
THE POTENTIAL OF STRATEGIC COALITIONS OF ALL-EMERGING COUNTRIES IN THE NEW GEOPOLITICAL ORDER

Iskandarsyah Siregar¹, Awang Azman bin Awang Pawi²

¹Universitas Nasional, Indonesia

²Universiti Malaya, Malaysia

Corresponding Author Email: regaranggi@presidency.com

Abstract:

This study, affiliated with emerging countries, explores strategic partnerships among Indonesia, Malaysia, and Brunei in today's global multipolar politics. It uses a linguistic approach, based on Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus-Based Semantic Mapping. The research reviews 312 state-owned publications from 2024 to 2026 to analyse how language shapes geopolitical cooperation. The findings show significant semantic merging, with Indonesia and Malaysia converging the most. This indicates a shared, albeit asymmetric, discursive framework. Quantitative data reveal that framing and conceptual metaphor (38.2% and 29.5%, respectively) dominate rhetorical strategies. Qualitative analysis shows Indonesia as the main force, Malaysia as a mediator, and Brunei as maintaining order in its territory and nearby areas if needed. Triangulating the conclusions shows that higher semantic matching drives more regional mutual aid, especially in ASEAN terms post-2011. The corpus also contains 29 documents; discursive fragmentation weakens coalition cohesion by adding vagueness. The study introduces 'semantic matching' as a new way to measure and assess national behaviour in international politics. These findings highlight how emerging-country groups can build shared narratives that align with the global landscape.

Keywords: *Coalition, Indonesia, Malaysia, Brunei, Geopolitical, Potential.*

Submission : December, 13th 2025

Revision : January 24th 2026

Publication : February 28th 2026

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary geopolitical order is shifting away from Western Europe's hegemonic centres. Between 2024 and 2026, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank project that emerging and developing economies will account for 60 per cent of global growth. Southeast Asia especially Indonesia, Malaysia, and Brunei remains successful in diversifying its trade holdings. This is achieved through import protectionism, digital economy expansion, and strategic regional diplomacy (IMF, 2025; World Bank, 2024). Beyond economic measures, the geopolitics of these states is

increasingly shaped by discourse. Language defines concepts such as sovereignty, collective security, and regional order, which affect capital markets. This shift, when seen through language use, is called 'discursive multipolarity.' Emerging states strategically use discourse to justify their rights or assert influence in a contested global order. Yet, a disconnect persists in the geopolitical agency of emerging countries within a strategic coalition. Indonesia, Malaysia, and Brunei share deep historical, cultural, and linguistic ties that go back to the Malay world. However, their cooperative networks are often more a matter of policy than shared discourse. Their political dialogue is framed in different terms and shaped by distinct semantic logics, limiting how they relate to one another and how they can build a coherent strategic bloc. The main challenge is that without a unified language strategy, emerging-country coalitions may have less impact on emerging geopolitics.

This research addresses a key question: Can a strategic coalition among Taiwan, Malaysia, and Brunei be developed through discourse-influence models? Specifically, how are these political coalitions linguistically prepared in official and diplomatic speeches? What effect does semantic change have on their consistency and cooperation? Furthermore, can a shared discursive framework enhance their collective agency internationally?

Mainstream literature on Southeast Asian unity focuses on economics, politics, and institutions, often overlooking language's role in shaping international life. Recent work in critical discourse analysis and geopollinguistics (e.g., Kuo & Marwick, 2024; Fairclough, 2013) highlights how discourse sustains power relations, though empirical studies of intrasean coalitions remain scarce. This paper addresses these gaps by combining sociolinguistic analysis with geopolitical theory to offer a new interdisciplinary perspective.

This work offers a new viewpoint. We consider strategic coalitions not just as material or institutional constructs but as discursive ones. These arise from the mutual influence of communications shaped by all parties: shared narratives, a semantic testing ground, and practice as a social context. The concept of "semantic alignment" is proposed as vital for successful coordination among newly emerging countries.

This study will utilise official speeches, policy statements, and diplomatic communications from Indonesia, Malaysia, or Brunei between 2024 and 2026. The methodology will employ critical discourse analysis in conjunction with corpus-based semantic mapping. The objective is to identify patterns of co-alignment or misalignment.

The study proposes several hypotheses. (H1) High levels of semantic alignment in diplomatic discourse point to higher rates of strategic cooperation. (H2) Discursive fragmentation reduces coalition effectiveness. (H3) Developing a shared geopolitical narrative promotes the standing of emerging country alliances globally. The study thus

repositions language as an independent variable for understanding and practising strategy in the multipolar world.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This review draws on critical discourse analysis (CDA), geopolitical linguistics, and constructivist international relations theory. In CDA, language is not just a reflection of power but directly shapes its structures, social reality, and relations between states and society (Norman Fairclough, 2013, p. 5). This view aligns with constructivist arguments advanced by Alexander Wendt (1999, p. 25), who argues that international structures are socially constructed. They arise from shared meanings and discursive practices. Geopolitical linguistics supports this perspective. States use strategic narratives, framing devices, and semantic alignment to position themselves in the world order (Kuo & Marwick, 2024, p. 218). In Southeast Asia, discourse is especially significant, since the Malay world shares a linguistic heritage. Semantic similarity in communication acts as soft infrastructure for geopolitical cohesion. Published references show that emerging economies are increasingly influencing changes in world governance structures (Kuo & Marwick, 2024, 267-9). Documents from the International Monetary Fund (2025, p. 12) and World Bank (2024, p. 33) highlight Southeast Asia's geostrategic position in global supply chains. However, macroeconomic analyses often focus only on economics and overlook language mechanisms that shape enduring cooperation. New perspectives are needed. A project on framing coherence in political communication (Chen et al., 2025, p. 7) shows that narrative consistency and framing consensus significantly affect state outcomes in international cooperation. Likewise, work on disinformation and the influence of communication on power reveals that too many divergent narratives from governments or their allies can weaken institutional trust (Kuo & Marwick, 2024, p. 220).

By going beyond national boundaries and examining how regional identities are constructed within ASEAN, the literature has complemented this analysis. Nonetheless, a group of scholars argue that ASEAN's "Unity in diversity" principle is consolidated by carefully negotiated linguistic practices which keep national sovereignty intact, no more than would be repugnant to collective identity (Acharya 2014: 58). However, empirical studies reveal persistent differences in how particular member states frame even their most fundamental terms. For example, Indonesia often talks about regional centrality, advocating a leadership-oriented discourse wherein this nation takes the lead, a role that Malaysia and Brunei tend to adopt much more cautiously, and sovereignty-preserving narratives. (Rüland, 2025, p. 102) These differences mean that linguistic heterogeneity may act as both an asset and an obstacle in the building of coalitions. Whilst scholarship in the area is rich, there is still work to be done: Firstly, many papers treat geopolitical cooperation primarily as institutional or economic, often ignoring how language itself can shape alliances. Secondly, although CDA has been widely applied within global power systems, it remains limited in its application to intra-regional coalitions among emerging

countries, particularly within the Malay linguistic sphere. Third, recent work on narrative and framing has not sufficiently integrated corpus-based methods capable of quantitatively capturing semantic alignment.

Because of this, the work prompts people to stop viewing strategic coalitions as strategies for the US to observe other countries. Now the author extends the meaning of a coalition to a joining in international politics. When prior studies regard discourse as the second layer of analysis, while at the centre of our research has always been language, this article uses qualitative CDA methods in combination with corpus-based semantic mapping to study how Indonesia, Malaysia and Brunei construct their geopolitical narratives between 2024 and 2026. In so doing, it makes a creative contribution to both linguistic and international relations scholarship, suggesting that the effectiveness of emerging-country coalitions is not simply a matter of material capabilities or institutional frameworks but must also take into account their discursive coherence.

METHOD

The study used a mixed-method approach, combining qualitative and quantitative analysis and triangulation. It integrated principles of international relations and knowledge from political communication scholars, applying them within the boundaries set by previous research on linguistic structure namely, discourse analysis within the scope of relevant texts from sociology or psychology studies. The central analytical framework is based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). It also draws on corpus linguistics, which incorporates linguistic evidence into the research based on how different geopolitical alliances are constructed in cultural semiotics and whether they occur concurrently with established cultural contentious forms (i.e., static forms). The central analytical framework is based on Norman Fairclough's Grammar of Language, using a caution-oriented approach. If you look at language as an instrument, you may find it hard to see anything else. Its central analytical framework, CDA, is adapted from grammatical analysis research for this work. This is because Fairclough sees language as a dialectical process, with both functional and social dimensions, so that grammatical regularities cannot be divorced from their actual social context (Norman Fairclough, 2013, p. 5; Alexander Wendt, 1999, p. 25).

The research is limited to texts officially issued by Indonesia, Malaysia and Brunei between 2024 and 2026, which are available online through government or ASEAN websites. These documents include ministerial speeches, policies, and joint declarations, which were particularly useful for our research because they were well-preserved on the internet and could therefore be retrieved directly. One way to ensure our data was reliable was to limit the sources of these publicly accessible formal texts. We chose this method because it is self-consistent and replicable. Nevertheless, while this ensures data reliability, it also means that our analysis is confined to formalised linguistic expressions.

For example, we may overlook grassroots or informal geopolitical narratives. To collect data, a systematic corpus was compiled according to predefined inclusion criteria: (1) officially published documents; (2) documents deal with regional or international cooperation; and (3) documents are in English or standardised Malay/Indonesian for comparability. A total of 312 documents were collected, yielding approximately 1.8 million word tokens after normalisation. We converted all texts into machine-readable formats and processed them using AntConc and Python-based natural language processing tools (NLTK). It was designed to be transparent and reproducible.

Data processing was conducted in three steps: the first step, lexical normalisation, standardises orthographic variability in Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Melayu during tokenisation. TF-IDF vectorisation for semantic content representations in each document. Cosine similarity measures are then applied to see how closely that semantic alignment matches language forms across nations.

The third stage was qualitative analysis through CDA. The focus included modality analysis, different construction frames, metaphors used, and narrative structures. Activities included double-coding procedures to ensure the coding reliability of that technology, yielding a Cohen's kappa coefficient of 0.87, indicating fairly high inter-coder agreement.

Triangulation: A strategy analytical approach to the evidence available. Key parameters guided by the objectives of six major projects influence international financial markets. This improves the validity of findings by cross-verifying conclusions from different sources and lines of argument.

This study processes raw data through various methods. Straight numbers furnish objective measures of alignment between semantic content representations, qualitative analysis puts these findings in their broader linguistic context, and macroeconomic data situates them within global geopolitical processes. Id.

Our conclusions were reached through an iterative analytical process. Initial findings from quantitative analysis were further refined through qualitative interpretation. In addition, at this stage, major points were confirmed or corrected using triangulation. Hypotheses about the relationships between semantic alignment indices and levels of discursive coherence were tested, reaching the thirties, with mentions of solidarity from different quarters.

In sum, this approach provides an effective and repeatable methodology for studying the lingual groundwork of global governance. By combining computational linguistics with critical discourse analysis, it introduces a new way to understand how language constructs emergent-country coalitions in the current global order

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

Consistent with prevailing practice for dataset quality control that reflects language standardisation and resource compatibility, the dataset of tones consists of English and Malay: two languages spoken widely throughout the area; Chinese, which is not often spoken in South-East Asia but increasingly significant today among users of the internet; and Arabic, spoken by small groups and Islamic state authorities representing this group. The text corpus consists of 312 official texts, 124 from Indonesia, 106 from Malaysia, and 82 from Brunei, produced between January 2024 and February 2026. The data set includes ministerial speeches, joint statements, Asean summit declarations and foreign policy briefings that are made publicly available through government and Asean repositories of reputable standing. After normalisation, the corpus contained 1,846,233 words. Lexical processing was performed using AntConc and Python, and semantic clustering was verified through inter-tagger agreement (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.87$), attesting to high reliability. The analytic procedure combines critical discourse analysis with corpus-based semantic mapping to identify patterns of convergence, divergence, and storyline coherence among the three states. Quantitative results indicate the degree of gradation towards semantic convergence across the entire corpus. Using cosine similarity scores derived from vectorised term-frequency inverse-document-frequency (TF-IDF) models, Indonesia–Malaysia discourse has the highest average semantic similarity (0.78), followed by Malaysia–Brunei (0.74) and Indonesia–Brunei (0.69). These values suggest a reasonable extent of agreement but also show noticeable discursive asymmetry. In temporal analysis, there has been a clear trend towards greater convergence, from 0.71 in 2024 to 0.76 in 2026. This suggests that geopolitical narratives are gradually aligning as a result of further regional cooperation in fields such as the Digital Economy and Maritime Security. These points also reflect strong divergence in opinion. But the coefficient of variation remains large ($\sigma = 0.08$), indicating continued heterogeneity.

Table 1. *Semantic Convergence Analysis*

Metric	Category / Context	Measure Type	Value
Semantic Similarity	Indonesia–Malaysia	Cosine Similarity	0.78
Semantic Similarity	Malaysia–Brunei	Cosine Similarity	0.74
Semantic Similarity	Indonesia–Brunei	Cosine Similarity	0.69

Temporal Trend	2024	Average Similarity	0.71
Temporal Trend	2026	Average Similarity	0.76
Statistical Dispersion	Corpus-wide	Coefficient of Variation (σ)	0.08
Interpretation	Regional Alignment	Observation	Increasing convergence in Digital Economy and Maritime Security
Interpretation	Discursive Structure	Observation	Persistent heterogeneity and asymmetry

Further empirical tests based on lexical frequency analysis validate the strategic-framing picture of divergence. A study on the word cluster "regional principal" shows 3.9% in Indonesia, 2.1% in Malaysia, and 1.3% in Brunei. This shows Indonesia's discursive positioning as a central player in Southeast Asia. Conversely, in a semantic cluster of "preserving sovereignty," Brunei ranks first (4.6%), Malaysia is second (3.8%), and Indonesia is third (2.5%). This aligns with general observations that Brunei's own discourse stresses preservation; it disdains interference. Indonesians, on the other hand, prefer to be proactive in formulating and pressing for new ideas, directions themselves. Malaysia finds itself in an intermediary position, often using a combination of speech types, such as cooperative integration, while maintaining national autonomy. A secondary, quantitative dimension surveys how rhetorical devices are distributed in terms of methods, as defined by the study's own analytical framework: framing, euphemization, delegitimation, and conceptual metaphor. (For the overall corpus, framing takes up 38.2%, conceptual metaphors 29.5%, euphemism 18.7% and delegitimization 13.6%. Indonesia has a higher-shaped framing (42.5%) and conceptual metaphors (31.8%); it often uses such narratives as 'regional resilience' and 'collective destiny. Malaysia has a balance, with 36.1% framing and 21.4% euphemization, indicative of restraint in diplomacy. Brunei shows more euphemism, with 21.1% reported by chi-square tests ($\chi^2 = 27.84, p < .01$), confirming differences across national corpora.

Table 2. *Strategic Framing Divergence*

Section	Variable / Cluster	Country / Corpus	Measure Type	Value	Interpretive Note
Lexical Cluster Frequency	regional principal	Indonesia	Percentage (%)	3.9	Highest; indicates discursive positioning as a central Southeast Asian actor.

Lexical Cluster Frequency	regional principal	Malaysia	Percentage (%)	2.1	Moderate presence.
Lexical Cluster Frequency	regional principal	Brunei	Percentage (%)	1.3	Lowest frequency.
Lexical Cluster Frequency	preserving sovereignty	Brunei	Percentage (%)	4.6	Highest; reflects preservation-oriented discourse and resistance to interference.
Lexical Cluster Frequency	preserving sovereignty	Malaysia	Percentage (%)	3.8	Intermediate position; combines cooperative integration with national autonomy.
Lexical Cluster Frequency	preserving sovereignty	Indonesia	Percentage (%)	2.5	Lower frequency; discourse tends to be more proactive and idea-driven.
Rhetorical Device Distribution	Overall Corpus	Framing	Percentage (%)	38.2	Most dominant rhetorical method in the full corpus.
Rhetorical Device Distribution	Overall Corpus	Conceptual Metaphor	Percentage (%)	29.5	Second most frequent rhetorical method in the full corpus.
Rhetorical Device Distribution	Overall Corpus	Euphemization	Percentage (%)	18.7	Moderate use in the full corpus.
Rhetorical Device Distribution	Overall Corpus	Delegitimation	Percentage (%)	13.6	Least frequent rhetorical method in the full corpus.
Rhetorical Device Distribution	Indonesia	Framing	Percentage (%)	42.5	Highest framing share; often linked to narratives such as regional resilience and collective destiny.
Rhetorical Device Distribution	Indonesia	Conceptual Metaphor	Percentage (%)	31.8	Strong metaphorical orientation in national discourse.

Rhetorical Device Distribution	Malaysia	Framing	Percentage (%)	36.1	Balanced framing pattern.
Rhetorical Device Distribution	Malaysia	Euphemization	Percentage (%)	21.4	Signals diplomatic restraint.
Rhetorical Device Distribution	Brunei	Euphemization	Percentage (%)	21.1	Relatively strong euphemistic tendency.
Statistical Test	Cross-national rhetorical-device distribution	Chi-square	χ^2	27.84	Confirms significant differences across national corpora.
Statistical Test	Cross-national rhetorical-device distribution	p-value	p	< .01	Statistically significant at the 1% level.

The survey establishes a yardstick based on the joint appearance of key political vocabulary. This index ranges from 0 to 1; values above 0.75 indicate high inter-speech conformity. When they make joint statements, Indonesia and Malaysia obtain an index score of 0.81, compared with 0.76 for Malaysia–Brunei and 0.72 for Indonesia–Brunei. It is worth noting that alignment scores rise in multilateral domains, particularly in ASEAN summit discourse (mean = 0.83), suggesting that organisational structures facilitate linguistic convergence. This finding supports our prediction that common platforms advance discursive harmonisation.

Qualitative analysis helps us gain a deeper understanding of these qualitative patterns. Indonesia maintains an assertive modality in discourse, employing likely verbs such as “must”, “will”, and “commit” to consolidate a national perception of leadership and responsibility. Malaysia uses hedging devices to maintain flexibility and diplomatic prudence; these are more than those of Brunei. “Should,” “can”, and “continue to” are widely dispersed in Malaysian discourse. Brunei's discourse is filled with deferential, consensus-seeking phrases like “reaffirm,” “support,” and “underscore.” Businesses were notions brought into being, acts that both contributed to lower overall characterisation but created fragmentation, particularly in relation to clause items.

Analysis of narrative anecdotes also shows that Indonesia tends to back a problem–solution–vision format. Malaysia often uses a context–balance–cooperation format that

emphasises mediation and inclusiveness. Brunei's discourse, on the whole, is geared towards continuing what is already going on and, especially, towards reaffirming existing agreements. These structural idiosyncrasies, while not intrinsically incompatible, will lead to different expectations for Coalition dynamics in the future and could consequently make it difficult for a joint strategic narrative to emerge.

A triangulated comparison of methods confirms the reliability of these findings. For example, qualitative observations of the tape's roughness and narrative ebb/flow are also borne out in quantitative scores of semantic similarity. Moreover, rhetorical strategy distributions match up with identified patterns of modality and framing. Similarly, temporal trends in the past connect seven years: ranging from 2019 (2013), when we observed "no significant change," to 1926 (1995), characterised by "a wave of cooperative initiatives", 2025 (p. 14), 2024 (p. 41), and 2008. They cover Southeast Asian economies and their overseas cooperation. These facts cohere a consistent picture which strengthens the analysis's rational basis and warrants trust in its validity. This confluence of evidence also validates not only this kind but also all subsequent research that this is indeed possible and worthwhile to pursue down this track.

Of particular importance, the data also reveals instances of discursive fragmentation. In about 27% of high-frequency geopolitical terms documents, there are abrupt shifts in framing, with cooperative stories replaced by sovereignty-assertive narratives. These cases will become evident after 1978. Such changes are particularly clear in bilateral instances involving highly sensitive issues, such as maritime frontiers and the between-tide land depression in Sanya, southern Hainan. Significantly, these figures show that there are combinations of cooperative and competitive discourses-- which, if not managed strategically, can undermine the coherence of the entire coalition.

The results provide empirical evidence for the study's hypotheses. Higher levels of semantic alignment are associated with stronger expressions of political cooperation, particularly in multilateral settings (supporting H1). Conversely, when discursive fragmentation affects scores or narrative coherence is reduced, as we have seen with Japan's China, there is also a significant decline in linguistic affinity (supporting H2). Finally, those documents which display a high alignment score and an unvarying narrative tend to express clearer collective visions. This implies that shared international narratives at the geopolitical level can improve coalition effectiveness by providing greater clarity of intention and shared priorities (supporting H3).

The findings highlight the importance of historical discourse in determining geopolitical outcomes. This is one that we can see significantly. In sum, while the shared understanding generated and the potential outcomes envisioned at various points in coalitions' ruling institutions are crucial for establishing successful structures, they remain shaped by the language that frames them. Between one country and another, a

single departure from strategy might undo the work. She cited information she had gathered on her own language as evidence; still, any reader can discover the arguments of this paper as "usual" rehashes beneath new names. Geographical cooperation is where the universal language of geopolitics is written. Drawing on quantitative and qualitative analysis, this study provides a model for analysing the linguistic foundations of geopolitical cooperation in an emerging multipolar system.

Discussion

Based on the evidence collected in this research, it is clear that strategic alliances between developing countries are not solely the result of institutional arrangements or economic dependence. Rather, they are also largely mediated by the extent to which nations align their languages and discourses. The available data demonstrate moderate-to-high semantic similarity scores across the corpora of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Brunei, indicating a shared geopolitical vocabulary. But it isn't evenly distributed. Such unevenness of distribution could be described as "asymmetric discursive convergence". That is to say, there is convergence, but differences in national policies make it uneven. From a linguistic perspective, this supports Fairclough's 2013 argument, which he assumes is his area of research. Discourse operates as a site for negotiation rather than for the assertion of uniformity, especially in contexts where power relations are fluid and complex."

That Indonesia is more similar to Malaysia (0.78) than to Brunei (0.69) in semantic terms can be understood from both linguistic and geopolitical perspectives. In terms of language, Indonesia and Malaysia exhibit greater uniformity in the standardisation of Malay-derived words. This makes it more likely that the meaning of phrases in diplomatic discourse will converge naturally. Geopolitically, both states also engage more actively in regional leadership and international cooperation, which entails a more coherent narrative.

By contrast, in Brunei's discourse, we can find a slightly higher frequency of sovereignty-preserving words. This lends itself to semantic resistance, thereby lowering the alignment score. This situation is not fragmented per se but reflects a dialectical discursive strategy which is intentional and flows from Brunei's political economy governance model. Therefore, the variation among alignment figures should be seen as functional differentiation rather than a weakness in the system.

The distribution of rhetorical strategies also supports the interpretation. In addition to international influences, Indonesia's use of framing and metaphors suggests it is trying to work out a larger national situation that makes little sense for the outside world. Frequent references to phrases like "regional resilience " and "collective destiny" also serve as a framing device to shape cognitive frames on regional issues more than they impinge physically or politically (that is, what sort of regional cooperation people

buy into). Malaysia's balanced mix of framing and euphemism indicates a mediating role, in which linguistic moderation maintains diplomatic leeway, enabling it to act on multiple levels. Brunei prefers euphemism--an old loan from the ancient Chinese officials' stock in trade--reinforcing sovereignty while maintaining a discourse of stability and continuity that minimises conflict. This pattern aligns with general theories of political communication: linguistic choices reflect strategic positions within a network of power relations (Kuo and Marwick 2024:221). These findings are also supported by similarly mixed patterns when controlled for both longer-term measures and intervening activities from the early 2015s of national (Malaysian) publication. Triangulation among quantitative measures, qualitative discourse patterns, and trends over time also strengthens these findings. The rise in semantic alignment among 2024-2026 matches observed increases in regional cooperation measures documented by the International Monetary Fund (2025:14) and the World Bank (2024:41). This convergence points to a substantive relation: that verbal conformism isn't simply a theoretical construct but very much tied in with real developments in trade, digital integration for the one belt one road, maritime coordination leading to concrete agreements supporting real economic benefit shared between countries. In this sense, language both reflects and drives the power relations in territorial conflicts, thereby reinforcing what the constructivist model implies: that shared meanings are the basis for international collaboration (Wendt 1999:135).

Meanwhile, the deed persists in approximately 27% of the corpus, with discursive fragmentation. This underscores the limits of current coalition dynamics. Abrupt changes in the data, from a cooperative stance to a sovereignty assertion, show that opposite narrative logics coexist within a single space for communication. State shifts like these, from a linguistic perspective, can be said to constitute one form or another of "discursive code switching," where countries oscillate between integrating and defensive narratives as they feel the pressure of their context. Although such flexibility may help navigate complex diplomatic environments, it also creates confusion, weakening the overall coherence of a strategic alliance. Our research has confirmed that the second hypothesis is correct, i.e. discursive fragmentation seriously hinders coalition effectiveness. This is not because it kills cooperation stone dead, but because it reduces the predictability and precision of cooperation, undermining everything at once. The argument of "semantic alignment" advanced in this study is substantiated when compared across different methods and materials. Meaning that high alignment scores in multilateral contexts, particularly the use of language within ASEAN discourse (mean = 0.83), signal an important role for institutional frameworks in promoting linguistic convergence. This implies that ASEAN not only serves as a platform for politics and the economy but also as a discursive forum where meanings are contested and codified into the prevailing norm. However, the lower levels of alignment which we observe in bilateral contexts reflect the

lack of a fully internalised shared narrative, and so more concerted efforts need to focus on alignments at the intergovernmental level.

The most important point, however, is an effort to dispel the notion that, with uniformity, the system it encompasses goes along well in hand. Effective coalition-building rather seems to require a mix of convergence and divergence; too much homogeneity will crush national identities and flexibility, while excessive variation may bring chaos. Where it achieves the desired degree of success, a meeting point is as likely as countries pursuing partial alignment. Nevertheless, developments suggesting an intermediate model may be deduced in Indonesia, Malaysia and Brunei. The model lines up with Acharya's (2014, p. 62) "pluralistic regionalism", where diversity is tempered by shared norms and communicative practices rather than obliterated.

Methodologically, the combination of corpus-based semantic analysis and critical discourse analysis holds great promise for advancing research on geopolitical linguistics. With TF-IDF vectorisation and cosine similarity, we can quantify the degree of alignment, while qualitative analysis can catch those context-based nuances that quantitative methods cannot reveal in isolation. Moreover, a high inter-code reliability coefficient of 0.87 is a further signal that researchers can adopt this approach without fear when their concerns are replicated. These are all windfalls for discourse analysts.

In the future, it is hoped that, by incorporating longitudinal data beyond 2026 or by comparing Southeast Asian coalitions with other emerging-country alliances, such as BRICS, this framework can be extended for wider application with entirely new results.

The significance of this study is not confined to the special cases of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Brunei. In today's geopolitical context, as emerging countries strive to assert themselves after years living in the shadow of major players like Japan, the ability to produce coherent, convincing narratives has become an indispensable resource. As they align their languages, countries exert soft power, enabling them to coordinate positions, voice collective interests, and raise their visibility at international meetings. Dispersed discourses, on the other hand, exert this power, even if it is implanted in sound institutional structures.

Finally, the discussion confirms that the big cushion of this country's strategic alliances, especially in language frameworks, has reached its peak. With empirical evidence supporting all three hypotheses, we can say that semantic conformity is good for cooperation, discursive fragmentation is bad, and shared narratives have strong effects on your position in the global marketplace. Most studies of contemporary geopolitical alliances focus on material factors of power. This paper, in contrast, by foregrounding the role of language, offers an altogether deeper understanding of how these are constructed and maintained.

CONCLUSION

According to this research, we can see that emerging countries' strategic coalitions do not depend solely on economic interdependence or institutional setups but, at the most fundamental level, on language alignment, discursive coherence, and the harmonisation of narratives. Based on official documents from Indonesia, Malaysia, and Brunei from 2024 to 2026, this study, using discourse analysis and critical language analysis, has confirmed that language is the central mode through which cooperation in international politics is created, made particular, and finally maintained. Meanwhile, empirical data show that, although a common semantic field exists – due to shared historical experiences and languages - across different countries, alignment is always asymmetrical and reflects each country's national priorities and strategic orientations. In fact, an analysis of quantity shows that the consensus among the three nations' semantics ranges from quite low to very high. The greatest conformity is still found between Indonesia and Malaysia, and Brunei's alignment is relatively weak by comparison. What we see here is not a sign of structural weakness but rather a functional stratification in discursive tactics. Indonesia's voice is bold, full of metaphors, and marks out the region's agenda-setter; as Malaysia, it is parity carefully balanced (logical paradox detected), its diplomat's language mediates its role; Brunei, cautious, necessarily in its expressions, as concerned with sovereignty and stability, misaligned ideas are uttered. The distinctions illustrate that effective coalition-building is not characterised by homogeneity but rather by a balance with differentiation, in which linguistic variety is effectively managed within a mutually shared system of communication.

Meanwhile, the study finds many examples of fragmented talk that resists processing into anything meaningful, especially associated with questions of great geopolitical consequence. The coexistence of cooperative and sovereignty-assertive narratives within the same communicative space demonstrates coalition dynamics in the emerging multipolar order. Fragmentation is welcome flexibility, but ambiguity can prevent collective action from ever taking shape or persisting, Malleson xpos Malcolm Matson (Fairclough, 2013, p. 97). Linguistic inconsistency confirms the charge, even if subtle, and undermines the trust upon which strategic alliances depend.

The triangulation of quantitative metrics, qualitative discourse patterns, and macro-level geopolitical data used in this section reinforces the robustness of the study's conclusions. The rise in semantic near-matching over time corresponds with reports confirmed of stronger regional cooperation from leading international institutions: the International Monetary Fund (2025) and the World Bank (2024). This interplay tells us that shared meanings do not so much reflect cooperation as actually make it seem.

In this way, language can be seen to operate as both an epistemic resource and a strategic one. It shapes states' understanding of their roles, the things they say, and their

behaviour in the global system. This is similar to what Halliday (1985) argues, though he emphasises that language generates context rather than dynamically influences society.

The study's major contribution lies in conceptualising "semantic alignment" as a measurable and operationalizable dimension of geopolitical strategy. By integrating the semantic mapping of corpora with a critical discourse approach, the research offers a methodology that is conceptually sound and deployable in practice, straddling both linguistic and international relations bar guilds This methodological approach not only opens up an empirical dimension for the field of geopolitical linguistics, but it also demonstrates that discursive coherence is not something indifferently abstract; rather, it has concrete consequences of a very direct sort for the efficacy of coalition action.

In conclusion, our hypothesis states that the potential for forming strategic coalitions among emerging nations like Indonesia, Malaysia and Brunei will exist only when these three states can not only stake out a common interest but put together an appropriate language narrative to express this interest in concrete terms. Semantic alignment enhances cooperation by promoting mutual understanding and concert-identity. Discursive fragmentation, however, limits it by creating ambiguity and difference. As the global order slowly shifts toward multipolarity, the ability to use language strategically may become an increasingly important factor in determining political agency. Therefore, future research should extend this analysis to wider coalitional environments and investigate how the digital communication environment is changing the scope of language for international cooperation in this way.

REFERENCES:

- Acharya, A. (2014). *Constructing a security community in Southeast Asia* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Chen, Y., Li, Z., & Thompson, R. (2025). Emotional framing and misinformation susceptibility in digital political discourse. *Journal of Political Communication Studies*, 12(2), 1–15.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- International Monetary Fund. (2025). *World economic outlook 2025: Navigating global divergence*. International Monetary Fund.
- Kuo, R., & Marwick, A. (2024). Critical disinformation studies: History, power, and politics. *Media, Culture & Society*, 46(2), 215–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437241291317>
- Korompot, C., Siregar, I., Khursanov, N., Abdullaev, D., & Mohamed, K. (2024). Investigating Gender DIF in the Reading Comprehension Section of the B2 First Exam. *International Journal of Language Testing*, (), 57-66. doi: 10.22034/ijlt.2023.421011.1301

- Rüland, J. (2025). ASEAN and the limits of regional cohesion. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 47(1), 95–115.
- Pangaribuan, R. E., Siregar, I., & Susanto, A. (2025). TINDAK TUTUR EKSPRESIF DALAM SERIAL FILM NANTI KITA CERITA TENTANG HARI INI PADA YOUTUBE KANAL TOYOTA INDONESIA: KAJIAN PRAGMATIK. *J-Symbol: Jurnal Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 13(1, April), 208–225.
- Putri, O. M., Siregar, I., & Rachmawati, K. (2024). Semantic analysis in understanding and maintaining Betawi cultural identity through the bikin rume traditional ceremonial process. *Putri | Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i1.7806>
- Sabrina, A., Siregar, I., & Sosrohadi, S. (2021). Lingual Dominance and Symbolic Power in the Discourse of Using the PeduliLindungi Application as a Digital Payment Tool. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 1(2), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2021.1.2.8>
- Salsabila, Siregar, I., & Sosrohadi, S. (2021). Analysis of Code Mixing in Jerome Polin Youtube Content “Nihongo Mantappu”. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 4(12), 01–08. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.12.1>
- Siregar, I., Hamzah, N. H. (2024). Effectiveness of the Language Preservation Model in the Betawi Community. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 274–283. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.901023>
- Siregar, I. (2026). Linguistics as Geopolitical Strategy: Framing, Legitimacy, and Power in Global Discourse. *Journal of Language Development and Linguistics*, 5(1), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.55927/jldl.v5i1.16344>
- Siregar, I. (2026). Prediction on the Future Condition of Betawi Language. *Nusantara Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 3(8), 1263–1271. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.intekom.id/index.php/njms/article/view/2006>
- SS Wahyuni, I Siregar, K Rachmawati, NH Hamzah. (2024). Written Language Errors Of Dysgraphic Children Aged 9-12 Years In Inclusive Classrooms. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 10(3), 3420-3430. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i3.4126>
- Tapsell, R. (2024). *Media, digital politics, and democracy in Indonesia*. Oxford University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2024). *Discourse and power* (Revised ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- World Bank. (2024). *Global economic prospects 2024*. World Bank