


Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in Indonesia's MBG Issue on X

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i6.1652>

*Alya Vania Rahma, Afifah Syahlina Br Hutagalung, Diantry Binarwaty Habibie

Nasution, Maha Lhaksmi, Rahmadsyah Rangkuti^{abcde}

¹²³⁴⁵Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: alya.vania201788@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

This study investigates Indonesian political discourse on X (formerly Twitter), focusing on public reactions to the government's Nutritious Food Program (MBG). It explores how netizens deploy rudeness strategies to articulate political views, grievances, and ideological stances. Data were collected via purposive sampling of ten public comments from the @salam4jari account on MBG-related posts. Employing a qualitative descriptive approach, the analysis applies Culpeper's impoliteness framework, encompassing updated categories (affective, coercive, entertaining) and classical ones (bald on record, positive, negative, sarcasm/mock politeness, withhold politeness). Findings reveal users frequently venting anger, dissatisfaction, or humor through direct verbal aggression, sarcasm, and emotional outbursts. Affective impoliteness appears in emotionally charged attacks, coercive in forceful demands for policy shifts, and entertaining in amusing yet degrading insults. The lack of withhold politeness suggests open rather than covert dissent. Overall, impoliteness serves as emotional catharsis and a tactic for bolstering group identity, wielding power, and challenging dominant narratives. This research enriches insights into digital communication in polarized contexts, underscoring the sociocultural dynamics of online linguistic behavior.

Keywords: *Impoliteness, Twitter, MBG Issue, Indonesian Politic, Online Communication*

Article History:

Received 30th October 2025

Accepted 22nd December 2025

Published 22rd December 2025



INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is currently facing a serious incident involving mass poisoning among students at various levels of education. This incident occurred after students consumed Nutritious Food (MBG) meals, which were intended to fulfill nutritional needs and improve the health of school-age children. (Pancani, P. C., & Ningsih, N, 2025). However, instead of providing benefits, these MBG meals caused health problems in hundreds of students. Based on reports circulating, as many as 400 students from various educational institutions, ranging from kindergartens, elementary schools, Islamic elementary schools, to junior high schools, experienced symptoms of poisoning such as nausea, dizziness, vomiting, and other digestive disorders. This incident not only had health implications for the students, but also raised public concern about the food safety and supervision system in the school nutrition program. The researchers took several comments from one of the MBG case in point 7 on Twitter posts as data for this study. This research focuses on examining how impoliteness manifests in Indonesian political Twitter comments, particularly in terms of its linguistic forms, strategic use, and wider social effects. Political communication on digital platforms is inherently influenced by social power relations, ideology, and personal background. When individuals respond to political figures or issues online, their comments often reflect their social identity, emotional stance, and political orientation. Consequently, Twitter discussions frequently include offensive remarks, sarcastic tones, and mocking statements intended to discredit

opponents or assert dominance (Anwar, M., Amir, F. R., Herlina, Anoegrajekti, N., & Muliastuti, L. 2021).

According to Culpeper (2008: 36), impoliteness is a communication behavior that aims to disparage the target (speaking partner) or makes them feel that way. According to this definition, being impolite depends on the speaker's intention as well as the listener's comprehension of that intention and their relationship. Stated differently, an action could be considered rude if the listener believes the speaker has threatened them or their discourse partner and damaged their face. Culpeper (1996) identifies 7 several forms of impoliteness strategies, such as Bald on Record, which is a direct, clear, and unambiguous way of speaking without attempting to minimize actions. Positive Impoliteness, which is A strategy aimed at damaging or disregarding the positive image of the audience. Negative Impoliteness, which is A strategy that targets listeners' desire for autonomy and freedom from coercion. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness, the using polite language insincerely to express disgust or mock the listener. and Withhold Politeness, which is deliberately not using polite forms or softening expressions when they are expected.

Culpeper (2011) also introduces the concept of the purpose or social effect of impolite comment. It means what social impact does such rude speech have on the target and the social situation. There are 3 impoliteness in these aspects as follows.

A. Affection impoliteness is a act of displaying emotion uncontrollably in situations when it is forbidden or inappropriate (like as laughing at a funeral) might be considered affection impoliteness. There are moments when emotional expression is more reactive and impulsive, and other moments when it is more strategic and utilitarian, as was covered in Emotions. Targeted displays of heightened emotion, usually rage, with the suggestion that the target is to fault for creating that negative emotional state constitute more instrumental affective impoliteness.

B. Coercive impoliteness is to rebalance the values of the producer and the target so that the former gains something new or has their existing advantages maintained. These advantages could be material (for example, using rudeness to make someone give you something) or symbolic (for example, using rudeness to make someone feel less valuable so that you can feel better about yourself). Coercive impoliteness is more likely to occur when there is an imbalance of social structural power because the more powerful member, such as a parent or boss, is less scared by retaliation, even if it can also be utilized in more equal interactions to engineer a gain in social power.

C. Entertaining impoliteness is always exploitative to some extent since it entails amusement at the expense of the victim (or potential target) of the rudeness. It involves a victim, or at least a potential victim, just like the other functional types of impoliteness. However, it is not necessarily the case that the target is aware of the rudeness, that the target is a "real" identity, or even that the participants who are entertained know who the target is. The target's genuine identity is frequently unknown or ambiguous in venues like graffiti or weblogs, and in literary fiction, the target is wholly made up.

According to Mills (2003: 139), impoliteness can only be practically comprehended and examined in relation to the comprehension of communities or groups of utterances and only in terms of different general discourse tactics amongst speakers. Impoliteness must be viewed as an evaluation of one's conduct rather than the inherent merits of speech, according to Mills (2003:122). Impoliteness is thus a highly nuanced evaluation of purpose. Impoliteness can be classified as either motivated or unmotivated, depending on the speaker's aim or the speech's goal.

Negative attitudes and actions that take place in specific situations are considered impoliteness (Culpeper, 2011: 254). Expectations, wants, and/or convictions about particular values all contribute to disrespectful behavior. Negatively perceived behavior is sometimes regarded as "disrespectful" when there is disagreement, when someone is defending their opinions or values, or when they hope that others will share their beliefs. (Junaidi, J., Januarini, E., & Pasaribu, G. R. (2024).

There are seven previous data in this research, First is came from by Murti, Pratama, and Yulianto (2023) titled "Impoliteness Strategies in Online Political Discourse: A Case Study of Indonesian Netizens' Comments on TikTok" analyzed impolite expressions in TikTok political comments using Culpeper's (1996) framework. The study found that sarcasm or mock politeness was the most dominant strategy, followed by positive and negative impoliteness. The researchers concluded that online anonymity encourages users to express hostility more freely in political discussions. Second, this Previous study by Santosa (2022) entitled "Sociolinguistics Approach: Impoliteness Strategy in Instagram Cyberbullying in @Lambe_Turah's Post of KPAI's Case" examined impoliteness strategies used by Instagram users in comments related to the KPAI controversy. Using Culpeper's (1996) theory, the research found that bald on record and negative impoliteness were the most frequently applied strategies to insult or attack others. The study concluded that social media users often employ impolite language as a means of expressing anger and reinforcing group identity. Third, this study came from Hasanah, Murni, and Lubis (2021) conducted a study entitled "Impoliteness Strategies Used by Haters and Supporters of Presidential Candidates in Cyber-Conflicts" to explore how social media users demonstrate verbal aggression in political discussions on Instagram. Using Culpeper's (1996) model, the researchers found that negative impoliteness appeared most frequently, followed by positive impoliteness, sarcasm, and bald-on-record strategies. The results showed that participants used impolite expressions mainly to justify their political opinions and to attack opposing sides in online debates. Fourth is came from by Arrasyd and Hamzah (2019) conducted a study titled "Impoliteness Strategies in YouTube Comment Section Found in Indonesian Presidential Debate 2019" to examine netizens' comments during the 2019 presidential debate between Jokowi-Ma'ruf and Prabowo-Sandi. Applying Culpeper's (1996) framework, they discovered 267 instances of impoliteness strategies across 200 comments, as several contained multiple forms of rudeness. The results indicated that positive impoliteness appeared most frequently, while withhold politeness was absent. The study concluded that strong political divisions online often lead users to employ harsh and emotionally driven language in expressing their opinions. Subsequently, the earlier research conducted by Kharisma, Mardani, and Putra (2024) presented a study titled "Impoliteness in the E-News Social Media Comment Section: A Descriptive Study" aimed at examining the ways in which Instagram users exhibit impolite behavior within the comment sections of E-News posts.

Utilizing Culpeper's (1996) framework, the study recognized all five classifications of impoliteness strategies: bald on record, positive, negative, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withholding politeness. The results indicated that positive impoliteness occurred most frequently, showing that users often use harsh or mocking language to express criticism. The study suggested that social media comment sections frequently serve as venues for emotional expression and face-threatening interactions. Sixth is came from Sibarani, Manik, and Sembiring (2022) entitled "Impoliteness Strategies on Anies Baswedan's Twitter Comments" examined 108 user comments on Anies Baswedan's official Twitter account from November 2021 to January 2022. Employing Culpeper's (1996) theory, the study discovered four types of impoliteness strategies: negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, bald on record, and sarcasm/mock politeness. The analysis revealed that negative impoliteness appeared most frequently (37%), followed by positive impoliteness (31.4%), bald on record (16.6%), and sarcasm/mock politeness (14.8%), while withhold politeness was absent. The researchers concluded that Twitter users tended to use impolite remarks as a way to criticize political figures and express opposition in either direct or sarcastic forms. Last is came from by Pangaribuan, Rangkuti, and Lubis entitled "Impoliteness Strategies and Power Performed By Netizen on Twitter". This study examines netizens' impoliteness strategies in comments on Jefri Nichol's tweets using a qualitative descriptive method. Based on Culpeper's (1996) theory, four impoliteness strategies were identified: bald on record, positive, negative, and sarcasm/mock politeness. Power analysis using Beebe's (1995) and Bousfield's (2008) theories revealed the existence of dominance and power hierarchy. Netizens were angry because Jefri's tweet touched on a sensitive topic about physical appearance.

From these seven previous, this research on incivility in Indonesian social media is still limited, especially in the context of politics on Twitter. Several previous studies have focused on one public figure, Jefri Nichol, and only used types of incivility such as bald on record, positive, negative, sarcasm, and withhold politeness. However, Culpeper's newer theories, such as Affective Politeness, Coercive Impoliteness, and Entertaining Impoliteness are highly relevant for understanding the expression of emotion and power in online political comments. Therefore, this study offers an update by applying these theories to political discourse on Twitter, thereby providing a broader and more contextual perspective in the study of digital political communication in Indonesia.

METHOD

A qualitative research methodology was used in this study to examine the manifestations and strategic uses of impoliteness within Indonesian political communication on X. The data were collected from publicly accessible comments posted on the X account @salam4jari (<https://x.com/salam4jari?s=21>), focusing on discussions related to Indonesian politics. This method enables an in-depth exploration of the linguistic characteristics, contextual dynamics, and sociocultural dimensions of impolite language in online political interactions, which often become more intense in polarized digital environments (Culpeper, 2011). The data were taken from a popular post on X about a current public matter, the government's Free Nutritious Food (MBG) Program at the height of discussions about reported food poisoning cases. Comments were gathered within 48 hours of the post to catch immediate reactions. We targeted posts with hashtags like #MBG, #MakananBergizi, or direct mentions of the program to keep things relevant to the study.

The dataset was built using purposive sampling of ten user responses to political posts, chosen with specific standards to ensure they were representative and useful for analysis. Comments were picked if they (1) directly talked about the MBG policy or how it was carried out, (2) showed clear signs of impoliteness in language, and (3) covered a variety of impoliteness tactics from Culpeper's model. This method aimed for diverse examples of rudeness rather than just one type. The small number of samples suited qualitative discourse analysis, emphasizing thorough language study over broad statistical claims. Each chosen comment had strong engagement, showing it mattered to the online group and reflected wider conversation trends.

All data came from open accounts with no privacy issues, sticking to the usual ethical rules for social media studies. To safeguard users, we swapped real usernames with made-up ones (like Dave!! or odongdaeng) and removed profile pictures during transcription. The team recognizes that even public comments need careful handling in research, especially with sensitive political topics. We chose public over private accounts for openness and to examine speech people meant to share publicly, adding to bigger political talks.

The comment analysis used Culpeper's (1996, 2011) framework for impoliteness tactics, covering traditional types like bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and the withholding of politeness, plus newer ones such as affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness, and entertaining impoliteness. The study relied on the impoliteness model from Brown and Levinson (1987), expanded by Culpeper (1996, 2011), as the main tool for sorting things out.

The analysis followed clear steps. First, the team read each comment several times to get comfortable with it and its background. Second, bilingual experts who know Indonesian and English, including internet slang and political talk, translated the comments. Third, two researchers coded each one separately using Culpeper's framework, watching for things like commanding words, insults, swear words, sarcasm hints, and persuasive tricks. If a comment mixed elements (like sarcasm and a direct insult), we picked the main tactic based on the core message and standout language. Coding differences were settled by talking it out, sometimes bringing in a third person. We kept notes on our reasoning and context.

All researchers are native Indonesian speakers with training in linguistics and pragmatics, and they're familiar with modern Indonesian political chats and online norms. This inside view helped unpack cultural nods, hidden meanings, and situation-specific language that outsiders might miss. Our grasp of Indonesian online culture and political tensions shaped the analysis, but we stayed objective by using set theories and checking interpretations with each other.

Even with a limited sample, the results offer useful insights and a fresh view of rudeness tactics in social media political talk. Focusing on one issue and platform limits how far it applies, but it lets us dig deep into the context. In particular, it points out how emotional, forceful, and fun rudeness often mix, helping improve Culpeper's model for digital political chats. More studies with bigger data from various platforms and topics could build on these early findings.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Data 1



dave !!! @bukanDWP · 16 Sep



Semoga cepet mati tuh yg bikin kebijakan...
matinya keseleg makanan jd tersiksa dulu pas
aspirasi... atau keracunan jd muntah2 sampe
dehidrasi trus ngerasain hipoxia... amin!

Figure 1. Bald on Record Impoliteness

Original: Dave!! (@bukanDWP): "Semoga cepat mati tuh yang bikin kebijakan... matinya keseleg makanan jadi tersiksa dulu pas aspirasi... atau keracunan jadi muntah-muntah sampe dehidrasi terus ngerasain hipoxia... amin!"

Translation: Dave!! (@bukanDWP): "I hope the person who made that policy dies soon... maybe by choking on their food so they suffer first while trying to catch their breath, or by getting poisoned so they throw up until they're dehydrated and experience hypoxia... amen!"

The comment conveys a direct and hostile desire for the target's painful death, explicitly detailing distressing scenarios such as choking, poisoning, dehydration, and hypoxia. No mitigating language is employed, nor is there any attempt to preserve the target's dignity. The utterance is deliberately offensive, demonstrating strong personal hostility and a clear disregard for established norms of politeness.

The statement includes explicit violent verbs such as "dies," "choking," and "poisoned," which serve to heighten the sense of aggression. The recurring descriptive phrases depicting suffering, such as "trying to catch their breath" and "throw up until dehydrated," act as amplifying markers, illustrating not only a desire for harm but also detailing the process involved. The lack of modal verbs like "might" and "should" further emphasizes the straightforwardness characteristic of bald on record impoliteness.

This instance exemplifies Bald on Record Impoliteness, in which the speaker intensifies the face-threatening act by employing straightforward and explicit language. The expression is overtly aggressive and intentionally harsh, with no effort to obscure its meaning or reduce its impact. It corresponds to the core characteristics of bald on record impoliteness, wherein the disrespect and threat are articulated in a direct, unambiguous, and confrontational manner designed to insult or provoke.

Data 2



Figure 2. Positive Impoliteness

Original: odongdaeng (@odongdaeng): "Bahasa kasarnya surat izin membunuh?"

Translation: odongdaeng (@odongdaeng): "Roughly translated a license to kill?"

The data presented above can be classified as an example of Positive Impoliteness. Positive impoliteness arises when a speaker intentionally undermines the hearer's positive face, which encompasses their desire to be liked, valued, and accepted, by overtly dismissing or contesting these face needs. This strategy frequently involves criticism, insults, or dismissive remarks that damage the interlocutor's self-image or social acceptance.

In this context, the phrase "Roughly translated, a license to kill?" conveys a sharp, ironic critique of a policy or statement, implying that it grants unchecked authority to commit acts of killing, serves as a sarcastic rhetorical inquiry, frequently indicating positive impoliteness as it diminishes the target's positive face through mockery. Through this rhetorical question, the speaker directly questions the legitimacy and moral standing of the subject, thereby provoking disagreement and potentially causing discomfort or embarrassment to the associated individual or institution. The use of evaluative terminology ("kill") engenders a hyperbolic reading of the policy, acting as a marker of semantic exaggeration. The rhetorical framework subtly charges the policy maker with malicious intent without explicit declaration, thereby positioning sarcasm as the primary linguistic tool.

The phrase employs irony as a means of delivering a strong negative evaluation, rejects any favorable interpretation of the subject, and deliberately challenges its acceptability. As such, it aligns with the characteristics of positive impoliteness, as it functions to undermine the target's positive face by issuing a clear, unmitigated, and critical attack on their reputation or social standing.

Data 3



Figure 3. Negative Impoliteness

Original: inall (@inall07): "Bajingan emang..., harusnya tanggung jawab kalau keracunan..., ini malah lepas tangan..."

Translation: inall (@inall07): "What a bastard..., they should be responsible if people got poisoned..., but instead, they just wash their hands off..."

The preceding comment clearly illustrates Negative Impoliteness, which endangers the hearer's negative face their wish to avoid imposition, criticism, or insult. The term "bajingan" which is similar to "bastard" acts as a straightforward insult that expresses anger and disapproval and acts as a clear lexical indicator of verbal aggression, directly undermining the target's negative face. The expression "should be responsible" emphasizes a deontic modal verb ("should"), which conveys a moral assessment and enforces a sense of duty crucial elements of negative impoliteness as they limit personal freedom. The adversative conjunction "but instead" amplifies the accusation by highlighting a lack of success, serving as a linguistic signal that intensifies blame.

Initially, it creates a sense of emotional intensity, subsequently rationalizing the offense by attributing blame. This clear display of disdain indicates the speaker's refusal to show respect or moderation and corresponds with Culpeper's concept of disdain and mockery as fundamental elements of negative impoliteness, in which the speaker aims to undermine the target's moral authority.

Moreover, the assertion "should take responsibility if individuals become poisoned" and "instead, they merely absolve themselves of responsibility" exemplify an act of blame and moral evaluation, which exacerbates the face-threatening quality of the remark. The speaker exerts moral and social pressure on the recipient, depicting them as negligent and untrustworthy.

Consequently, the remark demonstrates how online political discourse often obscures the distinction between moral indignation and verbal aggression. It demonstrates how language serves as a medium for emotional expression and ideological conformity, employing aggression as a means of asserting moral positions and fostering collective resistance against perceived injustices.

Data 4



Figure 4. Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness

Original: JANE 정7 (@janeuphorian...): "Welcome to Negara Komunis Rakyat Indonesia! Diam anda dijamin sepenuhnya oleh negara!"

Translation: JANE 정7 (@janeuphorian...): "Welcome to the People's Communist State of Indonesia! Your silence is fully guaranteed by the state!"

The statement presented above serves as an illustration of Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness, marked by the employment of seemingly courteous or affirmative phrases delivered with a sense of irony. Sarcasm is indicated by the use of seemingly polite lexical choices (such as "Welcome," "guaranteed," and "People's Communist State") that are employed ironically. The syntactic parallelism present in the phrase ("Your silence is fully guaranteed by the state") emulates the tone of official government communication, thereby generating a mock-formal register that prompts the reader to perceive the statement as a form of criticism.

Initially, the expression "Welcome to Negara Komunis Rakyat Indonesia!" may seem like a gracious salutation however, it operates as a sardonic commentary aimed at the government or ruling authorities, suggesting that the nation stifles freedom of expression. The following phrase "Your silence is fully guaranteed by the state" further emphasizes the sarcasm, as it subverts the anticipated positive implication of the term "guarantee" to communicate a notion of oppression and domination.

As noted by Culpeper (1996), sarcasm arises when individuals utilize politeness strategies in a disingenuous manner, thus converting a courteous expression into a potentially harmful act against someone's face. In this scenario, the speaker employs irony to critique the government's management of free expression, concealing feelings of anger and discontent beneath a facade of polite language. The use of a sarcastic tone amplifies the insult by enabling the speaker to mock authority while preserving an appearance of humor.

Within the domain of political discussions on social media, this form of feigned politeness enables individuals to articulate their disagreements in a pointed yet rhetorically astute manner. It functions as a means of political critique and social dissent, demonstrating how sarcasm can serve as a potent linguistic tool for opposition in online interactions. The incongruity between the positive lexical choices and the negative implications serves to characterize the utterance as sarcastic rather than literal.

Data 5

In this research, no evidence was discovered that illustrated the concept of Withholding Politeness. As noted by Culpeper (1996), this concept pertains to the intentional omission of anticipated polite behaviors, such as neglecting to respond, greet, thank, or acknowledge another speaker, which indirectly poses a threat to the hearer's face. The absence of such data can be linked to the communicative characteristics of X (formerly Twitter), which promotes explicit communication and swift interactions over silence. The lack of linguistic markers like greeting formulas, acknowledgments, or mitigation acts as a linguistic signal in itself. The dataset reveals a preference for explicit verbal expressions, underscoring the platform specific inclination towards direct confrontation instead of silence or non-responsiveness.

In the political discourse analyzed, the researchers primarily participated through overt verbal expressions like criticism, sarcasm, or direct confrontation types of impoliteness that depend on visibility and assertive positioning to garner attention and solidarity among similar-minded individuals. Therefore, the absence of withhold impoliteness in the dataset indicates the cultural and platform-specific inclination of Indonesian netizens to actively express their discontent rather than resorting to non-verbal methods. In a social media context that incentivizes engagement and immediacy, silence or lack of response holds diminished communicative significance and is seldom regarded as an effective means of conveying disapproval or hostility.

This observation underscores that in Indonesian online political exchanges, impoliteness is more commonly exhibited through expressive verbal tactics such as insults, sarcasm, and direct accusations rather than through the nuance of withheld politeness, highlighting a discourse culture marked by transparency, emotional fervor, and the quest for collective visibility in digital environments.

After describing the forms of impoliteness strategies based on Culpeper's (1996) initial approach, this study continues the analysis by reviewing how impolite utterances are used strategically in specific social and political contexts. This approach not only examines the linguistic forms, but also considers the social aims of the speakers, such as expressing emotions, reinforcing positions, and eliciting audience reactions.

The findings of this study align with earlier research on Indonesian digital discourse, which similarly identifies sarcasm, direct insults, and emotionally charged expressions as dominant features in political conversations (Murti et al., 2023; Santosa, 2020). Unlike previous studies that relied primarily on Culpeper's (1996) classical framework, this research incorporates Culpeper's (2011) functional categories—*affective*, *coercive*, and *entertaining* impoliteness, thereby offering a clearer understanding of how impoliteness functions not only as a face-threatening act but also as a means of expressing emotion, exerting pressure, and engaging audiences. In a cross-cultural perspective, Indonesian netizens demonstrate levels of directness comparable to American political discourse, while also employing humor-based insults similar to those observed in Japanese and Korean online communities, where ridicule often fosters social bonding. Furthermore, the findings highlight the sociocultural normalization of verbal aggression in Indonesian political spaces. Insults, sarcasm, and humor-driven attacks have become common tools for expressing dissatisfaction and negotiating social identity in online environments. The prevalence of entertaining impoliteness also shows that humor operates as a coping mechanism, helping users channel frustration, create solidarity, and critique authority in socially acceptable ways.

Following the discussion of broader discourse patterns, the analysis now proceeds to examine the functional types of impoliteness proposed by Culpeper (2011), such as *affective*, *coercive*, and *entertaining* impoliteness as follow.

Data 1



Teguh Saka R @HUGetSaka · 17 Sep

Program gagal bermasalah beban doang
Yg punya program klaim sukses besar
Propaganda muncul di bioskop
Mampuslah indo

Figure 5. Affection Impoliteness

Original: Teguh Saka R (@HUGetSaka): "Program gagal bermasalah beban doang yang punya program klaim sukses besar propaganda muncul di bioskop. Mampuslah indo"

Translation: Teguh Saka R (@HUGetSaka): "The program failed, it was just a burden. The program that claimed great success propaganda appeared in theaters. Indonesia is ruined"

From data above demonstrates a highly critical and provocative stance toward a particular program. The speaker condemns the program by calling it a failure and a burden, implying that it generates problems rather than benefits. The statement "Yg punya program klaim sukses besar" accuses the program's organizers of dishonesty or self-praise, suggesting that they falsely claim success despite evident shortcomings and as the employment of abbreviated, casual syntax in the phrase, enhances the impulsive, unrestrained tone characteristic of affective impoliteness. Furthermore, the phrase "Propaganda muncul di bioskop" reveals sarcasm and skepticism toward the authorities, insinuating that the program's achievements are exaggerated through media promotion. Additionally the term "propaganda" functions as a delegitimizing signifier, indicating feelings of distrust and anger.

This tweet exemplifies Affection Impoliteness, as the speaker employs assertive and confrontational language to enforce criticism and express hostility. The closing remark, "Mampuslah indo," heightens the severity of the attack, transforming the complaint into an overt verbal assault that conveys ill will toward the nation. Such language reflects a total rejection of the target's credibility and seeks to inflict emotional harm rather than engage in constructive dialogue. In summary, the tweet illustrates a form of linguistic aggression combining coercive, sarcastic, and disapproving features to express the speaker's anger and dissatisfaction toward the program and its creators.

Data 2



tititaraaaa @youngKselera... · 16 Sep

Fan account

udah anjir stop aja program ini, gaada yg
bener makanannya

Figure 6. Coercive Impoliteness

Original: tititaraaaa (@youngKselera): "Udah anjir stop aja program ini, gaada yang bener makanannya"

Translation: tititaraaaa (@youngKselera): "Stop this fucking program, none of the food is good"

This data above was shared the commenter who wanted this program to stop. This form can be categorized as a form of Coercive Impoliteness. This expression contains an element of coercion aimed at immediately stopping a program, mainly due to dissatisfaction with the quality of the food provided.

The use of the imperative verb "stop" functions as a primary coercive indicator, applying direct influence over the target. Immediately followed by the object "this program" indicates the speaker's strong intention to control the situation and impose their will on the intended party. This is a characteristic of coercive communication, as it ignores the possibility of dialogue or compromise. The choice of vulgar diction such as "fucking" reinforces the emotional intensity of the statement and creates an aggressive tone. This word not only serves to strengthen the expression but also contributes to increased rudeness in communication, which is strategically used to embarrass or pressure the other side into immediately acting according to the speaker's wishes. The statement "none of the food is good" employs categorical negation with the word "none," which allows for no compromise, emphasizing a forceful and commanding tone.

This statement expresses dissatisfaction in a firm and somewhat forceful manner, using direct language that leaves no room for negotiation or dialogue. This is an example of how someone uses coercive language to demonstrate dominance and a desire to control the situation, which is characteristic of coercive impoliteness.

Data 3



muti @mintychx · 23 Aug



Setidaknya kalo anies jadi otak gw kagak mendidih denger bacotan denial dari si penipu gendut

Figure 7. Entertaining Impoliteness

Original: muti (@mintychx): "Setidaknya kalau anies jadi otak, gue kagak mendidih denger bacotan denial dari si penipu gendut"

Translation: muti (@mintychx): "At least if Anis is in control, I won't get mad when I hear the denials from that fat ass"

From data above show the commentator expressing dislike in a sarcastic and humorous manner. The phrase "that fat ass" is a vulgar and degrading form of insult that is directed at someone who is not mentioned directly but is assumed to be known to the audience. It function as nominal phrase and the use of this term is conveyed in a lighthearted or semi-joking context, which makes it seem like a joke to some people. This is the main characteristic of Entertaining Impoliteness when rude or disrespectful remarks are framed as humor or entertainment. The comparative phrase "at least if Anis is in control" indicates a hyperbolic contrast, portraying the subject as so unappealing that even a contentious substitute is seen as more favorable. The comedic quality emerges from the blend of crudeness and informal conversational cues, which are typical of amusing rudeness.

This statement also implies political or social preferences by comparing two figures, while inserting insults against one of them. The aim is not only to express dislike, but also to invite emotional involvement from audiences who may agree or respond responsively, thereby creating an entertaining effect in public discourse, especially on social media.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, this research illustrates the political dialogue on X (previously as Twitter) regarding the MBG program is filled with a variety of impoliteness strategies as described by Culpeper (1996, 2011) such as encompass bald on record, positive, negative, sarcasm or mock politeness, withholding politeness, affection, coercive, and entertaining impoliteness. Each strategy signifies different levels of linguistic aggression and serves distinct communicative purposes, ranging from expressing anger and moral outrage to strengthening group identity and political perspectives. Bald on record impoliteness is evident in comments where users overtly attack or insult their targets without any form of mitigation, showcasing direct hostility

Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in Indonesia's MBG Issue on X

and emotional fervor. Negative impoliteness was illustrated through the application of a direct insult, specifically "bajingan" or "bastard," combined with moral condemnation to convey contempt and diminish authority. Sarcasm or mock politeness illustrates how irony and indirect language serve as rhetorical devices to mask insults within humorous or ostensibly polite phrases, rendering the attack appear clever or witty. In contrast, Coercive and Affectionate impoliteness merge verbal aggression with emotional pressure, emphasizes aggressive and confrontational phrasing such as "Mampuslah indo" (May Indonesia perish) to convey complete disapproval and discontent. Meanwhile Entertaining impoliteness framed a vulgar, degrading insult ("that fat ass") as humor to invite emotional involvement and express dislike, which demonstrates that impoliteness can also fulfill entertainment and solidarity roles within online communities. The implications of this study have important effects on both language and social politics. From a linguistic perspective, the rise of impoliteness that is affective, coercive, and entertaining shows a change in how we communicate online, where showing strong emotions and performing for an audience has become the norm. This indicates that Culpeper's broader framework is very useful for examining today's digital conversations. On the socio-political side, the results show how impoliteness acts as a tool for public pushback, group criticism, and community bonding, which can increase division and shape how people view government. These findings can help in creating digital literacy programs, setting up moderation rules, and improving political communication. Despite this study has made some contributions, it has limitations due to its small dataset and its focus on just one political issue. Therefore, it's really important for future research to explore several different areas. First, by broadening the dataset to cover various political topics and different social media platforms like TikTok and Instagram, researchers could gain a better understanding of how impoliteness varies across these platforms. Second, using quantitative or mixed-method approaches could help in measuring how often impoliteness occurs, its intensity, and how it relates to public sentiment. Lastly, future research could look into how gender differences, cultural norms, or power dynamics affect the way impolite expressions are created and understood. In general, this study underscores the importance of impoliteness as a fluid linguistic and social phenomenon in the context of Indonesian digital politics by looking at how people use language to challenge authority, show dissatisfaction, and build political identities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors express their heartfelt gratitude to the Faculty of Cultural Sciences at Universitas Sumatera Utara for providing the facilities and academic assistance that facilitated this research. They also wish to extend their profound thanks to the lecturers of the English Literature Department for their valuable guidance and constructive feedback throughout the progression of this study.

Additionally, the authors are thankful to the online community whose public comments served as the primary data for this research, offering significant insights into the topic of impoliteness in political discourse. They also acknowledge the support of colleagues and peers for their encouragement, critical evaluations, and engaging discussions, all of which played a crucial role in enhancing the quality of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Anwar, M., Amir, F. R., Herlina, Anoeграjekti, N., & Muliastuti, L. (2021). Language impoliteness among Indonesians on Twitter. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 37(4), 161-176.
- Arrasyd, A., & Hamzah, H. (2023, February 28). Impoliteness in the E-News Social Media Comment Section: A Descriptive Study. *Language and Education Journal*, 6 (1), 43-47.
- Aulia, P., Marlioni, R., & Suryani, L. (2019). An analysis on record politeness of pragmatic in Tinker Bell and the Great Fairy Rescue movie. *Infinity: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(6), 811-815. IKIP Siliwangi.

- Hasanah, R., Murni, S. M., & Lubis, F. K. (2024, November 11). Impoliteness Strategies Used By Haters and Supporters of Presidential Candidates in Cyber-Conflicts. *Proceedings of English Linguistics and Literature*, 4, 16-19.
- Junaidi, J., Januarini, E., & Pasaribu, G. R. (2024). Impoliteness in information account on Instagram. *JALC: Journal of Applied Linguistic and Studies of Cultural*, 2(1), 41-50. Rahis Cendekia Indonesia, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380781876_IMPOLITENESS_IN_INFORMATION_ACCOUNT_ON_INSTAGRAM
- Murti, R. W., Pratama, H., & Yulianto, H. J. (2024, September 15). Impoliteness Strategies in Online Political Discourse: A Case Study of Indonesian Netizens' Comments on Tiktok. *English Education Journal*, 14(3), 428-439.
- Pancani, P. C., & Ningsih, N. (2025). A Comprehensive Study on MBG (Makanan Bergizi Gratis) in the Prabowo-Gibran Cabinet: Evaluating the Psychological and Health Impacts of the Policy on Underserved Communities. *Journal of Psychology and Health Sciences*, 3 (4), 177-186.
- Pangaribuan, R. M., Rangkuti, R., & Lubis, R. A. (2021). Impoliteness strategies and power performed by netizens on Twitter. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, 29(2), 218-222.
- Pasaribu, A. N. (2021, April). Hate Speech on Joko Widodo Official Facebook: An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Used By Different Gender. *Eltin Journal*, 9 No.1(1), 56-64.
- Pasaribu, S., Marchella, Y., Dywanti, R. D., Ardiansyah, R., & Meisuri, M. (2025, Agustus 3). Analisis of Impoliteness Strategies in YouTube Comment Sections: A Case Study of Gibran Rakabuming's "Generasi Muda, Bonus Demografi, dan Masa depan Indonesia". *Jurnal Sadewa : Publikasi Ilmu Pendidikan, Pembelajaran dan Ilmu Sosial*, 3(3), 235-247.
- Santosa, M. P. (2020, Juni). Sociolinguistics Approach: Impoliteness Strategy in Instagram Cyberbullying in @Lambe_Turah's post of KPAI's Case. *AKSIS*(4 (1)), 16-19.
- Sari, D. A. P., & Kurnia, F. D. (2022). Language impoliteness among Indonesians on Twitter. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 3(1), 45-56.
- Sibarani, A. S., Manik, S., & Sembiring, A. R. (2022). Impoliteness Strategies on Anies Baswedan's Twitter Comments. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling*, 4 (5), 5109-5116.
- Situmorang, Y. F., Lestari, F. D., & Sinaga, N. T. (2024, Oktober 3). Impoliteness Strategies of the Hate Comments on Twitter. *Alacrity : Journal of Education*, 4(3), 220-228.
- Subyantoro, S., & Apriyanto, S. (2020). Impoliteness in Indonesian Language Hate Speech on Social Media Contained in the Instagram Account. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 11, 36-46.
- Oliveira, A. L. A. M. (2025). Twitter impoliteness metadiscourse and the political domain. *Trabalhos em Linguística Aplicada*, 64, e025023