

Bald on Record and Positive Impoliteness in Indonesian Speech Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Study of Prabowo's Speech at the 2026 National Coordination Meeting on the Environmental Crisis in Bali

Strategi Tuturan Langsung dan Ketidaksantunan Positif dalam Wacana Pidato Bahasa Indonesia: Studi Sociolinguistik terhadap Pidato Prabowo Subianto pada Rapat Koordinasi Nasional 2026 tentang Krisis Lingkungan di Bali

Sitrin Loda Nangi¹, Ni Made Diana Erfiani², Yohanes Octovianus Lesu Awolon³, Putu Chrisma Dewi⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Universitas Dhyana Pura

sitrindhima@gmail.com¹, dianaerfiani@undhirabali.ac.id²,
octovindryawolon@undhirabali.ac.id³, chrismadewi@uhn.ac.id⁴

Article Information	ABSTRACT
Description Submission: 05 April 2026 Revised: 30 April 2026 Accepted: 25 May 2026 Approved: 30 May 2026	<i>This study examines the use of bald on record and positive impoliteness strategies in President Prabowo Subianto's speech at the National Coordination Meeting (Rakornas) of the Central and Regional Governments held on February 2, 2026. In that forum, the President openly reprimanded the governors and regents of Bali in front of thousands of regional heads from all over Indonesia for their failure to handle the waste crisis, which was deemed to tarnish the national tourism image. This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach by applying Culpeper's (1996; 2011) impoliteness theory framework as the analytical instrument. The data are sourced from official transcripts and video recordings of the speech published by CNN Indonesia (2026) and cross referenced with the official transcript from the Cabinet Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia. The analysis results show that the bald on record impoliteness strategy dominates through direct criticism without mitigation and explicit commands, while positive impoliteness is present through utterances that publicly belittle the competence of regional officials.</i>
Kata Kunci strategi ketidaksopanan, wacana kepresidenan, langsung tanpa basa-basi, ketidaksopanan positif,	
Keywords <i>strategies of impoliteness, presidential discourse, bald on record, positive impoliteness,</i>	
	Abstrak Studi ini meneliti penggunaan strategi bald on record dan positive impoliteness dalam pidato Presiden Prabowo Subianto pada Rapat Koordinasi Nasional (Rakornas) Pemerintah Pusat dan Daerah yang diadakan pada 2 Februari 2026. Dalam forum tersebut, Presiden secara terbuka menegur para gubernur dan bupati Bali di depan ribuan kepala daerah dari seluruh Indonesia atas kegagalan mereka menangani krisis sampah, yang dianggap mencemari citra pariwisata nasional. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif dengan menerapkan kerangka teori ketidaksopanan Culpeper (1996; 2011) sebagai instrumen analisis. Data diambil dari transkrip resmi dan rekaman video pidato yang diterbitkan oleh CNN Indonesia (2026) dan dicross-referensikan dengan transkrip resmi dari Sekretariat Kabinet Republik Indonesia. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa strategi ketidaksopanan bald on record mendominasi melalui kritik langsung tanpa

mitigasi dan perintah eksplisit, sementara ketidak sopanan positif hadir melalui ucapan yang secara publik merendahkan kompetensi pejabat daerah.



Copyright © 2026 Sitrin Loda Nangi, Ni Made Diana Erfiani, Yohanes Octovianus Lesu Awolon, Putu Chrisma Dewi

1. Introduction

Language in the political context is not merely a neutral medium for conveying information, but a strategic resource through which authority and institutional relationships are built. In the field of sociolinguistics, political discourse reflects how power is exercised through linguistic choices in specific social contexts, especially in hierarchical communication between political actors.

A striking example of this phenomenon can be observed in the speech delivered by Prabowo Subianto during the National Coordination Meeting and the rajouring 2026 February 2. In addressing the environmental crisis in Bali, the President openly criticized local leaders by presenting visual evidence of polluted areas and questioning their performance with statements like "*Bagaimana turis mau datang kesitu, melihat sampah?*" and "*Apa susah nya sih?*". He further stated that central authorities would intervene if local governments failed to act. These statements were delivered directly, with little mitigation, in front of thousands of officials, making them very face-threatening in the context of formal institutions.

Recent studies on impoliteness in political discourse largely focus on public participation in the digital environment. For example, Anwar (2024) studied strategies of incivility in political memes during the Indonesian presidential election and found that positive impoliteness was the most dominant strategy, particularly in the form of attacking the credibility and social image of candidates. Similarly, a study on Indonesian cyber-pragmatics by Pratama and Yulianto (2024) shows that impoliteness often appears in Twitter discussions about political figures, where users employ direct insults and sarcastic expressions to convey ideological positions.

Furthermore, Lubis et al. (2025) analyzed impoliteness in online comments directed at Indonesian public officials and found that such language often serves as a form of public accountability, rather than mere aggression. Their findings indicate that positive impoliteness is often used to criticize competence and performance, suggesting that impoliteness can serve a social function in political discourse. In addition, Saragi et al. (2026) examined the digital response to statements made by Purbaya Yudhi Sadewa, the successor to Sri Mulyani Indrawati as Minister of Finance a senior economist appointed to oversee Indonesia's national budget and found that "positive unfriendliness" dominated with over 600 instances, highlighting the prevalence of attacks on reputation in public discourse.

Impoliteness also appears in more formal political interactions. Widarto, Sumarlam, and Djatmika (2024) found that bald on record impoliteness is frequently used by candidates to assert dominance and directly challenge opponents

in the third Indonesian presidential debate, indicating that direct and unambiguous language is associated with power assertion in competitive political contexts.

Despite these developments, most existing studies share the same limitation: they primarily focus on bottom-up communication, in which the public acts as the source of rude behavior while political elites are positioned as its targets (Murti et al., 2024; Lubis et al., 2025; Saragi et al., 2026). The reverse phenomenon where high-level political actors employ strategies of impoliteness toward subordinates within formal institutional contexts remains largely unexplored in Indonesian sociolinguistic research. This gap is significant because the function of impoliteness can vary greatly depending on power dynamics. In hierarchical contexts, impoliteness may function not as resistance or protest, but as a strategic instrument to assert authority, signal urgency, and compel behavioral change. To address this gap, this study adopts Culpeper's (1996; 2011) framework of unfriendliness, which provides a systematic classification of strategies including bald on record impoliteness and positive impoliteness to analyze how these strategies operate in top-down presidential discourse within formal state forums.

Based on this background, this study analyzes the strategies of bald on record impoliteness and positive impoliteness in Prabowo's speech at the 2026 Rakornas using Culpeper's theoretical framework (1996; 2011). This study is expected to fill the gap in the existing literature while also contributing to the development of sociolinguistic studies of Indonesian political discourse, particularly in understanding how impoliteness functions as an instrument of institutional power.

2. Method

This research uses a qualitative approach because its object of study is language in social and institutional contexts, which cannot be measured solely thru numbers, but rather needs to be understood through in-depth interpretation of meaning, function, and context of discourse. This approach was chosen because it can reveal how impoliteness strategies are specifically used in concrete communication situations, including linguistic nuances that would not be visible through a quantitative approach.

The data for this research consist of verbal utterances delivered in a speech by Prabowo Subianto at the National Coordination Meeting of the Central and Regional Governments, which was held on February 2, 2026, at the Sentul International Convention Center, Bogor Regency. The video recording and official transcript of the speech are publicly accessible through the official YouTube channel of the Cabinet Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia and the website setkab.go.id, so that the authenticity and traceability of the data can be academically accounted for. The forum was attended by 4,011 participants, consisting of heads of ministries and state institutions, governors, regents, mayors, and regional legislative assembly leaders from across Indonesia.

Data were collected through three stages. First, the entire video recording of the speech was watched and listened to in order to gain a thorough under-

standing of the context. Second, the speech was fully transcribed, and the transcription results were cross-checked against the official transcript published by the Cabinet Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia. Third, all utterances containing indicators of impoliteness based on Culpeper's framework (1996; 2011) were identified and marked.

Utterances were selected based on the following criteria: first, the utterance is directed at the governors and/or regents of Bali; second, the utterance contains at least one indicator of impoliteness based on Culpeper's (1996; 2011) framework; and lastly, the utterance occurs within the thematic segment of the speech specifically addressing Bali's waste management crisis. Utterances that did not meet all three criteria were excluded from the dataset.

The analysis uses two categories of impoliteness strategies from Culpeper (1996; 2011) as the main instrument. Bald on record impoliteness is identified through the following indicators: direct criticism without hedging or mitigation; explicit commands without preamble; accusations or negative evaluations conveyed openly; and the use of evidence to embarrass the targeted party in public. Positive impoliteness is identified through the following indicators: speech that belittles the competence or capacity of the interlocutor; threats of authority takeover; disregard for the right to speak or defend the targeted party; and speech that implicitly discredits the reputation of the targeted party in front of a large audience.

Data is analyzed through four sequential stages. First, all identified utterances are classified into the two strategy categories mentioned above. Second, each utterance is interpreted based on the situational context, including the power relationship between the speaker (president) and the interlocutor (governor/regent), as well as the context of the forum where the utterance is delivered. Third, the frequency of each strategy's occurrence is calculated to determine the more dominant strategy. Fourth, the findings are interpreted to answer how impoliteness functions as an instrument of power in presidential discourse.

3. Findings and Discussion

This section presents the detailed linguistic analysis of impoliteness strategies identified in Prabowo Subianto's address at the National Coordination Meeting of Central and Regional Governments, delivered on February 2, 2026, at Sentul International Convention Center, Bogor, West Java. The data consist of seven utterances extracted and transcribed from the official video recording and transcript published by the Secretariat of the Cabinet of the Republic of Indonesia (Sekretariat Kabinet RI, 2026). All utterances were originally delivered in Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia), with one bilingual instance (Data 7) involving a direct English-language quotation attributed to a foreign dignitary. The analysis applies Culpeper's (1996; 2011) impoliteness framework, specifically focusing on two strategies: bald on record impoliteness and positive impoliteness.

Table 1
Comprehensive Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in Prabowo's Rakornas 2026 Address

No	Strategy	Utterance (Indonesian)	Translation (English)	Culpeper indikator	Face Attack	Timestamp
1	Bald on Record	"ini maaf ya gubernur, bupati-bupati dari Bali. Ini real lho. Bali bulan Desember 2025. Bagaimana turis mau datang ke situ melihat sampah?"	"Well, sorry, governors and regents of Bali. This is real. This rhetorical question as negative evaluation; possibly come there when they see garbage?"	Direct, unmitigated criticism; rhetorical question as negative evaluation; apology that does not mitigate	Positive face: competence of regional leaders publicly questioned before national audience	1:40:24-1:40:41
2	Bald on Record	"Gubernur, bupati, SMA, SMP, SD di bawah kendali saudara. Apa susahnya sih?"	"Governors, senior high schools, high schools, elementary schools are all under your authority. How hard can it really be?"	Dismissive belittling question (particle <i>sih</i> = exasperated dismissal); no hedging whatsoever	Positive face: managerial capability of leaders degraded; failure framed as inexcusable	1:40:48-1:40:57
3	Bald on Record	"Kalau bupati dan gubernur tidak bisa, saya perintah Dandim, Danrem...corvee, corvee, Kepolisian, kerahkan, corvee, corvee, corvee."	"If the regents and governors cannot do it, I will order the authority; I order you to mobilize your subordinates, corvée, corvée, Police deploy them, corvée, corvée, corvée."	Explicit command bypassing the regional authority; triple repetition amplifies urgency; military deployed as substitute for civil leaders	Negative face: autonomy and institutional authority of regional officials directly threatened and overridden	1:40:19-1:40:50
4	Bald on Record	"Bila perlu, demi kepentingan rakyat, pemerintah pusat yang memimpin."	"But we cannot wait. Therefore, if necessary, for the sake of the people's interest, the central (bila perlu) does not"	Unmitigated institutional threat; conditional framing (bila perlu) does not	Negative face: freedom of action threatened; authority supersession	1:37:9-1:37:20

		<i>government will take the lead"</i>	soften the announced assertion of publicly authority override			
5	Positive Impoliteness	<i>"ini pantai kita. Ini halaman kita. Ayo kita bersihkan rame-rame, corvee."</i>	<i>"This is our beach. This is our yard. Come on, let us all clean it together corvée."</i>	Oversimplification: complex governance failure reduced to a trivial community cleanup; belittlement via domestic metaphor	Positive face: leaders credibility and problem-solving capacity publicly discredited; failure trivialized	1:41:06-1:41:14
6	Positive Impoliteness	<i>Projection of dirty Bali beach photographs on large screen before 4,011 nationwide participants + "Ini real lho, Bali bulan Desember 2025."</i>	<i>"Projection of dirty Bali beach photographs on large screen before 4,011 nationwide participants + "This is real, mind you Bali in December 2025."</i>	Multimodal public shaming: visual evidence of failure displayed before national leadership; authenticating tag preempts factual denial	Positive face: public image and institutional reputation of Bali officials damaged before entire national regional leadership community	1:40:29-1:40:33
7	Positive Impoliteness	<i>Dia bilang, "Your Excellency, I just came from Bali. Oh, Bali so dirty now. Bali not dirty nice." (Code-switching to English)</i>	<i>"He said to me, 'Your Excellency, I just came from Bali. Oh, Bali so dirty now. Bali not dirty nice.'" (Bilingual English maintained as original)</i>	Third-party negative testimony from foreign dignitary; code-switching to English invokes international frame of reference; blunt colloquial phrasing maximizes humiliation	Positive face: regional leaders shamed not only before Indonesian peers but against international standards reported directly to the head of state	1:39:34-1:39:43

Table 1 presents a comprehensive overview of all seven data points, organized by strategy, original utterance, applicable Culpeper indicator, and the type of face attack involved. The following subsections provide detailed analysis of each data point.

Bald on Record Impoliteness

Four instances of bald on record impoliteness were identified. This strategy is characterized by maximally direct utterances with no mitigation or face-saving effort (Culpeper, 1996).

Data 1: Unmitigated Direct Criticism (1:40:24-1:40:41)

"Ini maaf ya gubernur, bupati-bupati dari Bali. Ini real lho. Bali bulan Desember 2025. Bagaimana turis mau datang ke situ melihat sampah?"

Although "*maaf ya*" appears apologetic, it does not function as genuine mitigation it instead amplifies the directness of the criticism that follows. The rhetorical question at the end serves as an unmitigated public negative evaluation of the governors' and regents' governance performance, attacking their positive face by implying an obvious and inexcusable failure.

Data 2: Dismissive Belittling Rhetorical Question (1:40:48-1:40:57)

"Gubernur, bupati, SMA, SMP, SD di bawah kendali saudara. Apa susahnya sih?"

The speaker first enumerates institutional resources within the officials' control, then delivers the question "*Apa susahnya sih?*" (How hard can it really be?). The particle "*sih*" carries an exasperated, dismissive tone in Indonesian that intensifies the condescension. The pragmatic function is not inquiry but public assertion that the failure is inexcusable a precise attack on the officials' positive face.

Data 3: Explicit Command Bypassing Regional Authority (1:40:19-1:40:50)

"Kalau bupati dan gubernur tidak bisa, saya perintah Dandim, Danrem...corvee, corvee, corvee."

This is the most institutionally forceful instance in the dataset. The conditional clause establishes a direct link between officials' perceived incompetence and presidential intervention. Repeated use of "*saya perintah*" (I command) directed at military commanders bypassing civil regional authority constitutes an unmitigated threat. The triple repetition of "*corvee*" strips the utterance of ambiguity and delivers it with maximum performative force, attacking the negative face of regional officials by overriding their institutional autonomy.

Data 4: Unmitigated Institutional Threat (1:37:9-1:37:20)

"Bila perlu, demi kepentingan rakyat, pemerintah pusat yang akan memimpin."

Despite the conditional framing "*bila perlu*" (if necessary), this utterance functions as a settled announcement of authority override rather than a tentative possibility. The appeal to "*kepentingan rakyat*" (the people's interest) morally pre-empts any defense by regional officials. The face attack targets negative face through the public announcement of potential authority deprivation before the entire national regional leadership assembly.

Positive Impoliteness

Three instances of positive impoliteness were identified. This strategy attacks the addressee's positive face their desire to be perceived as competent and socially valued (Culpeper, 1996).

Data 5: Belittlement Through Oversimplification (1:41:06-1:41:14)

"Ini pantai kita. Ini halaman kita. Ayo kita bersihkan rame-rame, corvee."

The domestic metaphor "*halaman kita*" (our yard) reduces a complex governance challenge in a major international tourism destination to a trivial household chore. The inclusive pronoun "*kita*" (we/our) functions as a shaming device: if the task is as simple as a community cleanup, the regional officials with their full institutional resources have no defensible reason for failing. This directly discredits their positive face by dismissing the significance of their administrative role.

Data 6: Multimodal Public Shaming Through Visual Evidence (1:40:29-1:40:33)

(Projection of dirty Bali beach photographs on large screen before 4,011 participants) + "Ini real lho, Bali bulan Desember 2025."

This is the only multimodal instance in the dataset. Projecting photographic evidence of governance failure before thousands of national officials constitutes a calculated act of institutional public shaming. The verbal tag "*Ini real lho*" preempts any factual denial by the Bali officials. The face attack extends beyond the immediate addressees: unlike verbal utterances, the images are simultaneously consumed by the entire *Rakornas* audience, broadcasting reputational damage to the whole national regional leadership community in real time.

Data 7: Third-Party International Testimony (1:39:34-1:39:43)

"Dia bilang, 'Your Excellency, I just came from Bali. Oh, Bali so dirty now. Bali not nice.'" (Code-switching to English)

The speaker attributes the criticism to a senior foreign dignitary, invoking an international frame of reference that substantially amplifies the face threat. The code-switching to English reproduces the original words, lending them authenticity and heightening their impact. The juxtaposition of the formal address "Your Excellency" with the blunt colloquial assessment ("dirty," "not nice") inten-

sifies the humiliation. The regional officials are thus shamed not only before Indonesian peers but against international standards reported directly to the head of state.

The findings of this study reveal a systematic and complementary deployment of two impoliteness strategies in President Prabowo's address, each targeting a different dimension of face. This pattern warrants discussion not only in terms of linguistic classification, but also in relation to the broader sociolinguistic implications of impoliteness as an instrument of institutional power.

The dominance of bald on record impoliteness (57.1%) aligns closely with Culpeper's (1996) foundational observation that speakers with higher positional power are less constrained by politeness norms because the power differential reduces the addressees' capacity to retaliate. In this particular context, President Prabowo occupied the highest institutional position in Indonesia's political hierarchy, while the governors and regents of Bali despite holding significant regional authority were structurally unable to publicly challenge a presidential rebuke in a nationally broadcast forum. This power asymmetry created optimal conditions for bald on record deployment, as demonstrated by the four data points characterized by unmitigated criticism (Data 1), dismissive rhetorical questioning (Data 2), explicit military commands (Data 3), and unmitigated institutional threat (Data 4). This finding is further supported by Balci, Yetim, and Dinler (2025), who found that overt impoliteness functions as a deliberate strategic resource in hierarchical institutional settings, serving to reinforce authority and signal that the speaker has both the power and the intention to enforce consequences.

The three instances of positive impoliteness complement the bald on record strategy by targeting a qualitatively different dimension of face. While Data 1 through 4 primarily attack the addressees' negative face through commands, threats, and authority override, Data 5 through 7 systematically erode their positive face their public image, perceived competence, and professional standing through progressively escalating mechanisms. Data 5 employs deliberate oversimplification, reducing a complex governance challenge to a trivial household chore. Data 6 extends the attack into the multimodal domain by projecting visual evidence of failure before the entire national leadership assembly, a mechanism that Britos et al. (2025) similarly identified in the context of congressional hearings, where documentary evidence was deployed as a form of institutional public shaming. Data 7 amplifies the face attack to its maximum intensity by introducing the voice of a foreign dignitary, effectively internationalizing the regional officials' failure. This finding resonates with Yasin et al. (2024), who demonstrated that the strategic use of external perspectives in political discourse particularly from internationally recognized authorities' functions to construct or destroy ideological credibility in ways that purely domestic criticism cannot achieve. A particularly significant finding concerns the directionality of the impoliteness identified in this study.

The overwhelming majority of prior Indonesian sociolinguistic research on political impoliteness has examined bottom-up communication: the public attacking officials through social media comments (Murti et al., 2024; Lubis et al., 2025), digital responses to ministerial statements (Saragi et al., 2026), and political memes targeting candidates (Anwar et al., 2024). Even research on more formal political settings, such as Widarto, Sumarlam, and Djatmika's (2024) analysis of presidential debate discourse, focuses on candidates competing at the same level of institutional power rather than on hierarchically superior actors directing impoliteness downward at subordinates. The present study reverses this directionality entirely: here, the head of state is the agent of impoliteness, and subordinate regional officials are its targets in a formal, nationally broadcast state forum. This top-down configuration gives impoliteness a qualitatively different social function one that operates not as resistance, critique, or democratic accountability but as what this study terms institutional coercive discourse: the strategic deployment of face-threatening language as a governance mechanism designed to produce compliance, enforce accountability, and motivate behavioral change through the public exposure of failure.

The multimodal dimension of Data 6 warrants particular attention. Unlike the six verbal utterances in the dataset, the projection of photographic evidence operates through a visual channel that cannot be mitigated, interrupted, or re-framed by the addressees in real time. The combination of the visual display with the authenticating verbal tag "*Ini real lho*" (This is real, mind you) creates a doubly unmitigated attack: the images provide irrefutable factual evidence of failure, while the verbal tag eliminates the possibility of factual denial. This multimodal configuration produces a face attack of broader scope than any single verbal utterance, since the photographic evidence is simultaneously consumed by all 4,011 participants in the forum rather than being directed exclusively at the Bali officials. Future research employing a systematically multimodal analytical framework such as Kress and van Leeuwen's social semiotic approach would be well positioned to analyze this dimension more rigorously.

Finally, the code-switching in Data 7 merits separate discussion. By quoting the foreign dignitary's words in English rather than translating them into Indonesian, the speaker does not merely report criticism but performs it: the English utterances ("Bali so dirty now. Bali not nice") retain their original form, foregrounding their status as authentic, externally sourced, and internationally validated assessments.

The simplicity and bluntness of the English phrases in stark contrast to the formal diplomatic address "Your Excellency" creates a rhetorical juxtaposition that intensifies the humiliating quality of the testimony. This strategic use of code-switching as an amplifier of face-threatening content extends the findings of Yasin et al. (2024) and adds a specifically Indonesian dimension to the international literature on language choice in political impoliteness, where the selection of a prestige language variety to deliver negative evaluations has been shown to significantly increase their pragmatic force.

Frequency Distribution and Dominance

Table 2
Frequency Distribution of Impoliteness Strategies

Impoliteness Strategy	Frequency	Percentage	Data References
Bald On Record Impoliteness	4	57,1%	Data 1,Data 2,Data 3,Data 4
Positive Impoliteness	3	42,9%	Data 5,Data 6, Data 7
Total	7	100%	Data 1 through Data 7

As shown in Table 2, bald on record impoliteness is the dominant strategy in the address, accounting for four of the seven identified instances (57.1%), while positive impoliteness accounts for three (42.9%). Although the numerical gap is modest, the qualitative distinction in function is significant. The dominance of bald on record impoliteness reflects the specific power asymmetry of the Rakornas context. As Culpeper (1996) observes, speakers with higher positional power face fewer constraints on directness because the addressees have limited capacity to retaliate. In this setting, the speaker occupies the highest institutional position in Indonesia's political hierarchy, while the addressees cannot publicly challenge a presidential rebuke in a nationally broadcast forum. This asymmetry creates optimal conditions for bald on record deployment. The three instances of positive impoliteness complement the bald on record strategy by targeting positive face systematically through oversimplification, visual evidence, and international testimony dimensions that the more direct bald on record utterances do not fully exploit.

4. Conclusion

This study examined the use of bald on record impoliteness and positive impoliteness strategies in Prabowo Subianto's address at the National Coordination Meeting of Central and Regional Governments on February 2, 2026, with specific focus on utterances directed at the governors and regents of Bali over the province's unresolved waste management crisis. Applying Culpeper's (1996; 2011) impoliteness framework to a corpus of seven utterances transcribed from the official recording published by the Secretariat of the Cabinet of the Republic of Indonesia, the study arrived at three principal findings.

First, both bald on record impoliteness and positive impoliteness are consistently and systematically present in President Prabowo's address. The two strategies are not deployed randomly; they are distributed across distinct communicative functions and target different dimensions of face, suggesting a structured rather than incidental use of impoliteness in the speech.

Second, bald on record impoliteness emerged as the dominant strategy, accounting for four of the seven identified instances (57.1%), while positive impoliteness accounted for three (42.9%). The bald on record instances unmitigated direct criticism (Data 1), dismissive rhetorical questioning (Data 2), explicit military command bypassing civil authority (Data 3), and unmitigated institutional

threat (Data 4) collectively attack both positive and negative face through maximally direct, unhedged, and unambiguous language. The positive impoliteness instances deliberate oversimplification (Data 5), multimodal public shaming through visual evidence (Data 6), and amplified third-party international testimony (Data 7) exclusively target positive face through progressively escalating mechanisms of reputational damage.

Third, and most significantly from a sociolinguistic perspective, the findings demonstrate that in this particular context impoliteness does not function as a spontaneous expression of frustration or hostility, but as what this study terms institutional coercive discourse: the strategic and systematic deployment of face-threatening language as a governance mechanism designed to produce compliance, enforce accountability, and motivate behavioral change through the public exposure of failure before the broadest possible institutional audience. This represents a directionality top-down, from the head of state to subordinate regional officials in a formal state forum that has received considerably less attention in the Indonesian sociolinguistic literature than the more frequently studied bottom-up impoliteness (from public to officials in digital spaces).

These findings contribute to the growing body of sociolinguistic research on political discourse in Indonesia and extend the existing literature on Culpeper's impoliteness framework into an institutional governance context. They also affirm the relevance of sociolinguistic analysis for understanding not merely how political leaders speak, but how language functions as an instrument of power in the formal administrative machinery of the state.

For future researchers, the present analysis is intentionally bounded to two of Culpeper's five impoliteness strategies bald on record and positive impoliteness in order to maintain analytical focus. A comprehensive analysis applying all five strategies (including negative impoliteness, sarcasm/mock politeness, and withhold politeness) to the same corpus would yield a fuller account of the speech's impoliteness architecture. Additionally, a comparative study examining presidential addresses across multiple editions, or comparing Prabowo's institutional speech style with that of other Indonesian presidents or regional heads of government in comparable forums, would allow for generalization of the patterns observed here. Methodologically, the incorporation of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a complementary framework alongside or instead of a purely pragmatic approach would enable deeper examination of the ideological dimensions of power, authority, and accountability embedded in the language of this address. Finally, the multimodal dimension of Data 6 (the projection of visual evidence) merits more rigorous treatment than was possible in the scope of the present study; researchers with expertise in multimodal discourse analysis are encouraged to revisit this data point through a more systematically multimodal lens.

For the field of Indonesian sociolinguistics more broadly, this study demonstrates that the formal language of state governance presidential addresses, national coordination meetings, official state forums constitutes a rich and largely untapped corpus for institutional discourse research. The Rakornas,

the State of the Nation Address (Pidato Kenegaraan), and publicly accessible cabinet meeting footage represent categories of data whose linguistic properties have significant implications for understanding how power is exercised, communicated, and enforced through language in Indonesia's democratic institutional context. Systematic, sustained scholarly attention to these genres would substantially enrich the field.

For the general public and policy engaged readers, the findings of this study serve as a reminder that the language of political leadership is never merely communicative it is always simultaneously performative. Every utterance a leader makes in a public forum not only conveys a message but enacts a relationship of power, assigns social positions, and produces institutional consequences. Developing the capacity to read political language analytically to ask not only what was said but what was done by the saying is a form of civic literacy that supports more informed and critical engagement with the political communication that shapes public life.

Reference

- Anwar, M., Amir, F. R., Zuhriyah, S. A., Purbasari, R., & Rosa, H. T. (2024). Language impoliteness in memes contesting the 2024 presidential election in Indonesia. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 12(4), 1899–1912. <https://doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v12i4.12801>
- Aprokoah, J. O. (2023). Impoliteness strategies in political discourse: A study of Nigeria's president's campaign speech. *Awka Journal of English Language and Literary Studies*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.59284/ajells.2024.110>
- Balci, A., Yetim, H. T., & Dinler, M. (2025). The power of disrespect: Overt impoliteness and hierarchy in leader-level diplomacy. *European Journal of International Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13691481251407495>
- Britos, J. C., Miras, E. L., Villaraiz, A. V. S., & Syting, C. J. O. (2025). Impoliteness in the Office of the Vice President confidential fund congressional hearing: A socio-pragmatic analysis. *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies*, 9(3), 118–133. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejll.v9i3.659>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chankova, M. (2023). Evaluations of appropriateness through impoliteness in political discourse reframed for entertainment purposes. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 19(2), 279–299. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2023-0015>
- 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511975752>
- Culpeper, J., & Hardaker, C. (2017). Impoliteness. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, & D. Z. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 199–225). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7_8

- 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/j.pragma.2003.06.001>
- Hasanah, R., Murni, S. M., & Lubis, F. K. (2024). Impoliteness strategies used by haters and supporters of presidential candidates in cyber-conflicts. *Proceedings of English Linguistic and Literature*, 4, 16–19.
- Ikechukwu-ibe, C. J. (2025). An analysis of impoliteness as the oppositional discourse in the Nigerian EndSARS protest. *African Identities*, 23(1), 128–144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14725843.2023.2227355>
- Kaulika, A., Salim Mansyur, A., & Wardoyo, C. (2024). Impoliteness strategies in hate comments on Noah Schnapp's Instagram post. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 11(2), 449–464. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v11i2.33866>
- Lubis, D. N., Tantira, N., Sibarani, L. P. S., Siagian, T. L., & Rangkuti, R. (2025). Impoliteness strategies in online political discourse: A study of hate comments on Ahmad Sahroni's Instagram account. *Linguistics and ELT Journal*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.31764/leltj.v13i2.36958>
- Mbaka, N., & Atieno, C. (2025). Impoliteness strategies in political discourse during the impeachment of the deputy president of Kenya: A case study of Hansard parliamentary discourse. *Open Access Library Journal*, 12, e14214. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1114214>
- Murti, R. W., Pratama, H., & Yulianto, H. J. (2024). Impoliteness strategies in online political discourse: A case study of Indonesian netizens' comments on TikTok. *English Education Journal*, 14(3), 428–439. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v14i3.15973>
- Nurfitriah, R., & Wijana, I. D. P. (2025). Impoliteness strategies in the comment section of Donald Trump's Instagram account. *Anglophile Journal*, 5(1), 41–54. <https://doi.org/10.51278/anglophile.v5i1.1482>
- Pasaribu, S., Marchella, Y., Dywanti, R. D., & Ardiansyah, R. (2025). Analysis of impoliteness strategies in YouTube comment sections. *Jurnal Sadewa: Publikasi Ilmu Pendidikan, Pembelajaran dan Ilmu Sosial*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.61132/sadewa.v3i3.2028>
- Rabab'ah, G. (2025). Political rhetorical force: Analyzing the dynamics of threat in President Biden's speeches. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2582839>
- Saragi, C. N. (2026). Digital impoliteness strategies in response to Finance Minister Purbaya's assertions on the high-speed Whoosh project. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v14i1.18410>
- Setiawati, E., & Salamah. (2024). Navigating impoliteness in political discourse on social media: A cyber pragmatics analysis of the 2024 Indonesian presidential election. *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse Research*, 5(2), 222–231.

- Simanjuntak, H. M., (2024). Impoliteness strategies in the third Indonesia presidential debate 2024: Pragmatics research. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 10(3), 2635–2646. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i3.4080>
- Situmorang, Y. F., Lestari, F. D., & Sinaga, N. T. (2024). Impoliteness strategies of the hate comments on Twitter. *ALACRITY: Journal of Education*, 4(3), 220–228. <https://doi.org/10.52121/alacrity.v4i3.437>
- Tsoumou, J. M. (2023). "What is wrong with you people that you are happy someone has Covid": Impoliteness in the coronavirus pandemic era. *SAGE Open*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231161040>