

Research Article

Power representation and public resistance in the hashtag discourse #BubarkanDPR: A critical discourse analysis

Muhamad Saiful Mukminin¹, Ahmad Abdul Muhhit², Libra Dui Putra³, Jefri Zolila⁴, Md. Kamruzzaman Khandoker⁵, Aqeel Ahmed⁶

^{1,2,3,4}Master of Linguistics, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

⁵English Department, City University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

⁶English Department, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq

*Corresponding author's email: muhamadsaifulmukminin@mail.ugm.ac.id

Citation: Mukminin, M. S., Muhhit, A. A., Putra, L. D., Zolila, J., Khandoker, M. K., Ahmed, A. (2026). Power representation and public resistance in the hashtag discourse #BubarkanDPR: A critical discourse analysis. *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*. 7(1), 54-72. 10.23917/sosial.v7i1.13069

Article History:

Received: September 25, 2025

Revised: October 25, 2025

Accepted: April 27, 2026

Available Online: May 9, 2026

Keywords: *hashtag discourse, power representation, public resistance*

Abstract

This study investigates how power and public resistance are represented in the digital discourse of #BubarkanDPR, a prominent case of hashtag activism in Indonesia. The research adopts a mixed-method approach, combining Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and corpus linguistics to uncover linguistic patterns, symbolic meanings, and strategies of digital resistance. A total of 1,237 posts on the X platform containing the hashtag were collected between August 20 and September 1, 2025, using Python and Node.js tweet-harvest, followed by manual data cleaning. The analysis follows Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA model, text, discourse practice, and socio-cultural practice, assisted by AntConc 4.3.1 for frequency, collocation, and concordance analysis. The findings reveal that the DPR is discursively constructed as a symbol of corruption, betrayal, and democratic failure, while netizens express resistance through delegitimization, collective mobilization, and emotionally charged or vulgar language. These discursive strategies demonstrate a growing anti-establishment ideology and public disillusionment with formal political institutions. The study contributes theoretically by integrating corpus-based CDA to examine digital democracy and resistance, showing how online linguistic practices function as acts of discursive power negotiation. It underscores the role of digital spaces as arenas of contestation where citizens reframe authority and legitimacy in Indonesia's evolving democracy. This study implies an expanded understanding of how digital discourse practices shape citizens' political consciousness and drive the transformation of power relations within modern democratic spaces.



Introduction

The development of social media in Indonesia has created a dynamic digital public sphere (Andung & Swan, 2021). Platforms such as X have become primary means for the public to express opinions, shape narratives, and expand discussion networks. The phenomenon of hashtag activism has emerged as a form of political expression as well as social critique that spreads rapidly and is easily accessible to the public (Dadas, 2017; Goswami, 2018; Zulli, 2020). Hashtags are often used to mobilize solidarity, pressure policies, or highlight specific issues (Highfield & Miltner, 2023; Östin & Lindgren, 2024). In the political context, digital discourse is important to analyze because it reflects public opinion and opens space for resistance against power. For example, criticism of the DPR RI (The House of Representatives, Republic of Indonesia) often appears through viral hashtag campaigns, reflecting public dissatisfaction with policies or the behavior of representatives. Social media, therefore, functions not only as a space for entertainment but also as an arena for contesting ideas, advocacy, and social control.

DPR was positioned as both a symbol of legislative power and a target of public criticism within digital discourse. Negative perceptions of the DPR arose because the public considered the institution to have failed in fulfilling its representative function, tended toward corruption, and was unresponsive to the people's aspirations. This situation reflected a crisis of public trust in the DPR and state institutions more broadly, where political legitimacy was questioned and legislative authority was seen as morally and socially illegitimate. This crisis triggered the emergence of hashtag activism, notably #BubarkanDPR, which became a medium for collective expression among digital citizens to voice disappointment and demands for change. The hashtag appeared in relation to various controversial cases and events, ranging from contentious policies, alleged corruption practices, to conflicts between the public and state apparatus. This phenomenon demonstrated that social media served as both an arena for public resistance and an indicator of political sentiment, where criticism of the DPR was articulated symbolically, emotionally, and collectively through digital discourse. To understand the chronology and background of the emergence of the hashtag #BubarkanDPR, consider the following timeline.

Table 1. Timeline of #BubarkanDPR

Date/Period	Event & Context	Notes
August 19, 2025	Deputy Speaker of the DPR, Adies Kadir, stated that legislators' benefits included rising fuel allowances, rice subsidies, and housing allowance worth Rp 50 million per month.	This triggered public outrage, seen as excessive amid economic hardship.
August 20, 2025	Adies Kadir clarified his statement, saying there was a miscommunication	The clarification failed to ease public anger.

Date/Period	Event & Context	Notes
August 22-24, 2025	and that basic salaries and allowances remained unchanged. Other DPR members made controversial remarks (e.g., Nafa Urbach defending housing allowances; Ahmad Syahroni calling critics <i>tolol</i> "stupid").	These statements fueled stronger dissatisfaction.
August 25, 2025	A massive protest took place in front of the DPR/MPR building in Jakarta. Demonstrators demanded: "Disband the DPR," abolish salaries and allowances, and restructure the legislature.	The hashtag #BubarkanDPR went viral on social media.
August 28, 2025	Protests escalated with clashes, water cannons, and tear gas. An online motorcycle driver, Affan Kurniawan, was killed during the incident.	His death sparked solidarity and strengthened the #BubarkanDPR movement.
Late August – Early September 2025	The hashtag continued trending widely as criticism of the DPR intensified. Lawmakers announced cuts to benefits under public pressure.	The public viewed this as a partial victory of digital and street activism.
September 1, 2025	Activists released the "17+8 Demands" (25 demands), including abolishing DPR benefits, disbanding corrupt structures, and legislative reform.	#BubarkanDPR remained a central symbol of resistance.

Source: Compiled from various Indonesian online mass media with modifications

The chronology of #BubarkanDPR illustrated the dynamics of power relations and public resistance against the DPR as a symbol of legislative authority. Statements and actions by DPR members deemed controversial triggered public anger, creating a crisis of legitimacy and trust in state institutions. The hashtag #BubarkanDPR became a collective medium for citizens to express criticism, mobilize digital solidarity, and negotiate demands for legislative reform. Public resistance emerged through a combination of online discourse and street actions, which reinforced each other and influenced the DPR's legitimacy. Events that provoked public outrage demonstrated how digital opinion could serve as a tool of social control, pressuring political elites to implement policy changes. This trend highlighted that power was not only concentrated in formal institutions but was also negotiated through public discourse and collective action. In this context, hashtag activism functioned both as an indicator and instrument of resistance, emphasizing the tension between legislative authority and the public's aspiration for representation and justice within the democratic system.

Fairclough (2013) in his book *Language and Power*, views discourse not merely as a reflection of reality but as a social practice shaped by and shaping power structures within society. According to him, discourse plays a role in the production, distribution, and consumption of meaning, thereby reinforcing or

challenging existing power relations. In the context of the hashtag #BubarkanDPR, Fairclough's approach helps explain how digital publics use language to negotiate the legitimacy of the DPR as a legislative institution. The discourse demonstrates symbolic delegitimization, where criticism is not only rational but also emotional and collective. Furthermore, Fairclough emphasizes the interaction between public discourse and socio-political structures, illustrating how digital opinion can influence policy and public perception. Thus, analysis from a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective provides a scholarly understanding of digital discourse as a site of political and social resistance.

Research on power representation and public resistance in online discourse has been widely explored, yet with varying focuses and methodological limitations. Rumaf et al. (2025), for instance, examined President Prabowo's political speech and revealed how linguistic structures reproduce nationalist ideology and hierarchical power relations. While this study demonstrates the role of discourse in legitimizing authority, it centers on elite narratives rather than bottom-up resistance. Conversely, several studies on hashtag activism emphasize social media as a participatory arena for expressing political aspirations. Fadillah & Chang (2021) showed that #2019GantiPresiden transformed dispersed online voices into a coordinated political movement, while Iskandar et al. (2025) argued that #Nazarpemilu reflected both despair toward institutional failure and an act of digital mobilization. Similarly, Tripalupi et al. (2024) and Rahmawati & Mulyani (2025) demonstrated that hashtags such as #Netizenselalubena and #PeringatanDarurat operate as counter-discourses that challenge dominant power structures.

Other scholars have extended the discussion to issues of identity, ideology, and media framing. Studies by Rosida (2021) and Dharma et al. (2023) exposed how hashtags like #Ghosting and #kadrun construct social labeling and polarization within digital culture, while Uluwiah (2025) highlighted the exclusion of youth voices in news representations of #KaburAjaDulu. Similarly, Latief & Bahar (2022) and Aisyah & Hasfi (2022) revealed how sarcasm and irony in #PercumaLaporPolisi discourses signify public disillusionment with law enforcement, aligning with Pangestu et al. (2024) and Harmoko & Purwaningrum (2022), who emphasized the ideological diversity behind trending hashtags across sociocultural contexts. Despite these contributions, most studies remain descriptive, focusing either on sentiment or thematic content rather than the linguistic mechanisms that construct power and resistance. Few have systematically integrated corpus-based CDA to examine how digital discourse simultaneously represents institutional authority and public resistance. This study addresses that limitation by situating hashtag activism within the broader framework of digital democracy, power negotiation, and resistance theory, thereby providing a more nuanced understanding of how language functions as a tool of ideological struggle in online spaces.

The aforementioned studies have generally highlighted the role of hashtags as instruments of public resistance and tools for shaping collective opinion. However, few have explicitly examined how institutional power, such as that represented by the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR), is discursively constructed in relation to public resistance expressed through hashtag activism. Moreover, existing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) research on digital movements in Indonesia tends to focus on public sentiment or discursive style, without integrating corpus-based linguistic evidence that can provide more systematic insights into linguistic patterns of resistance. This study addresses that gap by combining CDA and corpus linguistics to analyze the representation of legislative power and public resistance within the digital discourse of #BubarkanDPR. It aims to reveal how discourse structures and linguistic choices reflect power relations and ideological contestation in Indonesia's digital democracy. Specifically, this research seeks to answer two questions: (1) How is institutional power represented in the digital discourse of #BubarkanDPR? and (2) How do netizens express public resistance through linguistic and discursive strategies within the hashtag? The study contributes to CDA by extending its application to the Indonesian digital context, thereby enriching critical linguistic and media studies on power, resistance, and democratic participation in online public spaces.

Method

The study combined qualitative and quantitative approaches to examine the digital discourse of #BubarkanDPR. Qualitatively, descriptive and interpretative methods were employed to analyze language patterns, symbolism, and public resistance strategies, allowing for an in-depth understanding of the social, cultural, and ideological contexts underlying digital communication practices. Quantitatively, frequency analysis of words, hashtags, and lexicons was conducted to identify dominant patterns, term distribution, and the intensity of public expression. These quantitative findings complemented the qualitative analysis by providing empirical evidence of the prevalence of themes, criticisms, and symbols of delegitimization within the digital discourse. Together, the two approaches offered a comprehensive perspective on how public sentiment and resistance were constructed and expressed online.

The data consisted of posts on the X platform using the hashtag #BubarkanDPR. The data included texts, hashtags, and digital language expressions from the public. The research data were collected by crawling posts on the X platform using the hashtag #BubarkanDPR during the period of August 20–September 1, 2025. The data collection process was conducted using Google Colab to facilitate an integrated Python–Node.js environment for social media data crawling. The procedure began by setting up the required libraries and software dependencies. The Pandas package was installed to manage and process data in tabular form, while Node.js was configured to support the execution of the tweet-harvest tool, which is built on the Node.js framework. The installation of Node.js involved updating the system repository,

importing the NodeSource GPG key, and verifying the installation to ensure compatibility and stability.

After the environment setup, an authentication token (Twitter Auth Token) was entered to authorize access to Twitter's data. The tweet-harvest v2.6.1 package was then used to crawl data directly from the X (formerly Twitter) platform. Parameters were specified in the script, including the search keyword (in this case, #BubarkanDPR), the time range of data collection, the language filter (Bahasa Indonesia), and the maximum number of posts to retrieve. The crawling process generated a CSV output file containing tweet metadata such as text, hashtags, and timestamps. Once the data were retrieved, they were imported into Python Pandas for further processing. The dataset was cleaned by removing duplicate, irrelevant, and spam entries, ensuring that only relevant and authentic posts were retained for analysis. A total of 1,237 tweets were obtained from the crawling process. The final dataset was then ready for subsequent linguistic and discourse analysis using AntConc 4.3.1 and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) techniques.

In general, this study employed a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach using Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model, which allows for a comprehensive analysis of discourse (Fairclough, 2013). This model divides the analysis into three main dimensions. First, text analysis, which focuses on linguistic structures, word choices, metaphors, and expressive styles to understand how meaning and attitudes are constructed linguistically. Second, discourse practice, which examines how discourse is produced, distributed, and consumed within social contexts, including intertextuality and interdiscursivity with media and other discourses. Third, socio-cultural practice, which connects discourse to social, political, and cultural conditions, examining how language reflects and shapes power relations, ideology, and public resistance. This approach enables researchers not only to describe language but also to systematically and scientifically interpret the socio-political meanings underlying the discourse.

To conduct the Text Analysis, this study utilized AntConc version 4.3.1. AntConc is a corpus linguistics tool that facilitates both quantitative and qualitative examination of language patterns. The software was employed to identify wordlists, word frequencies, collocations, and KWIC (Key Word in Context), enabling the mapping of dominant keywords, relationships between words, and the contexts in which they appear. The total number of tokens obtained was 23,687 tokens. With AntConc, the researcher could systematically extract linguistic data from the digital corpus, supporting discourse interpretation and revealing language trends that indicate attitudes, resistance, and delegitimization of power institutions. The use of AntConc helped ensure that the text analysis was conducted objectively, measurably, and transparently, allowing the discourse findings to be connected to broader social practices and ideological frameworks.

Results

The results of this research were organized into three levels of analysis in accordance with the framework

of Critical Discourse Analysis. First, Text Analysis outlined lexical patterns, dominant keywords, as well as the use of metaphors and vulgar expressions that shaped the discourse construction of the DPR. Second, Discourse Practice Analysis examined how the discourse was produced, circulated, and interacted with the media and other discourses, including those of politics and morality, thereby generating intertextuality and interdiscursivity. Third, Socio-Cultural Practice Analysis elaborated on the social and cultural contexts underlying the emergence of the #BubarkanDPR discourse, including representations of power, public resistance, and the ideological meanings embedded within it.

Text Analysis

The first stage in critical discourse analysis was to describe the text linguistically through corpus data. By using the AntConc tool, the researcher was able to trace the most frequently occurring words (wordlist), the relationships among words (collocation), and the context of their occurrences in concordance lines (KWIC/Key Word in Context). This analysis was important for identifying linguistic patterns that underpinned the construction of meaning in discourse. The wordlist showed dominant words that indicated the focus of the discourse, collocation helped to understand the semantic associations formed around key words, while KWIC revealed how those words were used in particular sentences or phrases.

The identification of dominant keywords was an important step to observe the main focus of the discourse that developed in the hashtag #BubarkanDPR. Words with high frequency reflected the most discussed topics while also showing the ideological constructions that social media users intended to emphasize. In corpus analysis, the appearance of dominant keywords not only indicated the intensity of the issue but also illustrated the opposition of discourse, such as the relations between the people and state institutions, or between power and public resistance. This could be observed in the following findings:

Table 2. Wordlist Data

Wordlist	Frequency
Bubarkandpr	1.276
DPR	459
Rakyat	422
Demo	132
Indonesiagelap	104
Polisipembunuh	164
polisipembunuhakyat	117
Prabowo	91
bubarkandprsontoloyo	81
Negara	75
Tolol	73
Sahroni	71
Anjing	43
dprbebanegara	41
kompascom	31
tempodotco	12

Wordlist	Frequency
detikcom	10
dprbebanrakyat	11
dewanpenindasrakyat	11

The wordlist data demonstrates the strong construction of the #BubarkanDPR discourse in the digital sphere. The word *bubarkandpr* (1,276) is the most dominant, emphasizing the collective demand for the dissolution of the legislative body. *DPR* (459) consistently appears in negative contexts, reinforced by lexicons such as *dprbebanegara* (41), *dprbebanrakyat* (11), and *dewanpenindasrakyat* (11), which indicate symbolic delegitimization. On the other hand, the word *rakyat* (422) is constructed as the opposition, namely the oppressed party in direct confrontation with the political elite. Public resistance is also reflected in *demo* (132) and the crisis metaphor *indonesiagelap* (104). State apparatuses are represented as repressive actors through terms like *polisipembunuh* (164) and *polisipembunuhrakyat* (117). The personalization of resistance also emerges through the mention of figures such as *Prabowo* (91) and *Sahroni* (71), who are positioned as targets of criticism or symbols of political resistance. Vulgar expressions such as *tolol* (73) and *anjing* (43) appear not merely as insults but as symbolic strategies to humiliate those in power. In addition, the presence of words such as *kompascom*, *tempodotco*, and *detikcom* indicates intertextuality, showing that digital public discourse does not stand alone but interacts with mainstream media narratives. Thus, the wordlist not only maps word frequency but also reveals power relations, ideological opposition, and strategies of resistance within the digital space.

The delegitimization of the DPR as a power institution was clearly visible in the #BubarkanDPR discourse. The word "Bubarkandpr" (1.276) appeared most dominantly, reflecting the collective demand to abolish the DPR as an official state institution. Its appearance marked a public consensus in the digital space that the DPR was no longer trustworthy. In addition, the word "DPR" (459) was frequently used in a negative context, reinforcing the image of the DPR as a symbol of power that was corrupt, elitist, and detached from the people's aspirations. This representation shifted the function of the DPR from a representative body to an object of public anger and disappointment. Meanwhile, the variation "bubarkandprsontoloyo" (81) showed a more emotional and vulgar form of resistance, in which harsh language was used as a strategy of symbolic delegitimization. This indicated that public resistance was not merely rational criticism but also an outpouring of collective emotions that constructed the DPR as a failed institution, illegitimate both morally and politically. For more clarity, several examples of data excerpts could be observed as follows.

- (1) *DPR hanya memikirkan kesenangan dan kenyamanan pribadi dan gerombolan. #BubarkanDPR-RI*
DPR only thought about its own pleasure and comfort as well as that of its clique. #DisbandDPR-RI
- (2) *Kenapa rakyat ingin DPR bubar? Karena banyak Anggota DPR tidak punya adab sama sekali! Seperti kader nasdem ini! #BubarkanDPR*

- Why did the people want the DPR to be disbanded? Because many DPR members had no manners at all! Just like this NasDem cadre! #DisbandDPR
- (3) *Mendingan DPR goblok dibubarin aja deh! DPR udah gak berguna lagi buat rakyat! #BubarkanDPR #BubarkanDPRsontoloyo #bubarkandprri #BubarkanDPRGoblok*
Better to just disband the stupid DPR! The DPR is no longer useful for the people! #DisbandDPR #DisbandDRPSontoloyo #disbandthedprri #DisbandDPRStupid

The data excerpts illustrate a consistent form of delegitimization of the DPR constructed by the public through digital discourse. In excerpt (1), the DPR is represented as an institution that prioritizes personal and group interests, thereby being positioned as an elitist body detached from the people. Excerpt (2) emphasizes the rationale for dissolution by highlighting the immoral behavior of DPR members, as reflected in the expression *tidak punya adab* "lacking manners," which indicates that the legitimacy crisis concerns not only performance but also ethics. Meanwhile, excerpt (3) presents a more emotional form of resistance through the label "stupid DPR" and the hashtag variation "BubarkanDPRsontoloyo." The use of vulgar language functions as a symbolic strategy to undermine the DPR's authority while simultaneously reinforcing public outrage. Collectively, these three excerpts demonstrate a pattern of resistance that combines rational criticism with vulgar expression. It's framing the DPR as a failed, useless institution no longer worthy of representing the people.

In the #BubarkanDPR discourse, the DPR was consistently constructed as a corrupt institution, indifferent to the people, and a burden to the state. The lexicon that appeared in the wordlist reinforced the symbolic delegitimization of this institution. The words "*dprbebanegara*" (41) and "*dprbebanrakyat*" (11) emphasized the image of the DPR as a body that only drained resources without providing benefits. Meanwhile, the phrase "*dewanpenindasrakyat*" (11) framed the DPR as a betrayer of the people it was supposed to represent. The appearance of these words showed that the public not only rejected the DPR's performance but also attacked its legitimacy as a democratic institution. This representation positioned the DPR not as a symbol of representation but as the common enemy of the people. For more clarity, several examples of data excerpts could be observed as follows.

- (4) *yaallah lemes bgt liat kondisi negara:(#bubarkandpr #polisipembunuh #dprbebanegara #DPR_DewanPenindasRakyat #DPRZionisLokal*
'Oh God, I feel so weak seeing the condition of this country :(#DisbandDPR #PoliceAreKillers #DPRBurdenOfTheNation #DPRCouncilOfPeople'sOppressors #DPRLocalZionists'
- (5) *hanya penjahat yang joget joget diatas penderitaan orang lain #BubarkanDPR #DPRbebanrakyat*
'Only criminals dance on top of other people's suffering #DisbandDPR #DPRBurdenOfThePeople'
- (6) *Biar pada paham itu anggota DPR gak usah banyak tingkah dan gak perlu banyak ngomong aneh2 sm Rakyat nya! #bubarkandpr #dprbebanegara #DPR_DewanPenindasRakyat*
'So that everyone understands, DPR members don't need to show off and don't need to say weird things to the people! #DisbandDPR #DPRBurdenOfTheNation #DPRCouncilOfPeople'sOppressors'

The data above showed how the public built symbolic delegitimization of the DPR through the use

of negatively nuanced hashtags. In data (4), the phrase “dprbebanegara” emphasized the image of the DPR as an institution useless to the state. The emotional complaint “yaallah lemes bgt liat kondisi negara” reinforced the sense of pessimism toward the political situation. Data (5) presented the statement “DPRbebanrakyat” combined with sharp criticism “penjahat yang joget joget di atas penderitaan orang lain,” positioning the DPR as a party that lacked empathy and instead exploited the people’s suffering. Meanwhile, data (6) criticized the behavior of DPR members directly with the hashtag “DewanPenindasRakyat,” portraying this institution as arrogant and unworthy of speaking on behalf of the people.

Personalization of resistance in the #BubarkanDPR discourse showed that public anger was not only directed at institutions but also embodied through certain political figures. The mention of names such as Prabowo and Sahroni shifted criticism from the structural domain toward individual accountability, turning them into symbols of corruption, betrayal, or involvement in systemic failure. This strategy served to humanize abstract criticism, making resistance appear more tangible and emotional. The digital sphere also enabled direct attacks on political elites, bypassing institutional filters and reinforcing the expression of public discontent. Consider the following data examples:

- (7) *Prabowo Presiden terngawur keblinger dan terburuk sepanjang sejarah Indonesia!! #polisipembunuh #bubarkandpr*
Prabowo as President was reckless, deluded, and the worst in Indonesia’s history!! #killerpolice #disbanddpr
- (8) *Sahroni yang bilang rakyat pendemo orang yang tolol sedunia ternyata... #bubarkandpr*
Sahroni, who said that protesting citizens were the dumbest people in the world, turned out to be... #disbanddpr

Data (7) and (8) illustrated the personalization of public resistance through the direct mention of political figures. In data (7), Prabowo was positioned as a failed president, with evaluative terms such as “terngawur” (reckless), “keblinger” (deluded), and “terburuk” (the worst) serving to delegitimize his leadership both morally and politically. The inclusion of hashtags #polisipembunuh and #bubarkandpr expanded the criticism by linking Prabowo to the repressive actions of the security apparatus and the demand for the dissolution of the DPR, thereby turning him into a symbol of state failure. Meanwhile, in data (8), Sahroni was constructed as an arrogant elite who demeaned the people, particularly through his statement that labeled demonstrators as “orang tolol sedunia” (the dumbest people in the world). This criticism underscored the distance between representatives and the represented, while highlighting the moral unworthiness of a politician. Thus, both data sets demonstrated a discursive strategy in which individual figures were made to embody institutional failure, making personal attacks simultaneously reinforce institutional delegitimation.

Vulgar expressions such as *tolol* (stupid) and *anjing* (dog) did not merely appear as forms of insult

but functioned as symbolic strategies to demean those in power. The choice of harsh words reflected public anger toward political elites who were perceived as having failed to fulfill the people's mandate. By employing vulgar language, society not only vented emotions but also emphasized a stance of resistance that was firm and uncompromising. Consider the following data examples:

- (9) *Dpr Anjing #demo #BubarkanDPR #bubarkandpr*
 DPR is a dog #demo #DisbandDPR #disbanddpr
- (10) *mau memperbaiki dengan cara apa kalian wahai anggota DPR rakyat sudah muak semua kebijakanmu tolol benar saja rakyat turun ke jalan untuk #BubarkanDPR panjang umur perjuangan*
 How do you expect to fix things, you members of the DPR? The people are fed up — all your policies are stupid. No wonder the people took to the streets for #BubarkanDPR. Long live the struggle

The expressions “anjing” (dog) and “tolol” (stupid) illustrated a form of public resistance expressed vulgarly as a symbolic strategy to delegitimize power. The word *anjing* functioned as a metaphor of dehumanization, reducing the dignity of the DPR from a position of honor to one of disgrace. Meanwhile, the word *tolol* served to reinforce the perception of incompetence and foolishness among DPR members in making policies. These expressions were not merely emotional insults but rather representations of collective disappointment toward a state institution perceived as failing to carry out its democratic function. By incorporating vulgar language into digital discourse, the public strengthened the solidarity of resistance and created a moral oppositional identity against the DPR.

Discourse Practice Analysis

The production of discourse in the hashtag #BubarkanDPR was carried out by the digital public actively engaged on X. Collectively, they utilized social media spaces as arenas to express disappointment, criticism, and resistance toward the DPR. Through the practice of hashtag activism, the public created a sense of solidarity bound by a narrative of resistance. The hashtag functioned as a tool to connect individual voices into a collective conversation, thereby constructing symbolic power to challenge the DPR's legitimacy. This activity reflected not only spontaneous resistance but also an organically organized discursive strategy. In this context, the public demonstrated an active role as producers of discourse rather than mere consumers of information. They formulated messages, disseminated them, and generated wide resonance. This indicates that digital discourse has become a primary medium for society in redefining power relations and articulating resistance against political institutions perceived as failing.

The circulation of discourse was marked by interactions between the digital public and mainstream media. Words such as “*kompascom, tempodotco, detikcom*” found in the corpus data demonstrate that the #BubarkanDPR discourse was not confined to social media but was also linked to national media coverage. This intertextuality underscores that public resistance discourse successfully penetrated the domain of professional journalism, thereby granting the issue of dissolving the DPR broader legitimacy and visibility. The media functioned as a channel that amplified public voices while extending the discourse's reach to

more heterogeneous audiences. Such circulation illustrates that digital discourse does not operate in isolation but interacts dynamically with news production and media narratives. Consequently, public resistance was articulated not only within the virtual sphere but also in the wider social arena through media reporting.

Interdiscursivity in the #BubarkanDPR discourse is clearly evident through the blending of multiple discursive domains. The protest discourse demanding the dissolution of the DPR is intertwined with political discourse, where the names of figures such as Prabowo, Puan Maharani, and Sahroni become targets of criticism. In addition, public figures such as Uya Kuya and Eko Patrio are also mentioned, illustrating how political discourse permeates the popular sphere. Moral discourse likewise emerges through words such as *rakyat, bangsa, keadilan* "people, nation, justice," which emphasize the moral legitimacy of public demands. The convergence of political, protest, moral, and popular discourses demonstrates that digital resistance is not monolithic but hybrid in nature. This interdiscursivity enriches the meaning of the #BubarkanDPR discourse and enhances its appeal to diverse audiences. Thus, the discourse is not merely an expression of anger but also a symbolic arena where politics, morality, and popular culture interact to shape a collective identity of public resistance.

Socio-Cultural Practice Analysis

The socio-cultural practice within the #BubarkanDPR discourse illustrates how social media has become a key arena for public expression amid a political trust crisis. The DPR is no longer positioned as the people's representative but as a symbol of democratic failure. Terms such as *bubarkandpr*, *dprbebanegara*, and *dewanpenindasrakyat* construct an image of the DPR as useless and even detrimental to society. Within digital political culture, this delegitimization goes beyond formal criticism, materializing in ridicule, insults, and viral negative metaphors. The digital sphere thus functions as both a channel for articulating frustration and a form of resistance. Culturally, the public inverts traditional power relations: whereas elites once monopolized control, people's voices now converge massively through digital networks. This marks a significant shift, as politics is no longer confined to parliaments or mainstream media but extends into digital spaces as symbolic battlegrounds.

Public resistance in this discourse manifests in three main forms: delegitimization, collective calls, and emotional expressions. Delegitimization is performed through negative labels such as *rats*, *burden of the state*, or *traitors to the people*, which deconstruct the DPR's public image. Collective calls surface through hashtags such as *#stopbayarpajak*, *#resetindonesia*, and *#revolusi*, signaling the people's desire to reclaim control over the nation's fate. Emotional expressions appear in vulgar terms such as *stupid* and *dog*, which function not merely as insults but as symbolic strategies to shame those in power. This pattern of resistance

demonstrates that the socio-cultural practices of the digital public are shaped not only by rational argumentation but also by affective dimensions. In this way, digital communities strengthen solidarity among those who feel oppressed while constructing a collective identity of the people united against political elites.

The ideological meanings embedded in the #BubarkanDPR discourse reflect a deep crisis of trust in state institutions. The public explicitly rejects the DPR as a morally and politically legitimate body. The discourse reveals an anti-establishment ideology in which the state is perceived as failing to protect the people and instead oppressing them through repressive apparatuses such as the police and Brimob. The representation of the police as *pembunuh rakyat* 'murderers of the people' reinforces that criticism extends beyond the DPR to the broader system of power deemed defective. From a socio-cultural perspective, this represents resistance against structures of domination. Legitimacy is no longer attributed to the state but to the solidarity of the people. This phenomenon shows how digital democracy enables the emergence of counter-ideologies rooted in collective disillusionment.

Personal branding of political figures also plays a role in this socio-cultural practice. Names such as Prabowo, Sahroni, and Puan Maharani, along with celebrities like Uya Kuya and Eko Patrio, appear in the discourse. This demonstrates that public resistance is directed not only toward institutions but also toward individuals perceived as representing systemic failure. In digital culture, these figures become personified targets of criticism. Critique thus becomes both structural and personal, creating a space in which political elites must confront public opinion directly. This phenomenon reflects the transformation of political culture in the social media era, where the public can directly influence the image and reputation of elites without relying on traditional media intermediaries. As such, the socio-cultural practice of this discourse highlights how politics has become increasingly intertwined with digital dynamics, where elite reputations can collapse under the collective power of the people.

The circulation of discourse in this case also demonstrates the close interaction between social media and mainstream media. The appearance of terms such as *kompascom*, *tempodotco*, and *detikcom* signals intertextuality, where the public quotes, contests, or amplifies media narratives. In socio-cultural practice, this reveals that political meaning-making is now polyphonic, i.e. no single authority dominates but rather multiple discourses compete for legitimacy. Social media provides space for the people to challenge dominant narratives usually monopolized by the state or major media outlets. Thus, the #BubarkanDPR discourse is not merely an emotional expression but part of a broader cultural shift in Indonesian politics. Digital democracy enables citizens to construct counter-narratives, articulate anti-establishment ideologies, and distribute resistance widely. This practice highlights how contemporary socio-cultural life shapes a new political sphere in which state legitimacy is contested in digital arenas that are fluid, massive, and resistant.

Discussion

This study found that the #BubarkanDPR discourse reflected a crisis of public trust in the legislative body, which was perceived as no longer fulfilling its role as the people's representative. Scientifically, this phenomenon could be explained through the concept of symbolic delegitimation, namely the use of language as an instrument to dismantle the image and authority of a power institution. Through corpus analysis, it was evident that the high frequency of the word *bubarkandpr* signaled the presence of a digital consensus that went beyond individual criticism and developed into a collective demand to abolish the institution. This showed that language in social media functioned as a political arena of resistance, where linguistic symbols were employed to challenge the legitimacy of formal power. This phenomenon was in line with Fairclough's (2013) theory, which emphasized that discourse not only represented reality but also shaped and constructed social reality. Thus, the #BubarkanDPR discourse was not merely a spontaneous critique, but a social practice reflecting the political consciousness of digital society toward the crisis of representation. This awareness further strengthened the position of social media as a space for articulating public resistance and as a tool for building collective solidarity in challenging power hegemony.

The pattern of public resistance in the #BubarkanDPR discourse was clearly evident through the use of vulgar lexicon, animal metaphors, and negative labeling directed at the DPR and state apparatus. Linguistically, this strategy functioned to undermine symbolic authority and deconstruct the image of power that was previously considered legitimate and authoritative. Words such as *tolol* (stupid) and *anjing* (dog) were not merely insults but also served as symbolic instruments to negate the moral and political legitimacy of the legislative institution. From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, this phenomenon could be understood as a discursive practice that constructed an ideological opposition between the people and the rulers. Social media provided a relatively free space for expression, enabling the public to voice criticism using nonformal, emotional, and even vulgar language. This trend indicated a shift in how the public expressed resistance: from formal discourse to more direct and aggressive symbolic expression. The findings aligned with Bersch & Lotta (2024), Salamon & Saunders (2024), and Velkova & Kaun (2021), who showed that digital media often served as arenas for reproducing resistance, where language strategies that challenged formal norms were used to strengthen group solidarity and amplify the impact of criticism toward power institutions.

The connection between public discourse and mainstream media in the #BubarkanDPR discourse demonstrated a significant pattern of intertextuality. The appearance of keywords such as *kompascom* and *tempodotco* indicated that digital discourse did not exist in isolation but rather interacted with and shaped the legitimacy of narratives through media coverage. Scientifically, this phenomenon illustrated the

mechanism of discourse circulation in the digital era, where public narratives were reinforced through cross-channel repetition and integration with mainstream information sources. From Van Dijk's (2012) perspective, this practice reflected a dialectical relationship between public discourse and broader social structures, in which public opinion and criticism could shape collective perceptions of institutions. Studies on the #OccupyWallStreet movement similarly confirmed this pattern, showing that hashtag activism relied on the amplification of narratives through mainstream media to achieve wider social resonance (Castañeda, 2012; Gerbaudo, 2023; Neu & Saxton, 2025; Penney & Dadas, 2014). Thus, this intertextuality underscored the role of media as both mediator and legitimizer of digital discourse.

The discussion of analytical findings can be linked to theoretical frameworks such as the logic of connective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012), digital movements (Jeppesen, 2018), and networked movements (Castells, 2015) to strengthen the understanding of the #BubarkanDPR movement's dynamics. In this context, citizens' political participation no longer depends on formal organizations but rather on individual interconnectedness through digital media, enabling collective action based on personal identity and shared emotions. According to Bennett & Segerberg (2012), digital movements operate through a logic of connectivity rather than membership, as reflected in the spontaneous spread of hashtags and resistance narratives. Castells (2015) further emphasizes that digital networks play a crucial role in shaping a new public sphere where power and resistance are renegotiated. Thus, integrating these theories helps explain how public resistance within #BubarkanDPR represents a new form of networked political activism grounded in social connectivity.

The findings indicated a strong anti-establishment ideology within the #BubarkanDPR discourse. Scientifically, this phenomenon could be explained through a crisis of political representation, in which state institutions were perceived as failing to meet public expectations, thereby triggering digital resistance. The frequency of words such as *rakyat* (the people), *demo* (demonstration), and *indonesiagelap* (dark Indonesia) reflected heightened political awareness based on collective emotion, signaling intense public engagement in critiquing state institutions. This phenomenon aligned with Castells' (2015) findings on networked movements, where digital movements combined emotional expression, symbolic actions, and political demands simultaneously. Thus, digital discourse not only reflected public dissatisfaction but also functioned as a mechanism for social and political mobilization.

Public resistance expressed through the #BubarkanDPR movement demonstrates a significant shift in patterns of citizens' political participation in the digital era. Social media has become a new arena for society to channel aspirations and criticism toward political power in a rapid, open, and massive manner. Through this hashtag, the public builds virtual solidarity and organizes symbolic forms of resistance against political institutions perceived to have lost legitimacy. Political participation is no longer dependent on

physical actions in public spaces but has shifted toward digital activities based on networks and collective emotions. This phenomenon signifies the emergence of a new participatory democracy, in which netizens act as active political agents who shape opinions, influence policies, and redefine the relationship between the people and those in power. Thus, #BubarkanDPR reflects a paradigm shift from traditional political participation toward a more fluid, egalitarian, and interactive form of digital resistance.

In addition, this study extends previous hashtag activism research by emphasizing the intertextual circulation between digital discourse and mainstream media, illustrating how online narratives gain legitimacy through cross-platform reinforcement. Unlike earlier works that treated social media as an isolated arena of expression, this research reveals its dynamic interaction with journalistic discourse, thereby amplifying the reach and credibility of public resistance. The integration of corpus linguistics and CDA also provides a more empirical and systematic understanding of how linguistic patterns embody ideological stances. However, the study recognizes several limitations, including the representativeness of Twitter data, which may not fully capture broader public sentiment, and the short timeframe of data collection, which constrains longitudinal interpretation. Despite these constraints, the findings offer valuable insight into the evolving forms of digital resistance and the growing role of social media as a site of ideological contestation in Indonesia's political landscape.

Conclusion

The hashtag discourse #BubarkanDPR reflected a profound crisis of public trust in political institutions and a strong form of digital resistance. The DPR was constructed not as a representative body but as a symbol of corruption, betrayal, and the failure of democracy. Public resistance emerged through delegitimization, collective calls for change, and the use of emotional as well as vulgar expressions as symbolic strategies of opposition. The discourse was also interdiscursive, blending protest narratives with political, moral, and media contexts, which strengthened its reach and impact. Overall, the findings highlighted how digital spaces functioned as arenas of power contestation, where the people sought to reposition themselves as the true holders of sovereignty. This revealed an ideological shift toward anti-establishment sentiments and underscored the role of digital democracy in shaping new forms of resistance against state power.

This research had certain limitations as it focused solely on a critical discourse analysis of the hashtag #BubarkanDPR on X, restricting the scope of data to a single social media platform. Moreover, it did not explore in depth the psychological factors of individual users or the socio-economic contexts underlying the emergence of public resistance. The analysis primarily emphasized the representation of power and forms of symbolic resistance without linking them to the tangible impacts on political policies or democratic dynamics. Therefore, future studies were recommended to broaden the data scope by including various

digital platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, or Facebook to capture a more diverse discourse landscape. Subsequent research could also adopt a multidisciplinary approach, incorporating perspectives from political sociology, social psychology, or media studies to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how public resistance was formed, circulated, and influenced power relations within the political sphere.

Author's Contributions

Muhamad Saiful Mukminin contributed to conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, and writing—original draft preparation of the manuscript. **Ahmad Abdul Muhhit** was responsible for the literature review. **Libra Dui Putra** and **Jefri Zolila** contributed to data collection. **Md. Kamruzzaman Khandoker** and **Aqeel Ahmed** were involved in writing—review and editing, particularly in grammar checking. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

All authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Data Availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Funding Info

The authors explicitly declare that this research did not receive any external funding.

References

- Aisyah, I., & Hasfi, N. (2022). Opini Publik dalam Gerakan Tagar #percumalaporpolisi di Media Sosial Twitter. *Interaksi Online*, 10(3), 605–618. <https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/interaksi-online/article/view/34985>
- Andung, P. A., & Swan, M. V. D. P. (2021). The Dynamics of Public Sphere in Social Media: Cybermedia Analysis. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 6(1), 42–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v6i1.825>
- Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 739–768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.670661>
- Bersch, K., & Lotta, G. (2024). Political Control and Bureaucratic Resistance: The Case of Environmental Agencies in Brazil. *Latin American Politics and Society*, 66(1), 27–50. <https://doi.org/10.1017/lap.2023.22>
- Castañeda, E. (2012). The Indignados of Spain: A Precedent To Occupy Wall Street. *Social Movement Studies*, 11(3–4), 309–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2012.708830>
- Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Dadas, C. (2017). Hashtag Activism: The Promise and Risk of "Attention." *Social Writing/Social Media: Publics, Presentations, Pedagogies*, 17–36. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2017.0063.2.01>
- Dharma, F. A., Hariyanto, D., & Muharram, F. (2023). Construction of Political Identity on Instagram: Unveiling the Kadrun Hashtag Movement in Indonesia's 2024 Presidential Election. *Academia Open*, 8(2), 10–21070. <https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.8.2023.6922>
- Fadillah, D., & Chang, J. (2021). The Song# 2019GantiPresiden and Political Communication in Simulacra Analysis. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 6(2), 292–302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v6i2.935>

- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Language and Power*. Routledge.
- Gerbaudo, P. (2023). From Occupy Wall Street to The Gilets Jaunes: On The Populist Turn in The Protest Movements of The 2010s. *Capital & Class*, 47(1), 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03098168221137207>
- Goswami, M. P. (2018). Social media and hashtag activism. *Liberty Dignity and Change in Journalism*, 1, 252–262.
- Harmoko, D. D., & Purwaningrum, P. W. (2022). Dimensi Sosiokultural Terhadap Tagar di Twitter Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Telaah*, 7(2), 192–201. <https://doi.org/10.31764/telaah.v7i2.6704>
- Highfield, T., & Miltner, K. M. (2023). Platformed Solidarity: Examining the Performative Politics of Twitter Hashflags. *Convergence*, 29(6), 1641–1667. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13548565231199981>
- Iskandar, D., Raharjo, D. H., Ngimadudin, N., Liliyana, L., & Nurapriyanti, T. (2025). Digital Political Discourse in #nazarpemilu Unique Hashtag on X/Twitter in The 2024 Indonesian Presidential Election. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 9(1), 191–206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v9i1.1556>
- Jeppesen, S. (2018). Digital movements: Challenging contradictions in intersectional media and social movements. *Communicative Figurations*, 21, 1–25.
- Latief, R., & Bahar, N. (2022). Cyberactivism sebagai Budaya Populer: Analisis Wacana Hashtag #PercumaLaporPolisi di Twitter. *Jurnal Dakwah Tabligh*, 23(1), 39–65. <https://doi.org/10.24252/jdt.v23i1.29301>
- Neu, D., & Saxton, G. D. (2025). Twitter Bots, Democratic Deliberation and Social Accountability: The Case of #OccupyWallStreet. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 38(3), 934–964. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-01-2023-6234%0A>
- Östin, E., & Lindgren, S. (2024). Bridging Activism and Party Politics: Mapping Frame Alignment Processes in Politicians' Use of Hashtags. *Social Media+ Society*, 10(2), 20563051241245668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051241245668>
- Pangestu, A., Rahmat, A., & Anoegrajekti, N. (2024). Analisis Wacana Kritis Tagar Foodporn dan Halalfood pada Instagram. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Indonesia*, 411–424. <https://adisampublisher.org/index.php/nasional/article/view/850>
- Penney, J., & Dadas, C. (2014). (Re) Tweeting in The Service of Protest: Digital Composition and Circulation in The Occupy Wall Street Movement. *New Media & Society*, 16(1), 74–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813479593>
- Rahmawati, S. A., & Mulyani, W. (2025). Analisis Wacana Kritis pada Tagar “Peringatan Darurat” di Media Sosial X. *Etnolinguist*, 9(1), 89–93. <https://doi.org/10.20473/etno.v9i1.67712>
- Rosida, S. (2021). Hashtag #Ghosting Sebagai Representasi Konten Tiktok: Analisis Wacana Kritis Teun A. Van Dijk. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik Dan Sastra (SEMANTIKS)*, 3, 218–230. <https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/prosidingsemantiks/article/view/53005>
- Rumaf, N., Anshori, D. S., Damaianti, V. S., Sastromiharjo, A., & Al Jumroh, S. F. (2025). Representasi Kekuasaan dalam Teks Pidato Presiden Prabowo Subianto: Tinjauan AWK Norman Fairclough. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 11(2), 2111–2124. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v11i2.5790>
- Salamon, E., & Saunders, R. (2024). Domination and The Arts of Digital Resistance in Social Media Creator Labor. *Social Media+ Society*, 10(3), 20563051241269320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051241269318>
- Tripalupi, M. F., Aini, H. N., & Ayodya, B. P. (2024). Kajian Resistensi Sosial Pengguna Media Sosial X Dalam Tagar# Netizenselalubelar Melalui Analisis Jaringan Komunikasi. *KOMUNIKATIF: Jurnal Ilmiah Komunikasi*, 13(2), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.33508/jk.v13i2.5811>
- Uluwiah, A. R. (2025). Representasi Generasi Muda Dalam Fenomena# KaburAjaDulu: Analisis Wacana Kritis Theo Van Leeuwen Terhadap Teks Berita Media Daring. *Jurnal Dinamika Pendidikan Nusantara*, 6(2), 463–485. <https://ejournals.com/ojs/index.php/jdprn/article/view/1986>

- Van Dijk, T. A. (2012). Structures of discourse and structures of power. In *Communication yearbook 12* (pp. 18–59). Routledge.
- Velkova, J., & Kaun, A. (2021). Algorithmic Resistance: Media Practices and The Politics of Repair. *Information, Communication & Society, 24*(4), 523–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1657162>
- Zulli, D. (2020). Evaluating Hashtag Zctivism: Examining The Theoretical Challenges and Opportunities of #BlackLivesMatter. *Participations, 17*(1), 197–215. <https://www.participations.org/17-01-12-zulli.pdf>