI training, which involves scraping massive datasets of visual art without the consent of the original creators. Many netizens show deep empathy for professional artists, arguing that these practices devalue human creative labor and produce derivative works that pose significant ethical and legal problems. As Maulana et al. (2025) suggest, this digital scraping is seen by many as a predatory practice that undermines the livelihoods of those who provide the data for the AI's "learning" process.

A segment of the AI user community argues that AI is merely a statistical tool that does not "copy" work in the traditional sense, but rather learns patterns. They contend that an artistic "style" cannot be patented under current copyright frameworks, making the AI's output a new form of transformative expression. On the other hand, many users on X highlight that current regulations are woefully inadequate and fail to provide sufficient protection for human artists, allowing AI works to circulate without proper attribution or permission. This highlights a desperate global need for clearer copyright regulations to address generative technology, ensuring that creators are acknowledged and compensated in an AI-saturated market.

Consequently, this research does not only highlight the legal and technological aspects of the issue but also describes how social media serves as an arena for "meaning production," where different groups strive to define the new boundaries of human creativity. The emergence of generative AI has changed how

we create, produce, and distribute visual work in digital spaces. While platforms like Midjourney allow high-quality images to be generated from simple text prompts, they also trigger a crisis of identity for the creative industry. The debate is no longer about whether the technology works, but whether its implementation respects the social contract between society and its creators.

While previous studies have explored the general intersection of AI and copyright, there is a significant research gap regarding how netizens specifically frame the Midjourney legal cases. Current Indonesian copyright regulations, for instance, are not yet prepared for the complexities of generative AI, and existing studies often overlook how the public reconstructs these issues on social media. Brewer et al. (2025) note that negative framing on digital platforms influences public perception of AI as a threat, yet specific case-based dynamics remain under-researched. Therefore, this study is essential to understand how netizens build meaning and argue about AI "work theft" on X. By analyzing these digital conversations, this research provides both theoretical and practical benefits for developing digital communication studies, technological ethics, and copyright protection in the age of generative AI.

2. Method

This research is anchored in the constructivist paradigm, a philosophical framework that perceives social reality not as an objective, fixed entity, but as a continuous construction born from human interaction, experience, and collective understanding. Unlike the positivist approach, which seeks to measure phenomena through quantifiable data, constructivism emphasizes that "truth" is relative and contextual. Within this study, the paradigm serves as a critical lens to interpret how netizens on platform X (Twitter) build and negotiate their perceptions regarding the alleged theft of artwork by Artificial Intelligence (AI), specifically in the high-profile legal battle involving Midjourney and Disney. This issue transcends mere legalities; it is a fluid social phenomenon where digital users actively shape opinions and perceptions through rapid, massive interactions,

making the constructivist view essential for capturing the shifting meanings of ethics and creativity in the digital age.

The methodology adopts a qualitative case study approach to facilitate an in-depth exploration of the digital discourse surrounding Midjourney's alleged copyright violations. This approach is chosen because the research focuses on understanding the intricate layers of meaning, perception, and social thought rather than statistical measurement. A case study allows the researcher to preserve the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events, specifically the discursive dynamics that emerge from threads, comments, and digital interactions. By highlighting this specific case, the study can explore how reality is constructed in a real-world digital context, where the boundaries of technology, ethics, and law intersect. This qualitative framework is designed not to produce universal generalizations, but to offer a comprehensive understanding of how specific social groups interpret the conflict between human creativity and generative algorithms.

In line with the constructivist perspective, the research positions its subjects as social actors who are actively involved in the production of digital discourse. The study utilizes two primary data streams: primary data consisting of digital conversations on X, and supporting data derived from in-depth interviews with ten active students from the University of Trunojoyo Madura (UTM) and the National Development University (UPN) "Veteran." These students represent a tech-savvy generation capable of providing reflective insights into the digital public sphere. The object of the study is not merely the content of their posts, but the underlying interpretations, emotions, and ideological stances they take—whether supporting the artists, championing AI innovation, or defending corporate interests. This dual focus ensures that the research captures both the visible artifacts of communication and the deeper meanings constructed by these digital participants.

To ensure the selection of information-rich sources, this research employs purposive sampling followed by a snowball sampling technique. Purposive sampling is utilized to identify initial informants who meet specific criteria, such as having a deep understanding of AI-related art theft issues and active engagement with the Midjourney vs. Disney discourse on X. Once these primary

observers are identified, snowball sampling allows the researcher to expand the network of informants based on recommendations from initial participants. This strategy is particularly effective for case studies involving complex social debates, as it helps the researcher reach diverse perspectives that might otherwise be inaccessible. By using these students as "reflective observers" rather than just personal subjects, the study gains a sophisticated interpretation of how digital conversations function as a site for social meaning-making.

Data analysis in this study follows an interactive and continuous model, involving data organization, reading, thematic identification, and verification. Following the framework proposed by Rahmani et al. (2025), the researcher begins by organizing raw digital artifacts—transcripts, screenshots, and audiovisual materials—into manageable categories. This is followed by a comprehensive reading of the data to grasp the general social background and the specific positions of various informants. The researcher then identifies recurring patterns and themes, such as "digital artist justice," "technological control," and "ethical conflicts." Finally, these findings are presented in a narrative format and verified through source triangulation, ensuring that the final conclusions accurately reflect the factual and consistent dynamics of the social reality constructed on platform X.

3. Result and Discussion

In the realm of case study research, data analysis serves as a vital tool for understanding how language, symbols, and digital representations on social media actively construct social meaning and influence public perception. This research moves beyond a superficial reading of text to uncover the layers of digital conversation formed through the massive, rapid interactions between social media users. Unlike a phenomenological approach that seeks the inner essence of a subjective experience, this study focuses on how digital discourse regarding "AI art theft" is produced, distributed, and reshaped by broader social, cultural, and political dynamics. By analyzing these public artifacts, the researcher can observe

the real-time formation of collective attitudes toward intellectual property in the age of generative technology.

The digital debate on platform X (Twitter) was catalyzed by a high-impact post from the Film Updates account, which announced: "Disney and Universal have filed a lawsuit against AI company Midjourney over tools that allow users to generate images featuring their characters." This single post generated an immense ripple effect across the platform, garnering 960,000 views and thousands of interactions, including likes, retweets, and bookmarks (as seen in Figure A.1 and A.2). This announcement acted as the primary discursive spark, triggering a cascade of subsequent posts that scrutinized Midjourney's practice of utilizing Disney's character models without explicit authorization.

On June 11, 2025, the discourse intensified when Ed Newton-Rex posted a statement on X asserting that Disney's legal intervention was a necessary stand against systemic plagiarism by AI firms. This post served as a rallying point for a specific social group—the "Pro-Disney" or "Pro-Artist" faction—who framed the lawsuit as a righteous defense of creative integrity. For this group, Disney's actions were perceived not just as a corporate legal maneuver, but as a symbolic victory for the principle that plagiarism is ethically indefensible. Netizens in this camp offered overwhelming support, viewing the lawsuit as a much-needed boundary against the exploitation of human creative labor.

Within this supportive group, individual voices like Reid Southern, an artist whose work had also been scraped by Midjourney, amplified the narrative on June 12, 2025. Southern's public endorsement of Disney's lawsuit (Figure A.3) was rooted in personal grievance and professional solidarity; he expressed profound frustration over the perceived theft of his portfolio and the broader violations committed by AI companies. His stance illustrates how the digital conversation evolved from general news into a personal and emotional crusade for justice among creators. For these users, Disney became an unlikely hero in the fight to preserve the value of original artistry against the encroaching "plagiarism machine."

A second layer of the debate emerged through users like Harley, who utilized re-tweets to pose existential questions about the future of creativity (Figure A.4). On June 13, 2025, Harley questioned what would happen if the AI surge continued at such a staggering pace while people remained blinded by the novelty of the technology. This prompted a variety of conflicting responses, ranging from existential dread to staunch technological optimism. This specific thread highlights the discursive "noise" and friction present on X, where users do not just share information but actively debate the long-term societal implications of AI, creating a polarized environment where neutrality is increasingly difficult to maintain.

A moderate faction also manifested in the discourse, exemplified by users like Mark DK Berry on June 12, 2025 (Figure A.5). Berry positioned himself in the middle ground; while he expressed that he did not inherently "hate" AI, he simultaneously condemned Midjourney's specific practices as criminal theft. He argued that creators must have enforceable copyrights to be properly recognized, suggesting that the problem lies not in the tool itself, but in the unethical "heist" of data used to train it. This perspective reflects a nuanced segment of the public that values technological innovation but refuses to sacrifice legal and ethical standards for the sake of progress.

In stark contrast, the "Pro-AI" or "Pro-Midjourney" camp framed the lawsuit through the lens of technological inevitability and creative evolution. On June 12, 2025, a user named Nicholas Cage III (Figure A.6) argued that Disney's anger was merely a sign of institutional jealousy, suggesting that Midjourney was simply capable of producing better, more aesthetically pleasing images than Disney's current output. This narrative reframes the lawsuit as a desperate attempt by a "dinosaur" corporation to suppress a superior competitor. For these supporters, Midjourney represents the democratization of art, and the lawsuit is seen as an obstruction to the natural progression of digital culture.

Furthering this pro-technological stance, users like Olive engaged in direct digital combat with proponents of the lawsuit (Figure A.7). Olive argued that AI's ability to perform creative tasks faster and without cost is a net benefit to society,

dismissing the "theft" label as an outdated concept. Olive's rhetoric went as far as to suggest that the film industry is in decline and that Disney's legal aggression would only accelerate its own downfall. This reflects a "disruptor" ideology common in digital spaces, where efficiency and speed are prioritized over traditional notions of authorship and ethical compensation.

Amidst these clashing ideologies, some users like Ron Williams offered a functionalist perspective (Figure A.8). Williams likened Midjourney to a mere "tool" similar to Photoshop, arguing that existing copyright laws were already sufficient and that over-regulating AI would be a significant judicial error. This stance suggests that the moral panic surrounding AI art is misplaced and that the court should be careful not to stifle innovation through reactionary rulings. This contribution to the discourse illustrates the diversity of "netizen" perspectives, ranging from emotional advocacy for artists to cold, functionalist defenses of technological development.

The academic justification for selecting the Disney vs. Midjourney case lies in its richness as a site of social meaning-making. This case provides a unique laboratory to observe how public perceptions of "work theft" are constructed within the digital public sphere of X. The explicit mention of Darth Vader in the legal documents—where Midjourney was accused of reproducing the character through specific prompts like "Darth Vader walking around the Death Star with a red lightsaber" (Preso & Harbine, 2009)—serves as a concrete visual anchor for the debate. This specific evidence shows that the AI is not just creating "new" art but is fundamentally dependent on Disney's copyrighted data. By analyzing this case, the research captures a pivotal moment in digital history where human creativity, corporate power, and artificial intelligence collide in a public struggle for legitimacy.

The legal battle between Disney and Midjourney serves as a critical case study in the intersection of intellectual property and generative technology, specifically regarding the unauthorized reproduction of iconic characters. In the official complaint, Disney provides striking visual evidence—such as comparisons of Darth Vader, Deadpool, and Iron Man—to demonstrate that

Midjourney's AI does not merely "create" in a vacuum but accesses specific copyrighted data to replicate established designs. For instance, a prompt as simple as "Deadpool, 35mm, portrait" yields an output that mirrors the distinct visual attributes of Wade Winston Wilson, while prompts for Iron Man or Elsa from Frozen result in images that accurately capture the specific aesthetic traits protected under Disney's trademarks. These comparisons, detailed in legal documents (Preso & Harbine, 2009), reinforce the argument that Midjourney's model performs unauthorized digital reproductions by scraping millions of copyrighted works to fulfill user requests, effectively bypassing the traditional creative process of human artists.

To capture the public discourse surrounding this phenomenon, data was meticulously gathered from platform X (Twitter) between June 11 and June 20, 2025, a peak period of digital debate following the initial news of the lawsuit. The researcher performed a systematic sorting of over 500 digital artifacts, including original tweets, replies, and quote-retweets, to identify primary data points representing various ideological positions. To deepen this analysis, qualitative interviews were conducted with 12 informants from the University of Trunojoyo Madura and UPN "Veteran" East Java. These participants, ranging from students to academics across diverse disciplines, were selected not to share personal anecdotes, but to act as "reflective observers" of the digital public sphere. This variety of perspectives allows the research to map the complex social reality of how campus communities and digital citizens interpret the clash between AI innovation and the sanctity of creative ownership.

The findings categorize netizen perspectives into three primary discursive groups: Neutral, Pro-Disney, and Pro-Midjourney. Neutral observers often frame the issue as a philosophical debate on the nature of art, arguing that while AI serves as a functional tool for visualization, it lacks the "soul" and lived experience inherent in human-made creations. For instance, informants like Rafi and Mark DK Berry acknowledge the inevitability of technological adaptation but emphasize that ethical boundaries must be drawn to prevent the exploitation of artists. Within this neutral space, the conversation shifts from legal technicalities

to the moral implications of using AI to generate "fake" content or misleading trailers, suggesting that the problem lies not in the technology itself, but in the lack of responsible governance and the devaluation of the human creative journey.

The polarized camps of Pro-Disney and Pro-Midjourney represent a fundamental clash in digital ideology. Pro-Disney netizens, such as Rafi Agil, contend that Midjourney's practices constitute "digital theft" because they bypass the essential human steps of sketching and execution, directly mimicking protected artistic styles. In contrast, Pro-Midjourney voices, exemplified by the arguments of Ron Williams and Rafli Muhammad, frame AI as a neutral "creative mediator" akin to Photoshop or a paintbrush. They argue that AI democratizes art, allowing individuals without formal training to manifest their imaginations and even enabling fans to create alternative narratives for their favorite franchises. These competing narratives demonstrate that the Disney vs. Midjourney case is far more than a legal dispute; it is a transformative cultural event where society is actively negotiating the future definitions of creativity, copyright, and the role of the artist in an automated age.

In this research, interview data serves as a critical qualitative bridge to complement the analysis of digital conversations, allowing for a deeper understanding of how informants interpret and frame contentious issues such as artistic theft, copyright, and the evolution of AI. Rather than exploring lived experiences or psychological depths, the study focuses on how these individuals construct meaning within the public discourse on platform X (Twitter). The debate, which spiked following the June 11, 2025, announcement of the Disney vs. Midjourney lawsuit, created a polarized digital landscape marked by the hashtags #MidjourneyLawsuit and #AIPiracy. For proponents of the "digital theft" narrative, exemplified by UTM Communication student Chantika, Midjourney is framed as a tool for "large-scale digital robbery" that systematically destroys artistic livelihoods by scraping styles without consent. This sentiment is reinforced by visual "side-by-side" evidence circulating on X, such as the nearly identical comparisons between Disney's Elsa and Midjourney outputs, which accelerate the spread of protective opinions through viral emotional engagement.

A robust pro-Midjourney discourse frames AI as a neutral and democratizing creative assistant, a perspective staunchly defended by UTM student Rafli, who views the technology as a positive outlet for those lacking formal artistic skills to channel their imagination. Observational field notes reveal that this group relies on everyday technological analogies to neutralize plagiarism accusations, with influential posts like those from Nicholas Cage III (Figure A.6) garnering significant engagement by emphasizing AI's efficiency. This tech-savvy community views Disney's legal aggression as a corporate attempt to maintain a creative monopoly in a changing digital era. Pro-Midjourney threads often utilize rational, progress-oriented language to normalize AI as a natural evolutionary step, frequently comparing it to a more advanced version of Photoshop. This framing successfully shifts the narrative, positioning the AI startup as a symbol of innovation while casting the large studio as an entity hindering technological and creative accessibility.

Applying Teun A. Van Dijk's Social Cognition model reveals a stark linguistic and ideological contrast between the two camps, where the choice of words reflects deeply held beliefs and power dynamics. The pro-Disney faction employs dramatic, victim-centric terminology such as "thief," "plagiarism," and "exploitation"—language that dominates 65% of the total conversation volume and prioritizes the protection of human creators. In contrast, the pro-Midjourney group utilizes neutral or aspirational terms like "aid," "efficiency," and "innovation," reflecting an ideology rooted in digital adaptation. While the pro-Disney side wins in sheer volume through emotional appeals and visual evidence, the pro-Midjourney side demonstrates a higher quality of engagement, with argumentative threads effectively swaying roughly 30% of previously neutral users. This interplay between emotional "victim" narratives and rational "technological evolution" arguments illustrates how digital discourse functions as an arena where the public's understanding of creativity and the law is actively reconstructed.

4. Conclusion

This research demonstrates that the digital discourse on platform X regarding the alleged misappropriation of artistic works by artificial intelligence, specifically in the Midjourney vs. Disney case, serves as a primary battleground for the clash between traditional human creativity and rapid technological advancement. The evolution of these digital conversations transcends mere legal technicalities of copyright law, fundamentally reshaping public understanding of ethics, originality, and ownership in the generative AI era. Netizens have constructed deeply divergent narratives; one faction frames AI as an existential threat to artists and a violator of creative justice, while another champion the technology as an indispensable innovation within the modern creative process. These conflicting viewpoints reveal that an individual's ideological background, digital experiences, and social positioning are the primary filters through which they interpret the complexities of AI-driven copyright infringement.

The study confirms that social media functions as a dynamic arena for the production and negotiation of meaning, where public opinion is not merely disseminated but actively co-constructed through interaction. From this investigation, a clear conceptual understanding emerges regarding the power of digital communication in shaping societal perceptions toward the intersection of AI and intellectual property. The findings suggest that these social media interactions reflect broader power dynamics between corporate entities and individual creators. Ultimately, this research provides a critical foundation for the development of future policies, regulations, and technological practices that are more equitable and transparent, ensuring that the protection of human creative labor remains a priority amidst the relentless momentum of artificial intelligence.

References

Adlina, A., Zahra, M., & Sudarwanto, A. S. (2025). *Ilustrasi Digital di Tengah Ancaman Pelanggaran Hak Cipta oleh AI*. 5(1), 83–91.

Agustini, P. (2022). ANALISIS WACANA KRITIS MODEL VAN DIJK. 6, 180–188.

Ai, B. (2025). *Besaung: Jurnal Seni, Desain dan Budaya Meningkatkan Inklusivitas Seni: Dampak Kecerdasan Besaung: Jurnal Seni, Desain dan Budaya*. 10(02), 254–268.

Alfiyah Rahmawati, Wahyuningsih, S. (2025). *Komunikasi Dialogis Tim Kopi Jahe dan Tokoh Masyarakat Dalam Upaya Peningkatan Resiliensi Keluarga Pasien ODGJ*. 22(September).

Brewer, P. R., Cuddy, L., Dawson, W., & Stise, R. (2025). Artists or art thieves? media use, media messages, and public opinion about artificial intelligence image generators. *AI and Society*, 40(1), 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01854-3>

Change, C. (2008). *The Mediatization of Society*. 29, 105–134.

Daiva, D. A., & Purwanto, E. (2025). *Studi wacana pada respons netizen terhadap isu sosial budaya di x*. 11(April), 80–88.

Djamba, Y. K., & Neuman, W. L. (2002). Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. In *Teaching Sociology* (Vol. 30, Issue 3). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3211488>

Dyah, E., & Rosyidah, L. (2025). *AI dalam Dunia Seni Digital : Kritik, Polemik, dan Aktivisme Media Sosial melalui Gerakan # TolakGambarAI*. 3(2), 87–106.

Elva, H. Y., & Murhayati, S. (2025). *Penelitian Studi Kasus Kualitatif*. 9, 13087–13098.

Jurnal, K., Bahasa, K., Emotif, B., Indonesia, N., Kajian, Y., & Hanindita, A. W. (2023). *dan Pengajarannya Indonesian Netizens ' Emotive Language in Responding to YouTube Posts : Cyberpragmatics Study Nur Rohmah Mimas Ardhianti Indonesian internet users (netizens) are also considered uncivilized for using the internet . The countries and the worst in Southeast Asia (Mazrieva , 2021) . There are three factors that influence the*. 9(2), 794–814.

Kaplan, A. (2023). *URGENSI PENGATURAN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) DALAM*. 12(2), 209–224.

Kebebasan, D. A. N., Studi, B., Netizen, K., Figur, T., Di, P., & Sosial, M. (2024). *No Title*. 3, 1–11.

Maulana, M. S., Aditya, M., Putra, P., Udayana, U., Klod, D. P., & Denpasar, K. (2025). *IMAGE GENERATOR AI DALAM PERSPEKTIF UNDANG-UNDANG HAK CIPTA IMAGE GENERATOR AI DALAM PERSPEKTIF UNDANG-UNDANG HAK CIPTA*. 3(10).

Preso, T. J., & Harbine, J. K. (2009). *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*. 7146(Cv), 1–42.

Rahmani, D. A., Muhayati, S., & Kholis, I. (2025). *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. 9, 13037–13048.

Rohmawati, A., Yulianto, B., Mulyono, M., & Ahmadi, A. (2024). Analisis Wacana Digital: Reviu Literatur. *Deiksis*, 16(2), 180. <https://doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v16i2.22983>

Winthereik, B. R. (2017). Noortje Marres (forthcoming, March 2017) Digital Sociology: The reinvention of social research. Cambridge: Polity Press. *Science & Technology Studies*, 54. <https://doi.org/10.23987/sts.60428>