Contesting Presidential Power: Impoliteness Strategies in YouTube Comments on the Indonesian President's Speech

Arina Isti'anah, Arlisya Kannitha Ramasyachri, Fortuna Devi Gunputri
arina@usd.ac.id
English Letters Department, Universitas Sanata Dharma, Indonesia

Abstract

The YouTube responses to Indonesian President Prabowo Subianto's speeches have sparked extensive online discussions and criticisms, providing a useful site for examining how language is used to challenge political authority in the digital environment. This study examines the use of impoliteness strategies by YouTube users to challenge the presidential power in comments on the president's speech. The study uses Culpeper's framework of impoliteness and qualitative discourse analysis of 100 YouTube comments from a news video of President Prabowo's speech. The analysis shows that the most common strategies are sarcasm or mock politeness, positive impoliteness and bald-on-record impoliteness. They are employed to challenge the president's credibility, express political discontent and negotiate power relations in an online participatory environment. The findings suggest that YouTube comment sections act as sites in which users publicly contest political authority through linguistic practices. This study contributes to the growing body of research on impoliteness in computer-mediated communication by demonstrating the use of the impoliteness strategies in Indonesian digital political discourse.

Keywords: comment; impoliteness; power; speech; YouTube

Introduction

As an innate property of human beings, language carries not only a communicative but also an ideological function, such as manifesting power and authority. Here, language is political reality, as reflected in a presidential address and statement. The language, register, and rhetorical strategy of a president can project authority, assert legitimacy, and delegitimise opposition, all of which can shape public understanding of the government's position well beyond its literal propositional content. This is in line with Fairclough's (1989) pioneering notion that language is used to reproduce and change power relations in society, in revealing ideological discourses that tend to be normalised and invisible. In this sense, the language of politics

perpetuates hierarchy and reinforces existing power structures. In other words, language constructs identities, governs political discourse, and mirrors the status of society (Swetha & Aravind, 2025). However, the power conveyed by language is not the only attribute of those who hold it. Language is a medium for displaying, preserving, or challenging power. It is used not only by dominant groups who wish to exercise or exploit power, but also by subordinate groups who wish to challenge this power and redefine their relationship to it.

This phenomenon can be observed when ordinary citizens use impoliteness strategies (Culpeper, 2011) to respond to presidential public statements, and in challenging the politeness that is often given to such utterances. Impoliteness strategies are frequently employed by digital language users to criticise political figures, including presidents, governors, and members of legislative bodies. Susilowati et al. (2026), for instance, examined how users on X metaphorically dehumanise Indonesian politicians through three strategies: animalising or objectifying politicians, associating politicians' emotions with particular types of animals or garbage, and associating politicians' characteristics with types of animals or garbage. This evidence shows that social media provides an alternative space for ordinary people to produce, circulate, and influence political information, which challenges the traditional gatekeeping power of mainstream media and institutions. The democratisation of communication increases the speed, scale, and scope of information sharing and allows for more voices to participate in public discourse (Rosário & Boechat, 2024; Schirch, 2021). This also implies a redistribution of discursive power, which allows citizens to progressively engage, contest, and shape political discourse.

Social media also offers digital language users various linguistic tools to express criticism of political leaders, such as hashtags, insults, sarcasm, or mockery (Ojukwu, 2026; Vladimirou & House, 2018). These linguistic features may constitute face-threatening acts that convey public distrust, disapproval, and opposition towards political actors. Because social media content can circulate rapidly across networks, impolite tweets and posts may become viral to amplify criticism and encourage other users to participate in collective condemnation (Vladimirou & House, 2018). A recent example is the hashtag #IndonesiaGelap, which went viral to express public opposition to the Indonesian government. The discourse surrounding the hashtag associated the perceived deterioration of Indonesia's political and economic conditions with both former president Joko Widodo and Prabowo (Susilowati et al., 2026). This means that social media language can cause public protests and demonstrations, and this can have an impact on policies and political actions.

As the Indonesian president, Prabowo has made some controversial headlines, especially during the main event to celebrate the 79th National Cooperative Day (HARKOPNAS/ *Hari Koperasi Nasional*) which was held at the Indonesia Arena, Gelora Bung Karno Complex, Jakarta on Sunday (July 12, 2026). The event themed "Koperasi Berdaya, Indonesia Berjaya" (Empowered Cooperatives, a Prosperous Indonesia) was led by President Prabowo Subianto to strengthen cooperatives as a pillar of the people's economy. The event was expected to inspire Indonesians to unite and to make cooperatives the main catalysts for the people's economy from the grassroots level up to the national level. However, President Prabowo Subianto told Indonesians to leave the country if they view Indonesia as a bleak nation. This assertion unequivocally indicates his aversion to criticism. He mockingly advised Indonesians to exit the nation. The

statement sparked disappointment among Indonesians, as reflected in YouTube comments. Various impolite expressions were observed on the platform. Therefore, this study aims to explore how language is used in the public sphere, specifically through YouTube comments, to challenge presidential authority.

Methodology

This study is examined within the cyber pragmatics approach, which focuses on understanding language use in digital, computer-mediated environments (Yus, 2011). Digital communication provides a productive context for examining impoliteness because its affordances and constraints shape how users construct, interpret, and respond to face-threatening acts. Features such as relative anonymity, potentially large and heterogeneous audiences, asynchronicity, and the absence or transformation of conventional non-verbal cues may influence the production and interpretation of impolite expressions (Salimi & Mortazavi, 2023). At the same time, digital platforms offer multimodal resources, including emojis, punctuation, capitalisation, and other graphic features, which may compensate for the limited availability of face-to-face paralinguistic cues. Cyberpragmatics therefore draws on established pragmatic theories, including Grice's Cooperative Principle and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory, while extending their application to the distinctive characteristics of computer-mediated discourse (Bărbuleț, 2023). Within this perspective, impoliteness can be understood as a form of strategic communication through which users intentionally or contextually attack an individual's face, or socially valued self-image, potentially generating interpersonal conflict, contestation, and broader social disharmony.

The data of this research were taken from a video uploaded by Kompas TV in its official YouTube channel. Kompas TV is a major private national television network in Indonesia, established in 2010. It utilises YouTube as a significant platform for distributing news and current affairs content. According to audience statistics data, the visitors of Kompas TV website are mostly male (63.04%) and female visitors are 36.96%, and the age group of 18-24 years is the largest user. The chosen video was posted on 12 July 2026 and had more than 50,000 views and 500 comments at the time of data collection. In the video, Indonesia's president Prabowo makes a speech calling for national unity and Indonesia's desire to rise and strengthen its position in the world. However, one statement in the speech drew particular public attention. "Yang merasa Indonesia suram silahkan kalau mau cari negara lain" ('Those who think Indonesia is bleak are welcome to look for another country'), said at about 1:12 of the video. Some members of the public viewed the statement as a dismissive response to citizens voicing concern about the country's political and socioeconomic climate. Later its circulation on YouTube created a large number of public responses, which made the comment section a relevant site for examining the lingual construction of criticism and opposition towards a political leader by citizens.

For the purposes of this study, the first 100 most popular comments presented in the YouTube video were collected using ExportComments . The popular comments were selected to gather responses that were more visible and participated in on the platform, as indicated by the

number of likes and the platform's comment ranking. The comments provide the main data set for the analysis of impoliteness strategies. The study does not read the comments as isolated expressions of negativity, but as pragmatic actions situated in a specific sociopolitical and digital context. Special attention is devoted to how commenters use impoliteness to question the president's claims, express their displeasure, build political opposition, and negotiate their own positions as members of the public. The incorporation of the cyberpragmatic perspective alongside Culpeper's (2011) model of impoliteness enables the study to investigate not only what forms of impoliteness occur but also how these forms function in digitally mediated political discourse.

The comments were downloaded from YouTube into an Excel spreadsheet with associated metadata such as posting date, badge status, number of likes, comment text and source. Consistent with ethical principles when conducting social media research, usernames, account names and other potentially identifiable information of commenters were removed from the analysis, and were not reported in the findings. The analysis focused primarily on the linguistic content of the comments and the ways users constructed impoliteness towards the political figure being examined. Each comment was manually examined and annotated according to three analytical dimensions: impoliteness strategies, linguistic markers, and non-linguistic markers. The identification and categorisation of impoliteness strategies followed Culpeper's (2011) framework, which provides a systematic account of how speakers intentionally attack or damage the target's face. The linguistic markers captured the lexical and grammatical resources through which impoliteness was realised, including insults, derogatory expressions, profanity, negative evaluations, sarcasm, rhetorical questions, and other forms of face-attack. Meanwhile, non-linguistic markers were identified based on Yus's (2011) account of digital communication, particularly the use of features such as emojis, punctuation, capitalisation, repetition, and other graphic or paralinguistic resources that may contribute to the interpretation of an utterance.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of 100 top YouTube comments from a news video of Prabowo's speech contains 87 impoliteness strategies: sarcasm or mock politeness, positive impoliteness, bald-on-record impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. As presented in Table 1, sarcasm or mock politeness is the highest-occurring strategy, with 45 occurrences, followed by positive impoliteness with 22 occurrences, and bald on-record in 19 occurrences. At the same time, negative impoliteness appears as the least occurring strategy, with only 1 occurrence.

Table 1. Occurrence of Impoliteness Strategies on the YouTube Comments

Impoliteness Strategies	Occurrence
Sarcasm or mock politeness	45
Positive impoliteness	22
Bald on-record impoliteness	19
Negative impoliteness	1
TOTAL	**87**

1. Sarcasm or mock politeness

The results show that sarcasm or mock politeness is the most frequent strategy, with 45 occurrences (51.7%). According to Culpeper (1996), a strategy counts as sarcasm or mock politeness when the face-threatening act (FTA) is carried out with politeness strategies that are obviously insincere. The dominance of this strategy indicates that the commenters tend to attack Prabowo's face indirectly through the use of apparently polite and positive expressions. This pattern is consistent with Leech's (1983) Irony Principle which states that a speaker who wishes to express disagreement can do so by using irony, seemingly observing the Politeness Principle (PP) on the surface but still conveying the offensive point to the hearer by implicature. This is why the commenters preferred statements with irony and mock politeness with an implied critical meaning, instead of merely stating their disagreement.

Table 2. Linguistic strategies on the occurrence of sarcasm or mock politeness

Linguistic Strategies	Occurrence
Mocking	26
Rhetorical statement	7
Insult	4
Hyperbole	3
Overstatement	2
Dysphemism	1
Metaphor	1
Understatement	1
TOTAL	**45**

As presented in Table 2, mocking is the most frequently occurring linguistic strategy. One example is the comment "Mari kita rame rame pindah dari negara Indonesia 💪💪" (Let's all move out of Indonesia together 💪💪). On the surface, the comment reads as an enthusiastic call to action, and the flexed-arm emojis reinforce this supportive, motivational tone. But the irony of the comment is likely unintentional: the individual is criticising the notion that a president would tell their own people to leave the country. The comment is a sarcastic reply by Prabowo to an invitation he made to citizens unhappy with Indonesia to go and live elsewhere. Language plays a key role in the construction of political discourse (Swetha and Aravind, 2025). By using sarcasm in his statement, Prabowo's statement was dismissive of public dissatisfaction and was mocked by YouTube commenters. The comment's apparent support contrasted with its underlying criticism thus fits Culpeper's (1996) notion of sarcasm or mock politeness.

Another example is the comment "Jadi teringat waktu itu ada londo ireng yg kabur ke Yordan 🤫" (It reminds me of the time a londo ireng fled to Jordan 🤫). The comment is an indirect jab at Prabowo, alluding to his departure from Indonesia during the political turmoil surrounding the fall of President Soeharto in 1998. Following allegations of his involvement in the abduction of pro-democracy activists, Prabowo was discharged from the military and subsequently left for Jordan. By describing this departure as kabur (fled), rather than with a neutral verb, the commenter draws on Prabowo's controversial past to undermine his image as a national leader.

The emoji 🤭, which conveys mock surprise or a feigned slip of the tongue, reinforces the insinuating tone, as if the commenter were hinting at something everyone already knows. The comment thus implies a hypocrisy: Prabowo can easily invite dissatisfied citizens to leave the country because he himself once left when the situation became difficult.

After mocking, rhetorical questions are the second most common linguistic strategy within the sarcasm or mock politeness category. Brown and Levinson (1987) describe a rhetorical question as one asked without any intention of obtaining an answer. In doing so, the speaker breaks the sincerity condition on questions, namely that the speaker genuinely wants the hearer to provide information. An example is the comment "Mau pindah negara tapi gratis semua syarat2 dan pengurusannya ada ga?" (I'd like to move to another country, but is there an option where all the requirements and paperwork are free?). On the surface, the commenter appears to be complying with the president's suggestion and asking for practical information. The question, however, is not a genuine request. It presupposes what the commenter already believes: that in Indonesia almost every administrative process comes at a high cost, so emigrating would require money that most ordinary citizens do not have. By posing a question whose answer is obviously "no," the commenter exposes the impracticality of Prabowo's suggestion and implies that it is out of touch with the realities faced by ordinary people.

Another comment reads, "Anak: pak dirumah ngakda makanan. Bapak: silakan pindah kerumah tetangga. 😂" (Child: Dad, there's no food at home. Dad: Feel free to move to the neighbour's house. 😂). Here, the commenter constructs a sarcastic analogy in which the home stands for the country, the father for Prabowo, and the child for the Indonesian people. In the scenario, a child tells his father that there is no food at home, and instead of addressing the problem, the father suggests that the child move to the neighbour's house. The analogy targets Prabowo's statement that people who see Indonesia as suram (bleak) should move to another country. Just as a father is expected to provide for his child, a head of state is expected to address citizens' hardships; the father's reply therefore portrays Prabowo as abandoning that responsibility. Culpeper et al. (2003) define impoliteness strategies as strategies designed to attack face and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony. In this case, the commenter does not attack Prabowo's face directly but uses a sarcastic analogy to present his statement as unreasonable and absurd. The laughing emoji 😂 frames the exchange as a joke, which makes the ridicule explicit and invites other viewers to laugh at Prabowo. The comment thus functions as an FTA that mocks the way Prabowo responds to public dissatisfaction and highlights how poorly his statement fits the problems people actually face.

2. Positive Impoliteness

Positive impoliteness is the second most frequent strategy, with 22 occurrences (25.3%). According to Culpeper (1996), positive impoliteness is the use of strategies designed to damage the hearer's positive face, that is, the hearer's desire to be approved of and appreciated. These strategies include ignoring or snubbing the hearer, being uninterested, unconcerned, or unsympathetic, using inappropriate identity markers, and using obscure or secretive language,

such as jargon or codes known only to certain groups (Culpeper, 1996). In the data, commenters use these strategies to attack Prabowo's positive face, targeting his self-esteem, his public image, and his desire to be valued.

Table 3. Linguistic strategies on the occurrence of Positive impoliteness

Linguistic Strategies	Occurrence
Insult	6
Criticism	4
Mocking	4
Overstatement	3
Rhetorical question	3
Interjection	1
Metaphor	1
TOTAL	**22**

Within positive impoliteness, insults are the most frequent linguistic strategy used by commenters to perform FTAs. Culpeper (2011) notes that the word *insult* derives from the Latin *insulto*, originally meaning to leap upon or assail, so its modern use reflects a metaphorical extension from physical attack to verbal aggression. He classifies insults as a conventionalised impoliteness formula, that is, a linguistic form that has become so regularly associated with impoliteness that it is recognised as offensive across many contexts. One example is the comment "Ituh ngomong asal mangap aja ga ada pilternya,, segampang ituh dia menanggapi keluh kesah masyarakat yg sedang kesusahan dengan mengatakan silahkan cari negara lain kalo merasa indonesia suram" (He just opens his mouth and talks without any filter. That's how easily he responds to the grievances of struggling people, by telling them to go find another country if they think Indonesia is so bleak). The insult is mostly in the first clause, "Ituh ngomong asal mangap aja ga ada pilternya" (He just opens his mouth and talks without any filter), which describes Prabowo as someone who speaks carelessly and without thinking. The commenter attacks the positive face of Prabowo by degrading his judgement and competence. The second clause adds another charge, the phrase "segampang ituh" (that easily) describes him as indifferent to the hardships of ordinary people. Culpeper (2011) argues that the remark functions as an insult because it creates a low value reading of its target.

Another example is the comment "Lihat lah rakyat Indonesia menderita penjabat malah kayak orang gila gak usah ngibarin bendera Indonesia mending ngibarin bendera Belanda 😂😂😂" (Look at the Indonesian people suffering, while the officials act like crazy people. No need to fly the Indonesian flag; might as well fly the Dutch flag instead 😂😂😂). This comment combines two strategies. First, the phrase *kayak orang gila* (act like crazy people) is an insult that attacks a positive face. Notably, the target is not Prabowo alone since by referring to *penjabat* (officials) in general, the commenter extends the attack to government officials as a whole. Second, the suggestion to replace the Indonesian flag with the Dutch flag is a form of mocking. By invoking the Dutch flag, the commenter likens the current government to the colonial regime, implying that although Indonesia is formally independent, its people are still treated as if they

lived under colonial rule. The repeated laughing emoji 😂😂😂 reinforces the ridicule and gives the comment a satirical tone, presenting the government as an object of laughter. This example supports the view that mockery serves as a common means of expressing political criticism in digital discourse (Ojukwu, 2026; Vladimirou & House, 2018).

3. Bald on-Record

Bald on-Record comes in as the third most frequently used strategy, occurring 19 times (21.8%). Based on Culpeper (1996), bald on-record is the clearest and most unambiguous way of throwing an FTA. The speaker may be very direct in expressing what exactly they mean, without trying to soften or hide the actual meaning. In line with Brown & Levinson (1987) that bald-on record strategy is suitable in a situation of relatively high power. In this section, it will become clear that commenters usually show bald on-record to strongly criticise the hearer, challenge their authority, and insult their reputation (Culpeper, 1996).

Table 4. Linguistic strategies on the occurrence of Bald on-Record

Linguistic Strategies	Occurrence
Insult	16
Emoji	1
Mocking	1
Harsh expression	1
TOTAL	**19**

As Table 2 shows, insults are the most frequent linguistic strategy within bald on-record impoliteness, indicating that commenters tend to criticise Prabowo directly through insulting expressions. Examples (1)–(5) illustrate this pattern.

(1) "Rakyat tidak bodoh itu benar pak.Yang BODOH itu President Probowo iya kan."
(It's true that the people aren't stupid, sir. The one who's STUPID is President Prabowo, right?)

(2) "CARI NEGARA LAIN MATAMU!! KAU PRABOWO SANA PINDAH NEGARA LAIN. INDONESIA TIDAK PANTAS UNTUK ORANG SEPERTI LU!!"
(FIND ANOTHER COUNTRY, YOUR EYES!! YOU, PRABOWO, GO MOVE TO ANOTHER COUNTRY. SOMEONE LIKE YOU DOESN'T DESERVE INDONESIA!!)

(3) "Prabowo jancuk !!!"
(Prabowo, you bastard!!!)

(4) "Presidennya yg tlol atau presidennya tlol?GENDUT ATHEIS!"
(Is it the president who's stupid, or is the president just stupid? FAT ATHEIST!)

(5) "sontoloyo"
(good-for-nothing)

In each example, the commenter attacks Prabowo without any mitigation, using expressions such as *bodoh* (stupid), *jancuk* (bastard), *tlol* (stupid), *gendut atheis* (fat atheist), and *sontoloyo* (good-for-nothing). Several features intensify these attacks by using capital letters and repeated

exclamation marks, which signal shouting. In addition, there are also informal and disrespectful second-person pronouns *kau* and *lu* in (2), used to address the president; and in (4), a mock question whose two "options" are identical, so that both answers lead to the same insult. Example (1) is also notable because it echoes and reverses the claim that the people are not stupid, redirecting the label *bodoh* towards Prabowo himself. These comments suggest that commenters want to express their disagreement as forcefully as possible and are willing to confront a figure of considerable power directly. This is consistent with Culpeper's (1996) observation that bald on-record impoliteness typically occurs when much face is at stake and the speaker intends to attack the hearer's face.

Another clear example of bald on-record impoliteness is the comment below.

(6) "Gak usah kasih mic kalau beliau pidato gak ada gunanya omongan mulut sama otak udh gak singkron makanya omon2 jadinya" (No need to give him a mic when he gives speeches, it's useless. His mouth and brain are no longer in sync, which is why it all turns into *omon-omon*).

The comment directly attacks two of Prabowo's abilities, namely his ability to speak meaningfully (*gak ada gunanya*, "it's useless") and to think coherently (*mulut sama otak udh gak singkron*, "his mouth and brain are no longer in sync"). By suggesting that he should not even be given a microphone, the commenter presents his speeches as worthless and, in effect, calls for him to be silenced. This undermines both his competence and his public image as the holder of the highest office in the country. The term *omon-omon* (empty talk) adds a further layer since Prabowo himself popularised the expression when criticising a political rival during the 2024 presidential campaign, so the commenter turns his own words against him. Interestingly, the commenter refers to Prabowo with the honorific pronoun *beliau*, yet this deferential form does nothing to soften the attack that follows. Unlike the sarcastic comments discussed earlier, this comment states its negative evaluation of Prabowo openly, which is consistent with Culpeper's (1996) definition of bald on-record impoliteness as an FTA performed in a direct, clear, and unambiguous way.

4. Negative Impoliteness

The least frequent impoliteness strategy in the video comments is negative impoliteness, with only one occurrence. Culpeper (1996) defines negative impoliteness as the use of strategies designed to damage the hearer's negative face wants. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), negative face is a person's desire for freedom of action, that is, the desire not to be impeded, controlled, or imposed upon by others. The term "negative" does not imply anything bad, but it refers to freedom from interference. Accordingly, a speaker who uses negative impoliteness typically attacks the hearer's freedom of action, for example by frightening, condescending to, or imposing on the hearer (Culpeper, 1996).

Table 5. Linguistic strategies on the occurrence of Negative impoliteness

Linguistic Strategies	Occurrence
Mocking	1
TOTAL	**1**

The only instance of negative impoliteness in the data is the comment "Pilihan rakyat sndr👍👍" (The people's own choice 👍👍). Unlike most comments, which target Prabowo directly, this comment appears to be directed at the voters who elected him. It implies that if people now find his statements unacceptable, they have only themselves to blame, a meaning that might be paraphrased as "You chose him, so enjoy the result." This realises Culpeper's (1996) negative impoliteness strategy of condescending, scorning, or ridiculing, as the commenter belittles the voters' judgement and holds them responsible for the situation. The double thumbs-up emoji 👍👍 expresses mock approval. On the surface, it endorses the people's choice, but in context, it conveys the opposite. The comment, therefore, also has a sarcastic quality, as it highlights the irony that a president elected by the people is now inviting those same people to leave the country.

Conclusion

This study has examined the impoliteness strategies used by YouTube commenters in response to President Prabowo's speech. Four of Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategies were identified in 87 instances. Sarcasm or mock politeness was the dominant strategy, with 45 occurrences (51.7%), followed by positive impoliteness with 22 occurrences (25.3%), bald on-record impoliteness with 19 occurrences (21.8%), and negative impoliteness with a single occurrence (1.1%). Each strategy was realised through a distinct set of linguistic strategies. Sarcasm or mock politeness was realised mainly through mocking (26 occurrences) and rhetorical questions (7), with smaller numbers of insults, hyperbole, overstatement, dysphemism, metaphor, and understatement. Positive impoliteness, which targeted Prabowo's positive face, was realised mostly through insults (6), criticism (4), and mocking (4), together with overstatements, rhetorical questions, an interjection, and a metaphor. Bald on-record impoliteness, the most direct way of performing an FTA, was dominated by insults (16 of 19 occurrences). The single instance of negative impoliteness was realised through mocking.

These findings show that most commenters attacked Prabowo's face indirectly rather than bluntly. Instead of insulting him outright, they frequently turned his own words against him, using irony, mock praise, and rhetorical questions to portray his statement, and by extension Prabowo himself, as foolish and out of touch with the hardships of ordinary citizens. Commenters also challenged his performance as president, questioned his competence for the office, symbolically excluded him from the national community by telling him to leave the country, and called him derogatory names. At the same time, the presence of bald on-record impoliteness shows that a considerable number of commenters were willing to attack the president directly with blunt and offensive language, despite the large power difference between them. Overall,

the results suggest that online comment sections give citizens a space to challenge a powerful political figure, and that they do so predominantly through indirect forms of impoliteness such as sarcasm and mockery.

This study has several limitations. First, the data were drawn from the comment section of a single video, published on the Kompas TV YouTube channel. Future studies could compare comments on the same speech across several platforms and channels, or collect a larger dataset, to produce more comprehensive and generalisable findings. Second, because the data are limited to written online comments, some impoliteness strategies, such as withhold politeness, could not be observed, as they typically consist of the *absence* of an expected polite act in face-to-face interaction. Future research could examine public responses to political speeches in offline settings. Finally, the analysis relied on the researchers' interpretation of the comments, as the commenters' actual intentions could not be verified. Future studies could complement textual analysis with interviews or questionnaires to confirm how commenters intended their remarks to be understood.

References

Bărbuleț, G. (2023). Applying Pragmatic Principles To Social Media Interactions: A Case-Based Analysis. *Journal of Linguistic and Intercultural Education*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.29302/jolie.2023.16.1.1

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *25*(3), 349–367. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3

Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*(10–11), 1545–1579. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00118-2

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Longman. (Original work published the University of Michigan)

Kompas TV. (2026a). *Pidato di Puncak Harkopnas, Prabowo: Yang Merasa Indonesia Suram, Silakan Cari Negara Lain | JMP* [Video recording]. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DY-8kWRECaE

Kompas TV. (2026b, July 12). *Prabowo: Yang Merasa Indonesia Suram, Silakan Cari Negara Lain*. https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2026/07/12/17572291/prabowo-yang-merasa-indonesia-suram-silakan-cari-negara-lain

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Taylor and Francis.

Ojukwu, C. K. (2026). Impoliteness Strategies in Selected Twitter Posts on the Supreme Court's Declaration of Tinubu as the Winner in the 2023 Election. *Nsukka Journal of the Humanities*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.62250/nsuk.2026.34.1.97.117

Rosário, A. T., & Boechat, A. C. (2024). How Automated Machine Learning Can Improve Business. *Applied Sciences*, *14*(19), 8749. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14198749

Salimi, E. A., & Mortazavi, S. M. (2023). "I Keep Forgetting You're Still Alive": Unmasking Impoliteness in the Xsphere. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, *38*, 18–33. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2023.38.02

Schirch, L. (2021). Digital information, conflict and democracy. In *Social Media Impacts on Conflict and Democracy* (1st edn, p. 22). Routledge. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003087649-2

Susilowati, N. E., Wijana, I. D. P., & Cholsy, H. (2026). Rats or Garbage? Dehumanizing Politicians through Metaphor. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *13*(1), 452–465. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v13i1.192

Swetha, M., & Aravind, B. R. (2025). Language as power: Analyzing the intersection of linguistics and politics in Ijeoma Oluo's work. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101405

Vladimirou, D., & House, J. (2018). *Ludic impoliteness and globalisation on Twitter: 'I speak England very best' #agglika_Tsipra, #Tsipras #Clinton*. *134*(Im/politeness and globalisation), 149–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.05.005

Yus, F. (2011). *Cyberpragmatics: Internet-mediated communication in context*. John Benjamins.