

## “Joe Biden is a corrupt politician!”: Impoliteness in Donald Trump’s Tweets

Fithrotul Izzah, Thomas Joko Priyo Sembodo\*  
English Department, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [thomassembodo@ugm.ac.id](mailto:thomassembodo@ugm.ac.id)

### ABSTRACT

This study investigates impoliteness strategies in 351 tweets taken from Donald Trump’s personal Twitter account (@realDonaldTrump) from the first presidential debate to the Election Day of the 2020 United States presidential election. The current study employed Bousfield’s (2008) taxonomy of impoliteness strategies to analyze the data. There were 568 occurrences of impoliteness strategies in 351 tweets. The most common impoliteness strategy is *use inappropriate identity markers* (23.59%), followed by *threaten/frighten* (21.13%) and *condescend, scorn, and ridicule* (20.59%). These strategies were employed to attack and discredit Trump’s political opponents as well as to attract prospective voters. On the other hand, two impoliteness strategies, namely *hinder/block* and *enforce role shift*, were not used in the tweets. The results indicate that Donald Trump’s tweets exhibited impoliteness that played a significant role as a means of a political campaign during the 2020 United States Presidential Election.

**Keywords:** *Donald Trump, impoliteness, online communication, political discourse, Twitter.*

### INTRODUCTION

Donald Trump, the 45th President of the United States, was one of the world leaders who frequently utilized social media. His prominent social media platform was Twitter, a microblogging site created by Jack Dorsey in 2006. Trump had engaged himself on Twitter for more than a decade before he was banned from the platform in 2021 due to violating the Twitter rules upon his remarks on the Capitol riot earlier this year. According to [thetrumparchive.com](http://thetrumparchive.com), Trump posted more than 46,000 tweets from 2009 to 2021. These tweets seemed to be the most important means of communication between Trump and the rest of the world. Trump’s active engagement on Twitter has prompted scholars from various fields to

examine how he utilized the aforementioned social media platform. For instance, Schneiker (2019) studied Trump’s political branding on Twitter and Nicolau et al. (2020) studied the influence of Trump’s participation on Twitter on the United States’ tourism industry.

However, most of the studies that have been conducted in regard to Donald Trump’s activities on Twitter focused on their political aspects (Albishri et al., 2019; Schneiker, 2019), psychological aspects (Choma & Hanoach, 2017; Jordan et al., 2018; Sherman, 2018), communication (Ott, 2017), or economic aspects (Angelini et al., 2018; Guo et al., 2021; Klaus & Koser, 2021). Very few studies have been conducted on their linguistic aspects,

particularly in terms of their impoliteness. Therefore, this paper seeks to enrich studies of Donald Trump's activity on Twitter from the perspective of linguistics, particularly with regard to impoliteness.

Moreover, it is interesting to examine impoliteness in social media. Most of the studies on impoliteness investigate direct conversation among people, but the growing era of social media has made indirect conversation feasible. Therefore, studies on impoliteness in this particular context, be it synchronous or asynchronous, will have valuable contributions to a better understanding of impoliteness.

Based on the aforementioned explanation, the current study has two objectives, namely (1) to identify impolite tweets on Donald Trump's personal Twitter account and (2) to classify Donald Trump's impolite tweets according to Bousfield's (2008) taxonomy of impoliteness strategy.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies on Donald Trump's activity on Twitter have been conducted from various perspectives such as politics (Schneiker, 2019), communication studies (Ott, 2017), and linguistics (Clarke & Grieve, 2019).

Ott (2017) conducted a case study of Donald Trump's tweets from the perspective of media ecology to explore the changing character of public discourse in the Age of Twitter which reveals how Twitter privileges discourse that is simple, impulsive, and uncivil. Meanwhile, Schneiker (2019) conducted a study of Donald Trump's branding on Twitter, examining the political identity presented by Trump on Twitter. The results indicate that Trump created a distinctive branding as a "superhero anti-politician celebrity." On the other hand, Clark & Grieve (2019) conducted a study that draws on a linguistic analysis of Donald Trump's tweets by examining the style of the language used in his account and how it changed over time. The study reveals four general patterns of Donald Trump's stylistic variation, which represent the degree of conversational, campaigning, engaged, and advisory discourse and the styles shift systematically depending on the communicative goals.

In addition, studies on impoliteness have been widely conducted to investigate literary works such as novels (Methias, 2011; Paternoster, 2012) and plays (Aydinoğlu, 2013). However, few studies on impoliteness in social media has not been conducted. Nevertheless, there are several studies conducted to investigate how impoliteness is used in social media such as Facebook (Hammod & Abdul-Rassul, 2017), Weibo (Zhong, 2018), YouTube (Lorenzo-Dus et al., 2011), and Twitter (Vladimirou & House, 2018).

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In general, impoliteness refers to acts that can elicit harmful consequences to the interlocutor. The earliest notion of impoliteness dates back to Brown & Levinson's (1987, pp. 65-55) Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), referring to

"acts that primarily threaten the addressee's negative-face want, by indicating (potentially) that the speaker does not intend to avoid impeding addressee's freedom of action" or "acts that threaten the positive face-want, by indicating (potentially) that the speaker does not care about the addressee's feelings, wants, etc."

Subsequently, Culpeper (1996) suggested another theory of impoliteness which is essentially the opposite of Brown & Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies (i.e., bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record). Culpeper's strategies consist of bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withholding impoliteness. Moreover, positive impoliteness and negative impoliteness have their respective output strategies.

The latest theory of impoliteness was proposed by Bousfield (2008), who defines impoliteness as

"the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (1) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (2) with deliberate *aggression*, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted', or maximized in

some way to heighten the face damage inflicted” (original emphasis).

Bousfield’s (2008) impoliteness strategies were adapted from Culpeper’s (1996) positive impoliteness and negative impoliteness output strategies: a) snub, b) disassociate from the other, c) be uninterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic, d) use inappropriate identity markers, e) seek disagreement/avoid agreement, f) use taboo words, g) threaten/frighten, h) condescend, scorn, or ridicule, i) and explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect. However, he also suggested the following additional strategies: j) criticize, k) hinder/block, l) enforce role shift, and m) challenges.

Specifically, this study employs Bousfield’s (2008) theory of impoliteness. Considering that Bousfield’s (2008) impoliteness model has not been examined across various discourses as many as Culpeper’s (1996) impoliteness model has, Bousfield’s (2008) impoliteness theory was employed to assess to what extent his theory is applicable in the current type of discourse.

## METHODS

The data used in this study were tweets taken from Donald Trump’s personal Twitter account (@realDonaldTrump) posted from September 29 to November 3, 2020, marking the first presidential debate and the Election Day of the 2020 United States presidential election. The period was chosen as it was considered “the most important dates in the 2020 presidential contest”, according to Reuters (Ax, 2020). However, only tweets that met the following criteria were included: (1) the tweets must be tweeted from Donald Trump’s personal Twitter account (@realDonaldTrump) and not any other account such as the official Twitter account of the President of the United States (@POTUS); and (2) replies, quote tweets, and deleted tweets were included but not retweets, links, and media.

The data collection was effectively carried out with the help of Twitter Advanced Search (twitter.com/search-advanced) and Trump Twitter Archive (thetrumparchive.com). Furthermore, tweets that met the aforementioned criteria were

carefully analyzed using Bousfield’s (2008) impoliteness strategies. The overall results are presented in a table indicating the frequency and percentage of each strategy identified in Donald Trump’s tweets within the assigned period.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In total, there were 568 occurrences of impoliteness strategies in 351 tweets. They were classified according to Bousfield’s (2008) impoliteness strategies. Table 1 below presents the frequency of the impoliteness strategies found in Donald Trump’s tweets. The following sections discuss each strategy in detail.

Table 1. Frequency of impoliteness strategies in Donald Trump’s tweets

Strategy	Token	%
Snub	25	4.40
Disassociate from the other	36	6.34
Be uninterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic	7	1.23
Use inappropriate identity markers	134	23.59
Seek disagreement/avoid agreement	20	3.52
Use taboo words	2	0.35
Threaten/frighten	120	21.13
Condescend, scorn, or ridicule	119	20.95
Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect	49	8.63
Criticize	22	3.87
Hinder/block	0	0.00
Enforce role shift	0	0.00
Challenges	34	5.99
<b>Total</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>100.00</b>

### Snub

The first impoliteness strategy, that is, *snub*, was used 25 times (4.40%). According to Bousfield (2008), *snub* threatens the positive face of the interlocutor while at the same time preventing the interlocutor from interacting with the snubber. Within the context of Donald Trump’s tweets, the *snub* impoliteness strategy was employed not necessarily to disrespect others by ignoring them, as formerly

suggested by Bousfield (2008), because there was no attempt from Trump to prevent his interlocutors from conversing with him. However, as the tweets were in accordance with Culpeper's (1996) and Bousfield's (2008) argument in that *snub* attacks the positive face of the interlocutor, they were nevertheless categorized under the category of *snub*.

It is also noticeable that *snub* may overlap with *condescend*, *scorn*, or *ridicule*. However, both of them are different since the former results from the speaker's unwillingness to accept or comply with the hearer's action, whereas the latter involves relative power (Bousfield, 2008).

The following example demonstrates the realization of *snub* as a means of showing protest against electoral fraud.

(1) 20/09/29; 12:22 AM

[RT] NEVER SEEN BEFORE: Cash-For-Ballot EXCHANGE caught on camera #CashForBallots [QT] *Rigged Election!*

Another example illustrates Donald Trump's disagreement with the fact that Chuck Schumer had not been prosecuted for threatening the Supreme Court.

(2) 20/10/12; 8:34 AM

[RT] 1. Chuck Schumer threatened two justices a few months ago if they didn't rule as he demanded. Now he's insisting that Judge Barrett recuse herself from ruling on Obamacare and any election matters that may come before the Supreme Court.

[QT] He should have been prosecuted for the threats he made to the Justices. *Pathetic!*

Based on the previous examples, it can be concluded that the purpose of employing *snub* may vary depending on the situational context as long as it aims at attacking the positive face of the interlocutor.

### Disassociate from the Other

The second impoliteness strategy, *disassociate from the other*, was used 36 times (6.34). It was widely employed to suggest the idea that Donald Trump was different from the typical political figures in the United States. The most popular statement identified as *disassociate from the other* is the following tweet

in which Trump declared that he was not a politician although he was a president—who was literally considered one.

(3) 20/10/21; 8:56 PM

If I do not sound like a typical Washington politician, it's because I'm NOT a politician. If I do not always play by the rules of the Washington Establishment, it's because I was elected to fight for YOU, harder than anyone ever has before!

The following example demonstrates the use of the *disassociate from the other* impoliteness strategy in a way that Trump attempted to show that he stood with the American people, who belonged to "the heroes of Law Enforcement", and that his opponents did not stand with the American people or, in other words, belonged to the rioters.

(4) 20/09/30; 10:31 PM

I want to defend & preserve our nation's historic values. *Our opponents stand with rioters – I stand with the heroes of Law Enforcement.* Biden says Antifa is just an idea. Ideas don't assault cops & burn down buildings. Antifa is a domestic terrorist org.

Donald Trump disassociated himself from other political figures since he saw himself as "an outsider of the bigger picture of this political scene" (Wijanarko & Sembodo, 2018), given the fact that his background was business instead of politics or military.

### Be Uninterested, Unconcerned, Unsympathetic

The *be uninterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic* impoliteness strategy is among the rarest impoliteness strategies in Donald Trump's tweets. The total number of occurrences of this strategy is only seven. Apparently, this happens not only in this study but also in other studies such as Perelmutter (2018), Lorenzo-Dus et al. (2011), and Blitvich (2018). The strategy itself was mainly employed to indicate that Trump did not know and did not want to know about matters that he was not concerned with, as shown in the following example.

(5) 20/10/12; 4:14 PM

Viewership for NBA Finals Finale Crash Nearly 70%, Beaten by Random Sunday Night

Football Game

<https://breitbart.com/sports/2020/10/12/viewership-for-nba-finals-finale-crash-nearly-70-from-2019-again-beaten-by-random-sunday-night-football-game/...> via @BreitbartNews  
Maybe they were watching in China, but I doubt it. *Zero interest!*

Oftentimes, this impoliteness strategy was employed because Donald Trump previously had a dispute with another person, which eventually resulted in him being uninterested, unconcerned, or unsympathetic towards the person.

(6) 20/10/13; 6:31 PM

[RT] Will you be watching Chris Wallace this Sunday?

[QT] No thanks!

### Use Inappropriate Identity Markers

The *use inappropriate identity markers* impoliteness strategy is the most common impoliteness strategy in Donald Trump's tweets. There were 134 occurrences of this strategy. It can be noted that the realization of this strategy varies. Bousfield (2008) provided examples of the strategy using the phrase *my young fellow* or *my young feller* sarcastically. Perelmutter (2018) considered opting for feminine and neutral forms where three "grammatical genders" are available as inappropriate, and according to Wei (2020), the use of homophones and puns may suggest impoliteness.

In this study, the *use inappropriate identity markers* strategy was commonly signified extensively by giving inappropriate nicknames to Trump's political opponents, ranging from political figures to organizations. The nicknames were usually formulated by adding a degrading characteristic or quality in front of the surname, for instance, *Sleepy Joe*, *Crooked Hillary*, *Crazy Bernie*, *Mini Mike Bloomberg*, and *Little Ben Sasse* as illustrated in the following tweet.

(7) 20/10/12; 5:10 PM

*Sleepy Joe Biden* had a particularly bad day today. He couldn't remember the name of Mitt Romney, said again he was running for the U.S. Senate and forgot what State he was

in. If I did any of this, it would be disqualifying. With him, he's just *Sleepy Joe!*

In addition, Donald Trump also created a new term, namely *the Lamestream Media* to refer to media institutions that, according to him, persistently reported fake information about him.

(8) 20/10/12; 9:02 AM

SO MUCH FAKE NEWS! *The Lamestream Media* has gone absolutely insane because they realize we are winning BIG in all of the polls that matter. They write or show one false story after another. They are truly sick people. VOTE!!!

### Seek Disagreement/Avoid Agreement

There were 20 occurrences of the *seek disagreement/avoid agreement* impoliteness strategy in Donald Trump's tweets. It is particularly signified by the use of *I* or *we* to refer to Trump and/or his supporters and *s/he* or *they* to refer to his political opponents, which indicates the disagreement between both parties (Bousfield, 2008).

(9) 20/09/29; 9:34 AM

Joe wants to shut down this Country. *I want to keep it OPEN!*

Occasionally, personal pronouns were not used to demonstrate the use of the strategy. Instead, collective nouns were employed. The following example shows how collective nouns were employed as a *seek disagreement/avoid agreement* strategy.

(10) 20/10/08; 11:43 AM

Biden will Shutdown the Economy at the tip of a hat, raise your Taxes, knock out your Second Amendment and Defund, or close, your Police. The Suburbs would be next, get ready. Also, and incredibly, PACK THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. *This is not what the USA wants!!! #MAGA*

It is also interesting to note that some researchers have made distinctions on the subject of disagreement. Drawing on Masullo Chen & Lu (2017) and Teomim Ben-Menachem & Livnat's (2018) distinctions, Donald Trump's tweets that demonstrate the *seek disagreement/avoid agreement* strategy may be categorized as uncivil, undesirable

disagreement considering how Trump expressed his disagreements and the purpose of conveying the statements.

### Use Taboo Words

The *use taboo words* impoliteness strategy is the least common impoliteness strategy in Donald Trump's tweets with only two occurrences in 351 tweets. Two of the tweets were posted on October 15 and October 27. Both tweets used the typical phrase *what the hell* to demonstrate the strategy.

(11) 20/10/15; 12:27 AM

People are fleeing California. Taxes too high, Crime too high, Brownouts too many, Lockdowns too severe. VOTE FOR TRUMP, *WHAT THE HELL DO YOU HAVE TO LOSE!!!*

(12) 20/10/27; 9:03 AM

[RT] NYC Council

[QT] New York. Vote for Trump. *What (the Hell!) do you have to lose?*

However, even though *what the hell* can be categorized as an impoliteness strategy of *use taboo words*, it is considered acceptable in social contexts because it is "mildly taboo" compared to other taboo words such as *fuck* or *shit* (Culpeper, 1996). Moreover, it was employed as a booster to encourage people to take part in the election rather than to enhance the face-threatening act by insulting or offending them (Bousfield, 2008).

### Threaten/Frighten

The *threaten/frighten* is the second most common impoliteness strategy in Donald Trump's tweets after *use inappropriate identity markers*. It was identified in 120 occurrences. This strategy attacks the negative face of the interlocutor, namely freedom of action (Bousfield, 2008). The strategy was commonly employed to intimidate the citizens of the United States by making horrible presumptions that something terrible would happen if Trump was not elected as a president for the second time. Conditional sentences were frequently used to produce tweets that belong to this strategy as shown in the following example.

(13) 20/10/05; 6:30 AM

*IF YOU WANT A MASSIVE TAX INCREASE, THE BIGGEST IN THE HISTORY OF OUR COUNTRY (AND ONE THAT WILL SHUT OUR ECONOMY AND JOBS DOWN), VOTE DEMOCRAT!!!*

However, some of the realizations of the *threaten/frighten* strategy did not use conditional sentences but used coordinating conjunction *or* to provide two alternatives, one of which is unpleasant, as demonstrated in the following tweet.

(14) 20/10/05; 6:45 AM

Virginia Voters! Your Governor wants to obliterate your Second Amendment. I have stopped him. I am the only thing between you and your Second Amendment. Working hard in Virginia. It's IN PLAY. *Better Vote for your favorite President, or wave goodbye to low taxes and gun rights!*

### Condescend, Scorn, or Ridicule

This impoliteness strategy is the third most common impoliteness strategy in Donald Trump's tweets. There were 119 occurrences of the *condescend, scorn, or ridicule* strategy. It was widely employed to degrade Trump's political opponents because he intended to assert his relative power as the President of the United States.

For instance, Donald Trump purposefully condescended Joe Biden by stating that Biden's 47 years achievement was nothing compared to Trump's 47 months achievement as a president. Trump wanted to show that he was more successful than Biden because Trump was elected as the President of the United States in his first election, but Biden had never been a president despite his long political career.

(15) 20/09/29; 9:39 PM

*I did more in 47 months as President than Joe Biden did in 47 years!*

Trump also humiliated Ben Sasse with no hesitation by stating that Sasse was the least effective and was the worst of all the 53 senators from the Republican Party as shown in the following example.

(16) 20/10/07; 9:39 AM

*The least effective of our 53 Republican Senators, and a person who truly doesn't have what it takes to be great*, is Little Ben Sasse of Nebraska, a State which I have gladly done so much to help. @SenSasse was as nice as a RINO can be until he recently won the Republican....

In previous studies, the *condescend, scorn, or ridiculed* impoliteness strategy was shown to be realized in different forms. Culpeper (1996) reported the use of diminutives to belittle others. Vladimirov & House (2018) showed the use of analogy and juxtaposition to belittle others' "professional identity", and Ardila (2019) gave an example of the strategy by inquiring for a response in the form of a yes or no question.

### Explicitly Associate the Other with a Negative Aspect

There were 49 occurrences of the *explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect* impoliteness strategy in Donald Trump's tweets. Other studies, such as Bousfield (2008), provided an example of the use of this strategy by associating someone with Adolf Hitler. Moreover, Murphy (2014) provided an example of the use of this strategy by David Cameron, who made a blatant comparison between Gordon Brown and jellyfish. In Donald Trump's case, among the negative connotations used to associate Trump's political opponents are 'disaster' to form negative associations for individuals, 'catastrophe' to form negative associations for decisions, and 'puppet' to indicate someone being an accomplice to somebody else.

The following tweet demonstrates the use of 'disaster' as an impoliteness strategy.

(17) 20/10/07; 8:40 AM

[RT] The people of NYS need a change from the elected officials who have done nothing but destroy NYS State. VOTE for someone who truly cares VOTE Nicole Malliotakis for Congress

[QT] *Rose is a disaster for New York*. Not listened to, or respected, in Washington. A puppet for Pelosi!

Meanwhile, the following tweet demonstrates the use of 'catastrophe' to refer to Joe Biden's agenda which was unjust according to Trump.

(18)

20/10/12; 8:21 PM

*Joe Biden's agenda would be a catastrophe for Florida Seniors*. For years, Biden tried to cut Social Security and Medicare. Now Biden is pledging mass amnesty and federal healthcare for illegal aliens—decimating Medicare and destroying Social Security...

Last but not least, 'puppet' was commonly used to *explicitly disassociate the other with a negative aspect* as follows:

(19)

20/10/10; 2:38 PM

*Joe Biden is a PUPPET of CASTRO-CHAVISTAS like Crazy Bernie, AOC and Castro-lover Karen Bass*. Biden is supported by socialist Gustavo Petro, a major LOSER and former M-19 guerrilla leader. Biden is weak on socialism and will betray Colombia. I stand with you!

### Criticize

There were 22 occurrences of the *criticize* strategy in Donald Trump's tweets. It was a strategy that has not been widely discussed as an independent strategy within the framework of impoliteness except in Bousfield (2008). It was employed by giving advice in a demeaning instead of an embracing tone; thus, impolite.

The following tweet demonstrates the realization of this strategy by dishonoring the Commission on Presidential Debates for providing a terrible anchor and candidate.

(20) 20/09/30; 3:19 PM

[RT] BREAKING: The Commission on Presidential Debates says it will add new "tools to maintain order" to the upcoming debates after a chaotic first contest between President Trump and Democratic nominee Joe Biden. #Debates2020

[QT] *Try getting a new Anchor and a smarter Democrat candidate!*

Another realization of the strategy is by mocking Anthony "Tony" Fauci regarding his

statements about wearing a mask during the pandemic.

(21) 20/10/19; 2:08 PM

*...P.S. Tony should stop wearing the Washington Nationals' Mask for two reasons. Number one, it is not up to the high standards that he should be exposing. Number two, it keeps reminding me that Tony threw out perhaps the worst first pitch in the history of Baseball!*

According to Ardila (2019), this impoliteness strategy has been part of politicians' everyday business. However, if it is aggravated and fails to be accommodated, it may lead to demagoguery.

### Hinder/Block

This strategy was not employed in any of Donald Trump's tweets. It is probably due to the fact that the interaction was carried out asynchronously instead of synchronously. Thus, strategy rarely occurs in the context of social media in general or Twitter in particular since there is a pause between conversations.

### Enforce Role Shift

This strategy was also not found in any of Donald Trump's tweets since Trump did not seem to intentionally attempt to shift one's role to another through his tweets.

### Challenges

This impoliteness strategy was used 34 times in Donald Trump's tweets. According to Bousfield (2008), the strategy was aimed at contesting ideas and opinions made by other parties by asking a challenging question or questioning the status, perspective, value, and so on, and it has to be in the form of questions (Bousfield, 2008). As is the case with the *criticize* strategy, this strategy has not been widely discussed in previous studies other than Bousfield (2008).

In Trump's tweets, this strategy employed interrogative sentences. In the following example, *challenges* cooccurs with *threaten/frighten* as an emphasis of the statement.

(22) 20/09/30; 10:13 AM

Biden wants to Pack the Supreme Court, thereby ruining it. Also, he wants no fracking, killing our Energy business, and JOBS. Second Amendment is DEAD if Biden gets in! *Is that what you want from a leader?* He will destroy our Country! VOTE NOW USA.

Meanwhile, the following example demonstrates the use of this strategy without the *threaten/frighten* strategy to question unfair treatment by one party to another.

(23) 20/10/28; 7:34 PM

*Why isn't Biden corruption trending number one on Twitter?* Biggest world story, and nowhere to be found. There is no "trend", only negative stories that Twitter wants to put up. Disgraceful! Section 230.

## CONCLUSION

This study aims at investigating impoliteness strategies in Donald Trump's tweets during the 2020 United States presidential election, particularly between the first presidential debate and the Election Day. From 351 tweets, eleven impoliteness strategies were identified in 568 occurrences. The most common impoliteness strategy is the *inappropriate identity markers* strategy, followed by the *threaten/frighten* strategy and the *condescend, scorn, or ridicule* strategy. Trump had a tendency to use these strategies more than the others as a means of (1) attacking his political contenders while at the same time undermining them; and (2) attracting prospective voters. The high frequency of impoliteness strategies employed in Donald Trump's tweets found in this study confirms Culpeper's (1996, p. 349) compelling argument that "impoliteness behavior is not a marginal activity".

Moreover, it is interesting to note that this study has shown that impoliteness on Twitter is used by politicians, in this case Donald Trump, as a means of political campaigns. This finding contradicts Vladimirov & House's (2018) previous study, which suggested that impoliteness on Twitter is used for entertainment purposes among users by making fun of political figures. On the other hand, it is intriguing



to note that Donald Trump exhibited patterns of impoliteness on Twitter, as Lorenzo-Dus et al. (2011) previously investigated on YouTube. In the case of Donald Trump, the patterns exhibited were “general patterns of stylistic variation” (Clarke & Grieve, 2019).

Despite the strong points, the current paper has its shortcomings. Firstly, there is only a relatively small number of tweets (351 tweets) selected in this study compared to previous studies such as Schneiker (2019) and Clarke & Grieve (2019), who collected 1,469 and 21,739 tweets, respectively. Therefore, the tweets may not be representative of impoliteness in Donald Trump's tweets in general. Therefore, further studies are needed to characterize Donald Trump's impoliteness in his tweets.

## REFERENCES

- Albishri, O., Tarasevich, S., Proverbs, P., Kioussis, S. K., & Alahmari, A. (2019). Mediated public diplomacy in the digital age: Exploring the Saudi and the U.S. governments' agenda-building during Trump's visit to the Middle East. *Public Relations Review, 45*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2019.101820>
- Angelini, E., Foglia, M., Ortolano, A., & Leone, M. (2018). The “Donald” and the market: Is there a cointegration? *Research in International Business and Finance, 45*(June 2017), 30–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2017.07.129>
- Ardila, J. A. G. (2019). Impoliteness as a rhetorical strategy in Spain's politics. *Journal of Pragmatics, 140*, 160–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.11.017>
- Ax, J. (2020). The 2020 U.S. presidential election calendar: Day by day. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-timeline-idUSKBN25Y1HI>
- Aydinoğlu, N. (2013). Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies: An Analysis of Gender Differences in GERALD L. HORTON'S PLAYS. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 83*, 473–482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.093>
- Blitvich, P. G. C. (2018). Globalization, transnational identities, and conflict talk: The superdiversity and complexity of the Latino identity. *Journal of Pragmatics, 134*, 120–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.02.001>
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction* (Vol. 167). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.167>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587263>
- Choma, B. L., & Hanoch, Y. (2017). Cognitive ability and authoritarianism: Understanding support for Trump and Clinton. *Personality and Individual Differences, 106*, 287–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.10.054>
- Clarke, I., & Grieve, J. (2019). Stylistic variation on the Donald Trump Twitter account: A linguistic analysis of tweets posted between 2009 and 2018. *PLoS ONE, 14*(9), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0222062>
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 25*(3), 349–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Guo, S., Jiao, Y., & Xu, Z. (2021). Trump's effect on the Chinese stock market. *Journal of Asian Economics, 72*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2020.101267>
- Hammod, N. M., & Abdul-Rassul, A. (2017). Impoliteness strategies in English and Arabic Facebook comments. *International Journal of Linguistics, 9*(5), 97–112. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v9i5.11895>
- Jordan, K. N., Pennebaker, J. W., & Ehrig, C. (2018). The 2016 U.S. Presidential candidates and how people tweeted about them. *SAGE Open, 8*(3), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018791218>
- Klaus, J., & Koser, C. (2021). Measuring Trump: The Volfefe Index and its impact on European financial markets. *Finance Research Letters, 38*(January), 101447, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101447>

- Lorenzo-Dus, N., Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, P., & Bou-Franch, P. (2011). On-line polylogues and impoliteness: The case of postings sent in response to the Obama Reggaeton YouTube video. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(10), 2578–2593.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.03.005>
- Masullo Chen, G., & Lu, S. (2017). Online political discourse: Exploring differences in effects of civil and uncivil disagreement in news website comments. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 61(1), 108–125.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2016.1273922>
- Methias, N. W. (2011). Impoliteness or underpoliteness: An analysis of a Christmas dinner scene from Dickens's Great Expectations. *Journal of King Saud University - Languages and Translation*, 23(1), 11–18.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksult.2009.12.001>
- Murphy, J. (2014). (Im)politeness during Prime Minister's Questions in the U.K. Parliament. *Pragmatics and Society*, 5(1), 76–104.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.5.1.04mur>
- Nicolau, J. L., Sharma, A., & Shin, S. (2020). The tourism effect of President Trump's participation on Twitter. *Tourism Management*, 81(October 2019), 104133, 1–8.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104133>
- Ott, B. L. (2017). The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 34(1), 59–68.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2016.1266686>
- Paternoster, A. (2012). Inappropriate inspectors: Impoliteness and overpoliteness in Ian Rankin's and Andrea Camilleri's crime series. *Language and Literature*, 21(3), 311–324.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947012444221>
- Perelmutter, R. (2018). Globalization, conflict discourse, and Jewish identity in an Israeli Russian-speaking online community. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 134, 134–148.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.03.019>
- Schneiker, A. (2019). Telling the story of the superhero and the anti-politician as president: Donald Trump's branding on Twitter. *Political Studies Review*, 17(3), 210–223.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1478929918807712>
- Sherman, R. A. (2018). Personal values and support for Donald Trump during the 2016 US presidential primary. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 128(January), 33–38.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.02.020>
- Teomim Ben-Menachem, E., & Livnat, Z. (2018). Desirable and undesirable disagreements: Jewish women studying the talmudic texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 138, 30–44.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.08.014>
- Vladimirou, D., & House, J. (2018). Ludic impoliteness and globalization on Twitter: 'I speak England very best' #agglika\_Tsipra, #Tsipras #Clinton. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 134, 149–162.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.05.005>
- Wei, J. M. (2020). Naming candidates as preemptive discursive practice: The 2016 Taiwan presidential race. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 166, 84–96.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.05.012>
- Wijanarko, A., & Sembodo, T. J. P. (2018). Impoliteness and Power in U.S. Political Campaign Debates: The Case of Donald Trump | Wijanarko | Lexicon. *Lexicon*, 5(1), 28–37.  
<https://jurnal.ugm.ac.id/lexicon/article/view/41277>
- Zhong, W. (2018). Linguistic Impoliteness Strategies in Sina Weibo Comments. *International Journal of Linguistics & Communication*, 6(2), 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.15640/ijlc.v6n2a4>