Impoliteness On Youtube Comments Towards Yusuf Mansur About Investment Scam

Virda Natesya[1], Sondang Manik[2], Jubilezer Sihite[3]

[1, 2, 3] English Literature Department Faculty of Languages and Arts

University of HKBP Nommensen Medan, Indonesia

Email: virda.natesya@student.uhn.ac.id[1], sondang.manik@uhn.ac.id[2], jubilezer.sihite@uhn.ac.id[3]

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis Perbedaan pengucapan Diphthong antara Joe Biden dan Boris Johnson pada Abstrak - Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui lebih jauh tentang ujaran kebencian di depan umum yang umum digunakan oleh masyarakat. Akibatnya muncul persoalan, yakni mengenali jenis-jenis ketidaksopanan, jenis-jenis yang paling umum digunakan, dan bagaimana hal itu dimanifestasikan dalam komentar yang dibuat kepada Yusuf Mansur di siaran YouTube. Penelitian ini menggunakan teori Culpeper dan metodologi kualitatif. Setelah dilakukan investigasi, ditemukan bahwa Kesantunan Negatif paling banyak terjadi dengan data 52 (52%), Kesantunan Serkas/Mock dengan data 17 (17%), dan Ketidaksantunan Positif dengan data 16 (16%). Ketidaksantunan Botak di Rekam (15%) Komentar dalam penelitian ini cenderung memberikan ketidaksantunan Negatif kepada pendengar dan tidak mempertimbangkan dampak yang diterima pendengar karena ketidaksantunan semacam ini merupakan ketidaksantunan negatif.

Kata kunci: *Ketidaksopanan, Netizen, Komentar, Penipuan Investasi, YouTube*

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the Differences in pronouncing Diphthong between Joe Biden and Boris Johnson in *Abstract* - This study intends to learn more about public hate speech, which is commonly utilized by people. As a result, an issue arose, namely recognizing the sorts of impoliteness, the types most commonly utilized, and how they were manifested in comments made to Yusuf Mansur on YouTube broadcasts. This study employs Culpeper's theory and qualitative methodologies. Following the investigation, it was discovered that Negative Impoliteness was the most prevalent with data of 52 (52%), Sercasm/Mock Politeness with data of 17 (17%), and Positive Impoliteness with data of 16 (16%). Bald on Record Impoliteness (15%) The comments in this study tend to provide the listeners Negative Impoliteness and do not consider the impact received by the listeners because this sort of impoliteness is a negative impoliteness.

Keywords: *Impoliteness, Netizen, Comments, Investment Scam, YouTube*

INTRODUCTION

Due to the social nature of humans, people need more chances to interact with one another. People frequently use smartphones. Most often, written language is used to communicate. Many individuals in people's life make remarks that are quite popular in terms of economy, education, style, look, and gender. This is covered in sociolinguistics as well, where community members' remarks on the link between language and society, both positively and negatively, are taken into account. The remarks can occasionally be rude.

One of the contemporary phenomena is impoliteness. Which individuals utilize words, clauses, and sentences to communicate their feelings or dislikes. This rudeness might be displayed to someone directly or indirectly. The community's feelings might be expressed through wrath, disappointment, dislike of someone, and other emotions.

In addition to being considered as a structure, language is also seen as a social system, a means of communication, and a facet of culture. Language diversity describes the variety of

languages spoken by members of different communities. Sociolinguistics is generally concerned with the study of various languages, word choice, and word usage in society.

Culpeper Identifies five categories of impoliteness, namely; Bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness. says that rudeness may be shown nonverbally as well as verbally. Consider the way people avoid making eye contact as an example of how impoliteness is shown. It's crucial to look at paralinguistic and nonverbal elements when determining impoliteness.

Bald on Record Impoliteness

Impoliteness is typically utilized when the speaker aims to target the hearer's face and there is a lot of face-attacking. When the face is not irrelevant or minimized, the face threatening act is carried out in a direct, lucid, precise, and direct manner.

Positive impoliteness

The application of methods intended to damage the addressee's appealing personality and desire to fit in with society. A person's desire to be recognized and needed by others is shown by a positive facial expression.   According to Culpeper (1996), positive impoliteness can take many different forms, including (a) ignoring or snubbing the other person, (b) excluding the other person from an activity, (c) distancing oneself from the other, (d) acting detached or uncaring, (e) using an inappropriate identity marker, (f) using cryptic or secretive language, (g) seeking disagreement, (h) making the other person feel uncomfortable, I using tab

Negative impoliteness

Negative impoliteness is the practice of using methods intended to harm the addressee's negative face needs. Here, a person's desire to be left alone is expressed through negative facial wishes. Any competent adult member who displays negative face wants other people's restraints on their behavior. Additionally, it alludes to the desire for independence.

Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Sarcasm/mock politeness is a false behavior that threatens someone's face while using a pleasant demeanor. Sarcasm can be used to convey the opposite emotion, which suggests that the speaker is not getting his point over in its entirety. We can draw the conclusion that actual politeness is hampered by the awareness of sarcasm.

Withhold Politeness

Withhold polititness is the absence of politeness in times where it is necessary. As Culpeper (2011) pointed out, omitting to thank someone for a gift can be viewed as a deliberate lack of civility. Furthermore, withholding politeness strategies is a strategy for failing to execute as expected politeness tactics.

Baoqin, Afzaal, Younas, and Noor in (2020), tried to analyze Impoliteness Strategies and Rapport-Challenge Pragmatic Orientation in Competing Utterance; Bustan and Alakrash in (2020), An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Performed by Donald Trump Tweets Addressing the Middle East Countries; Shinta, Hamzah and Wahyuni in (2018) Impoliteness Strategies used by Supporters and Detractors of Ahok in their Online Comments by Gender; Erza and Hamzah in (2018), analyse a Impoliteness used by Haters on Instagram Comments of Male-Female Entertainers; Alias and Yahaya in (2019) Impoliteness Strategies used by Malaysian Netizens in Response to the Music Videos of Drag Queens; Pasaribu, A.N. in (2021), uncover hate speech on Joko Widodo's official Facebook about impoliteness strategies used by different gender; Alemi and Latifi in (2019), The Realization of Impoliteness in Arguments between the Democrats and Republicans over the Government Shutdown Issue in the US.

The study concept will be addressed by giving a solution based on the severity of the translation. For the data, the writer will use social media, namely YouTube comments that lead to a preacher named Yusuf Mansur.

METHOD

The qualitative method is used in this research. Qualitative descriptive research analyses data and then presents stories about the community's circumstances, behavior, and perspectives.

This study focuses on impoliteness comments made by various YouTube users in response to Yusuf Mansur's acts in connection with investment fraud. This impoliteness will be employed as information in the form of words, clauses, and sentences. The information was obtained from the Hotman Paris episode *"Eklusif! Klarisifikas Yusuf Mansur dugaan investasi bodong part 1."*

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Demonstrates the effects of Yusuf Mansur comprehension of the impoliteness inherent the comments on the Hotman Paris show YouTube channel. Including the total amount of data for each sort of impoliteness as well as the percentage of data discovered. There are four sorts of impoliteness displayed to Yusuf Mansur on the Hotman Paris YouTube Channel, namely: Bald On Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, and Sarcasm/Mock Politeness. The sort of action chosen does not instantly provide the outcomes computed using impoliteness terms in YouTube netizen comments. It was discovered negative impoliteness in notes of impoliteness as high as 52%, percent in phrases and sentences, with a total of 52 data based on speaker categorization.

Sercasm/mock politeness was identified in 17% of disrespectful remarks directed at partners/speakers. The number of persons who remarked on rudeness was 17, according to the statistics. Positive Impoliteness from upsetting statements or speakers accounts for 16% of the total. There are 16 data points that include unpleasant remarks. And the most affordable

Table1. The Percentage of Impoliteness on YouTube Comments against Yusuf Mansur

Types of Impoliteness	Impoliteness	
	Total of Impoliteness	Percentage
Bald on record impoliteness	15	15%
Positive Impoliteness	16	16%
Negative Impoliteness	52	52%
Sarcasm/Mock Politeness	17	17%
Total	**100**	**100%**

This study focuses on the use of impoliteness in Yusuf Mansur. When Yusuf Mansur was invited to the event, comments on the Hotman Paris YouTube video displayed four different sorts of rudeness. The investment case was explained by Yusuf Mansur. Internet users made a lot of rude remarks at that time. The results are divided into four categories: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness and sarcasm/mock politeness. Based on data research, Based on data research, the study discovered that Culpeper theory's Negative Impoliteness is the most dominant.

This is so because distinct objects are being used. Some studies like news, user comments on the internet, and reader feedback. While being studied, the participant who is embroiled in a scandal, Ustadz Yusuf Mansur, was the subject of netizen remarks on video YouTube. Because of this, rudeness that is offensive to others is most dominant. This is how this study's data content differs from those of other research. On YouTube, user comments are often lengthier. Because everyone may have voice an opinion via a YouTube comment. By employing the impoliteness approach, it is possible to gauge the severity of the insults that internet users direct at strangers on social media.

DISCUSSION

This section explained the discussion on the findings which had been found by the writer. The present study presented a discussion of the result of data analyze about types and the differences in the pronunciation of diphthong based on the theoretical framework by Kelly Gerald (2000). This study discusses about types of diphthong and differences pronunciation of diphthong.

Kelly Gerald divided diphthong into two of diphthong, they were centering diphthong and closing diphthong. In the present study, the writer found 35 words which included in Joe Biden and Boris Johnson speech transcription. After analyzing and finding the data, the writer found some results explained as follows.

Firstly, from types of diphthong, the results of the present study showed that there were 20 data that found in the Joe Biden and 19 data found in the Boris Johnson speech. In this study, the writer found two types of diphthong in Joe Biden and Boris Johnson speech. They were centering diphthong and closing diphthong. Closing diphthong most found in Joe Biden and Boris Johnson speech. There were 27 words that included in closing diphthong.

The present study it was found that in centering diphthong [ɪə] there is 3 words by Joe Biden, diphthong [eə] there is 2 words by Joe Biden and 3 words by Boris Johnson, diphthong [ʊə] there is 2 words by Boris Johnson. Besides, there were closing diphthong found in Joe Biden and Boris Johnson speech. They were diphthong [eɪ] there 5 words by Joe Biden and 5 words by Boris Johnson, diphthong [aɪ] there 6 words by Joe Biden and 1 word by Boris Johnson, diphthong [aʊ] there 3 words by Joe Biden and 2 words by Boris Johnson, diphthong [əʊ] there 1 word by Joe Biden and 2 words by Boris Johnson. The writer uses diphthongs to make it easier for the audience to understand every word spoken by someone.

From the analysis of the types of diphthong in Joe Biden and Boris Johnson speech transcription, in pronouncing diphthongs clear sentences, pronunciation used 2 types of diphthong. They were centering diphthong and closing diphthong. From this result, it showed some similarity and differences with previous study.

The types of diphthong in this study is closing diphthong which part of diphthong. The same result is also obtained by Dosia et al. (2017), Ponidi et al. (2021) show that there are types of diphthong founded in 2 texts which are dominated by closing diphthong. Dosia explained that production of diphthong have types, they are centering diphthong and closing diphthong. Thus, it diphthong /eɪ/ was produced 21 times, diphthong /aɪ/ was used 15 times, diphthong /ɔɪ/ was mentioned once, diphthong /aʊ/ was stated 7 times, diphthong /əʊ/ was produced 16 times.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis and findings, the researchers came to the conclusion that Hotman Paris' comments on Yusuf Mansur's YouTube video display four different forms of impoliteness. These four impoliteness categories are: Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness and Sarcasm/Mock Politeness. This researcher found 100 data found that came from comments on YouTube Hotman Paris, more comments than that were just the audience's desire for the host to investigate the guest star Yusuf Mansur who was invited to the event, and there was also support or prayer for Yusuf Mansur, requests submitted to presenters, and sweet words that use poetry.

The study determines that the most prevalent category is negative impoliteness, with 52% of the data consisting of words, phrases, and clauses. We can plainly observe the difference in the use of negative categories of impoliteness against the use of the three types of impoliteness in communicating this to Yusuf Mansur. Negative impoliteness is used to damage the partner/listener. Insults are carried out by insulting, ridiculing, degrading, and scaring the partner/speaker so that someone is happy commenting according to the demands of netizens for the crime of the partner/listener.

REFERENCES

Afzaal, M.B.M., Younas, M., Noor, U. (2020). Impoliteness Strategies and Rapport-Challenge Pragmatic Orientation in Competing Utterance. *Revista Argentina de Clínica Psicológica,* XXIX(3).

Alemi, M., Latifi, A. (2019). The Realization of Impoliteness in Arguments between the Democrats and Republicans over the Government Shutdown Issue in the US. *Russian Journal of Linguistics,* 23(1).

Alias, A., Yahaya, M.Q.A. (2019). Impoliteness Strategies Used By Malaysian Netizens In Response To The Music Videos Of Drag Queens. *International Journal of Social Science Research,* 1(2).

Benabdellah, F.Z. (2018). Impoliteness Strategies and Gender Differences among Disney Modern Protagonists. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies,* 3(4).

Bustan, E.S., Alaskrash, H.M. (2020). An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Performed by Donald Trump Tweets Addressıng the Middle East Countries. *Global Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, Vol. 1.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics 25* UK: Lancaster University.

Culpeper, J. (2005). *Impoliteness & Entertaiment in TV Quiz Show*. Lancaster: Lancaster University Press.

Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cresweel, J.W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Third edition. SAGE.

Ezra, S., Hamzah. (2018). Impoliteness Used By Haters On Instagram Comments Of Male-Female Entertainers. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature,* 7(1).

Faiqah, F., Nadjib, M., Amir, A.S. (2016). Youtube Sebagai Sarana Komunikasi Bagi Komunitas Makassarvidgram. J*urnal Komunikasi KAREBA*, 5(2).

Fauzi, N., Fatonah, K. (2020). Ketidaksantunan Berbahasa Indonesia Anak Sekolah Dasar Di Kampung Candulan Cipondoh Tangerang. *Eduscience : Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 6(1).

Hasmeed, A.F. (2020). The Realization Of Strategies Of Impoliteness In Iraqi Facebook Comments On Covid_19. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(6).

Holmes, A & Wilson, N. (2013) *An introduction to Sociolinguistics*. (5th ed). England: Pearson Education Limited. Routledge.

Ibrahim, A.H. (2020). A Socio-Linguistic Analysis of Impoliteness in Political Tweets. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change,* 11(1).

Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, C. S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge. (1th ed).

Liu, X. (2017). Impoliteness in Reader Comments on Japanese Online News Sites. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 3(2).

Mirhosseini, M., Mardanshahi, M., Dowlatabadi, H. (2017). Impoliteness Strategies Based on Culpeper's Model: An Analysis of Gender Differences between Two Characters in the movie Mother. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research,* 4(3).

Rabab'ah, G., Alali, N. (2020). Impoliteness in Reader Comments on the Al-Jazeera Channel News Website. *Journal of Politeness Research,* 16(1).

Shinta, M.V., Hamzah., Wahyuni, D. (2018). Impoliteness Strategies Used By Supporters And Detractors Of Ahok In Thei Online Comments By Gender. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature,* 7(1).

Subyantoro, Apriyanto. (2020). Impoliteness in Indonesian Language Hate Speech on Social Media Contained in the Instagram Account. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics,* Vol. 11.

Pasaribu, A.N (2021). Hate Speech On Joko Widodo's Offical Facebook: An Analysis Of Impoliteness Strategies Used By Different Gender. *ELTIN Journal: Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia ,* 9(1).

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). A*n Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd. (5th ed). p.277.

Yule, G. (2006). *The study of language* (3rd ed). New York: Cambridge University Press

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatic*. Oxford university press. (1th ed). H.G. Widdowson: Linguistics.

Zhong, W. (2018). Linguistic Impoliteness Strategies in Sina Weibo Comments. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication,* 6(2).