p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/index

p-ISSN 2252-7427 e-ISSN 2541-3635
Indonesian EFL Journal
AISEE
The Association of Indonesia Scholars of English Education

# THE PRACTICE OF PRESUPPOSITION IN CRITICAL DISCOURSE ON FREE NUTRITIOUS EATING PROGRAMS: A PRAGMATIC STUDY ON PLATFORM X

**Fauzan Almaarif[1], Moh. Tahir[2], Gazali[3], Agustan[4], Ulinsa[5]**
[1,2,3,4,5]*Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia*

**Correspondent author's email address:** fzanocan@gmail.com

APA Citation: Almaarif, F., Tahir, M., Gazali., Agustan., & Ulinsa. (2026). The practice of presupposition in critical discourse on free nutritious eating programs: A pragmatic study on platform X. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 12*(3), 1177-1194. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v12i3.206

Received: 21-05-2026 Accepted: 22-07-2026 Published: 30-09-2026

**Abstract:** Criticism of public policy on social media is not always conveyed directly, but can be built through presuppositions that place certain assumptions as information that is considered to have been known together. This study examines the practice of presupposition in comments criticizing the Free Nutritious Eating Program (MBG) on Platform X. The research uses a qualitative descriptive approach with an interpretive orientation. Data in the form of 90 public comments were purposively selected and grouped into three parts of the analysis, namely 60 data to identify six types of presuppositions based on (Yule, 1996), data to identify social and artistic criticism based on (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005), and 10 data analyzed in an integrated manner using the theory of presupposition, criticism, and *Appraisal* (Martin & White, 2005). The results showed that all six types of presuppositions were found. Presupposition triggers present assumptions about the circumstances, actions, and causal relationships that are the basis for the speaker to deliver criticism. Social criticism questions the safety of beneficiaries, managers' profits, and budget priorities, while artistic criticism highlights coercion, restrictions on freedom, and closed dialogue spaces. In the ten integrated analysis data, presupposition triggers build on the assumptions underlying criticism, while criticism orientation shows the problems highlighted, both socially and artistically. Systems *Appraisal* show how the speaker evaluates the problem through *Attitude* Dominated *Judgment*, take a position against other views through *Commitment* Dominated *Disclaim Counter*, as well as strengthening evaluation through *Graduation* which includes *Force Intensification* and *Force Quantification*. These findings suggest that presupposition practices also shape the way speakers evaluate and express their rejection of MBG policies. The results of the study are limited to the interpretation of selected data and are not intended to describe the proportion of categories in the overall comments on Platform X.
**Keywords:** *presupposition; social criticism; artistic criticism; appraisal; free nutritious meal program*

## INTRODUCTION

The public communication space has changed along with the development of social media. Language not only functions as a means of exchanging information, but also as a medium to convey attitudes, views, and assessments of social issues (Ramadhani et al., 2026). Through the comment column, users bring together various perspectives, respond to opinions, and debate emerging issues (Koswara, 2025); Solihin et al., 2025). This dynamic can be seen in research on hate speech and discriminatory expressions as well as impoliteness in comments (Cruz-Silva & López-Paredes, 2026; Kernell & Noh, 2026). A similar phenomenon is also taking place on the X platform, where users express their views and respond to various issues that are developing. (Chidayat et al., 2025).

One of the issues that triggered public discourse on platform X is the Free Nutritious Meal Program (MBG), which will begin to be

implemented in stages on January 6, 2025 under the coordination of the National Nutrition Agency (BGN) (Agustini & Mulyani, 2025). This program aims to increase the nutritional intake of the community, especially school children, toddlers, pregnant women, and lactating mothers, as well as support the health, growth, and improvement of the quality of Indonesia's human resources. As a policy that concerns the interests of the wider community, this program has generated a variety of responses, both support and criticism (Kiftiyah et al., 2025). Criticism of MBG includes issues of nutritional fulfillment, budget use, equitable distribution, and transparency and accountability for program implementation (Purnomo et al., 2025 ;Hadinata, 2026). Other responses highlight the implementation of policies that are considered to limit the public's freedom to question decisions or express their views (Mustika Maharani et al., 2026). These various criticisms show that netizens' comments not only assess the implementation of the program, but also question the basis, orientation, and way the policy is implemented.

Boltanski & Chiapello (2005) describes criticism as a response to circumstances that are seen as contrary to the values or order that are considered appropriate. The criticism consists of social criticism (*Social Critical*), which highlights inequality and injustice, as well as artistic criticism (*Artistic Criticism*), which emphasizes freedom, autonomy, and the rejection of restraint. In the context of public policy, both orientations can explain the basis of the dissatisfaction conveyed through comments (Napitupulu et al., 2026). Criticism is not always conveyed directly through explicit statements, but can be conveyed indirectly through speech that hints at a problem (Prihandini & Ulfah., 2026). Implicit meaning is an important aspect in the delivery of criticism because the speaker does not always express his intention directly. Understanding criticism requires interpreting the context and assumptions behind the speech. Therefore, critical analysis needs to examine the relationship between the speech delivered and the underlying presupposition to explain how the assumptions inherent in speech shape the reader's understanding of the criticized issue, especially when the speaker does not convey his criticism directly (Giunta et al., 2026).

In pragmatic studies, the assumptions underlying speech can be analyzed through the concept of presupposition. Yule (1996) Define a presupposition as something that the speaker assumes has been known or accepted by the speech partner before the speech is delivered. Presuppositions are divided into six types, namely existential, factive, lexical, structural, nonfactual, and counterfactual. The classification helps identify the presuppositions that accompany speech and understand meanings that are not always explicitly stated (Macagno, 2026; Asro & Andriyani, 2025). In critical commentary, presuppositions present information that underlies the speaker's judgment. Presupposition analysis helps explain how the speaker leads the reader to understand the problem based on the point of view built through speech.

In addition to containing presuppositions, critical comments also contain judgments that are realized through language choices. These evaluative aspects can be analyzed using the system *Appraisal* (Martin & White, 2005), which includes *Attitude*, *Commitment*, and *Graduation*. *Attitude* in relation to the evaluation of objects or behaviors, *Commitment* explain the speaker's position on other views, while *Graduation* examine the strengthening or weakening of evaluative meaning. In commentary, these three aspects can help reveal differences in the way speakers evaluate policies, respond to circulating views, and affirm critical attitudes through the intensity of the language used. Assessment can be directed at policies and their implementation, while the speaker's position on other views can show how comments are constructed in public discussion spaces. Strengthening or weakening evaluations also helps explain the extent to which criticism is affirmed through language choices (Sandre et al., 2026).

Research on presuppositions has examined

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/index

the process of understanding and its use in a variety of contexts. Dietrich et al. (2024) suggests that presupposition processing is concerned with contextual distance and semantic plausibility. Informative functions and trigger types also affect presupposition accommodation (Giunta et al., 2025), while (Schmitz et al., 2025) examine the role of information retrieval from memory in the resolution of presuppositions and the understanding of discourse coherence. In the political context, the use of presuppositions in newspaper articles criticizing the Russian war (Al-Ebadi, 2024). Meanwhile, a study of Indonesian political memes (Sufi & Princess, 2026) shows the use of presuppositions to convey criticism and ideological positions indirectly. These studies show that presuppositions play a role in understanding information and conveying implicit meanings in discourse. However, studies that link the type of presupposition to the form of criticism and linguistic evaluation in netizens' comments on public policy are still limited. This relationship is important to study to explain how presuppositions are used in conveying criticism and how the criticism is strengthened through language choices.

Studies on digital criticism show that social media is a space for the public to evaluate policies and demand government accountability. Suganda et al. (2025) found that negative comments on development (IKN) not only convey an assessment of policies, but also contain demands and considerations that are realized through evaluative, directive, and analytical actions. Nasrullah et al. (2026) identify expressions of disappointment, socio-economic grievances, and delegitimization of authority in YouTube comments regarding the adjustment of LPG subsidy regulations. Meanwhile, (Shea et al., 2025) It shows that rebuttals to news comments on social media use a variety of strategies, including personal attacks, logical disqualifications, and moral judgments. Naepi et al. (2026) highlighting the issue of protecting academic freedom, especially the unclear definition and application of regulations that can limit critical expression. In the Indonesian context, (Arintyas et al., 2026) found that digital mobilization through #BubarkanDPR and 17+8 People's Demands is related to demands for accountability and institutional response. understood precisely. Overall, previous research shows various forms and strategies of digital criticism. In the context of netizens' comments about the Free Nutritious Meal Program (MBG), the study of presuppositions helps to understand the meaning of criticism, especially when criticism is conveyed indirectly through diction choices whose meaning depends on the context and common knowledge between users.

A number of studies on the Free Nutritious Meal Program (MBG) reveal the problem of policy implementation and various community responses. Rares et al. (2026) Finding implementation constraints, especially in setting goals and adjusting policies to local conditions. Squirting (2025) Identify public sentiment and communication issues in the implementation of the program. Cici Suhaeni et al. (2025) found YouTube comment themes related to prices, food distribution, perception of benefits, and people's emotional and political reactions. Ferry Darmawan et al. (2026) found criticism from netizens in the form of rejection of the program, distrust of the government, policy and budget issues, and innuendo against the implementation of MBG. Meanwhile, (Soma & Uchiyama, 2026) Finding parents' expectations for nutrition education, monitoring of food providers, and transparency and supervision of the program. Overall, previous research has revealed the problem of MBG implementation and the diverse public responses to the program. However, studies that examine how presuppositions are used in netizens' comments to convey criticism of MBG on Platform X are still limited. Presupposition analysis, forms of criticism, and Appraisal systems can provide a deeper understanding of how criticism is constructed through language, how speakers convey their assessment of MBG policies, and how presuppositions guide readers in interpreting criticized issues.

The study of language and digital discourse also provides a foundation for understanding

how criticism is delivered. Sikorskii & Carrió-Pastor (2026) examine negative evaluations of politicians in X through the system *Appraisal*, while (White, 2025) Explain the role of evaluative choices in the formation of the perspective and persuasive power of journalism. Krykoniuk et al. (2025) Develop a framework for analyzing the relationships between messages based on attitude, cohesion, coherence, and logic quality. Stolwijk et al. (2026) testing automated approaches to measure interactivity, diversity, rationality, and impropriety in political discussions, while (Gajewska, 2026) Comparing credibility-based argumentation strategies in television and social media debates. Overall, the study describes language evaluation, argumentation strategies, and the quality of digital interactions. However, the relationship between the assumptions underlying comments, the orientation of social criticism, and the realization of language evaluation on public policy have not been the integrated focus of these studies. This study fills this gap by integrating presupposition theory (Yule, 1996), social criticism (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005), as well as the *Appraisal* (Martin & White, 2005). The novelty of the analysis lies in the use of three perspectives to explain the types of presuppositions, forms of criticism, and presupposition practices in critical commentary on MBG. This approach is expected to expand the pragmatic study of public policy discourse by revealing the practice of presupposition in criticism and the way netizens express judgment through language.

Based on this gap, this study is entitled "The Practice of Presupposition in Critical Discourse on the Free Nutritious Meal Program: A Pragmatic Study on Platform X" with the aim of (1) describing the types of presuppositions contained in comments criticizing the Free Nutritious Eating Program (MBG) on Platform X; (2) describing the form of criticism conveyed in the comment; and (3) describing the practice of presupposition in criticism of MBG.

## METHOD

This study uses a qualitative descriptive approach with an interpretive orientation to describe and interpret the use of language in digital discourse (Alejandro & Zhao, 2024). This approach is used to analyze netizens' comments on Platform X by considering lingual units and speech context in identifying the types of presuppositions, examining the orientation of criticism towards MBG, and analyzing the practice of presupposition in criticism through the relationship between the type of presupposition, the orientation of criticism, and the evaluation of language based on the system *Appraisal* (Herring, 2025). The research was directed to answer three objectives, namely to describe the types of presuppositions, forms of criticism, and presupposition practices in comments criticizing the Free Nutritious Eating Program (MBG). The analysis prioritized the depth of interpretation over statistical representativeness. Therefore, the findings were limited to the data analyzed and were not intended to be representative of all users of Platform X.

The research data was in the form of 90 public comments on Platform X that criticized the Free Nutritious Eating Program (MBG). Comments were collected from various uploads discussing MBG, both on news media accounts, institutional or political party accounts, public official accounts, and other user accounts. Data sources were selected purposively by considering the relevance of the discussion to MBG, the existence of linguistic elements that are in accordance with the focus of the research, and the adequacy of context to support interpretation (Yu et al., 2025). Data collection was carried out on June 5–August 31, 2026. A total of 200 initial comments were collected and selected based on their relevance to the research focus. Comments are retained when discussing MBG, contain linguistic elements that can be analyzed based on a theoretical framework, and have sufficient context to interpret.

Data selection was carried out purposively based on suitability with the research focus and analysis needs (Bouncken et al., 2026). Of the 90 selected comments, 60 data were analyzed

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/index

based on six types of presuppositions according to (Yule, 1996), 10 data each. A total of 20 data were analyzed based on two forms of criticism according to (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005), namely social criticism and artistic criticism, 10 data each. The other ten data were analyzed in an integrated manner using presupposition theory (Yule, 1996), critical theory (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005), as well as the *Appraisal* (Martin & White, 2005), which includes *Attitude*, *Commitment*, and *Graduation*. The selection of data was based on the suitability of the comments with theoretical indicators and adequacy. Comments that are not relevant to MBG, duplicate, only contain symbols without linguistic elements that can be analyzed, or do not have adequate context are excluded from the corpus. Comments that pass the selection are then grouped based on theoretical indicators in each category. If the number of comments in a category has not reached 10 data, the researcher again searches and selects other comments that meet the criteria for the category until the number is sufficient (Scheel, 2026). This process is carried out in each category until 90 comments are obtained, consisting of 60 data for the analysis of the type of presupposition, 20 data for the analysis of the form of criticism, and 10 data for integrated analysis through the Appraisal system. The determination of the same number in each category is a strategy for the preparation of the analytical corpus to ensure that all categories are represented in the analysis, not to describe the proportion of the appearance of categories in the overall comments on Platform X (Noakes et al., 2025).

The researcher acts as the main instrument (*The Human Instrument*) in data collection, selection, encoding and interpretation (A'yun et al., 2025). Coding is done manually and deductively based on indicators within each theoretical framework. Presupposition analysis refers to linguistic triggers and the context of comments, the classification of criticism is based on social or artistic orientation, while analysis *Appraisal* refers to subsystems *Attitude*, *Commitment*, and *Graduation*. Data are recorded in a corpus table that contains code, comments, lingual units, triggers, and interpretations. Data that have the potential to cause differences in interpretation are reviewed by considering the context of the comments and the theoretical indicators used. Data analysis follows an interactive model (Matthew B. Miles & Huberman, 2007), which includes data condensation, data presentation, and conclusion drawing and verification. The application of the theoretical framework was adjusted to the purpose of analysis in each data group. A total of 60 data were analyzed using presupposition theory (Yule, 1996), while 20 data were analyzed based on the classification of social criticism and artistic criticism (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005). The other 10 data were analyzed integratively by linking the types of presuppositions, critical orientation, and linguistic evaluation through the system *Appraisal* (Martin & White, 2005). The entire coding and interpretation process is carried out by the researcher himself without involving a second coder.

This study uses publicly accessible comments on Platform X while still considering user privacy. The use of social media data needs to consider the norms, characteristics, and context of interactions on each platform to determine ethical practices, including anonymization and inclusion of sources. In line with these considerations, the identity of the accounts in this study was not included and each comment was coded (Harrington, 2025). The data is used for academic purposes with the privacy of users in mind.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis was carried out on 90 netizens' comments on Platform X which were divided into three groups according to the research objectives, namely 60 data for the type of presupposition (six types, 10 data each), 20 data for the form of criticism (social criticism and artistic criticism, 10 data each), and 10 data for the practice of presupposition through *the Appraisal system*. This division is determined through a quota of 10 data per category, so that the percentage in Table 1, including the same 11.1% in each category, shows the composi-

tion of the analytical corpus and not the frequency of category occurrence on Platform X. The results are therefore read qualitatively as a variety of triggers and criticism orientation, not as a comparison of numbers.

Table 1. *Distribution of research data*

| Yes | Focus of Analysis | Categories | Data Code | Quantity (F) | Present (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Types of presuppositions | Existential | PE1–PE10 | 10 | 11,1 |
| | | Factual | PF1–PF10 | 10 | 11,1 |
| | | Lexical | PL1–PL10 | 10 | 11,1 |
| | | Structural | PS1–PS10 | 10 | 11,1 |
| | | Nonfactual | PN1–PN10 | 10 | 11,1 |
| | | Counterfactual | PK1–PK10 | 10 | 11,1 |
| 2. | Forms of criticism | Social criticism | KS1–KS10 | 10 | 11,1 |
| | | Artistic criticism | STEPS 1–UKA10 | 10 | 11,1 |
| 3. | The practice of presupposition in criticism | Appraisal System (*Attitude, Engagement, Graduation*) | SA1–SA10 | 10 | 11,1 |
| Total | | | | 90 | 100% |

*Types of presuppositions*

An analysis of 60 comments shows that all six types of presuppositions (Yule, 1996) i.e. existential, factive, lexical, structural, nonfactual, and counterfactual, found in comments criticizing the Free Nutritious Eating Program (MBG) on Platform X. The six types show that differences in information are presupposedly through the use of language.

Table 2. *Corpus of existential presupposition data*

| Code | Data | Triggers | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| PE1 | It's funny, he said that the program is for school children, but the most noisy when there is a problem is the managers. | *The managers* | Supposition the existence of the MBG management which is actually more prominent in the polemic than children as the target of the program. |
| PE2 | It is evident that mbg is not for school children and pregnant women, but for businessmen and office holders. | *Businessman, businessman, office holder* | It is assumed that MBG involves the interests of businessmen and officials, so that its implementation is considered to deviate from the original purpose of the program. |
| PE3 | Well, I tell you that MBG has a lot of mafia. Many people are looking for profit, starting from the corruption of raw materials that should buy fresh ones to buy bad quality ones so that they can make a lot of profit. | *Mafia MBG* | Suppose the existence of mafia practices in MBG that are oriented to profit through food corruption. |

Note. The amount of data that is analyzed in depth is set through a quota of 10 per category and does not reflect the distribution in the corpus. A single comment can contain more than one trigger.

All triggers in Table 2 are in the form of noun phrases that name or label certain parties so that the existence of these parties is assumed without the need to be introduced. The triggers are divided into business actors and officials (PE1, PE2, PE4, PE7), criminal labels such as mafias and thugs (PE3, PE6), markers such as certain groups and individuals (PE5, PE8), and buzzers (PE9, PE10). The use of existential prepositions allows netizens to assume the existence of the beneficiary without mentioning their identity, while buzzers assume the existence of support driven in the public space. In all data, the party assumed to exist is the executor or interested party, not the beneficiary.

Table 3. *Factive presupposition data corpus*

| Code | Data | Trig-gers | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| PF1 | He is not malnourished. But he is not smart enough to know the MBG process which is at a bad rate and often poisoned. Height does not add to the problem. | *Know* | Suppose that the MBG process is inadequate and often causes poisoning |
| PF2 | If the basis of this MBG idea is because he has found stunted children several times, why not just make it specific into a kind of nutrition improvement program for certain communities, so it is more targeted and clear. | *Found* | It is assumed that the idea of MBG departs from the findings of stunting children, but the program has not been specifically designed so that it does not meet the target. |
| PF3 | MBG programs whose food is not nutritious. CISDI found that 17% of MBG menus only meet Nutritional Adequacy. The reality in the field is that the menu is determined by SPPG owners, not nutritionists. Food is often stale. Many foods are not consumed. | *Find* | It is assumed that only 17% of the MBG menu meets nutritional adequacy. |

The trigger in Table 3 is a factive verb that places the content of the proposition as a fact that is known, realized, understood, or accepted by the speaker. The verb know, find, find, be aware, be aware, be aware, and understand (PF1, PF2, PF3, PF6, PF8, PF10) presupposes the truth of the information contained in the complementary clause. For example, the verb found in PF3 presupposes that only 17% of the MBG menu meets nutritional adequacy. Meanwhile, the verb regret and surprise (PF4, PF7, PF9) treats the event or circumstance that is the basis for regret and surprise as facts. The expression I admit (PF5) also marks the speaker's acceptance of the truth.

Table 4. *Lexical presupposition data corpus*

| Code | Data | Triggers | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| PL2 | The problem of MBG is state capture. It is no longer thugs asking for rations, but one country has been dominated by advanced stage malignant cancer. MBG is just one of the many rottencies that have emerged. | *Next* | It assumes that state control has taken place and reached an increasingly severe level. |
| PL3 | Again and again the MBG poisoning is still calculated as a percentage of that cheap human life. | *More* | It is assumed that cases of MBG poisoning have occurred repeatedly. |
| PL4 | I don't stop thinking about the people who play at MBG, finally one by one they started to pretend to be doing community service anymore, that MBG is a project, a business that must benefit them, not the people who benefit from it. | *Still* | It is assumed that support for MBG is maintained even though the program has caused many casualties. |

The triggers in Table 4 mark two patterns of lexical presuppositions. The first pattern is a marker of recurrence (*continuous*, *again*, *repeated*, *repeated*, *consecutive*; PL1, PL3, PL5, PL6, PL7, PL10) which presupposes that an event or circumstance has occurred before. Four data attribute this pattern to cases of MBG poisoning (PL1, PL3, PL7, PL10), so that poisoning is positioned as a recurring problem. Meanwhile, PL5 and PL6 use these markers to highlight the discussion of MBG that continues to be raised and the operation of programs that are expected to occur again. The second pattern is in the form of sustainability markers (continued, *still*; PL2, PL4, PL8, PL9) that presuppose that a state or activity has taken place and has not yet ended.

Table 5. *Corpus of structural presupposition data*

| Code | Data | Triggers | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| PS1 | For whatever reason, I'm fed up with this mbg. Bpjs pbi/bp local government on this ggr is deactivated, school skrg must be online. What is the urgency of this mbg? Making the poisoning of children is still maintained, ohhhh because emg has become a field of corruption. It's worth it, the state at the end of this year will be dissolved. | *What is the urgency of this MBG?* | It is assumed that the urgency of implementing MBG needs to be questioned because the policy is considered to burden the community and cause a bad impact. |
| PS2 | Feeding our children with what? Shredded bread? Malkist? Roma biscuit pudding? High-sugar brownies? Tango wafers? Tempeh chips? Fried beans? Marinated catfish that is not vacuumd? Go home, call the prayer mat, pray, pray to God to get a more halal job soon. | *Feeding our children with what?* | It is assumed that the MBG menu is dominated by foods that are considered unhealthy and do not meet the nutritional needs of children. |
| PS3 | Feeding 60 million? Whose money is it using? What is the quality? What is the corruption? MBG is a waste of state money. 1 million jobs? Who lost their jobs because of 2 MBG. How much is affected by the inflation effect of the increase in basic food prices due to MBG. | *How is the quality?* | Assuming that the quality of MBG is considered not guaranteed and its implementation needs to be accounted for. |

The triggers in Table 5 are dominated by interrogative constructions with the *question words what*, *how*, *how much*, and *who* (PS1–PS4, PS6, PS8), yes/no questions (PS5, PS7, PS9), and elliptical constructs (PS10). The structure places certain propositions as information that the speaker assumes. On PS4, for example, the question *How many children are poisoned again?* assumes that a case of poisoning has occurred before. Another word also raises a lexical presupposition about recurrence. Other questions highlight the urgency, quality, benefits, financing, evaluation, and accountability of the implementation of MBG.

Table 6. *Nonfactual presupposition data corpus*

| Code | Data | Triggers | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| PN1 | The head starts to get heavy is this a sign that mbg is going to stop or it's time to sleep and dream. | *Dream* | Assuming that MBG stops is still limited to hope or wishful thinking, not reality. |
| PN2 | If the school can reject MBG, I can already imagine what will happen. There will be a lot of threats/pressure on the Principal and Teachers from the school who refuses. Especially, the threat of BOS funds to be withdrawn like the one yesterday was crowded. | *Imagine* | It assumes that schools that reject MBG will face threats and pressure, including withdrawal of BOS funds. |
| PN3 | Imagine if the parent panicked to see his child having seizures like this, but the government never imagined being an orphan whose child was a victim of MBG. | *Imagine* | It is assumed that the government does not have empathy for parents' panic when their children become victims of MBG. |

Nonfactual presuppositions are presuppositions that arise through expressions that place the content of the proposition as something that is not considered to be fact or reality. Triggers in Table 6 include *imagining* (PN2, PN3, PN5, PN9), *dreaming* or *dreaming* (PN1, PN4, PN6), and *pretending* (PN7, PN8, PN10). *Dreams* and *imagines* present circumstances that have not yet been realized, such as the termination of MBG and the improvement of program quality (PN1, PN4, PN5, PN6). Meanwhile, *pretending* shows the contradiction between the circumstances displayed by the government and the conditions that are considered to actually occur (PN7, PN8, PN10).

Table 7. *Corpus of counterfactual presuppositions data*

| Code | Data | Triggers | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| PK1 | MBG should be stopped. The budget is to increase subsidies, because if oil rises, it will affect all sectors until purchasing power. If MBG is stopped, there will be no negative impact, but it will be better. | *It should be* | It assumes that MBG should be stopped and the budget diverted to subsidies, when in fact the program is still running. |
| PK2 | If you support mbg, you should also feel strange why when you are temporarily dismissed during a school holiday, the one who protests is the employer. While. School holidays. In fact, temporary holidays can be used for evaluation, if you want to improve the program. Meanwhile, during school holidays, the children who are the main targets can be at home. They do not protest. | *It should be* | It is assumed that the school holiday period should be used to evaluate MBG, while in reality the temporary suspension is actually questioned by the organizer entrepreneurs. |
| PK3 | This is if yes: if the kitchen is only targeted for 1 school with a minimum menu of 25-30 thousand per serving and of course it is very suitable to eat, I think this mbg will not cause controversy like so far which only pursues quantity but poor quality. | *Should it be* | It is assumed that MBG will not cause controversy if the quality of the food and the number of recipients are considered, when in reality the implementation of the program prioritizes quantity over quality. |

Counterfactual presuppositions assume alternative circumstances that are contrary to ongoing reality or conditions. The triggers in Table 7 include markers of what should and should be (PK1, PK2, PK6, PK8, PK10), as well as markers of assumptions, assumptions, and ifs, (PK3, PK4, PK5, PK7, PK9). These markers present conditions that are considered more appropriate, but have not been realized in the implementation of MBG. These alternative conditions include the termination or evaluation of MBG (PK1, PK2, PK4, PK5, PK8), improvement of the quality and implementation mechanism (PK3, PK6, PK10), and the transfer of budget priorities for the public interest (PK7, PK9). The counterfactuality in this data lies in the contradiction between the conditions expected by the speaker and the reality of the implementation of MBG, so that criticism is built through the highlighting of the gap between the policies that should be implemented and the conditions that actually occur.

*Forms of criticism*

Analysis of 20 comments by classification (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005) produces two forms of criticism, namely social criticism (Table 8) and artistic criticism (Table 9).

Table 8. *Social criticism data corpus*

| Code | Data | Lingual units | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| KS1 | "We apologize and we promise to fix it", the answer that appeared when MBG poisoning occurred. After all, the name is also a hypocritical mouth that will definitely lie, in fact cases of MBG poisoning continue to occur almost every day. | *It happens continuously almost every day.* | Criticizing the repeated cases of MBG poisoning despite promises of improvement. |
| KS2 | If you continue to do so, please, but it would be better to remove the mbg kitchen, return the distribution to the school, what is the point of having a school canteen but not empowered, the school canteen understands the needs of students better and is also easier to control, this is even busy looking for money from the mbg kitchen. | *It is better to remove the MBG kitchen; the school canteen understands the needs of students better.* | Problematic is the orientation of MBG management which only focuses on the profits of entrepreneurs so that the needs of students are neglected. |
| KS3 | If you support mbg, you should also feel strange why when you are temporarily dismissed during a school holiday, the one who protests is the employer. While. School holidays. In fact, temporary holidays can be | *The protesters were the businessmen; the children who became victims.* | Highlighting the interests of entrepreneurs that are more visible through the protest against the termination |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | used for evaluation, if you want to improve the program. Meanwhile, during school holidays, the children who are the main targets can be at home. They do not protest. | of MBG than the needs of students as beneficiaries. |

The social criticism in Table 8 centers on the losses or injustices experienced by the public. The most common issues are repeated safety and poisoning (KS1, KS4, KS9, KS10), followed by the profit orientation of entrepreneurs or managers (KS2, KS3, KS6), budget burdens and priorities (KS7, KS8), and ignored community aspirations (KS5). In these data, objections are measured by their impact on beneficiaries and society so that the underlying value is justice for the benefits and burdens of the program

Table 9. *Corpus of artistic criticism data*

| Code | Data | Lingual units | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| KA1 | At my child's school, I want to have a meeting with the owner of the MBG kitchen because the school has not sent MBG for 3 weeks. All parents of students have petitioned to reject MBG, but the kitchen still persuades them to accept wkwkwk who is here who doesn't want this program to stop. | *Persuade them to accept it.* | Criticizing efforts to maintain MBG by ignoring the wishes of the student's guardians who have expressed their rejection of the program. |
| KA2 | The journalist who asked about the MBG issue was then revoked from the ID card of the palace reporter, considered asking outside the agenda. But precisely from the question, we know that the president really cares about the problem of MBG poisoning. Whoever revokes his ID Card, he does not understand the freedom of the press! | *The journalist's ID card was revoked.* | Highlighting restrictions on press freedom through the revocation of journalists' ID cards after asking questions about MBG. |
| KA3 | It's very frustrating, yes, I already know that the program is problematic, prone to irregularities, corruption. It's still stubborn as if the program is successful, I already know cases of poisoning everywhere. | *Just stubbornly pretend that the program is a success.* | Questioning the attitude of the organizers who continue to maintain the program despite facing various problems and cases of poisoning. |

The artistic criticism in Table 9 centers on the restriction of freedom and space for participation. The restriction of expression and information is seen in the revocation of journalists' ID cards (KA2), information disclosure (KA4), freedom of opinion (KA5), and the prohibition of posting (KA6). The forced acceptance of programs is seen in KA1 and KA7, the closure of dialogue and input spaces in KA3, KA8, and KA10, and the dominance of the bureaucracy that prioritizes compliance with KA9.

*Presupposition practice through appraisal system*

The analysis of 10 data on presupposition practices in criticism of MBG was carried out by applying three theoretical frameworks in an integrated manner, namely presupposition (Yule, 1996), social criticism and artistic criticism (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005), as well as the *Appraisal* (Martin & White, 2005). The three frameworks are used to identify the types of presuppositions, forms of criticism, and the use of subsystems *Attitude*, *Commitment*, and *Graduation* in the same data. The corpus of data is presented in Table 10.

Table 10. *Data corpus of presupposition practices through the appraisal system*

| Code | Data | Presupposition | Criticism | Attitude | Commitment | Graduation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SA1 | The people of Nagekeo have their houses destroyed, sleeping in the refugee tent The ✕ President comes: | Lexical (*not yet*): indicates a state that has not been | Social: highlighting the incompatibility of | Judgement: evaluation of the handling of community problems. | Entertain: the question "*MBG is benefited*?" opens up the assessment room. | Force Intensification: the word "*even*" reinforces opposition. |

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/index

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 'MBG feels the benefits? Do you want to continue?' ✅ The house is not in order, even the flagship program is being promoted. The stage of disaster grief feels like a customer satisfaction survey. | achieved, namely that the residents' houses have been repaired. | government communication priorities with the conditions of disaster-affected communities. | Appreciation: a negative assessment of government communication through the analogy of a "*customer satisfaction survey*". | Disclaim Counter: the word *"even"* contradicts the condition of refugees with MBG promotion. | |
| SA2 | In the past, I found it difficult to imagine how much 1 billion dollars was. After there was MBG, it became easy for me to imagine it. It turns out that only 8% of MBG's budget is taken from the education budget. It's very cheap for the US war losses in front of MBG. | Factual (*apparent*): shows that 8% of the MBG budget is sourced from the education budget and presents the information as a fact that is only known to the speaker. | Social: issues with the allocation of the MBG budget associated with the use of the education budget and the comparison of financing priorities | Appreciation: an assessment of the magnitude of war losses through the phrase "*very cheap*". This expression builds irony because the war losses are compared to the MBG budget. | Proclaim Pronounce: the word "*apparently*" confirms information about budget allocation as a finding that needs to be considered by the reader. | Force Intensification: the word once reinforces the evaluation in the phrase "*very cheap*". Force Quantification: the word "*only*" limits the proportion of the stated budget to 8% |
| SA3 | After reading the news that the kitchen mbg wants to be made in the prison and the workers are inmates, they are paid. The more questioned: what is the skck for making a job application? | Structural (*the question "What is SKCK for job application actually for?):* indicates that SKCK is a requirement in the job application process. | Social: questioning the inequality of employment opportunities and the implementation of administrative requirements for job seekers | Judgement Propriety: Questioning the propriety of the application of SKCK requirements for job seekers when inmates actually get the opportunity to work in the MBG program. | Entertain: the question "*What is SKCK actually for?* " opens up space to question the relevance of SKCK requirements in the job acceptance process. | Force Intensification: The word "*makin*" increases the intensity of the speaker's critical attitude after reading the news about the involvement of inmates as MBG kitchen workers. |

Table 10 presents an integrated analysis of the ten comments by relating the types of presuppositions, the orientation of criticism, and *the Appraisal system*. The presupposition analysis shows that all six types of presuppositions are found in the data. Presupposition triggers present assumptions about certain circumstances, actions, and relationships that are the basis of the speaker in delivering criticism. Based on their orientation, eight comments contain social criticism, while the other two contain artistic criticism, namely SA5 and SA8. The composition is the result of data selection for analysis purposes, not an overview of the frequency of criticism on all comments on Platform X.

In the *Appraisal system*, the speaker's assessment of the problem is analyzed through three aspects. *Attitude* shows the speaker's attitude or evaluation of the person, action, or situation being discussed. This aspect is dominated by *Judgement* which is found in seven data, mainly to assess the appropriateness of implementing actions in SA3, SA5, SA7, SA8, and SA10. In addition, *Appreciation* is found in four data, namely SA1, SA2, SA4, and SA9, to provide an assessment of the situation or policy. No direct expression of feelings (*Affect*) was found.

Furthermore, *Engagement* shows how the speaker positions his or her position against other views in the comment. The most prominent category is the *Disclaim Counter* with seven data, which is used to build opposition to a view or situation. Other categories include *Entertain* in SA1 and SA3, *Proclaim Pronounce* in SA2, and *Attribute Acknowledge* in SA6. *Graduation* shows how speakers increase or limit the power and scope of assessment. In the analyzed data, this aspect includes *Force Intensification* to reinforce the intensity of the evaluation and *Force Quantification* to indicate the size or scope of something. Both forms appear in data that have appropriate linguistic markers.

*Types of presuppositions in MBG criticism*

The findings in Tables 2–7 show that all six types of presuppositions are used to convey criticism through things that are considered already known. This is in line with the concept of pragmatic presupposition, which is information that is considered as shared knowledge in conversation (Alford-Duguid, 2025). Phrase *"MBG mafia"* (PE3), for example, assumes the existence of a mafia in the implementation of MBG. Meanwhile, the question *"How many more children are poisoned?"* (PS4) assumes that cases of poisoning have occurred before and are repeated. This characteristic is in accordance with Levinson's (1983) explanation, that presuppositions remain understood even if speech is changed into a negative form or question. This can be seen in speech *"I don't regret choosing"* (PF4) which still assumes that the speaker has chosen, and *"No more poisoning"* (PL3) which still presupposes previous poisoning.

The use of this presupposition makes the criticized party not only have to respond to the speaker's statement, but also the assumptions underlying the statement. This is in line with the view (Simons, 2025) that presuppositions can be used to convey views that seem to have been mutually agreed upon. In the context of criticism of MBG, the use of presuppositions allows the speaker to direct the reader's attention to a particular issue without having to state it directly. Previous research has shown that classification (Yule, 1996) can be applied to various forms of communication, such as online media, films, documentaries, and product commentary (Nasrul & Kifli Alwi, 2025); Asmaya Jutri et al., 2025; Asro & Andriyani, 2025; Tri Maelani, 2026). This study expands its application to comments on public policy. This study focuses on spontaneous comments on Platform X that use everyday expressions, such as *"Please"*, *"Absolutely"*, and *"Right"*, to criticize the MBG policy. In particular, in existential data, the party whose existence is assumed always refers to the implementer or interested party in the program, not the beneficiary (PE1–PE10). On the other hand, (Dietrich et al., 2024; Giunta et al., 2025) suggests that the understanding of presuppositions is influenced by the context and type of triggers. In line with these findings, the context of the poisoning case in the MBG commentary may help explain the use of presuppositions that indicate the repetition of events (PL1, PL3, PL10).

Nonfactual and counterfactual presuppositions both refer to circumstances that are different from reality so they need to be clearly distinguished. Nonfactual presuppositions are characterized by words or expressions such as *"dreaming"*, *"imagining"*, and *"pretending"* that indicate that the content of speech does not correspond to reality or has not yet happened. Meanwhile, counterfactual presuppositions are characterized by assumptions or imperative expressions such as *"if"*, *"assumptions"*, *"ifs"*, *"should"*, and *"should"* that indicate a different state from the reality being discussed. Each trigger is only included in one type of presupposition. In nonfactual data, differences are seen be-

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/index

tween the imagined and the perceived real circumstances (PN7, PN8, PN10). In the counterfactual data, the difference can be seen between the conditions that should have occurred and the implementation of the MBG program (PK1, PK9, PK10).

*Forms of criticism of the MBG programme*

Social criticism in this research data is related to the safety of beneficiaries, the profits of managers, and the priorities of the MBG budget. These issues are in line with the findings (Ferry Darmawan et al., 2026) shows that criticism of MBG is dominated by implementation issues, especially food quality, poisoning cases, and uneven distribution. Research (Cici Suhaeni et al., 2025) found three trends in comments, namely concerns about food prices and food distribution, views on the benefits of MBG for children and society, and emotional and politically influenced responses. Meanwhile, (Rares et al., 2026) found that the determination of MBG recipients in North Sulawesi prioritizes administrative readiness rather than the level of vulnerability of the community. As a result, vulnerable groups such as toddlers, pregnant women, and breastfeeding mothers have not been reached, while distribution in urban areas is easier to implement than in archipelagic and remote areas. Meanwhile, artistic criticism is related to coercion, restrictions on freedom of expression, and closed spaces for dialogue (Br Panjaitan et al., 2025). These issues are related to information verification, evaluation of political actors' actions, and accountability demands (Pratiwi & Junaedi, 2026), direct, indirect, and virtual resistance to the silencing of freedom of expression (Simangunsong & Shenna, 2024), as well as the dominance of negative sentiment in the discussion of legal processes, state losses, and institutional accountability (Hastuti et al., 2026). Although discussing adjacent issues, previous research has tended to group findings based on themes or sentiments. Framework (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005) provides a distinction based on the basis of objection, namely loss and injustice in social criticism as well as autonomy and dominance in artistic criticism. This distinction can be seen in KS9 which demands accountability for poisoning cases and KA4 which questions information disclosure and community involvement.

Framework uses (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005) In this study, it is an adaptation to analyze criticism of public policy. According to Boltanski, criticism is a confrontation between reality and the demand for justice (Corrêa, 2025). Based on this framework, social criticism includes objections to the distribution of MBG losses, benefits, and liabilities. Artistic criticism includes objections to restrictions on freedom of choice, expression, and participation, as well as dominance in the implementation of MBG programs. Categorization is based on the object of objection in speech, not solely on the use of specific words (Lyhne et al., 2025). If a data contains both forms of criticism, the categorization is carried out based on the most dominant problem.

Some data show a wedge between social and artistic criticism. The KA7 data is categorized as artistic criticism because it issues the forced acceptance of MBG through the threat of sanctions against schools that reject the program. The main objection is not to material losses due to sanctions, but to restrictions on the school's freedom to determine attitudes. The KA9 data highlights the dominance of the bureaucracy that limits civil liberties and community participation. Meanwhile, KA10 questions the rejection of input in the form of alternative management of MBG through the school canteen. This criticism is categorized as artistic criticism because it emphasizes the limited space of the community to convey alternatives and determine the implementation of the program.

*The practice of presuposis in MBG's criticism*

In the ten SA data, presuppositions became the basis for speakers to build assessments and convey criticism of MBG. Eight data contained social criticism and two data contained artistic criticism (SA5 and SA8). The composition was a strategy for selecting analytical data, not an overview of the frequency of criticism on Platform X. In *the Attitude aspect, Judgement* was found in seven data and *Appreciation* in four data, while *Affect* was not found. These findings show that the assessment is more directed at the propriety of the organizer's actions and conditions related to the implementation of the program. The assessment appears to be criticism of actions that are considered intimidating to parents (SA8) and forcing the acceptance of MBG by schools (SA10), as well as the economic conditions of the depressed community (SA4). In *the Engagement* aspect, the speaker uses questions to open up the assessment *space (Entertain*), affirmation of information (*Proclaim Pronounce*), acknowledgement of other sources (*Attribute Acknowledge*), and contradiction of previous propositions (*Disclaim Counter*). Meanwhile, *Graduation* is used to strengthen the assessment or expand the scope of meaning, such as "once" in SA2 and "most knowing" in SA6.

Findings on the Attitude aspect are in line with

the research (Sikorskii & Carrió-Pastor, 2026), found the use of Judgement to evaluate the capacity, behavior, and appropriateness of political figures in offensive comments on Platform X. Both also showed the use of Graduation to strengthen judgments against criticized parties. Pratiwi & Junaedi (2026) found that political commentary was used to verify information, evaluate the statements and actions of political actors, and question legitimacy and accountability. Hastuti et al (2026) It was also found that negative comments about corruption discussed a lot about the legal process, state losses, and institutional accountability. The findings showed that comments on social media contained assessments of actions, problems, and parties that were considered to cause problems or be responsible for the problems criticized. This study expands the discussion by examining the presuppositions that underlie the judgment and critical orientation of the speakers. (Vivit Arista Dewi et al., 2026).

The relationship between presupposition and Appraisal is seen when the same lingual unit performs different analytical functions. The word "apparently" in SA2 triggers the factive presupposition as well as a marker of affirmation (Proclaim Pronounce), while the question in SA3 gives rise to a structural presupposition as well as opens up a space for assessment (*Entertain*). In SA9, "assume" establishes an alternative condition that becomes the basis for criticism of budget allocation priorities. This relationship shows that presuppositions explain the information assumed in speech, while Appraisal describes how the speaker makes judgments, takes a position against other views, and reinforces meaning. These two frameworks are also different from the classification of criticism used to determine the basis of the speaker's objections, i.e. social injustice or restrictions on freedom, whereas *Appraisal* is used to identify the realization of judgment in language. Therefore, all three frameworks work on different layers of analysis: presuppositions reveal assumed information, social and artistic criticism identifies the orientation of objections, whereas Appraisals describe how those objections are evaluated and delivered.

## CONCLUSION

This study shows that criticism of the Free Nutritious Meal Program on Platform X is not only conveyed through explicit statements, but also through information that is assumed to be known. First, six types of presuppositions are found in critical commentary: existential naming the executor or interested party, factive and lexical framing poisoning as a true and recurring event, structural demanding accountability through questioning, and nonfactual and counterfactual presenting circumstances different from reality.

Criticism of MBG is divided into social criticism and artistic criticism. Social criticism is related to the safety of beneficiaries, managers' profits, and budget priorities, while artistic criticism is related to coercion, restrictions on freedom of expression, and closed dialogue spaces. Third, the practice of presupposition in criticism appears when the information assumed to be the basis for assessment in Appraisal: assessment is more in the form of judgement on the actions of the implementer, the position of the speaker is largely built through the Disclaim Counter, and the intensity of the evaluation is strengthened through Graduation. Thus, the interpretation of critical comments on public policy needs to pay attention to the assumptions underlying the speech, the basis of the objection value, and the way in which the assessment is positioned. These findings are descriptive and limited to the data analyzed.

## CONFESSION

The author expresses his gratitude to the presence of Allah Almighty for the completion of this research, and expresses his deep gratitude to his beloved parents for the prayers and support that always strengthens. The author also expresses his gratitude and appreciation to the supervisors, examiners, and academics of the S2 Indonesian Language Education Study Program, Tadulako University for the direction, input, and scientific correction that are very valuable in improving this manuscript, as well as the closest parties who have provided moral support during the research process.

## REFERENCES

A'yun, S. Q., Habsy, B. A., & Nursalim, M. (2025). Qualitative research models: Literature review. *Indonesian Journal of Education Research, 4*(2), 341–354. https://doi.org/10.31004/jpion.v4i2.367

Agustini, U., & Mulyani, S. (2025). The effectiveness and challenges of free nutritious meal programs as an educational intervention in Indonesia. *Journal of Education Performance*, *4*(3), 362–368. https://doi.org/10.33578/kpd.v4i3.p362-368

Al-Ebadi, H. K. (2024). An analysis of pragmatic presuppositions in political newspaper articles. *Journal of Scientific Development for Studies and Research*, *5*(19), 286–305. https://doi.org/10.61212/jsd/254

Alejandro, A., & Zhao, L. (2024). Multi-method qualitative text and discourse analysis: A methodological framework. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *30*(6), 461–473. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004231184421

Alford-Duguid, D. (2025). Learning from presupposition. *Mind & Language*, *40*(4), 402–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12549

Arintyas, A. P. R. D. A., Aristi, S., & Maulana, M. A. (2026). From hashtag to policy: Viral anger and lawmaking in Indonesia's digital democracy. *Golden Ratio of Law and Social Policy Review*, *5*(2), 337–348. https://doi.org/10.52970/grlspr.v5i2.1949

Asmaya Jutri, F., Anggraini, F., Fathurrahman, & Prihatin Syahroni, I. (2025). Presumption in short film review: A pragmatic study. *Alinea: Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching*, *5*(2), 452–465. https://doi.org/10.58218/alinea.v5i2.1525

Asro, S. A. N., & Andriyani, S. (2025). Presupposition in the character of Judy: A pragmatic analysis of the *Zootopia* movie script. *Al-Lisan*, *10*(1), 118–130. https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v10i1.5695

Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (2005). *The new spirit of capitalism*. Verso. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315768632-2

Bouncken, R. B., Czakon, W., & Schmitt, F. (2026). Purposeful sampling and saturation in qualitative research methodologies: Recommendations and review. *Review of Managerial Science*, *20*(2), 579–615. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-025-00881-2

Br Panjaitan, E. J., Tambunan, F. B., Fitriyani, M. N., Kerwin, & Rangkuti, R. (2025). Illocutionary acts in the hashtag #KaburAjaDulu: A cyber activism discourse study on social media X. *JL3T (Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching)*, *11*(2), 287–306. https://doi.org/10.32505/jl3t.v11i2.12769

Chidayat, A. T., Shiddieq, D. F., & Nurhayati, D. (2025). Public sentiment analysis on platform X following the mixed fuel scandal using the naïve Bayes algorithm. *MALCOM: Indonesian Journal of Machine Learning and Computer Science*, *5*(4), 1220–1230. https://doi.org/10.57152/malcom.v5i4.2220

Darmawan, F., Yusuf, M., Haq, R. S., & Deri, Y. P. I. (2026). Analysis of the content of netizen's criticism of the free nutritious eating program on the Instagram comment of the National Nutrition Agency. *ULIL ALBAB : Multidisciplinary Scientific Journal*, *5*(7), 2549–2567. https://doi.org/10.56799/jim.v5i7.17942

Dewi, V. A., Pastika, I. W., & Simpen, I. W. (2026). The use of existential presuppositions in the Instagram comment column of @jakarta.keras on the upload of the corruption case of PT Pertamina Patra Niaga. *BLAZE : Journal of Language and Literature in Linguistic Education and Development*, *4*(1), 84–97. https://doi.org/10.59841/blaze.v4i1.3646

Dietrich, S., Seibold, V. C., & Rolke, B. (2024). Discourse comprehension and referential processing: Effects of contextual distance and semantic plausibility on presupposition processing. *Language and Cognition*, *16*(4), 2032–2054. https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2024.45

Gajewska, E. (2026). Media affordances as dialogue rules: A corpus-driven analysis of ethos-centered argumentation in TV debates and social media. *Corpus Pragmatics*, *10*(2), 64. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-026-00267-z

Giunta, G., Roccaforte, M., Pouscoulous, N., & Lombardi Vallauri, E. (2025). Presupposition: Accepted information or embraced beliefs? The role of informative function and trigger type in separating two levels of accommodation. *Folia Linguistica*, *59*(3), 839–865. https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2024-0027

Giunta, G., Roccaforte, M., Pouscoulous, N., & Lombardi Vallauri, E. (2026). Presupposition, assertion, and epistemic vigilance across development. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *254*, 94–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2026.01.001

Hadinata, M. (2026). Free nutritious meal policy in Indonesia under President Prabowo: A policy, fiscal, and political analysis grounded in international evidence. *Journal of Bina Praja*, *18*(1), 65–78. https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.18.2026.2896

Harrington, C. (2025). Making ethical judgement calls about qualitative social media research on sensitive issues. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *28*(4), 397–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2024.2393796

Hastuti, M. I. S., & Aziz, S. (2026). Netizen opinion on corruption news in social media: Sentiment and issue framing in Indonesia. *Palakka: Media and Islamic Communication*, *7*(1), 62–76. https://doi.org/10.30863/palakka.v7i1.11602

Herring, S. C. (2025). Methodological synergies in the study of digital discourse: A critical reflection. *Discourse, Context & Media*, *67*, 100931. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2025.100931

Kernell, G., & Noh, S. (2026). The AI referee: How online interventions shape incivility and user engagement in news discussions. *Social Media + Society*, *12*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051261428916

Kiftiyah, A., Palestine, F. A., Abshar, F. U., & Rofiah, K. (2025). Free Nutritious Meals (MBG) program in the perspective of social justice and socio–political dynamics. *PANCASILA: Indonesian Journal*, *5*(1), 2797–3018. https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v5i1.726

Koswara, I. (2025). Digital discourse and public voice: YouTube commentary in the case of #IndonesiaGelap. *Global Communicator*, *8*(2), 11–24. https://doi.org/10.33822/gk.v8i2.11895

Krykoniuk, K., Hopkin-King, C., & Roberts, S. G. (2025). Developing a discourse space for analysing online discourse. *Discourse, Context & Media*, *67*, 100929. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2025.100929

Lyhne, C. N., Thisted, J., & Bjerrum, M. (2025). Qualitative content analysis–framing the analytical process of inductive content analysis to develop a sound study design. *Quality & Quantity*, *59*(6), 5329–5349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-025-02220-9

Macagno, F. (2026). Common ground and the presuppositions of questions. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *23*(1), 27–51. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2025-8005

Maelani, T. (2026). Presuppositions on slimming supplement product descriptions on Shopee and their contradictions with buyer reviews. *Vocational Journal: Language, Linguistic, and Literary Education*, *3*(2), 48–57. https://doi.org/10.51574/vokatif.v3i2.4844

Maharani, W. M., Vyandri, M. A., Moeslim, A. H. A., & Paramita, D. (2026). Digital responsiveness loop in the democratic governance of Indonesia's free nutritious meal programme. *JianE (Journal of State Administration Sciences)*, *8*(2), 130–154. https://doi.org/10.32938/jan.v8i2.11029

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis: A resource book on new methods*. UI Press.

Naepi, S., Jack, K., Waymouth, M., Naepi, C., & Vandewiele, C. (2026). The right to speak: Exploring academic freedom in turbulent times. *Higher Education*, *91*(4), 1399–1418. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-025-01476-2

Napitupulu, L. H., Indriyanto, K., & Rawson, D. D. (2026). Hope within critique: Satire and political distrust in Indonesian social media comments. *OKARA: Journal of Language and Literature*, *20*(1), 102–121. https://doi.org/10.19105/ojbs.v20i1.24808

Nasrul, & Alwi, A. K. (2025). Presumption and entailment in Najwa Shihab's YouTube podcast with "Prabowo Subianto Talks Ideas" (Pragmatic studies). *Journal of Indonesian Language and Literature Education*, *15*(1), 103–119. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbsi.v15i1.93177

Nasrullah, R., Murodi, Suhaimi, Musyarrofah, U., Khoiriyah, N., & Saraka, M. Y. (2026). Emotional discourse and symbolic contestation in Indonesia's digital public sphere: An ethnographic content analysis of online reactions from YouTube comments on LPG subsidy regulatory adjustment news. *Frontiers in Communication*, *10*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1737481

Noakes, T., Uys, C. S., Harpur, P. A., & van Zyl, I. (2025). A role for qualitative methods in researching Twitter data on a popular science article's communication. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, *9*, 1431298. https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2024.1431298

Pratiwi, H. R., & Junaedi, F. (2026). Digital political discourse on corpus-based GNFI Instagram comments. *Community: Journal of Communication and Information Technology*, *18*(2), 383–404. https://doi.org/10.23917/komuniti.v18i2.15235

Prihandini, A. A. A. H. P., & Ulfah, A. P. (2026). A pragmatic analysis of implicature in social media comments on news posts about Donald Trump. *Indonesian EFL Journal (IEFLJ)*, *12*(3), 1091–1100. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v12i3.181

Purnomo, A., Putikadyanto, A., & Nur, A. (2025). Free nutritious meal program: A critical analysis of Indonesia's education transformation towards the Golden Generation 2045. *ENTITA: Journal of Social Sciences and Social Sciences Education*, *1*(Special Edition), 767–780. https://doi.org/10.19105/ejpis.v1i.19191

Ramadhani, R. N., Patekkai, I., Marfuah, J., Ulinsa, U., & Pujiningtyas, A. (2026). Expressive speech acts fostering social harmony in Tulo Village interpersonal conversations. *Open Academia*, *11*(2), 2–5. https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.11.2026.15027

Rares, J. J., Mamentu, M., Ridha, M., & Abidin, Z. (2026). Implementation of universal welfare policies in the Global South: A case study of Indonesia's free nutritious meal program. *Frontiers in Political Science*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2026.1845044

Sandre, A. S., Megah S, S. I., & Sugiharti, S. (2026). An appraisal analysis of English comments on YouTube educational videos. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, *8*(2), 510–534. https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v8i2.510-534

Scheel, A. (2026). Long comment branch sampling for social media research. *Mediální Studia*, *59*(2), 152. https://doi.org/10.65502/si1-2026.08

Schmitz, T., Nouwen, R., & Dotlačil, J. (2025). Memory retrieval in discourse: Illusions of coherence during presupposition resolution. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *143*, 104637. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2025.104637

Shea, A. L., Omapang, A. K. B., Cho, J. Y., Ginsparg, M. Y., Bazarova, N. N., Hui, W., Kizilcec, R. F., Tong, C., & Margolin, D. B. (2025). Beyond *ad hominem* attacks: A typology of the discursive tactics used when objecting to news commentary on social media. *PLOS ONE*, *20*(8), e0328550. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0328550

Sianturi, H. R. P. (2025). Politics on a plate: Equivocal communication in Indonesian presidential nutrition policy. *Frontiers in Communication*, *10*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1612652

Sikorskii, S., & Carrió-Pastor, M. L. (2026a). Appraising impoliteness on X: A case study of Isabel Díaz Ayuso. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *254*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2025.12.010

Sikorskii, S., & Carrió-Pastor, M. L. (2026b). Appraising impoliteness on X: A case study of Isabel Díaz Ayuso. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *254*, 149–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2026.02.005

Simangunsong, B. A., & Shenna. (2024). Forms of resistance to the silencing of freedom of expression on Instagram accounts @gejayanmemanggil. *Journal of Communication Sciences*, *21*(2), 273–288. https://doi.org/10.24002/jik.v21i2.7620

Simons, M. (2025). Availability without common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, *48*(1), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-024-09426-4

Solihin, O., Firmansyah, D., Abdullah, A. Z., & Dhahiyat, A. P. (2025). The utilization of AI in digital content analysis: A case study of social media commentary. *JUPENDIS Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *3*(2), 117–129. https://doi.org/10.54066/jupendis.v3i2.3141

Soma, R. I., & Uchiyama, T. (2026). Parents' expectations on the emerging Free Nutritious Meal Program in Indonesia. *Journal of Nutrition and Food*, *21*(2), 119–126. https://doi.org/10.25182/jgp.2026.21.2.119-126

Stolwijk, S. B., Boukes, M., Yeung, W. N., Liao, Y., Münker, S., Kroon, A. C., & Trilling, D. (2026). Can we use automated approaches to measure the quality of online political discussion? How to (not) measure interactivity, diversity, rationality, and incivility in online comments to the news. *Communication Methods and Measures*, *20*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2025.2553300

Sufi, M. I. F., & Putri, D. M. (2026). Presupposition in political memes: A cyber-pragmatic approach to Indonesian politics. *SIGEH ELT: Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, *6*(1), 753–770. https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v6i1.4512

Suganda, D., Yuliawati, S., Rachmat, A., & Suparman, T. (2025). Exploring the negative criticism of readers' comments on online news on the construction of a new capital city of Indonesia (IKN). *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *12*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2450888

Suhaeni, C., Mualifah, L. N. A., & Wijayanto, H. (2025). LDA topic modeling analysis of public discourse on Indonesia's Free Nutritious Meals Program (MBG). *IJID (International Journal on Informatics for Development)*, *14*(1), 587–600. https://doi.org/10.14421/ijid.2025.5211

White, P. R. (2025). Appraisal theory and the analysis of point of view in news and views journalism – unpacking journalistic "persuasiveness." *Language & Communication*, *100*, 95–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2024.11.005

Yu, J., Domahidi, E., Benmaarouf, K., & Steinmetz, N. (2025). Quantity or quality? Comparing social media data sampling strategies for government crisis communication research. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, *124*, 105531. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2025.105531

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.