

Ironic Language Style in Social Media Comment Sections and Its Implications for Figurative Meaning Learning in Sixth-Grade Elementary School

Received: 04/08/2026 ¹Fikri, ²Agus Saripudin, ³Arya David Pratama, ⁴Abdalaziz Alhindi Osman Mohammed

Accepted: 21/08/2026 ¹²³Sriwijaya University, Indonesia
⁴Islamic Omdurman University, Sudan

Published: 02/09/2026 ¹fikri@fkip.unsri.ac.id *Corresponding author
²aryadp@gmail.com
³agus_saripudin@fkip.unsri.ac.id
⁴alhindiosman@gmail.com

How to cite :

Fikri, F., Saripudin, A., Pratama, A. D., & Mohammed, A. A. O. (2026). Ironic Language Style in Social Media Comment Sections and Its Implications for Figurative Meaning Learning in Sixth-Grade Elementary School. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dasar Indonesia*, 5(3), 403-414. <https://doi.org/10.51574/judikdas.v5i3.5632>

Abstract

Ironic language style has become increasingly prevalent in the comment sections of public figures' social media accounts, yet studies linking this digital-discourse phenomenon to elementary students' competence in understanding figurative meaning remain scarce. This study aims to describe the types and pragmatic meanings of ironic language style found in the comment section of a public figure's account on platform X and to formulate its implications for developing figurative-meaning learning materials for sixth-grade elementary students. A descriptive qualitative design was employed, involving 91 utterances collected from the comment sections of four posts related to a disaster-relief working visit, using the observation-note-taking (simak-catat) technique and investigator triangulation for data validity. Data were analyzed using the Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña interactive model. The results show that cynicism was the most dominant type (71 utterances, 78.0%), followed by sarcasm (15 utterances, 16.5%) and irony (5 utterances, 5.5%), reflecting a tendency among social media users to favor explicit, low-cognitive-load forms of criticism over the more inferentially demanding form of irony. These findings align conceptually with the Phase C Indonesian Language Learning Outcomes, which require sixth-grade students to distinguish fact from opinion and understand figurative meaning, a competency that becomes developmentally accessible only toward the upper grades of elementary school. It is recommended that the findings be used as a professional reference for teachers in designing age-appropriate figurative-meaning materials, rather than as reading material presented directly to students, given the adult political content of the source data. The study contributes a model for repurposing adult digital-discourse data into a resource for elementary teachers' professional development without compromising child-appropriate content standards.

Keywords: Ironic Language Style, Figurative Meaning, Elementary School, Digital Discourse, Phase C

Abstrak

Gaya bahasa sindiran semakin marak digunakan pada kolom komentar akun media sosial tokoh publik, namun penelitian yang mengaitkan fenomena wacana digital ini dengan kompetensi memahami makna kiasan pada peserta didik sekolah dasar masih terbatas. Penelitian ini bertujuan mendeskripsikan jenis dan makna pragmatis gaya

bahasa sindiran pada kolom komentar akun tokoh publik di platform X, serta merumuskan implikasinya terhadap pengembangan bahan pembelajaran makna kiasan bagi peserta didik kelas VI sekolah dasar. Penelitian menggunakan desain kualitatif deskriptif, melibatkan 91 tuturan yang dikumpulkan dari kolom komentar empat unggahan terkait kunjungan kerja pascabencana, menggunakan teknik simak-catat dan triangulasi penyidik untuk menjaga keabsahan data. Data dianalisis menggunakan model interaktif Miles, Huberman, dan Saldana. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan sinisme sebagai jenis paling dominan (71 tuturan, 78,0%), diikuti sarkasme (15 tuturan, 16,5%) dan ironi (5 tuturan, 5,5%), yang mencerminkan kecenderungan pengguna media sosial memilih bentuk kritik yang eksplisit dan menuntut beban kognitif lebih rendah. Temuan ini memiliki relevansi konseptual dengan Capaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Fase C yang menuntut peserta didik kelas VI membedakan fakta dan opini serta memahami makna kiasan. Direkomendasikan agar temuan ini dimanfaatkan sebagai rujukan pengembangan profesional guru dalam merancang bahan ajar makna kiasan yang sesuai usia, bukan sebagai bahan bacaan langsung bagi peserta didik, mengingat muatan data sumber berasal dari wacana politik dewasa.

Kata Kunci: Gaya Bahasa Sindiran, Makna Kiasan, Sekolah Dasar, Wacana Digital, Fase C

Introduction

Language is not always used to convey literal meaning. In many communicative events, speakers deliberately deviate a word's meaning from its literal referent to achieve a particular effect, such as softening criticism, asserting dissatisfaction, or indirectly mocking another party. This phenomenon is known in stylistic studies as ironic language style, which comprises three main forms: irony, cynicism, and sarcasm (Keraf, 2010). The three differ in intensity and mechanism: irony works through a contradiction between literal meaning and intended meaning, cynicism voices doubt about the sincerity of someone's motives, while sarcasm delivers criticism sharply and explicitly, verging on insult (Keraf, 2010; Ratna, 2014).

The ability to understand meaning that is not conveyed directly is one marker of a child's linguistic maturity. Unlike vocabulary acquisition and sentence structure, which develop from an early age, the ability to interpret figurative meaning, including irony and sarcasm, only develops stably toward the end of childhood, alongside the rapid development of social cognition and perspective-taking (Creusere, 1999; Filippova & Astington, 2008; Happé, 1993). At this stage, children begin to distinguish between what is literally said and what the speaker actually intends, a pragmatic competency that requires the capacity to withhold literal meaning while inferring the implicit meaning behind it (Gibbs, 2000).

This developmental competency aligns with the demands of the Indonesian Language Phase C Learning Outcomes (CP) within the Merdeka Curriculum, which targets fifth- and sixth-grade elementary students. At this phase, students are expected to distinguish fact from opinion and understand denotative, connotative, and figurative meaning in various types of text, both spoken and written (Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, 2022). Sarcasm/irony, as a form of language style that works through the deviation of literal meaning, is a concrete manifestation of the figurative-meaning competency demanded by this CP. Unfortunately, teaching materials on ironic language style in elementary schools still largely rely on conventional textbook examples that tend to be static and fail to reflect the communication style of the digital generation.

Social media, particularly platform X (formerly Twitter), has become a productive arena for the public to express social criticism indirectly through ironic language style. This platform's character limit encourages users to formulate sarcasm in a dense, terse, and context-laden manner (Boyd, 2014; Fuchs, 2021). Comment sections on public figures' official accounts are among the most productive spaces for generating variations of ironic language style, ranging from subtle irony and cynicism that questions sincerity, to sharp and confrontational sarcasm (Rahardi, 2020). Pragmatically, the meaning contained in an ironic utterance is not determined solely by the literal meaning of the sentence, but by pragmatic force that operates based on the context of the speech situation (Leech, 1983), so that interpreting sarcasm requires shared understanding between speaker and reader regarding the event underlying the utterance.

Studies on ironic language style in digital discourse and popular media have proliferated over the past decade. Arisnawati (2020) examined ironic language style as a form of indirect communication in the Laiyolo language and found that sarcasm functions to preserve social politeness while delivering subtle criticism. In the realm of digital entertainment, Cahyani et al. (2022) identified irony in stand-up comedy content on YouTube, while Kenwening (2020) examined sarcasm in social-critique videos on the same platform. In text- and image-based social media, Hasanah et al. (2021) analyzed netizens' use of sarcasm on Instagram, while Nurwanda (2020) examined the pragmatic functions of language style in social media discourse more broadly. Nevertheless, research specifically linking findings on ironic language style from digital discourse with the development of figurative-meaning competency at the elementary level, particularly Phase C, remains very limited. This is the gap this study seeks to bridge.

This research gap is important to bridge given several considerations drawn from studies of children's language development. Ages 11–12, corresponding to sixth-grade elementary students, mark the period when the ability to understand irony and sarcasm begins to stabilize (Filippova & Astington, 2008; Pexman, 2008). Before this age, children tend to interpret ironic utterances literally due to limited capacity to process the mismatch between expectation and reality that lies at the core of irony's mechanism (Creusere, 1999). In addition, upper-grade elementary students now grow up in a digital ecosystem saturated with public discourse laden with sarcasm, making the strengthening of critical literacy toward indirect forms of language an important part of their digital literacy skills (Livingstone, 2014), even though exposure to the source discourse itself must be fully mediated by teachers.

Based on the foregoing, this study aims to (1) describe the types of ironic language style found in the comment section of a public figure's account on platform X, (2) describe the pragmatic meanings contained therein, and (3) formulate their implications for developing figurative-meaning learning materials for sixth-grade elementary teachers. The novelty of this study lies in positioning adult digital-discourse data as an object of linguistic analysis that is then reoriented into a resource for teachers' professional development, rather than as reading material presented directly to students, so that its linguistic relevance can be utilized without disregarding the appropriateness of content for children's developmental stage. Theoretically, this study is expected to enrich digital-discourse-based stylistic and pragmatic studies; practically, it is expected to serve as a reference for elementary teachers in designing more contextual figurative-meaning materials.

Research Method

This study employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive design to systematically describe the types and meanings of ironic language style in verbal data, without manipulating the research subjects (Moleong, 2021). The research data consist of verbal utterances containing ironic language style (irony, cynicism, and sarcasm), sourced from the comment section of a public figure's official account on platform X across four posts related to a working visit to a flood-disaster site, including a site inspection, the distribution of medical aid, and a New Year's moment with affected residents. Data were drawn from an official account and publicly accessible comment sections; user identities in the reporting of results were anonymized into data codes (D1, D2, and so on) to maintain academic propriety in reporting. Although several excerpts (e.g., D1, D72, D8) implicitly reference the public figure's position through terms such as "president," the account name and specific identity of the figure are deliberately left unstated throughout this manuscript; this is a consistent methodological choice intended to keep the analytical focus on the linguistic patterns of the utterances themselves rather than on the identity of the person being discussed, applied consistently alongside the anonymization of commenter identities described above.

Given that the data analyzed contain sharp political criticism and, in a small number of cases, explicit language directed at a public figure, the ethical basis for their use warrants explicit statement. Consistent with common practice in social media discourse research, data originating from publicly accessible digital spaces, posted voluntarily by users under a platform's public terms of service, were treated as public text that does not require additional individual informed consent from commenters; author identities were nonetheless anonymized into data codes as an added layer of protection for the individuals who produced the comments analyzed.

The main research instrument was the researcher (as human instrument), who served as planner, collector, analyst, and interpreter of the data (Moleong, 2021). Data collection was carried out using the observation method followed by a note-taking technique (Mahsun, 2014), through three stages: thoroughly observing all comments on the four selected posts, selecting comments that explicitly contained ironic language style while excluding comments that were direct compliments, spam, or irrelevant, and recording the selected data into a data that had been coded according to the type of language style identified through linguistic and pragmatic markers.

Data validity in this study was checked through investigator triangulation, namely a re-examination of the classification results and meaning interpretation by an independent expert reviewer outside the main researcher (Moleong, 2021), given that the boundary between cynicism and sarcasm is not always sharp in practice and often depends on contextual interpretation. To operationalize this process, utterances were coded as cynicism when they questioned the sincerity of a motive through comparison or rhetorical questioning without explicit insult; as sarcasm when they employed overtly harsh diction, capitalization, or personal labeling that directly attacked dignity; and as irony when the utterance's surface form (e.g., a question, a wish, or a piece of advice) contradicted its contextually implied meaning. These criteria, summarized in Table 2, served as the coding scheme applied prior to analysis rather than only as a post hoc description of the results.

This process produced a number of minor corrections to the initial classification before the final data was used in the analysis stage, so that the total data analyzed in this

study amounted to 91 utterances. It should be noted as a limitation that agreement between the researcher and the independent reviewer was reached qualitatively through discussion and consensus rather than quantified through a statistic such as Cohen's Kappa; future studies employing multiple independent coders are encouraged to report such a coefficient to strengthen the reliability of similarly fine-grained classifications.

Data analysis followed the interactive model of [Miles et al. \(2014\)](#), consisting of four stages: data collection from all comment sections of the selected posts; data reduction by focusing on utterances containing ironic language style and discarding irrelevant data; data display in the form of classification tables and descriptive accounts; and drawing conclusions regarding the dominant type of language style, the pragmatic meaning contained therein, and formulating its implications for figurative-meaning learning in sixth grade, with reference to the Phase C Learning Outcomes of the Merdeka Curriculum ([Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, 2022](#)) and the framework of children's pragmatic development ([Creusere, 1999](#); [Filippova & Astington, 2008](#)).

Results

This section presents the core findings of the analysis of ironic language style in the comment sections of four posts by a public figure's account on platform X regarding a working visit to a flood-disaster site, covering the distribution of language-style types, the linguistic markers of each type, and example data representing the variety of forms and contexts found.

Distribution of Irony Language Style Types

Analysis of the comment sections of the four posts yielded 91 utterances identified as containing ironic language style, spread across posts about the site inspection, the distribution of medical aid, and the New Year's moment with affected residents. The distribution of language-style types is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Distribution of Irony Language Style Types

Type of Irony Language Style	Number of Utterances	Percentage
Cynicism	71	78.0%
Sarcasm	15	16.5%
Irony	5	5.5%
Total	91	100%

As a general overview before the detailed account of each type, Table 2 summarizes the dominant linguistic markers and pragmatic functions of each type of ironic language style found.

Table 2 Linguistic Markers and Pragmatic Functions of Each Type of Irony Language Style

Type	Dominant Linguistic Markers	Pragmatic Function
Cynicism	Contrastive comparisons, rhetorical questions, regional-language code-mixing, light metaphor	Voicing doubt about the sincerity of a motive without attacking personal dignity
Sarcasm	Capital letters, repeated punctuation, explicit/harsh diction, personal labeling	Venting anger and rejection directly, tending to attack dignity
Irony	Prayer/hope/small-talk-question structure that contradicts the context	Delivering veiled criticism through a contradiction between literal meaning and intent

It is worth noting that the markers listed for cynicism and sarcasm are primarily

lexical and surface-level in nature (e.g., specific word choices, capitalization), whereas the marker identified for irony is structural-pragmatic, namely a contradiction between an utterance's surface form and its contextually implied meaning. This asymmetry is itself a notable finding: unlike cynicism and sarcasm, irony in this data cannot be reliably identified from lexical cues alone and requires contextual inference, which likely also contributes to its comparative rarity in the dataset.

Cynicism

Cynicism was the most dominant type found, accounting for 71 of the 91 utterances (78.0%), generally taking the form of doubt about the sincerity of the action displayed by the public figure. Several examples of the data are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Examples of Cynicism Data

Code	Utterance Excerpt	Brief Context
D1	“Sekelas presiden datang ke lokasi dgn pakaian biasa saja. Anggota DPR datang ke lokasi kayak mau perang.” [‘Someone of presidential rank comes to the site in ordinary clothes. A parliament member comes to the site dressed like they’re going to war.’]	Contrasts the plainness of an official's clothing with another party's attire at the disaster site.
D2	“Lain kali gk usah di stickerin.. emang sudah seharusnya lu datang kesana dengan membawa bantuan..” [‘Next time no need to put stickers on it.. it’s only right that you go there bringing aid..’]	Questions the formality of branding disaster-relief aid with identity stickers.
D3	“Hasil kebijakan merusak hutan.” [‘The result of a policy that destroys forests.’]	Links the flood disaster to the impact of forest-management policy.
D4	“Udah main pahlawan-pahlawanannya?” [‘Done playing the hero act?’]	Uses a metaphor implying a theatrical impression of the action displayed.
D7	“10,5 jt hektare lahan sawit vs 1000 dus indomie” [‘10.5 million hectares of oil-palm land vs. 1,000 boxes of instant noodles’]	An extreme numerical comparison between the scale of land exploitation and the scale of the aid given.
D8	“Saatnya yg model termul2 pecat pak presiden.” [‘Time to sack the empty-talk types, Mr. President.’]	Urges the evaluation of officials deemed to be all talk and no action.
D9	“Sawit juga pohon...” [‘Oil palm is a tree too...’]	Mocks an argument that equates the ecological function of natural forest with oil-palm plantations.
D10	“Kenapa gak ditetapkan sebagai bencana nasional? Ora ono duit?” [‘Why hasn’t it been declared a national disaster? No money, is it?’]	A rhetorical question mixed with Javanese mocking the budget allocation for disaster response.

Data D1 and D2 show that speakers juxtapose two contrasting realities (plainness versus completeness of attire, a visit versus the absence of concrete aid) to imply a mismatch between the image displayed and the substantive action expected. Data D7 uses a similar strategy but with a far more extreme numerical comparison, juxtaposing the scale of environmental damage (“10.5 million hectares”) with the scale of aid received (“1,000 boxes of instant noodles”) to highlight the imbalance between ecological loss and the compensation provided. Data D8 uses the informal term “termul2” (from the word “mulut”/mouth) to mock officials deemed to be all talk, while data D9 mocks the logic of a

particular argument through a short declarative statement followed by a laughing emoji. Data D10 shows an interesting variation in the form of code-mixing with Javanese (“Ora ono duit?”) that reinforces the cynical tone toward the issue of budget limitations. Overall, cynicism in this data operates through comparison, rhetorical questions, and inserted emojis, without using harsh words that directly attack the public figure's personal dignity.

Sarcasm

Sarcasm was found in 15 utterances (16.5%), marked by blunt, sharp, and confrontational word choice. Several examples of the data are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Examples of Sarcasm Data

Code	Utterance Excerpt	Brief Context
D67	“KENAPA SUMATERA TIDAK STATUS BENCANA NASIONAL.. TAKUT KALAU NAIK STATUS BENCANA NASIONAL TERBONGKAR MALING TERIAK MALING, KERUSAKAN HUTAN, DILIPUT NEGARA ASING TERBONGKAR BANGSATNYA.” [‘WHY ISN’T SUMATRA GIVEN NATIONAL DISASTER STATUS.. AFRAID THAT RAISING IT TO NATIONAL DISASTER STATUS WOULD EXPOSE THE THIEF CRYING THIEF, THE FOREST DAMAGE, COVERED BY FOREIGN MEDIA, EXPOSING THE BASTARDS.’]	Protests the absence of national disaster status while accusing officials of concealing the forest-damage issue.
D87	“Selamat tahun baru 2021 bapak sawit.” [‘Happy New Year 2021, Mr. Oil Palm.’]	Mocks the president's verbal slip in stating the wrong year, combined with a label referencing plantation policy.
D21	(a personal attack mocking physical appearance and invoking a past political record)	Directs criticism at the leader regarding his subordinates' attitude toward public criticism.
D22	(an insult toward a minister's competence, paired with a parody of a controversial statement)	Condemns the rigidity of disaster-response bureaucracy compared with the responsiveness of public donations.

Data D67 and D87 show markers typical of sarcasm, namely the use of capital letters as written intonation emphasis and demeaning personal labeling. Data D21 and D22, whose content contains personal mockery and coarse language and are therefore not quoted verbatim in this report to preserve academic propriety, display an even more aggressive sarcasm pattern: both open with a laughing emoji as a form of mockery, followed by direct insults attacking the public figure's competence or personal dignity, and close with an emphatic statement that reinforces the demeaning tone. Unlike cynicism, which tends to imply meaning indirectly, sarcasm in this data delivers criticism explicitly, leaving little room for interpretation, so its illocutionary force is more directly attacking in nature.

Irony

Irony was the least frequently found type, appearing in 5 utterances (5.5%). Examples of the data are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Examples of Irony Data

Code	Utterance Excerpt	Brief Context
D15	“Agak telat ya pak, macet kah?” [‘A bit late, sir, was there traffic?’]	Mocks the speed of the disaster response through a question that seems like ordinary small talk.
D58	“Sekalian pantau-pantau kayu bpk yg ikut hanyut.” [‘While you’re at it, check on your timber that got swept away too.’]	Suggests monitoring ‘timber’ amid the disaster inspection as a subtle jab at land-ownership issues.
D72	“Semoga sehat selalu presiden bangsaku, Bersihkan koruptor, Semoga 1 dollar As bisa ke 3 ribu rupiah.” [‘May my nation’s president always be healthy, clean up the corruptors, may the US dollar drop to 3,000 rupiah.’]	Expresses an economically impossible hope as a form of veiled criticism.

All three examples show markers typical of irony, namely the delivery of meaning that appears positive or neutral on the surface (a prayer, a suggestion, an ordinary question) yet carries an opposite intent that can only be understood through the context of the underlying event. Data D15 takes the form of small-talk that is normally friendly in tone, yet in the context of a disaster response deemed slow, the question instead implies criticism of the delay. Data D58 uses a suggestion-like sentence structure that is literally neutral, but the word “timber” in the context of a deforestation issue implies a jab at alleged land ownership. Data D72, which is on the surface a prayer and a good wish, in fact implies distrust toward the realization of government economic policy through a request that is mathematically and economically impossible.

Overall, these findings indicate that social media users on platform X tend to favor more explicit and communicatively efficient forms of sarcasm (cynicism and sarcasm) over the form that demands more complex rhetorical reasoning (irony). The variety of linguistic strategies used, ranging from numerical comparisons, regional-language code-mixing, capital letters, to contradictory prayer structures, illustrates the richness of ironic forms found in contemporary digital discourse, and forms the basis for further discussion of pragmatic meaning and its implications for figurative-meaning learning in the Discussion section.

Discussion

The findings of this study provide empirical grounding that ironic language style in social media comment sections can be systematically mapped and reoriented into a resource for developing contextual figurative-meaning teaching materials for sixth-grade elementary students.

Cynicism

The dominance of cynicism in this study's data confirms the character of cynicism as a form of sarcasm that voices doubt about the sincerity of someone's motives without necessarily using harsh diction (Keraf, 2010). Pragmatically, the implicature contained in netizens' cynical utterances aims to expose the gap between the caring narrative displayed on social media and the empirical reality felt by the public (Leech, 1983). This finding reinforces Hasanah et al. (2021), who likewise found a tendency among netizens to use skeptically toned sarcasm when responding to public figures' caring narratives on social media, and is consistent with a similar pattern found in studies of sarcasm in digital

entertainment (Cahyani et al., 2022; Kenwening, 2020).

Sarcasm

Sarcasm in this data represents a more assertive form of rejection and the articulation of accumulated public anger. The use of capital letters, repeated punctuation, and explicit diction in data D67 illustrates how, in computer-mediated communication, typographic devices such as capitalization can function as a textual equivalent of the vocal emphasis that marks spoken sarcasm (Hancock, 2004), even though Rockwell's (2007) original findings on vocal and prosodic markers of sarcasm were derived from spoken rather than written conversational interaction. The smaller proportion of sarcasm compared with cynicism (16.5% versus 78.0%) suggests that most netizens in this data still favored a relatively more restrained form of criticism; this is an interpretive observation of the present authors rather than a claim drawn from Kreuz & Glucksberg (1989), whose echoic reminder theory instead explains sarcasm as a listener's recognition that a speaker is alluding to some antecedent expectation or norm that has been violated, a mechanism more directly relevant to the comparative and expectation-violating character of the cynicism examples discussed above.

Irony

The small proportion of irony compared with cynicism and sarcasm is consistent with the findings of Pexman (2008) and Kreuz & Glucksberg (1989) that understanding and producing irony demand a higher cognitive load, because both speaker and interlocutor must process the mismatch between literal meaning and intended meaning (Attardo, 2000; Colston, 2000). The character limit of platform X appears to push users toward more direct and communicatively efficient forms of sarcasm, namely cynicism and sarcasm, rather than irony, which demands a more subtle discourse construction (Gibbs, 2000).

Relevance to Phase C Learning Outcomes and Implications for Teachers

The findings regarding the variety of types and pragmatic meanings of ironic language style have conceptual relevance to the Indonesian Language Phase C Learning Outcomes, which target fifth- and sixth-grade students to understand denotative, connotative, and figurative meaning, and to distinguish fact from opinion (Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, 2022). This relevance must be interpreted with caution: children's ability to understand irony and sarcasm develops gradually and only shows stability toward the end of childhood (Creusere, 1999; Filippova & Astington, 2008), while the content of the utterances in this study's data is adult political discourse containing sharp criticism, including harsh diction in some sarcasm data, and therefore should not be presented directly to sixth-grade students in its original form.

Based on this consideration, the utilization of this study's findings for elementary education is directed toward two strategies. First, as a reference for teachers' professional development in understanding contemporary forms of sarcasm in digital spaces, giving teachers a more contextual understanding when designing figurative-meaning teaching materials, rather than relying solely on conventional textbook examples. Second, as a reference framework for composing example sarcastic sentences that have been adapted to themes appropriate to children's world—for instance, the cynicism pattern in data D2 can be adapted into “Wow, how kind of you to help after the work is already done” for a friendship context, while the irony pattern in data D72 can be adapted into “I hope your homework gets done soon” said to a friend who in fact has not even started the assignment,

and the sarcasm pattern in data D67 can be adapted into a capitalized, exaggerated remark such as “WOW, GREAT JOB forgetting your homework AGAIN this week!” to illustrate, in a classroom-safe context, how capitalization and exaggerated praise function as markers of sarcasm. With this kind of adaptation approach, the linguistic structure of sarcasm can be studied without exposing students to the political content of the source data, while simultaneously strengthening their critical digital literacy ([Livingstone, 2014](#)). Compared with [Arisnawati \(2020\)](#) and [Nurwanda \(2020\)](#), who stopped at describing the functions and forms of sarcasm, this study goes further by explicitly formulating a pathway for reorienting adult digital-discourse data into a resource for elementary teachers' professional development.

This study has limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. The data were drawn from a single account and a single series of disaster-related events, so generalization to sarcasm patterns on platform X as a whole should be made with caution. More specifically, because all data originate from a single thematic event, namely a post-disaster accountability visit, the marked dominance of cynicism (78.0%) may partly reflect the specific characteristics of political accountability discourse in crisis contexts rather than a general pattern of ironic language use on platform X as a whole; readers should therefore interpret the observed distribution as characteristic of this genre and event rather than as a universal proportion. This study also has not empirically tested the effectiveness of the adapted teaching materials on sixth-grade students, so claims regarding their pedagogical suitability and effectiveness remain conceptual. Future research is therefore recommended to develop and pilot a figurative-meaning teaching module based on these findings directly with sixth-grade elementary students, to broaden the scope of data sources to other accounts, topics, and discourse genres, and to directly involve teachers in the piloting process of such teaching materials.

Conclusion

This study aimed to describe the types and meanings of ironic language style in the comment section of a public figure's account on platform X and to formulate its implications for figurative-meaning learning in sixth-grade elementary school. The results show that of the 91 utterances analyzed, cynicism was dominant (71 utterances, 78.0%), followed by sarcasm (15 utterances, 16.5%) and irony (5 utterances, 5.5%), a pattern reflecting social media users' tendency to favor explicit forms of criticism that carry a lower cognitive processing load than irony. Cynicism predominantly represents social doubt about the sincerity of a public figure's actions, sarcasm represents a more explicit rejection and anger, while irony works through a contradiction between literal meaning and intended meaning.

These findings have conceptual relevance to the Indonesian Language Phase C Learning Outcomes, which require sixth-grade students to understand figurative meaning and distinguish fact from opinion, a competency that, developmentally in pragmatics, only becomes reliably accessible toward the end of childhood. Given that the data are drawn from adult political discourse with some sharply critical content, their utilization in the elementary school context is directed specifically toward serving as a reference for teachers' professional development and a source of inspiration for composing example sarcastic sentences adapted to themes appropriate to children's world, rather than as reading material presented directly to students. This study has limitations regarding the scope of its data source, drawn from a single account, and the fact that the adapted teaching materials have not been empirically tested; future research is therefore recommended to

develop and test the effectiveness of a figurative-meaning teaching module based on these findings with sixth-grade elementary students, to broaden the scope of data sources, and to directly involve teachers and students in the piloting process.

References

- Arisnawati, N. (2020). Gaya bahasa sindiran sebagai bentuk komunikasi tidak langsung dalam bahasa Laiyolo. *Medan Makna: Jurnal Ilmu Kebahasaan dan Kesastraan*, 18(2), 136–148. <https://doi.org/10.26499/mm.v18i2.2314>
- Attardo, S. (2000). Irony as relevant inappropriateness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(6), 793–826. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00070-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00070-3)
- Boyd, D. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.
- Cahyani, K. P., Ariansyah, Y. T., & Abimubarak, A. (2022). Gaya bahasa ironi stand up comedy Mamat Al Katiri dalam konten YouTube Somasi. *Referen: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa dan Sastra*, 1(2), 167–175. <https://doi.org/10.22236/referen.v1i2.10246>
- Colston, H. L. (2000). On necessary conditions for verbal irony comprehension. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 8(2), 277–324. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.8.2.04col>
- Creusere, M. A. (1999). Theories of adults' understanding and use of irony and sarcasm: Applications to and evidence from research with children. *Developmental Review*, 19(2), 213–262. <https://doi.org/10.1006/drev.1998.0474>
- Filippova, E., & Astington, J. W. (2008). Further development in social reasoning revealed in discourse irony understanding. *Child Development*, 79(1), 126–138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01115.x>
- Fuchs, C. (2021). *Social media: A critical introduction* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2000). Irony in talk among friends. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 15(1–2), 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2000.9678862>
- Hancock, J. T. (2004). Verbal irony use in face-to-face and computer-mediated conversations. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 23(4), 447–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X04269587>
- Happé, F. G. E. (1993). Communicative competence and theory of mind in autism: A test of relevance theory. *Cognition*, 48(2), 101–119. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(93\)90026-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(93)90026-R)
- Hasanah, U., Rahim, A. R., & Syamsuri, A. S. (2021). Analisis penggunaan gaya bahasa sarkasme netizen di media sosial Instagram. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 7(2), 411–423. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v7i2.1255>
- Kenwening, L. (2020). Gaya bahasa sindiran Bintang Emon dalam video DPO (Dewan Perwakilan Omel-Omel) di media sosial Twitter. *Journal Educational of Indonesia Language*, 1(1), 9–14. <https://doi.org/10.36269/jeil.v1i01.296>
- Keraf, G. (2010). *Diksi dan gaya bahasa* (Rev. ed.). PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Kreuz, R. J., & Glucksberg, S. (1989). How to be sarcastic: The echoic reminder theory of verbal irony. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 118(4), 374–386. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.118.4.374>
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Livingstone, S. (2014). Developing social media literacy: How children learn to interpret risky opportunities on social network sites. *Communications*, 39(3), 283–303. <https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2014-0113>

- Mahsun. (2014). *Teks dalam pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Kurikulum 2013*. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. (2022). *Capaian pembelajaran mata pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia untuk jenjang pendidikan dasar dan menengah pada Kurikulum Merdeka*. Center for Curriculum and Assessment Standards.
- Moleong, L. J. (2021). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (Rev. ed.). Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nurwanda, A. (2020). Analisis gaya bahasa dan fungsi pragmatis dalam wacana media sosial. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 8(2), 112–125.
- Pexman, P. M. (2008). It's fascinating research: The cognition of verbal irony. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(4), 286–290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00591.x>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2020). *Pragmatik siber: Analisis kesantunan wacana media sosial*. Amara Books.
- Ratna, N. K. (2014). *Stilistika: Kajian puitika bahasa, sastra, dan budaya*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Rockwell, P. (2007). Vocal features of conversational sarcasm: A comparison of methods. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 36(5), 361–369. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-006-9049-0>