



Violation of the Politeness Principle in Political Humor on Instagram: A Pragmatic Analysis of Netizen Comments

Deden Sutrisna

Universitas Majalengka, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: dedensutrisna@unma.ac.id

Received: May 20, 2026; Revised: June 12, 2026; Accepted: August 25, 2026; Published: August 31, 2026

Abstract. This study examines violations of the politeness principle in political humor on Instagram. This topic is important because netizen comments on political posts do not merely function as immediate responses but also serve as a means of expressing criticism, satire, disappointment, and distrust toward political actors, institutions, and public policies. This study aims to describe the forms of politeness principle violations and explain their pragmatic functions in constructing political humor in digital spaces. A descriptive qualitative approach with a pragmatic perspective was employed in this study. The data consisted of ten netizen comments collected from Instagram posts published by BBC Indonesia, kumparan.com, and narasinewsroom. The data were analyzed based on ten politeness maxims, namely the tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, sympathy maxim, opinion-reticence maxim, obligation of the speaker to the hearer maxim, obligation of the hearer to the speaker maxim, and feeling-reticence maxim. The data analysis revealed that violations of the politeness principle emerged through satire, irony, insinuation, sarcasm, hyperbole, rhetorical questions, generalization, and the use of emojis. These violations were used to convey criticism of the legal system, demands for justice, moral responsibility, public accountability, and the relationship between educational institutions and power. These findings indicate that political humor on Instagram does not merely function as entertainment but also operates as a pragmatic strategy for delivering socio-political evaluation in a sharp, concise, and publicly engaging manner.

Keywords: political humor; Instagram; politeness; pragmatics; satire; netizens



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Social media is currently used as an important space for the public to respond to various political issues rapidly, openly, and creatively. Within this digital space, Instagram is used not only as a medium for sharing information but also as an arena for shaping public opinion through comments, memes, short videos, visual satire, and political humor. Netizens' responses to political issues often appear in the form of brief utterances that are evaluative, emotional, and easily disseminated. From this pattern of communication, it can be understood that language practices on social media need to be positioned as part of digital communication that has pragmatic contexts, purposes, and consequences. In pragmatics, language is understood not merely as a system of signs but also as a communicative act used by speakers to convey intentions within particular contexts.

Therefore, netizen comments in political humor on Instagram can be positioned as pragmatic data that represent how society interprets, criticizes, and responds to political realities. The distinctive character of political humor lies in its function, which not only creates

amusement but also carries criticism of political actors, policies, institutions, and events. Through humor, criticism can be delivered in a light manner while still maintaining strong evaluative force. In satire studies, political humor is often explained through the tension between a form that appears amusing and content that is essentially critical. Through this mechanism, humor can be used as a means of discussing power, injustice, and public concerns without necessarily relying on formal argumentative forms.

From the perspective of humor theory, amusement may also arise from semantic incongruity, script opposition, the play of expectations, and interpretive surprise shared by both the speaker and the reader. Thus, political humor on Instagram can be understood as a communicative practice that combines entertainment, criticism, and socio-political evaluation. One prominent linguistic phenomenon in political humor on Instagram is the emergence of violations of the politeness principle. Netizens frequently use insinuation, irony, sarcasm, hyperbole, rhetorical questions, generalization, and emotional expressions to respond to political issues.

Such utterances have the potential to violate politeness norms because they may maximize criticism, intensify disagreement, reduce sympathy, or openly express negative feelings. The politeness principle explains that polite communication is directed toward maintaining the balance of social relations by minimizing expressions that disadvantage others and maximizing expressions that benefit others. However, in political humor, violations of politeness do not always appear as communicative failures. These violations can be used strategically to create humorous effects, strengthen satire, and sharpen criticism. From a pragmatic perspective, violations of politeness are closely related to the speaker's intended meaning, the social context, and the relationship between the speaker and the party targeted by the criticism.

Brown and Levinson conceptualize politeness as a strategy for managing acts that potentially threaten face, particularly when utterances concern another party's self-image, honor, or social position. In a more critical context, impoliteness can be understood as the use of linguistic resources to attack, demean, or undermine the image of a particular party. Therefore, political comments that appear harsh, cynical, or impolite need to be analyzed not only in terms of their linguistic forms but also in relation to the pragmatic functions constructed through context. In political humor on Instagram, violations of politeness can be used as a strategy to express distrust in the legal system, demand public accountability, or satirize the closeness of certain institutions to power. Meaning in digital political humor is often not conveyed directly.

Many netizen comments employ implicature, irony, and insinuation to communicate meanings that differ from their literal interpretation. In implicature theory, utterance meaning is explained as extending beyond what is explicitly stated because readers need to interpret the speaker's intention based on conversational principles and the context of use. In digital communication, this interpretive process becomes increasingly complex because meaning may be shaped by the relationship among text, emojis, images, captions, political situations, and the audience's shared knowledge. Therefore, comments such as pseudo-praise, rhetorical questions, or hyperbolic expressions in political humor on Instagram need to be understood as forms of pragmatic communication that rely on readers' inference.

Recent studies on digital political communication explain that social media provides extensive space for the emergence of evaluative, aggressive, satirical, and critical utterances. In studies of cyber political communication, it has been found that direct speech strategies and impoliteness can be used to mark group identity, mobilize emotions, and gain political visibility in digital spaces. In digital democracy studies, politeness and impoliteness in online political discussions are associated with the quality of public participation, openness of deliberation, and the potential for conflict among participants. In addition, within the context of Indonesian social media, algorithmic logic and the formation of digital enclaves can intensify polarization and encourage the spread of sharp and antagonistic utterances.

Thus, political humor on Instagram needs to be situated within a broader context, namely as part of digital political communication practices shaped by platform culture, audience responses, and power dynamics. Previous studies on impoliteness and incivility in online

political communication explain that impolite utterances are not always uniform in nature. In certain contexts, impolite utterances may still contain arguments, criticism, or political evaluations considered meaningful by particular digital communities. In addition, through the mechanisms of digital platforms, the emergence of emotional utterances can be amplified because content that provokes responses often receives greater attention within the social media ecosystem.

In humor studies, humor strategies are also understood not only as devices for creating amusement but also as ways for speakers to manage social relations, build solidarity, and convey criticism indirectly. Based on these tendencies, the analysis of political humor on Instagram needs to connect the forms of politeness violations with their pragmatic functions, rather than merely classifying utterances as polite or impolite. Although studies on political humor, politeness, impoliteness, implicature, and digital communication have developed considerably, research that specifically maps violations of the politeness principle in Instagram political humor based on Leech's ten maxims remains limited.

Most previous studies have focused more on political impoliteness in general, criticism strategies, or political satire as a form of social expression. Other studies have placed greater emphasis on the functions of humor, mechanisms of implicature, or the influence of digital platforms on political communication. However, few studies have specifically examined how violations of the maxims of opinion-reticence, approbation, sympathy, feeling-reticence, obligation of the speaker to the hearer, agreement, tact, obligation of the hearer to the speaker, modesty, and generosity are used in Instagram political humor comments. This gap provides an important basis for the present study.

The novelty of this study lies in mapping violations of the politeness principle in Instagram political humor by using Leech's ten politeness maxims as the main analytical parameters. In this study, the types of violated maxims are not only identified but also explained in terms of their pragmatic functions in constructing satire, irony, sarcasm, hyperbole, rhetorical questions, generalization, pseudo-praise, and emotional expression. The contextual contribution of this study lies in its focus on Instagram comments, as netizen comments represent a form of political participation that is spontaneous, concise, responsive, and closely connected to digital communication culture. Thus, this study offers a pragmatic reading of political humor as a digital communication practice that combines impoliteness, criticism, and entertainment.

Based on this background, this study aims to describe the forms of violations of the politeness principle in political humor on Instagram and to explain the pragmatic functions of these violations in constructing socio-political criticism. Specifically, this study seeks to identify violations of the ten politeness maxims in netizen comments on political posts. This study is expected to contribute to the development of pragmatic studies, particularly studies of politeness, impoliteness, and digital political humor. In addition, this study is also expected to enrich the understanding of how society uses humor as a means of criticism, evaluation, social control, and political participation on social media.

2. Methodology

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach with a pragmatic perspective. The descriptive qualitative approach was chosen because the research data consisted of netizen comments containing political humor utterances. Therefore, the analysis was directed toward describing the forms, contexts, and pragmatic functions of the utterances rather than toward statistical measurement. In qualitative research, linguistic data are understood as social phenomena that need to be interpreted based on their context of use. On this basis, the netizen comments in this study were treated as units of digital discourse that represent how society expresses criticism, satire, disappointment, and evaluation of political issues. A pragmatic perspective was used because the focus of this study lies in the relationship between utterances, context, speakers' intentions, and the communicative effects produced.

The data were analyzed not only based on sentence structures that are explicitly observable but also by considering the context of the posts, the political issues being referred to, the targets

of criticism, and the humor markers appearing in the comments. In language research, the analysis of utterances needs to consider both linguistic units and their contexts of use so that the meanings obtained are not detached from the communicative situation. On this basis, violations of the politeness principle in Instagram political humor were analyzed as pragmatic phenomena that integrate linguistic forms, social context, and critical functions.

The main framework of this study is Leech's politeness principle, particularly the ten politeness maxims, which include the maxims of opinion-reticence, approbation, sympathy, feeling-reticence, obligation of the speaker to the hearer, agreement, tact, obligation of the hearer to the speaker, modesty, and generosity. These ten maxims were used as parameters to identify and interpret forms of politeness violations in political humor comments on Instagram. Through this design, the types of violated maxims were not only classified but also explained in terms of their pragmatic functions in constructing humor, satire, irony, and socio-political criticism. The data of this study consisted of netizen comments on Instagram posts containing political humor and indicating alleged violations of the politeness principle.

The comments analyzed comprised ten data items and were obtained from three Instagram accounts, namely BBC Indonesia, kumparan.com, and narasinewsroom. These three accounts were selected because they published posts concerning political issues and public policies that elicited evaluative responses from netizens. The issues forming the data context included the Chromebook case, the controversy surrounding the MPR quiz competition judge in West Kalimantan, and the discourse on campuses serving as kitchens for **Makanan Bergizi Gratis**. The data sources were selected purposively because this study did not aim to collect all political comments on Instagram, but rather to select comments relevant to the focus of analysis. The data criteria used in this study included four main aspects.

First, the comments had to appear on Instagram posts discussing political issues, public policies, state institutions, or public figures. Second, the comments had to contain elements of humor, satire, irony, insinuation, sarcasm, hyperbole, or evaluative expressions that had the potential to generate humorous effects. Third, the comments had to indicate a violation of one of the politeness maxims. Fourth, the context of the posts had to be traceable so that pragmatic interpretation could be conducted responsibly.

Table 1. Data Sources

Data Source	Issue Context	Number of Data	Focus of Politeness Violations
BBC Indonesia	the Chromebook case involving the former Minister of Education, Nadiem Makarim	4 comment	Violations of the opinion-reticence, approbation, sympathy, and feeling-reticence maxims
kumparan.com	The controversy surrounding the MPR quiz competition judge in West Kalimantan	4 comment	Violations of the forgiveness, agreement, tact, and apology maxims
narasinewsroom	The discourse on campuses serving as kitchens for <i>Makanan Bergizi Gratis</i>	2 comment	Violations of the modesty and generosity maxims

Data analysis was conducted through several stages, namely data reduction, classification, pragmatic interpretation, and conclusion drawing. In the data reduction stage, the collected comments were selected based on their relevance to the focus of the study. Comments that did not contain elements of political humor or did not indicate violations of the politeness principle were excluded from the analytical corpus. Data that met the criteria were then coded based on the source and the sequential number of the data. Data validity was maintained through source triangulation and theoretical triangulation.

Source triangulation was carried out by examining the correspondence among the comments analyzed, the context of the posts, the content of the news or issues discussed, and supporting elements such as emojis and language style. This step was taken to ensure that the interpretation of the comments was not detached from the socio-political context underlying their emergence. Theoretical triangulation was conducted by using Leech's politeness principle as the main framework and pragmatic concepts concerning context, speaker intention, and communicative function as interpretive tools.

3. Results and Discussions

Based on the analysis of netizen comments on political posts on Instagram, it was found that political humor contained violations of the ten politeness maxims. These violations did not appear in a uniform form of utterance but were distributed across various issue contexts, namely the Chromebook case, the controversy surrounding the MPR quiz competition judge in West Kalimantan, and the discourse on campuses serving as kitchens for **Makanan Bergizi Gratis**. Each context showed different pragmatic functional tendencies, ranging from criticism of the legal system and government, demands for justice and accountability, to satire directed at the relationship between educational institutions and power.

Tabel 2. Distribution of Issue Contexts, Number of Comments, and Types of Violated Politeness Maxims

Data Source	Issue Context	Number of Data	Focus of Politeness Violations
BBC Indonesia	the Chromebook case involving the former Minister of Education, Nadiem Makarim	4 comment	Opinion-reticence maxim, approbation maxim, sympathy maxim, and feeling-reticence maxim
kumparan.com	The controversy surrounding the MPR quiz competition judge in West Kalimantan	4 comment	Forgiveness maxim, agreement maxim, tact maxim, and apology maxim
narasinewsroom	The discourse on campuses serving as kitchens for <i>Makanan Bergizi Gratis</i>	2 comment	Modesty maxim and generosity maxim

This distribution indicates that violations of the politeness principle in Instagram political humor occur not only in comments that directly attack particular parties but also through insinuation, rhetorical questions, irony, hyperbole, and emotional expressions. Thus, netizen comments function not merely as responses to news posts but also as a form of pragmatic participation in evaluating socio-political issues.

3.1 Violations of the Politeness Principle in the Context of Criticism of Law and Government

In the data obtained from the BBC Indonesia account, the issue context relates to the Chromebook case involving the former Minister of Education, Nadiem Makarim. In this context, netizen comments show a tendency to criticize the legal system, the government, and Indonesia's political conditions. The politeness violations that emerged include violations of the opinion-reticence maxim, approbation maxim, sympathy maxim, and feeling-reticence maxim. The comment *"From the cases of Tom Lembong and Nadiem, we learn that no matter how much we love our country, we should never be willing to enter the government..."* indicates a violation of the opinion-reticence maxim. The utterance is expressed directly and in a generalized manner, thereby showing no restraint in conveying an opinion.

The expression *"we should never be willing to enter the government"* reflects a pessimistic attitude toward the world of government and leads readers to the judgment that involvement in

government may result in legal or political risks. The humor in this comment emerges through the form of satirical advice that appears to offer a life lesson, while in fact conveying criticism of the political situation. A violation of the approbation maxim is evident in the comment *"Will Wowo become a hero again? As has happened before."* In form, the word "hero" appears to function as praise. However, in the context of the utterance, the word is used ironically to satirize a particular political figure. Praise, which should maximize approbation, is transformed into satire that contains suspicion toward power dynamics.

The sentence *"as has happened before"* strengthens the ironic meaning because it directs readers to previous events perceived as having a similar pattern. The comment *"RIP law and justice in Indonesia"* demonstrates a violation of the sympathy maxim. The expression "RIP" is commonly used in contexts of condolence, but in this comment it is used to suggest that law and justice are considered to have "died." The utterance is hyperbolic because it presents criticism of the legal system through the metaphor of death. The use of fire emojis reinforces the emotional expression of anger, disappointment, and satire toward the condition of law, which is perceived as not functioning as it should.

A violation of the feeling-reticence maxim is found in the comment *"I have never felt this ashamed to be a law graduate."* This comment openly expresses a sense of shame toward the condition of law in Indonesia. The utterance does not merely convey a personal feeling but also satirizes law enforcement officers and the parties involved in the political issue. The folded-hands emoji reinforces the impression of resignation, disappointment, and irony. Thus, the violation of the feeling-reticence maxim is used to construct concise emotional criticism with strong evaluative force.

3.2 Violations of Politeness in the Context of Demands for Justice and Accountability

The data from the kumparan.com account relate to the controversy surrounding the MPR quiz competition judge in West Kalimantan. In the post, netizens responded to the judge's scoring error, which was perceived as disadvantaging the competition participants. The comments that appeared demonstrated violations of the forgiveness maxim, agreement maxim, tact maxim, and apology maxim. Unlike the previous context, which focused more on the legal system and government, this context more strongly reflects demands for justice, responsibility, and public accountability. The comment *"Is an apology all there is? Annul the victory; that would be fair"* indicates a violation of the forgiveness maxim. The speaker does not accept the apology as a sufficient resolution but instead demands corrective action in the form of annulling the victory.

The question *"Is an apology all there is?"* reflects dissatisfaction with a formal response perceived as failing to restore justice. In this context, the violation of politeness is used to emphasize that an apology without concrete action is considered inadequate. A violation of the agreement maxim is evident in the comment *"Making a mistake as a judge is understandable, but what is not acceptable is the way the response was given and the defensive attitude without clear evidence...."* This comment contains a contrastive structure between the part that can be accepted and the part being criticized. The speaker still allows room for understanding through the expression *"making a mistake as a judge is understandable,"* but then emphasizes disagreement through the phrase *"what is not acceptable."*

This pattern shows that the comment does not merely reject the issue, but constructs criticism by distinguishing between a technical error and a defensive attitude considered unprofessional. The comment *"The panel of judges showed that the power of decision was in their hands..."* demonstrates a violation of the tact maxim. The utterance criticizes the party holding authority because they are perceived as using power to defend a decision. The expression "showed power" marks a negative evaluation of the power relation between the judges and the participants. In the context of the competition, participants occupy a weaker position; therefore, this comment highlights the alleged injustice in the exercise of authority. A violation of the apology maxim is found in the comment *"Where are the judges? Are they not going to apologize?"*

The comment is expressed in the form of a rhetorical question containing a demand for moral responsibility. The speaker questions the absence of an apology from the judges, who are perceived to have made a mistake. This question is not merely intended to elicit an answer, but to satirize the party considered to have failed to demonstrate responsibility. Thus, political humor in this context operates through criticism of public ethics and the moral obligations of the party at fault.

3.3 Violations of the Politeness Principle in the Context of Satire toward Educational Institutions and Power

The data from the narasinewsroom account relate to the discourse on campuses serving as kitchens for **Makanan Bergizi Gratis**. Netizen comments in this context show satire toward the relationship among higher education institutions, government policy, and power interests. The two maxims violated are the modesty maxim and the generosity maxim. The comment *"Unhas and IPB are truly campuses that produce the favorite workforce of Indonesian officials"* demonstrates a violation of the modesty maxim. On the surface, the comment appears to praise certain universities. However, in the context of the discourse on campuses serving as kitchens for MBG, the phrase *"campuses that produce the favorite workforce of Indonesian officials"* functions as irony. This comment satirizes universities perceived as being too closely aligned with the interests of officials or the government.

The humor emerges from the use of pseudo-praise that actually contains criticism of the independence of higher education institutions. The comment *"So that it stays safe... no student demonstrations..."* indicates a violation of the generosity maxim. The utterance satirizes the alleged presence of particular interests behind campus support for government programs. The phrase *"so that it stays safe"* leads readers to interpret that the policy is not merely implemented for the public interest, but also to maintain the comfort of certain parties so that they do not face student protests. The laughing emojis strengthen the humorous effect while also indicating that the criticism is delivered in a casual and satirical manner.

The findings in this context show that political humor does not only directly attack political actors but can also be directed at institutions perceived as having ties to power. Criticism of campuses is not conveyed through lengthy argumentation but through brief comments that combine irony, insinuation, and shared knowledge about the relationship among students, campuses, and government policy. Overall, the findings show that violations of the politeness principle in Instagram political humor are constructed through several linguistic patterns. These patterns include insinuation, irony, satire, sarcasm, hyperbole, rhetorical questions, generalization, pseudo-praise, and the use of emojis. Each pattern has a different pragmatic function, yet all contribute to strengthening socio-political criticism.

Table 3. Presents a Summary of the Relationship Among the Data, The Violated Maxims, Linguistic Markers, and Their Pragmatic Functions

Data Code	Comment Excerpt	Violated Maxim	Linguistic Marker	Pragmatic Function
1	"never be willing to enter the government"	Opinion-reticence	Generalization and satirical advice	Conveying pessimism toward the government
2	"will [he] become a hero again?"	Approbation	Pseudo-praise and irony	Satirizing a particular political figure
3	"RIP law and justice in Indonesia"	Sympathy	Hyperbole, death metaphor, and emojis	Criticizing the condition of law and justice
4	this ashamed to be a law graduate"	Feeling-reticence	Expression of shame and resignation emoji	Expressing disappointment with law enforcement

Data Code	Comment Excerpt	Violated Maxim	Linguistic Marker	Pragmatic Function
5	"Is an apology all there is?"	Forgiveness	Rhetorical question	Demanding concrete action following an apology
6	"what is not acceptable is the way the response was given and the defensive attitude"	Agreement	Contrast and evaluative rejection	Criticizing the judges' defensive attitude
7	"showed that the power of decision was in their hands"	Tact	Criticism of power relations	Highlighting the abuse of authority
8	"Are they not going to apologize?"	Apology	Rhetorical question	Demanding moral responsibility
9	"campuses that produce the favorite workforce of Indonesian officials"	Modesty	Pseudo-praise and satire	Satirizing the closeness of campuses to power
10	"So that it stays safe... no student demonstrations... 🤪🤪🤪"	Generosity	Insinuation and laughing emojis	Satirizing the interests behind the policy

Table 3 shows that violations of the politeness principle in the data do not merely stand as expressions of rudeness, but are connected to particular pragmatic functions. In issues concerning law and government, these violations are used to express disappointment and distrust. In the issue of the MPR quiz competition, the violations are used to demand justice and responsibility. In the issue of campuses and MBG, the violations are used to satirize the relationship between educational institutions and power. These findings indicate that political humor on Instagram has a concise, responsive, and evaluative communicative character. Netizens utilize violations of politeness to deliver criticism sharply, while still packaging it in a form that attracts public attention. Thus, violations of the politeness principle constitute one important mechanism in the construction of digital political humor.

Discussions

The findings of this study show that political humor on Instagram functions as a pragmatic space for netizens to convey socio-political criticism through violations of the politeness principle. In the ten comments analyzed, violations of politeness do not merely appear as forms of verbal impoliteness, but also as a communicative mechanism for expressing disappointment, suspicion, demands for justice, and criticism of power relations. The data, which were drawn from the contexts of the Chromebook case, the controversy surrounding the MPR quiz competition judge, and the issue of campuses serving as MBG kitchens, show that political humor can move from criticism of the legal system and public accountability to satire directed at educational institutions perceived as being closely aligned with power interests.

Thus, netizen comments on Instagram cannot be understood merely as spontaneous utterances, but rather as discursive practices that combine humor, criticism, and socio-political evaluation. The dominance of violations of the politeness principle in the data indicates that impoliteness in political humor does not always appear as a disruption of communication. In the context of humor, violations of politeness can instead function as rhetorical strategies to strengthen the effect of criticism. Utterances such as *"RIP law and justice in Indonesia"* or *"Is an apology all there is?"* show that speakers deliberately use sharp, hyperbolic, and unmitigated forms of expression to construct satirical force. When viewed through Leech's politeness principle, such utterances deviate from the orientation toward maintaining social harmony because they maximize criticism, disagreement, and the expression of negative feelings.

However, in the context of digital political humor, these deviations have pragmatic functions because they can attract readers' attention, create humorous effects, and emphasize the speaker's critical stance toward the issue being discussed. In the context of the Chromebook case, violations of the opinion-reticence, approbation, sympathy, and feeling-reticence maxims indicate the strong expression of public disappointment toward the legal system and government. The comment *"never be willing to enter the government"* does not merely convey an opinion, but also constructs a pessimistic generalization that involvement in government risks leading someone into legal and political problems. Meanwhile, the use of the word "hero" in the comment *"Will Wowo become a hero again?"* shows pseudo-praise that pragmatically functions as satire.

This pattern indicates that political humor often uses forms of language that appear light on the surface but contain sharp negative evaluation. In other words, violations of politeness in this context become a channel for expressing distrust toward legal institutions and power dynamics. In the context of the controversy surrounding the MPR quiz competition judge, violations of the forgiveness maxim, agreement maxim, tact maxim, and apology maxim show that political humor is used to demand justice and moral responsibility. The comment *"Is an apology all there is? Annul the victory; that would be fair"* indicates that a formal apology is considered insufficient if it is not followed by corrective action. A similar pattern appears in the comment *"Where are the judges? Are they not going to apologize?"* which uses a rhetorical question to demand accountability from the party perceived to be at fault.

This pattern shows that violations of politeness can function as a strategy of social control. Netizens do not merely laugh at public mistakes but use humor to pressure authorities to act fairly and responsibly. In the context of campuses serving as MBG kitchens, violations of the modesty maxim and generosity maxim reveal satire toward the relationship between educational institutions and power. The comment *"campuses that produce the favorite workforce of Indonesian officials"* uses pseudo-praise to satirize universities perceived as being too closely aligned with the interests of officials. Meanwhile, the comment *"So that it stays safe... no student demonstrations..."* simplifies the rationale behind the policy into an alleged strategy to avoid student protests. Both comments show that political humor is not always directed at formal political actors, but also at non-political institutions perceived as being connected to power agendas.

In this case, violations of politeness function as a tool for questioning the independence of educational institutions and the critical position of campuses in responding to public policies. Linguistically, violations of the politeness principle in the data are constructed through irony, satire, sarcasm, hyperbole, rhetorical questions, generalization, pseudo-praise, and the use of emojis. These forms show that Instagram political humor relies heavily on semantic density. Netizen comments are generally brief, yet they can contain complex criticism because they are supported by the issue context and the readers' shared knowledge. Fire emojis, laughing emojis, and folded-hands emojis do not merely function as digital ornaments, but serve as markers of emotional stance, such as anger, cynicism, amusement, resignation, or irony.

Thus, a pragmatic analysis of Instagram political humor needs to consider both verbal and digital nonverbal elements because both mutually construct meaning. These findings align with the tendency in digital pragmatics studies showing that social media has become a fertile space for the emergence of evaluative, aggressive, satirical, and critical utterances. In digital political communication, sharp utterances often gain attention because they correspond to the fast, concise, and responsive character of social media. However, this study extends this interpretation by showing that violations of the politeness principle in Instagram political humor do not merely indicate impoliteness, but also reveal more complex pragmatic functions. Maxim violations are used to criticize the law, demand accountability, satirize power, and build emotional solidarity with readers who share similar concerns.

Thus, political humor becomes a form of public participation that operates through language strategies that are not always polite, but remain communicative and impactful. Theoretically, the findings of this study affirm that Leech's politeness principle remains relevant for examining

digital communication practices, particularly when applied contextually. In the data of this study, maxim violations cannot be separated from the political issues underlying them, the targets of criticism, and the forms of humor employed. Politeness is not only concerned with efforts to maintain interactional harmony, but also with how speakers choose to deviate from politeness norms in order to achieve particular communicative purposes.

Therefore, violations of the politeness principle in Instagram political humor can be understood as pragmatic strategies that utilize impoliteness to construct critical force, humorous effects, and the audience's emotional engagement. Overall, this discussion emphasizes that political humor on Instagram is a digital communication practice that combines impoliteness, criticism, and entertainment. Violations of the politeness principle do not only indicate sharp or impolite forms of language, but also reveal how netizens respond to political issues in creative, concise, and evaluative ways. Within the space of Instagram, political criticism does not always appear in the form of lengthy argumentation, but may emerge through brief comments that are satirical, ironic, and emotional.

Thus, Instagram political humor functions as a channel of public expression that enables society to voice concerns, build solidarity, and exercise social control over actors and institutions perceived as problematic.

4. Conclusions

This study affirms that political humor on Instagram functions not only as a form of digital entertainment but also as a pragmatic strategy for conveying socio-political criticism through violations of the politeness principle. Based on the analysis of ten netizen comments on political posts on Instagram, it was found that violations of the politeness principle appeared in various forms, including violations of the opinion-reticence, approbation, sympathy, feeling-reticence, forgiveness, agreement, tact, apology, modesty, and generosity maxims. These violations were used to respond to three issue contexts, namely the Chromebook case, the controversy surrounding the MPR quiz competition judge in West Kalimantan, and the discourse on campuses serving as kitchens for **Makanan Bergizi Gratis**.

These findings show that netizen comments are not merely spontaneous reactions to political issues, but also a form of public participation in evaluating law, power, policy, and institutional accountability. Violations of the politeness principle in the data operate through several linguistic strategies, such as satire, irony, sarcasm, hyperbole, rhetorical questions, generalization, pseudo-praise, and the use of emojis. These strategies enable political criticism to be conveyed in a concise, sharp, emotional, and attention-grabbing manner. In the context of the Chromebook case, violations of politeness were used to express disappointment and distrust toward the legal system and government. In the context of the controversy surrounding the MPR quiz competition judge, violations of politeness were used to demand justice, moral responsibility, and public accountability.

Meanwhile, in the context of campuses serving as MBG kitchens, violations of politeness were used to satirize the relationship among educational institutions, government policy, and power interests. Thus, violations of politeness in Instagram political humor do not always indicate communicative failure, but can function as a deliberately chosen mechanism of criticism to strengthen satirical force and humorous effects. Theoretically, this study strengthens the relevance of Leech's politeness principle in examining digital communication practices, particularly political comments that are humorous, satirical, and evaluative. This study shows that politeness maxims can be used not only to assess the politeness of utterances but also to explain how deviations from politeness norms are utilized as pragmatic strategies in political humor.

Practically, these findings provide an understanding that social media, particularly Instagram, serves as a space for public expression that enables society to convey criticism creatively, concisely, and communicatively. However, this study is limited in terms of the amount of data and the platform scope, as it focuses only on Instagram comments from three news accounts. Therefore, future studies may expand the data corpus, compare other platforms

such as TikTok, X, YouTube Shorts, or Facebook, and examine audience responses so that the understanding of politeness violations in digital political humor becomes more comprehensive.

Referensi

- Attardo, S. *Linguistic Theories of Humor*; Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, Germany, 1994.
- Brown, P.; Levinson, S.C. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1987.
- Culpeper, J. Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 1996, 25, 349–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Dynel, M. Humorous Phenomena in Dramatic Discourse. *European Journal of Humour Research* 2013, 1, 22–60.
- Grice, H.P. *Logic and Conversation*. In *Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 3. Speech Acts*; Cole, P., Morgan, J.L., Eds.; Academic Press: New York, NY, USA, 1975; pp. 41–58.
- Leech, G.N. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2014.
- Lim, M. Freedom to Hate: Social Media, Algorithmic Enclaves, and the Rise of Tribal Nationalism in Indonesia. *Critical Asian Studies* 2017, 49, 411–427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2017.1341188>
- Mahsun. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan Strategi, Metode, dan Tekniknya*; Rajawali Pers: Jakarta, Indonesia, 2012.
- Markham, A.; Buchanan, E. *Ethical Decision-Making and Internet Research: Recommendations from the AoIR Ethics Working Committee*; Association of Internet Researchers: Chicago, IL, USA, 2012.
- Moleong, L.J. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*; Remaja Rosdakarya: Bandung, Indonesia, 2006.
- Papacharissi, Z. Democracy Online: Civility, Politeness, and the Democratic Potential of Online Political Discussion Groups. *New Media & Society* 2004, 6, 259–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444804041444>
- Rossini, P. Algorithmic Outrage: How Digital Affordances Amplify Political Incivility Online. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 2022, 27, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmac005>
- Rossini, P. Beyond Incivility: Understanding Patterns of Uncivil and Intolerant Discourse in Online Political Talk. *Communication Research* 2020, 47, 1161–1191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218816220>
- Rustono. *Pokok-Pokok Pragmatik*; IKIP Semarang Press: Semarang, Indonesia, 1999.
- Simpson, P. *On the Discourse of Satire: Towards a Stylistic Model of Satirical Humour*; John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2003.
- Sudaryanto. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*; Sanata Dharma University Press: Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 2015.
- Yanti, Y.; Thamrin, T.; Hasan, D.C.; Izmayanti, D.K.; Irma; Pramujiono, A. Bald on Record Strategy and Politeness in Cyber Political Communication: A Pragmatic Analysis of Speech in the 2024 Indonesian Presidential Election. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya* 2026, 12, 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v12i1.42196>
- Yus, F. *Cyberpragmatics: Internet-Mediated Communication in Context*; John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2011.