

Deviations from Politeness Principles in Humor Content on The YouTube Account @Tretan Universe

Fatimah Nurul Ramadhani^{1*}, Markhamah²

^{1,2} Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to describe and analyze the forms of politeness principle deviations in humorous content on the @Tretan Universe YouTube account. The phenomenon warrants investigation as it involves intricate communication strategies that balance humor creation with linguistic propriety. Employing a qualitative descriptive approach, this research analyzes utterances from the 22-minute podcast "Reveal Mutants 'SUGENG TUMBLER' ft. Obing." Data collection employed non-participant observation and note-taking techniques, with analysis conducted using the distributional method and validated through theoretical triangulation. Findings identify five violation types: (1) tact maxim violations (3 instances) through unfavorable comparisons, direct criticism, and repetitive queries; (2) generosity maxim violation (1 instance) via self-benefit maximization; (3) approbation maxim violations (3 instances) through disparagement, inappropriate analogies, and interlocutor belittlement; (4) agreement maxim violations (2 instances) via uncooperative responses and repetitive questioning; and (5) sympathy maxim violation (1 instance) through antipathy maximization. These violations demonstrate that politeness breaches in humorous content constitute not merely instances of impoliteness but rather deliberate communicative strategies employed to establish rapport with the audience.

Keywords: deviations from politeness principles, digital comedy, humor

Introduction Section

Language serves as the primary instrument of human communication. According to Siregar et al. (2023), language functions as a communicative tool in both individual and group interactions, enabling communication and interaction in daily life. Furthermore, Keraf, as cited in Tambunan (2022), argues that language serves three fundamental functions: as a means of communication, self-expression, and social control. It is commonplace for interlocutors to comprehend the speaker's intended message during verbal exchanges, thereby facilitating effective communication that adheres to established conventions. Consequently, communication necessitates an instrument or mutual agreement, namely, language.

Communication refers to the expression or intention of a speaker conveyed to an interlocutor through words or symbols. According to Nurjaman et al. (2024), communication constitutes a process of sharing information, including ideas, thoughts, and messages from one individual to another, enabling both parties to derive benefits. Therefore, communication fundamentally depends on the knowledge possessed by individuals when receiving or conveying information to their interlocutors. Speech participants should observe various rules governing the communicative process. Thus, communicative objectives can be achieved effectively and exert influence from the speaker to the interlocutor.

Effective communication occurs when the parties involved—speakers and listeners—adhere to mutually agreed-upon rules. According to Liliyan et al. (2023), both parties must acknowledge the existence of norms that govern actions, linguistic principles, and interpretation in conversation. In the pragmatic context, communication encompasses not only linguistic aspects but also social and contextual dimensions that influence the meaning of utterance (Rahardi, 2020). This aligns with Yule's perspective (as cited in Rizky, 2024), which posits that pragmatics examines how context influences meaning interpretation in communicative interactions. However, one party may occasionally deviate from expected speech patterns for specific purposes, such as joking, mocking, or teasing. Such deviations can hinder the establishment of rapport or even trigger conflict due to misunderstanding. According to Wijana and Rohmadi (as cited in Ardia & Safitri, 2025), communicative deviations may occur due to various factors, including differences in cultural background, communicative objectives, and situational context. One frequently occurring form of deviation involves violations of politeness principles in communication.

An individual who violates principles of propriety or politeness maxims in speech may be perceived as discourteous or impolite. Consequently, in communication, each participant must adapt to applicable rules to avoid causing harm, hurt feelings, or demeaning others. Leech (1983) explicates that the politeness principle encompasses several maxims: (a) tact maxim, (b) generosity maxim, (c) approbation maxim, (d) modesty maxim, (e) agreement maxim, and (f) sympathy maxim.

* Corresponding author: mar274@ums.ac.id

This politeness principle functions to maintain social equilibrium and avoid conflict in verbal interaction (Hidayah & Nazirun, 2024). In other words, effective communication is communication that observes and implements these maxims.

In the current digital era, communicative phenomena have undergone significant development through various social media platforms, including YouTube. This platform functions not only as entertainment media but also as a space for verbal interaction that reflects the dynamics of language use in informal contexts (Androutsopoulos, 2020). Content produced on YouTube frequently displays freer and more entertaining communicative styles, yet not infrequently contains deviations from linguistic politeness norms.

Communication that observes politeness maxims includes humor-based communication. Humor or joking functions to entertain oneself and others. According to Danasaputra et al. (2023), humor constitutes an attitude adopted by individuals to evoke cheerfulness and elicit laughter from audiences. Humor aims to provoke audience laughter through entertainment and frequently employs character exaggeration to create comic effects. Within the pragmatic context, humor is often constructed through violations of conversational principles, including politeness maxims (Attardo, 2020). This strategy creates tension between normative expectations and utterance reality, thereby generating comic effects.

Humor manifests in various artistic forms, including literature, theater, film, and advertising, with the primary objective of delighting audiences. Humor may be performed anywhere, provided it aligns with contextual conditions. One such instance can be found on the YouTube channel @Tretan Universe. This YouTube channel produces content in the form of humorous podcasts featuring individuals with special needs. Content on this YouTube channel, particularly the video entitled "Reveal Mutants 'SUGENG TUMBLER' ft. Obing" with a duration of 22 minutes and 15 seconds, contains pronounced humorous elements. The video features the discovery of a new "mutant," namely "Sugeng," with Tretan Muslim serving as the MC.

The phenomenon of humor utilization in digital content, particularly that involving individuals with special needs, raises intriguing ethical and linguistic questions worthy of examination. On one hand, humor can function as a vehicle for social inclusion and normalization (Martin & Ford, 2018); on the other hand, it potentially creates stigmatization if not managed judiciously. Within this context, analysis of politeness maxim deviations becomes highly relevant for understanding the communicative dynamics that occur.

In this content, the researcher identified politeness maxim deviations committed by Tretan Muslim when communicating with "Sugeng" or "Obing." These deviations merit investigation because they occur within a humorous context possessing distinctive characteristics. According to Navarro-Carrillo et al. (2021), maxim deviations in humor do not invariably carry negative connotations but may function as strategies for creating solidarity and constructing group identity. However, the boundary between acceptable humor and potentially offensive humor becomes exceedingly thin, particularly within public communication contexts on social media. The objective of this article is to examine the forms of politeness maxim deviations in humorous content on the @Tretan Universe YouTube account.

Research on politeness maxim deviations has been conducted by several researchers, including Mangkudilaga & Surana (2022), Zazula & Surana (2023), Aziz & Gintings (2022), Syafutri et al. (2023), Minaliawati & Pujiati (2022), and Fadilla & Wulandari (2023). Based on these studies, researchers have identified politeness maxim deviations across various objects of investigation. The distinction between this research and previous studies lies in several aspects. First, the specific research object humorous podcast content on the @Tretan Universe YouTube channel, possesses unique characteristics in language use and humor strategies. Second, the communicative context involving individuals with special needs as interviewees provides an additional dimension to politeness analysis in language. Third, this research not only identifies forms of deviation but also analyzes the communicative purposes underlying these deviations within the digital humor context. Given this research gap, this study is essential to conduct.

Method

This study employs qualitative research methods. According to Rohmadi & Nasucha (2017), qualitative research emphasizes data in the form of combinations of diction, clauses, discourse, and phrases obtained in the field. This definition aligns with that proposed by Abdussamad (2021), who states that qualitative research methods constitute research methods used to investigate natural object conditions, in which the researcher serves as the key instrument, data collection techniques employ triangulation, data analysis is inductive in nature, and qualitative research results emphasize meaning rather than generalization. This research employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive method. This method was selected because the research aims to describe and analyze forms of politeness maxim deviations in humorous content. The research object comprises a YouTube video on the @Tretan Universe account entitled "Reveal Mutants 'SUGENG TUMBLER' ft. Obing." The research subjects include Tretan Muslim, Sugeng, and Obing. The data in this research consist of utterances in dialogues containing politeness maxim deviations. The data source for this research is the YouTube video with the aforementioned title. Data collection techniques included non-participant observation and note-taking. Data validity was tested using theoretical triangulation. Data analysis in this research employed the distributional technique.

This research examines content involving individuals with special needs, thereby requiring particular attention to research ethics aspects. The analyzed video constitutes public content uploaded on the YouTube platform with full participation from all involved parties (Fazeli et al., 2023). The analytical focus is directed toward linguistic phenomena and communication strategies in humorous discourse, not to assess or judge the individuals involved. The researcher

endeavors to avoid language use or interpretations that might generate stigma or demean participants. It should be noted that humor in this content transpires within the framework of established relationships among participants, where all parties contribute to creating entertainment value. This research strives to contribute to understanding how humor operates in digital media while continuing to respect the dignity of all parties involved in the content.

Result and Discussion

This research investigates the forms of politeness maxim deviations in the @Tretan Universe YouTube account. These maxim deviations were identified in a podcast video entitled "Reveal Mutants 'SUGENG TUMBLER' ft. Obing," which has a duration of 22 minutes and 15 seconds. The data in this research consist of utterances spoken by Tretan Muslim as MC, Obing as Co-Host, and Sugeng as the guest speaker. Based on the research conducted, forms of politeness maxim deviations were found in the tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim.

Tact Maxim Deviations

The principle in the tact maxim, according to Leech (1983), stipulates that speech participants must minimize harm to others and maximize benefits for interlocutors. However, speech participants frequently utter their speech with the intention of harming others, without considering the consequences of their utterances. Based on the research conducted, tact maxim violations were found in three categories: minimizing harm to others through comparison and showing weaknesses, direct reprimands, and repetitive questioning.

1) Tact maxim deviations through comparison and showing weaknesses

(1) Obing: "Prabowo"

Tretan Muslim: *"Nahhh, Prabowo's correct. Mang Obing turns out to be somewhat better when next to Sugeng, bro, I swear. He knows it's 2024 and knows Prabowo"*.

The context of this utterance is that Tretan asked Sugeng about the current year, and Sugeng answered with Thursday. Tretan then asked Sugeng again about who the current Indonesian president is, and Sugeng responded to this question by saying "eee." Tretan Muslim, whose question was not answered, asked Obing about who the Indonesian president is. In this utterance, Obing was able to answer Tretan Muslim's question correctly, unlike Sugeng, who did not provide an answer appropriate to the question. Then Tretan stated, "Mang Obing turns out to be somewhat better when next to Sugeng, bro, I swear. He knows 2024 and knows Prabowo."

Tretan's utterance demonstrates a tact maxim violation (Leech, 1983), which requires the speaker to minimize harm to others and maximize benefits for others. In this data, Tretan actually maximizes harm to Sugeng by placing him in a lower position compared to Obing. Moreover, the use of "somewhat better" explicitly states that Sugeng is in a "not better" condition, which clarifies the weakening nature of the utterance. Sugeng suffers harm, namely the potential fracturing of interpersonal relationships between Sugeng and Obing, decreased self-confidence, and the potential emergence of a negative image of Sugeng.

2) Tact maxim deviations through direct reprimands

(1) Tretan Muslim: *"That's the consequence of insufficient dental socialization since childhood..."*

The context of this utterance contains a review of Sugeng and Obing's dental condition. In the podcast, Sugeng and Obing showed the condition of their teeth to all viewers. Tretan Muslim, as the podcast MC, instructed Obing to open his mouth wider so that Obing's teeth could be clearly seen on camera. The dental condition of Obing and Sugeng shows irregularities, evident from both individuals' broken, blackened, and gapped teeth.

Tretan Muslim's utterance stating "That's the consequence of insufficient dental socialization since childhood" constitutes a form of deviation from the tact maxim proposed by Leech (1983). This maxim requires the speaker to maximize benefits for the interlocutor and minimize harm to the interlocutor. In this utterance, Tretan does something contrary to this maxim by explicitly commenting on the condition of both dental forms and implicitly delivering a direct reprimand about the interlocutor's health habits. This causes harm to Sugeng and Obing in the form of shame and decreased self-confidence.

(2) Tretan Muslim: *"Sorry, but, like this, are you actually thinking?"*

Sugeng: "Thinking, yes, thinking."

The context of this utterance is that Tretan Muslim asked Sugeng about the ruling on playing slots using online loan money and borrowing from friends. Sugeng responded by answering "Eee" and showing behavior like looking upward, but not providing a definite answer. Tretan Muslim, observing Sugeng's movements, asked, "Sorry, but, like this, are you actually thinking?" which constitutes a direct reprimand. The utterance spoken by

Tretan to Sugeng indicates a deviation from Leech's (1983) tact maxim, which should maximize benefits and minimize harm to the interlocutor. In this context, although prefaced with the word "sorry" as a form of politeness, the essence of the question actually causes harm to Sugeng. The utterance explicitly questions Sugeng's seriousness in answering questions, causing harm in the form of potentially undermining Sugeng's credibility as a resource person.

3) *Tact maxim deviations through repetitive questioning*

- (1) Tretan Muslim: "Just review this, yeah, here it is, go ahead, bro."
 Sugeng: "Free?"
 Tretan Muslim: "Free"
 Sugeng: "*Don't have to pay?*"
 Tretan Muslim: "Don't have to"
 Sugeng: "*How much is this?*"
 Tretan Muslim: "Don't have to"
 Sugeng: "*How much does this cost?*"
 Tretan Muslim: "Don't have to, damn it."

The context of this data is that Tretan Muslim gave McDonald's food to Sugeng. Sugeng received the food by asking, "Free?" then Tretan answered with "Free." Sugeng spontaneously repeated his question again, but with different words. Tretan, given the same question, said "don't have to, damn it" as an answer to the repeated question by Sugeng.

The form of utterance repeating questions performed by Sugeng does not conform to the tact maxim (Leech, 1983), which stipulates that in communicating, one must minimize harm to the interlocutor and maximize benefits for the interlocutor. Sugeng, by asking the same question, can cause harm to the interlocutor in the form of repeating the same answer. Moreover, Tretan Muslim's response "don't have to, damn it" indicates annoyance due to repetitive questions that are inefficient. Therefore, this utterance is included in tact maxim violation utterances in minimizing interlocutor harm through providing repetitive questions.

Generosity Maxim Deviations

The generosity maxim, according to Leech (1983), is a maxim expressed with commissive and impositive sentences. This maxim requires every speech act participant to maximize self-sacrifice and minimize benefits for oneself. However, it is not impossible that in a communication process, speech participants violate the generosity maxim. This research found 1 instance of generosity maxim violation in the form of maximizing benefits for oneself; the following presents an analysis of the form of deviation performed.

1) *Generosity maxim deviations in the form of maximizing self-benefit*

- (1) Obing: "Most like"
 Tretan Muslim: "*Now this Co-Host helps, damn.*"

The data context is that Obing is a Co-host whose task is to help interview the resource person. Tretan Muslim asked Sugeng about the name of the player Sugeng likes most at Liverpool. In this utterance, Sugeng did not immediately answer Tretan's question but only repeated "most like." Obing, as a participant in the conversation, explained by saying "most likely." After saying this, Tretan commented, "Now this Co-Host helps, damn."

Tretan Muslim's utterance indicates a deviation from Leech's (1983) generosity maxim, which requires the speaker to minimize benefits for oneself and maximize benefits for others. In this context, Tretan Muslim should appreciate Obing's assistance in a more courteous manner without highlighting the benefit he obtained. However, Tretan's utterance explicitly states that he was helped ("Co-Host helps"), which indicates he maximizes benefit for himself in the interview process.

Approbation Maxim Deviations

The approbation maxim according to Leech (1983), stipulates that when speech participants successfully increase praise for the interlocutor and reduce criticism for the interlocutor. This maxim is expressed with expressive and assertive sentences. This maxim requires the speaker to be polite not only in offering something but also in expressing feelings and stating opinions. With this maxim, it is expected that speech participants do not mock, disparage, or demean other parties. However, it is not impossible that in a communication process, speech participants violate the approbation maxim. The following is an analysis of the forms of deviation performed.

1) *Approbation maxim deviations in the form of disparagement and comparison with others*

- (1) Tretan Muslim: *"Don't protest much, guys, just watch it, damn, eventually this has aired, dog, still eventually, if you want fast, watch Dean KV, watch Vindes, their streams are on time, if here the streaming is at the owner's whim..."*

The context of this utterance is that Tretan Muslim performed an opening for the podcast with Sugeng and Obing. This utterance demonstrates an approbation maxim violation proposed by Leech. The approbation maxim requires the speaker to maximize praise for the interlocutor and minimize criticism for the interlocutor. In this context, Tretan Muslim should appreciate or be neutral toward viewers who provide criticism regarding his podcast's airing schedule. However, the opposite occurs. Tretan Muslim uses harsh diction such as "damn" and "dog," which are forms of disparagement toward viewers. The utterance "Don't protest much, guys, just watch it, damn, eventually this has aired, dog" demonstrates an attitude of not appreciating viewers who criticize the airing delay. Even when comparing his podcast with other content creators like Dean KV and Vindes, Tretan Muslim does not provide appreciation to them but rather uses the comparison to justify his arbitrary attitude with the statement, "if here the streaming is at the owner's whim."

2) *Approbation maxim deviations in the form of expressing feelings by comparing with inanimate objects*

- (1) Tretan Muslim: *"How does it fall out, like, those teeth don't come off, do you know stalactite caves? Caves where water keeps dripping, stalactite caves."*

The context of this utterance is that Tretan Muslim asked Obing about the cause of Obing's tooth loss condition. Obing answered because of frequently drinking hot coffee. Viewed from Obing's dental condition, it shows a dental state that is hollow and whose teeth are not intact. In the context of this conversation, when Tretan Muslim stated "How does it fall out, like, those teeth don't come off, do you know stalactite caves? Caves where water keeps dripping, stalactite caves," comparing Obing's dental condition with stalactite caves demonstrates a violation of Leech's approbation maxim, which requires the speaker to maximize praise for others and minimize criticism for others. Properly, in courteous interaction, the speaker needs to avoid statements that can demean or mock the interlocutor's physical condition. Tretan Muslim's utterance actually maximizes criticism by making a mocking comparison between Obing's hollow and decayed dental condition with stalactite rock formations in caves formed by water dripping. This comparison is clearly demeaning in nature and does not demonstrate appreciation for the interlocutor's condition.

3) *Approbation maxim deviations in the form of belittling the interlocutor*

- (1) Obing: "K"
Tretan Muslim: *"Acting all stylish with that setup."*

The context of this data is that Tretan Muslim wanted to test Obing's skill in saying alphabet letters, from letters A, B, C, and so on. Obing answered by directly mentioning the sequence of alphabet letters, but before finishing, Obing said an incorrect letter sequence. For example, after letter F should be letter G, but Obing mentioned letter K. Tretan Muslim directly expressed his opinion about Obing's attitude, who was already confident to answer all questions, but in reality, Obing did not answer the questions correctly.

Tretan Muslim's utterance saying *"Acting all stylish with that setup"* to Obing constitutes a form of deviation from the approbation maxim proposed by Leech. According to Leech, the approbation maxim requires the speaker to maximize praise for others and minimize criticism or critique of others. In this context, Tretan Muslim should provide a response that more appreciates Obing's effort in answering questions, even though his answer was incorrect. However, instead of providing praise or constructive criticism, Tretan Muslim actually mocked Obing's body language and confident attitude with a sarcastic tone. This utterance tends to maximize criticism and minimize appreciation toward the interlocutor, which contradicts the principle of the approbation maxim. The use of the phrase "acting all stylish" cynically shows that Tretan Muslim focuses more on the negative aspect of Obing's appearance rather than providing courteous appreciation or correction.

- (2) Tretan Muslim: *"Okay, thank you for watching. The guest star fell asleep. Mang Obing, who is the president this time?"*

The data context is that a Tretan Muslim asked about the name of the President currently leading Indonesia to Sugeng. In this utterance, Sugeng did not answer but only mumbled. Tretan Muslim's utterance reading "Okay, thank you for watching, the guest star fell asleep, Mang Obing, who is the president this time" demonstrates a deviation from the approbation maxim proposed by Leech. According to Leech, the approbation maxim requires the speaker to maximize praise for others and minimize criticism or critique of others. In the context of this conversation, Tretan Muslim should provide a response that more appreciates his interlocutor, even though

Sugeng did not provide a satisfying answer. However, the opposite occurs; Tretan Muslim actually expressed sarcasm by calling Sugeng "the guest star fell asleep," which implicitly demeans and mocks Sugeng's inability to answer a simple question about the Indonesian President's name. This utterance contains criticism that minimizes appreciation for the interlocutor and maximizes critique, thus contradicting the principle of the approbation maxim.

Agreement Maxim Deviations

According to Leech (1983), the agreement maxim requires speech participants to reduce disagreement between themselves and others and increase agreement between them. However, it is not uncommon to find agreement maxim violations when speaking with interlocutors in maximizing disagreement toward the speaker. The researcher found 4 data violating the agreement maxim in the form of uncooperative answers and repetitive questions.

1) Agreement maxim deviations in the form of providing uncooperative answers

(1) Tretan Muslim: "The candy, what candy is that?"

Sugeng: "Candy in your heart."

Tretan Muslim: "I'm shocked, I'm shocked by your answer earlier, ever, ever been to the dentist?"

The data context is that Tretan Muslim asked about the name of the candy, causing cavities experienced by Sugeng. Sugeng answered this utterance with "Candy in your heart," then Tretan responded with "I'm shocked, I'm shocked..." The answer given by Sugeng does not agree with the question given by Tretan Muslim.

Based on the analysis of conversational data between Tretan Muslim and Sugeng, there is an agreement maxim deviation. In Leech's politeness theory in language, the agreement maxim requires the speaker to maximize agreement or consensus with the interlocutor and minimize disagreement in communicative interaction. However, in the context of this conversation, Sugeng actually violates this principle by providing an answer completely irrelevant to Tretan Muslim's question. When Tretan asked what type of candy caused Sugeng's cavities a factual question requiring an informative answer, Sugeng instead responded with the metaphorical sentence "Candy in your heart," which has no logical connection to the conversation topic. This deviation becomes even clearer from Tretan's reaction, stating "I'm shocked, I'm shocked..." as a form of surprise at the mismatched answer received. Sugeng's response actually maximizes disagreement (maximizing disagreement) by providing an answer that is flirtatious or joking, whereas the agreement maxim desires the existence of communicative cooperation that maintains harmony and utterance relevance.

2) Agreement maxim deviations in the form of uttering repetitive questions

(1) Tretan Muslim: "Just review this, yeah, here it is, go ahead, bro"

Sugeng: "Free?"

Tretan Muslim: "Free"

Sugeng: "Don't have to pay?"

Tretan Muslim: "Don't have to"

Sugeng: "How much is this?"

Tretan Muslim: "Don't have to"

Sugeng: "How much does this cost?"

Tretan Muslim: "Don't have to, damn it."

The data context is that Tretan gave food to Sugeng in the form of fried chicken with McDonald's brand. Sugeng received it by saying, "Free?" Then Tretan Muslim confirmed that the food was free. However, as if unsatisfied with the answer given by Tretan Muslim, Sugeng repeated several times about the price of the food that had been given.

Based on the interaction context between Tretan Muslim and Sugeng, a deviation from the agreement maxim proposed by Leech occurred. The agreement maxim requires the speaker to maximize agreement or consensus with the interlocutor and minimize disagreement in conversation. However, in this utterance, Sugeng actually violates this principle by repeatedly asking the question "Free?" multiple times, even though Tretan Muslim had provided a clear affirmative answer. This excessive question repetition indicates that Sugeng deliberately maximizes disagreement by not accepting or not believing the answer that had been given by his interlocutor. Sugeng's skeptical and repetitive attitude creates communicative tension that should have been avoidable if he had complied with the agreement maxim by accepting Tretan Muslim's answer from the beginning. As a result of this deviation, communication becomes disharmonious and triggers a negative emotional response from Tretan Muslim, who finally utters the harsh word "Don't have to, damn it" as a form of annoyance toward the disagreement continually prolonged by Sugeng.

Sympathy Maxim Deviations

The sympathy maxim, according to Leech (1983), is a maxim that requires the speaker and interlocutor to reduce antipathy and increase sympathy between themselves and their interlocutor. Sympathy maxim violations occur when maximizing antipathy toward others. In this maxim violation, 1 datum was found; the following is an analysis of the form of deviation performed.

1) Sympathy maxim deviations in the form of uttering repetitive questions

- (1) Tretan Muslim: *"How does it fall out, like, those teeth don't come off, do you know stalactite caves? Caves where water keeps dripping, stalactite caves."*

In the conversation context between Tretan Muslim and Obing regarding an incomplete dental condition, a deviation from the sympathy maxim proposed by Leech (1983) occurred. According to Leech, the sympathy maxim requires the speaker to maximize sympathy toward the interlocutor and minimize antipathy. In this exchange, Obing explained that his incomplete dental condition was caused by the habit of continuously drinking coffee. As a response, Tretan Muslim should demonstrate sympathy or at least be neutral toward Obing's explanation. However, Tretan Muslim's utterance reading "How does it fall out, like, those teeth don't come off, do you know stalactite caves? Caves where water keeps dripping, stalactite caves" actually displays an attitude of antipathy and demeans Obing's physical condition. The comparison of Obing's dental condition with stalactite caves formed due to continuous water dripping constitutes a form of discourteous treatment because it compares the interlocutor's physical deficiency with an inanimate object.

This research identified five types of politeness maxim deviations in humorous content on the @Tretan Universe YouTube account, comprising 12 instances, containing: (1) tact maxim violations in the form of comparing and showing weaknesses, showing direct reprimands, and providing repeated questions; (2) generosity maxim violations in the form of maximizing benefits for oneself; (3) approbation maxim violations in the form of disparaging and comparing with others, comparing with inanimate objects, and belittling the interlocutor; (4) agreement maxim violations in the form of providing uncooperative answers and repeated questions; (5) sympathy maxim violations in the form of maximizing antipathy.

Dominant findings indicate that tact maxim and approbation maxim violations occur most frequently in this humorous content. This aligns with humor characteristics that exploit politeness norm violations to create comic effects, as proposed by Attardo (2020), that humor is often constructed through violations of conversational principles.

The results of this research are relevant to research conducted by Aulia & Nuricahyati (2024), Sriharyati (2022), Aryanis et al. (2022), Zazula & Surana (2023), Mangkudilaga & Surana (2022), Syafutri et al. (2023), Minaliawati & Pujiati (2022), and Fadilla & Wulandari (2023). The similarity between this research and several studies is that they all found politeness maxim deviations. Research differences lie in the data on generosity or modesty maxim violations, which were not found in this research. Research differences also lie in the research object. In this research, the object is the @Tretan Universe YouTube account.

Conclusion

This study identifies five forms of politeness maxim violations in YouTube podcast humor content by @Tretan Universe, consisting of violations of the tact maxim (three types: making unfavorable comparisons and exposing weaknesses, direct reproach, and repetitive questioning), the generosity maxim (one type: maximizing self-benefit), the approbation maxim (3 forms: disparagement, comparison with other objects, and belittling interlocutors), the agreement maxim (2 forms: uncooperative responses and repetitive questioning), and the sympathy maxim (1 form: maximizing antipathy). The main findings indicate that politeness violations in this content are not merely breaches of communicative ethics but rather deliberate communicative strategies to create comic effects and build rapport with audiences. This research contributes theoretically to the development of Leech's politeness theory in digital media contexts by demonstrating that the concepts of "cost" and "benefit" in politeness maxims need to be reconceptualized for digital spaces. Additionally, this study has practical implications for content creators and digital platforms. Recommendations for future research include analyzing more than one video on the YouTube channel, involving audience comment analysis, and exploring how politeness norms function in digital humor.

Acknowledgement

With deep gratitude, I would like to thank everyone who has helped and supported me in writing this article. Your support, advice, and motivation have been invaluable and have made this process even more rewarding. I would also like to express my gratitude to the YouTube channel @Tretan Universe, whose content was the subject of this study.

References

- Abdussamad, Z. (2021). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Makasar: Syakir Media Pers.
- Androutsopoulos, J. (2020). Investigating Digital Language/Media Practices, Awareness, and Pedagogy: Introduction. *Linguistics and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2020.100872>
- Ardia, D., & Safitri, D. A. (2025). *Filsafat Bahasa*. Pekalongan: Penerbit NEM.
- Aryanis, F., Utami, S., & Kusmiyati, K. (2022). Kesantunan Berbahasa di Lingkungan STAI Nurul Hidayat Selatpanjang. *Jurnal Ilmiah FONEMA*, 5(2), 129–148. <https://doi.org/10.25139/fn.v5i2.4982>
- Attardo, S. (2020). *The linguistics of humor: An introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Aulia, A. R., & Nuricahyati, W. F. (2024). Penyimpangan Maksim Kesopanan dalam Video “Mbambong” di Youtube Woko Channel. *Jurnal Nakula : Pusat Ilmu Pendidikan, Bahasa Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 2(5), 29.
- Aziz, A., & Gintings, M. F. M. (2022). Penyimpangan Prinsip Kerja Sama dan Prinsip Kesopanan dalam Wacana Humor Cangehgar Radio Rama FM Bandung. *JIPIS*, 31(1), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.33592/jipis.v31i1.1924>
- Danasaputra, I. R., Wanodyatama, N. P., & Greenetia, G. (2023). Analisis Penggunaan Humor dalam Film Werewolf. *Jurnal SORA-Pernik Studi Bahasa Asing*, 7(2), 95–104. https://doi.org/10.58359/jurnal_sora.v7i2.102
- Fadilla, A. R., & Wulandari, P. A. (2023). *Analisis Pelanggaran Prinsip Kesopanan dalam Trend Vlog oleh Youtubers Indonesia dan Korelasinya Terhadap Pola Pikir Generasi Milenial*.
- Fazeli, S., Sabetti, J., & Ferrari, M. (2023). Performing Qualitative Content Analysis of Video Data in Social Sciences and Medicine: The Visual-Verbal Video Analysis Method. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22, 16094069231185452.
- Hidayah, S. A., & Nazirun, N. (2024). Analisis Penggunaan Hiponim dan Hipernim dalam Koran Riau Pos Edisi Agustus 2020. *Sajak: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengabdian Sastra, Bahasa, Dan Pendidikan*, 3(1), 225–235. <https://doi.org/10.25299/s.v3i1.16584>
- Leech, G. (1983). *The Principle of Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Liliyan, A. N., Sabat, Y., & Sari, E. A. (2023). Conversational Implicature Found in Students' conversations of Pragmatic Class. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 12(3), 957–970. <https://ojs.fkip.ummetro.ac.id/index.php/english/article/view/8418>
- Mangkudilaga, Eriko. B., & Surana, S. (2022). Penyimpangan Maksim Kesopanan dalam Film Tilik Karya Wahyu Agung Prasetyo (Kajian Pragmatik). *JOB (Jurnal Online Baradha)*, 18(3), 1137–1156. <https://doi.org/10.26740/job.v18n3.p1137-1156>
- Martin, R. A., & Ford, T. (2018). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. Academic press.
- Minaliawati, E., & Pujiati, T. (2022). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kesopanan pada Siniar Sruput Nendang Marlo dan Marco di Kanal Youtube. *Diskursus: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia*, 5(2), 200–211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/diskursus.v5i2.14073>
- Navarro-Carrillo, G., Torres-Marín, J., & Carretero-Dios, H. (2021). Do trolls just want to have fun? Assessing the role of humor-related traits in online trolling behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 114, 106551.
- Nurjaman, U., Sulastri, A., Anisa, A., & Hodijah, A. S. (2024). Konsep Good Team Player, Komunikasi, Negosiasi: Entrepreneur Pendidikan. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Al Hadi*, 4(2), 53–61. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31602/jmpd.v4i2.15348>
- Rahardi, K. (2020). Mendeskripsi Peran Konteks Pragmatik: Menuju Perspektif Cyberpragmatics. *Transformatika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 3(2), 164.
- Rizky, S. (2024). Pemahaman Pragmatik dalam Menafsirkan Makna Implisit Ujaran sebagai Strategi Meningkatkan Efektivitas dan Efisiensi Komunikasi. *Basaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Budaya*, 1(2), 53–64.
- Rohmadi, M., & Nasucha, Y. (2017). Dasar-dasar penelitian bahasa, sastra, dan pengajaran. *Surakarta: Pustaka Brilliant*.
- Siregar, U. A., Silvi, N., Hasibuan, W., & Rambe, N. F. (2023). Bahasa sebagai Alat Komunikasi dalam Kehidupan Manusia. *Jurnal Hata Poda*, 2(2), 95–104. <https://doi.org/10.24952/hatapoda.v2i2.10535>
- Sriharyati, R. (2022). Penyimpangan Prinsip Kesopanan pada Web Series Indonesia Teluk Alaska Produksi MD Entertainment. *Jurnal Hasta Wiyata*, 5(2), 146–153. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.hastawiyata.2022.005.02.05>

- Syafutri, H. D., Arnisyah, S., Novita, R., Ester, E., & Ernawati, E. (2023). Penyimpangan Prinsip Kesantunan Berbahasa di Kalangan Remaja Suku Dayak Kanayan Dialek Ahe Kabupaten Bengkayang Kalimantan Barat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dikdaya*, 13(1), 214–221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33087/dikdaya.v13i1.413>
- Tambunan, R. (2022). *Analisis Alih Kode dan Campur Kode dalam Vlog Nebeng Boy: Kajian Sociolinguistik*.
- Zazula, S. A., & Surana, S. (2023). Pelanggaran Maksim Kesopanan dalam Video Ngamen pada Youtube Woko Channel (Kajian Pragmatik). *JOB (Jurnal Online Baradha)*, 19(2), 168–187. <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/baradha/article/view/54909>