PROSIDING
SENALA
Seminar Nasional
Linguistik Indonesia



Available online:
https://senala.upnjatim.ac.id
E-ISSN:
3123-335X
Prodi Linguistik Indonesia
Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Jawa Timur
Jl. Rungkut Madya, Gn. Anyar, Kec. Gn. Anyar, Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60294

Submitted: 07/10/2026 Accepted: 01/11/2026 Published: 05/11/2026

Research Article

Beyond the Threat: Emotional Dimensions and Affective Intentions in YouTube Comments on Megathrust News

Muhammad Fikri Asysyamil*
Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia
*Correspondence Author, E-mail: muhammadfikriasysyamil@mail.ugm.ac.id

Abstract

Background: The potential megathrust disaster in Indonesia has become a widely discussed issue following increased public attention to disaster warnings and related news coverage. YouTube comments reflect how netizens interpret disaster risks through language. However, previous studies have rarely examined how emotional dimensions relate to the communicative purposes underlying netizens' responses. Purpose: This study aims to identify the emotional dimensions and affective intentions represented in YouTube comments on news coverage of the potential megathrust disaster. Methods: A qualitative descriptive approach was applied to 479 comments from three YouTube news videos published in September 2026, selected through purposive sampling based on relevance, public attention, and variation in information presentation. The data were analyzed through domain and theme analysis, using semantic component analysis to identify lexical markers and semantic domains, followed by classification based on Scherer's semantic dimensional structure of emotion and affective types. Results: Negative-active emotions were dominant (262 comments), followed by positive-passive (100 comments), negative-passive (75 comments), and positive-active (42 comments), indicating that skepticism, criticism, and negative evaluation were frequently accompanied by tendencies toward action. Attitude was the most frequent affective type (349 comments), followed by interpersonal stance (259 comments) and mood (153 comments), whereas preference was rare and affect disposition was not identified. Conclusion: Netizens' comments functioned not only as emotional expressions but also as forms of social evaluation and positioning directed toward institutions and responsible actors. These findings contribute to a deeper understanding of language-based emotional representation in digital disaster communication.

Keywords: affective type, emotional dimension, megathrust, semantic component analysis, YouTube comment

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia faces substantial disaster risks because it lies along the Ring of Fire and active tectonic plate boundaries (Cummins, 2016). This disaster potential is one of the causes of public sentiment in news coverage, because the media play an important role in shaping the public's perception of, and emotional response to, ongoing situations (Han et al., 2022).

One disaster story that has recently been widely discussed is the series of volcanic eruptions and earthquakes. These closely spaced disasters then raised the possibility of a major disaster looming along the plate boundary running across Sumatra and Java, namely the potential megathrust disaster (Windupranata et al., 2024). A megathrust event has in fact occurred in Indonesia before, namely the great tsunami in Aceh Province in 2004 (Fuady et al., 2021). The issue has continued to be discussed publicly and, in 2026, spread widely and was taken seriously because it was preceded by a series of disasters and by a warning video delivered by the Canadian weather observer Frankie McDonald, followed by a clarification from the Meteorology, Climatology, and Geophysics Agency (BMKG).

The video and news coverage of the potential megathrust disaster elicited various public responses on social media (Assaudi & Wahyutama, 2025). These responses can be seen in the comments on social media content, particularly on YouTube, one of the platforms the public uses to express opinions and emotions and to request help (Salsabila & Hizbaron, 2021; Zulqarnain et al., 2025). Comments on social media thus represent public emotion in response to the issue under discussion (Houssain et al., 2024). In language studies, the word choices found in such comments can be analyzed to examine meaning, semantic relations, and the construction of social responses to disasters (Bromhead, 2021). In this study, each word or lexical item chosen in a comment forms a meaning and can influence other items by connecting the components that build meaning. These meaning components then form meaning relations and, subsequently, semantic domains, a process referred to as semantic component analysis (Nida, 1975).

Semantic component analysis can serve as the first analytical tool for identifying the lexical items in the comments, which form meaning domains used to classify netizens' emotions and their purposes. Scherer (2005) explains that emotion lies under the affective umbrella as a series of affective episodes influenced by the appraisal of an event as a stimulus, whether internal or external, that is relevant to the speaker. To identify a speaker's emotion, the words or lexical items used can be examined either directly or through their meaning relations within 36 affect categories, known as the Geneva Affect Label Coder (GALC). These labels are then recategorized by the direction of valence (positive and negative valence) and by the level of energy and attitudinal tendency (active and passive), which are mapped onto a semantic dimensional structure of emotion. Furthermore, to identify and distinguish the emotional intention being expressed, Scherer also maps five types of affective phenomena, namely preferences, attitudes, moods, affect dispositions, and interpersonal stances. The whole analysis can be illustrated with the following YouTube comment on the news coverage of the potential megathrust disaster.

“Mungkin Tuhan ingin me’restart Indonesia..”
(“Perhaps God wants to ‘restart’ Indonesia..”)

This comment contains lexical markers such as [Tuhan] ‘God’, [me’restart] ‘to restart’, and [Indonesia], which form a semantic domain of surrendering the situation to God, as an entity with full power, to affect Indonesia, as the evaluative target. The comment has negative valence because it implicitly conveys dislike, and low activation because it shows no drive toward direct action but rather a feeling of resignation. The comment therefore forms a negative-passive emotion in the semantic dimensional structure. It also falls under the affective types of attitude and mood, which indicates that it is intended to evaluate a clear target, namely Indonesia, and to express the commenter's inner state of resigning the situation to the one in power, namely God.

Research on language and emotion in disaster contexts has examined both media coverage and public responses. Rosemary et al. (2023) found that Indonesian online coverage of earthquakes and tsunamis emphasized physical losses, government delays, and religious perspectives more than scientific mitigation or response measures. Hariyani et al. (2026) similarly reported that technical language and sensationalized megathrust narratives may contribute to panic when not accompanied by mitigation literacy. Alinda et al. (2026) found that intensive news exposure was associated with increased megathrust risk perception, particularly through self-relevance and news credibility. Fitriyah et al. (2025) found that social media discussion of megathrust risks emphasized fear and threats more than preparedness. Together, these studies suggest that disaster language can shape risk interpretation and emotional responses (Van Kleef & Heerdink, 2015). Research on public comments has also identified affective meanings in social media discourse. Kovalyshyn and Albota (2023) mapped hopelessness, anger, and hope in Instagram comments from a conflict zone, while Khalifatunnisa et al. (2026) showed how lexical and connotative meanings in TikTok and Instagram comments can construct empathy, appreciation, and affirmation.

Based on the previous studies discussed above, research on language and emotion in disaster contexts has largely focused on two separate sides. Studies on the news coverage side focus on how framing and language use in the media influence the public's affective condition. Studies on the public response side, however, show that social media comments can represent affect mainly in general contexts such as conflict, motivational content, and rhetoric, rather than in the context of the potential megathrust disaster, and few data are available on netizens' responses to this issue. In addition, emotion mapping in previous studies has rarely integrated emotional dimensions with the purposes behind the expression of emotion in comments. Preliminary observation of the comments, however, suggests that netizens express emotions not only to convey how they feel but also to evaluate particular parties or to state an inner state. Consequently, how netizens' emotions and their purposes are represented in language is not well understood, and it is presently unclear how emotional dimensions and affective types work together in responses to the megathrust threat. Identifying emotions and identifying the purposes behind them in netizen comments therefore remain a major challenge. The findings are expected to provide a clearer picture of how the threat of a megathrust disaster is represented through the affect and language used by netizens. To address this gap, this study aims to identify netizens' emotional dimensions based on the semantic structure of emotion and the purposes of their comments based on affective types in YouTube comments on news coverage of the potential megathrust disaster in Indonesia.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative descriptive approach to examine how netizens' emotions and affective intentions are represented through language in YouTube comments about the potential megathrust disaster in Indonesia. It interprets lexical choices, semantic relations, and affective expressions rather than measuring emotional responses statistically. The analysis combined domain analysis (Spradley, 1980, as cited in Saldaña, 2021), theme analysis (Saldaña, 2021), and semantic component analysis (Nida, 1975). Because Spradley’s domain analysis was developed for ethnographic data, it was adapted by constructing domains from lexical markers and meaning relations in comments and mapping them onto Scherer’s (2005) semantic dimensions of emotion and affective types. The study analyzes expressed meanings; it does not test effects on viewers’ perceptions or actual mitigation behavior.

The data source consisted of comments from three YouTube videos discussing the potential megathrust disaster in Indonesia during September 2026. The videos were selected using purposive sampling based on three criteria: (1) the videos reported on the potential megathrust disaster and obtained more than 100,000 views; (2) the videos were published during the period when the issue received significant public attention in September 2026; and (3) the selected videos represented different perspectives of disaster information delivery. The first video, "[FULL] JANGAN PANIK & MUDAH PERCAYA RAMALAN 'MEGATHRUST' DI INDONESIA | Primetime News" ["Do Not Panic and Do Not Easily Believe the 'Megathrust' Prediction in Indonesia"] by Metro TV on 9 September 2026 (https://youtu.be/UGUH7kPDx8w?si=pcDf0bk2txSWTy74), represents rapid news reporting that emphasizes factual clarification and efforts to reduce public panic. The second video, "[FULL] Ancaman Gempa Megathrust Mengintai Indonesia, dr Daryono: Ini Bisa Terjadi Kapan Saja! | NTV" ["The Megathrust Earthquake Threat Looms over Indonesia, Dr Daryono: It Could Happen Anytime!"] by Nusantara TV on 14 September 2026 (https://youtu.be/CJn5OiE6hpk?si=kHMYR4IPY8tRduqL), represents expert-based communication through direct statements from a disaster specialist. The third video, "Pakar Wanti-wanti Gempa Megathrust Capai Magnitudo 8,9, Berdampak ke Jakarta | OneNews Update" ["Experts Warn Megathrust Earthquake Could Reach Magnitude 8.9, Affecting Jakarta"] by tvOnenews on 14 September 2026 (https://youtu.be/d9U9y_7pNEg?si=h_Aa6fMpzpo73fp0), represents concise information dissemination based on statements from experts and official institutions related to disaster issues. Afterward, the videos are referred to as Video 1, Video 2, and Video 3, and each comment is cited by video and comment number (example, V1-1 for comment 1 of Video 1)

The population of this study comprised all newest comments on the three selected videos. The sample was drawn through purposive sampling by selecting comments that were relevant to the megathrust discourse and reflected responses toward the news content. Each comment was treated as one unit of analysis, while reply comments were excluded to maintain consistency in examining individual public responses. Comments consisting only of emojis or symbols without contextual meaning, duplicated or repeated comments, and comments unrelated to the discussed issue were excluded from the dataset so that each analyzed comment contained sufficient linguistic information for interpreting emotional representation and communicative intention. The comments were collected manually on 28 September 2026, by reading the comment section of each video, in the default of the newest comment. At the time of collection, the videos displayed 109, 94, and 366 newest comments, respectively 569 in total. From those data collections, 3 comments were excluded because they consisted only of emojis or symbols, 43 because they were duplicated or repeated, only the first occurrence was kept, and 44 because they were unrelated to the discussed issue. The final dataset consisted of 92, 76, and 311 comments from Video 1, Video 2, and Video 3, respectively 479 comment, which distribution across the three videos is presented in the Result and Discussion section.

The data analysis was conducted through several analytical stages. First, lexical markers within each comment were identified to determine words or expressions that represented evaluative, emotional, or attitudinal meanings. These lexical markers were then examined through semantic component analysis (Nida, 1975) to identify the relationships between meaning components, including the speaker, the event or object being discussed, and the evaluated target, and to construct semantic domains. The semantic domains were then interpreted to determine the emotional representation of netizens through Scherer's (2005) semantic dimensional structure of emotion. The 36 categories of the Geneva Affect

Label Coder (GALC) described by Scherer (2005) served as a conceptual reference for recognizing emotion related lexical items. However, comments were not individually coded according to each GALC label. Instead, each comment was classified directly according to the valence and activation dimensions described below.

Each comment was interpreted in relation to the content of the relevant news video, its lexical choices and the theoretical framework. Valence was classified as positive or negative. Positive valence represented acceptance, appreciation, or favorable responses toward the issue, whereas negative valence represented rejection, dissatisfaction, oor unfavorable responses. When the literal wording differed from the intended evaluation, as in sarcastic expressions, valence was determined from the surrounding linguistic context or co-text. Activation was classified as active or passive. Active responses indicated a tendency toward action, including demands, criticism, rejection, or proposed action, whereas passive responses reflected resignation, dependence on external actors or the absence of an expressed tendency toward action. In accordance with Scherer's (2005) semantic dimensional structure, activation was operationalized as the extent to which a comment performed or called for action toward a target.

A comment was coded as active when it (a) demanded, urged, or proposed an action; (b) directed an accusation, criticism, mockery, or rejection at an identifiable actor or piece of information; (c) wished an event to befall a specified party, which functions as a symbolic attack even when worded as a prayer; or (d) stated a preparedness action. A comment was coded as passive when it expressed acceptance, surrender to God or fate, prayer for protection, fatigue, indifference, or helplessness without a directed demand or target. Accordingly, criticism was coded negative-active when it was addressed to an indetifiable target and carried an accusation, demand, or rejection, and negative-passive when the negative evaluation was framed as resignation, futility, or weariness. Comments containing both features were coded according to the dominant communicative act. The combination of the two parameters produced four emotional dimensions, namely positive-active, positive-passive, negative-active, and negative-passive. Each comment was assigned to one dominant dimension based on its overall meaning construction.

Furthermore, the semantic domains were examined to identify the communicative purposes underlying emotional expressions using Scherer's (2005) classification of five affective types. Preferences refer to expressions of liking or disliking without a clearly developed evaluation. Attitudes represent evaluations directed toward a specific target. Moods indicate the speaker's internal emotional condition, while interpersonal stances refer to the speaker's positioning toward other individuals, groups, or evaluated entities. Affect dispositions, which refer to relatively stable emotional tendencies, were retained in the classification but could not be identified, because the data were limited to publicly expressed comments and provided no information on the personal background of the commenters. Unlike emotional dimensions, a single comment could be assigned more than one affective type when multiple communicative purposes were identified.

The analysis was conducted by a single researcher. Interpretations were based on the lexical markers, semantic relations, contextual meanings, and theoretical definitions described above. Particular attention was given to ambiguous expressions, including prayers accompanied by criticism, sarcastic statements, and comments expressing evaluations of institutions or political actors. Such expressions were interpreted by considering the surrounding linguistic context and the dominant communicative meaning rather than relying solely on isolated words. The same analytical criteria were applied across all three videos to support comparison on a common analytical basis. Only publicly accessible comments were

analyzed. Usernames, profile information, and timestamps were not recorded in the dataset, and quotations are limited to short excerpts identified by video and comment number rather than by author. The study did not interact with commenters.

The final stage involved counting the comments in each emotional dimension and affective type for each video, expressing the counts as percentages of each video's comments to account for unequal sample sizes, and organizing the results into a taxonomic classification to compare the three videos. The emotional dimensions were then cross-tabulated with the affective types to examine which categories occurred together in the same comment. The dominant distribution patterns were then identified as themes and interpreted to describe the emotional tendencies and communicative purposes expressed by netizens in responding to the potential megathrust disaster discourse. These steps were applied consistently to all comments so that the patterns of the three videos could be compared on the same analytical basis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overall Distribution of Emotional Dimensions and Affective Types

A total of 479 YouTube comments were collected from three selected news videos, consisting of 92 comments from Video 1 (Metro TV), 76 comments from Video 2 (Nusantara TV), and 311 comments from Video 3 (OneNews). The distribution of emotional dimensions and affective types is presented in Table 1. Negative-active was the dominant emotional dimension (262 comments), followed by positive-passive (100 comments), negative-passive (75 comments), and positive-active (42 comments). Regarding affective types, attitudes were the most frequent (349 comments), followed by interpersonal stances (259 comments) and moods (153 comments), whereas preferences appeared in only two comments and affect dispositions were not identified.

Table 1. Distribution of Emotional Dimensions and Affective Types across the Three Videos, n (%)

Video	n	Semantic Dimensions of Emotion				Affective Types				
		P-A	P-P	N-A	N-P	Pref	Att	Mood	AffDisp	IntStan
1	92	15 (16.3)	11 (12.0)	49 (53.3)	17 (18.5)	0 (0.0)	68 (73.9)	26 (28.3)	0 (0.0)	52 (56.5)
2	76	9 (11.8)	16 (21.1)	40 (52.6)	11 (14.5)	2 (2.6)	58 (76.3)	21 (27.6)	0 (0.0)	43 (56.6)
3	311	19 (6.1)	72 (23.2)	173 (55.6)	47 (15.1)	0 (0.0)	223 (71.7)	106 (34.1)	0 (0.0)	164 (52.7)
Total	**479**	**42 (9.0)**	**100 (20.7)**	**262 (54.7)**	**75 (15.7)**	**2 (0.4)**	**349 (72.9)**	**153 (31.9)**	**0 (0.0)**	**259 (54.1)**

Description: Emotional dimensions: P-A (Positive-Active), P-P (Positive-Passive), N-A (Negative-Active), N-P (Negative-Passive). Affective types: Pref (Preferences), Att (Attitudes), Mood, AffDisp (Affect Dispositions), IntStan (Interpersonal Stances). One comment could contain more than one affective type. Percentages are calculated from the number of comments (n) in each video, so the percentages of affective types do not add up to 100.

Because Video 3 contributed 311 of the 479 comments (64.9%), the aggregate figures largely reflect this video, and percentages per video were therefore used to compare the sources. Negative-active remained the largest dimension in each video (53.3%, 52.6%, and 55.6%), and attitudes remained the most frequent affective type in each video (73.9%, 76.3%, and 71.7%), which shows that the dominance of these categories is not an artifact of the largest dataset.

The dominance of negative-active responses indicates that commenters often expressed skepticism, criticism, or negative evaluation directed toward identifiable targets, rather than fear alone. Attitudes were also frequent, suggesting that comments commonly evaluated institutions, authorities, or social groups instead of merely describing personal

feelings. This supports the view that social media comments can function as social signals in disaster discourse (Khalifatunnisa et al., 2026).

Overall, the comments combined emotional expression with social evaluation. Institutions, authorities, and social groups were frequent targets, showing that responses to disaster discourse also involved judgments about responsibility.

Emotional Dimensions of Netizens' Responses

Dominant Emotional Pattern

The analysis of semantic dimensions of emotion shows that negative-active was the most dominant emotional pattern across the collected comments. This category represents emotional responses with negative valence combined with active activation, indicating that commenters expressed dissatisfaction, skepticism, or rejection while simultaneously showing tendencies toward action, criticism, or evaluation. The negative dimension was represented through various semantic domains, including distrust toward disaster information, skepticism regarding repeated warnings, criticism of authorities, and negative evaluations of human behavior related to environmental and social conditions.

For example, a comment stating *"Katanya gempa dll itu ga bisa diprediksi..kenapa BMKG masih selalu membohongi rakyat..."* ["They say earthquakes and the like cannot be predicted.. why does BMKG keep lying to the people.."] (V3-1) contains lexical markers such as [membohongi rakyat] and [BMKG], which construct a semantic domain of distrust toward an official institution. Although the comment expresses a negative perception, the activation dimension is reflected through the demand for institutional accountability, shown through the statement *"hapus saja badan ini"* ["just abolish this agency"]. Therefore, the emotional construction is categorized as negative-active because the dissatisfaction is directed toward an identifiable actor and accompanied by an implied demand for change.

Another pattern found in negative-active responses was the attribution of disasters to human actions. Comments containing expressions such as *"Setiap bencana selalu didahului oleh bejatnya perilaku manusia"* ["Every disaster is always preceded by the depravity of human behavior"] (V1-4) demonstrate a semantic relation between disaster events and moral evaluations of human behavior. In this case, the potential megathrust disaster is not only interpreted as a natural phenomenon but also connected with social and moral criticism. This finding shows that disaster discussions on social media may expand beyond scientific explanations into broader evaluations of social responsibility.

This pattern suggests that commenters often directed uncertainty and dissatisfaction toward governments, institutions, or society. However, the comments alone cannot establish whether these attributions reflect commenters' broader perceptions or how they affect preparedness behavior.

Emotional Representation Across Different News Videos

Although all three videos demonstrated the same dominant pattern of negative-active emotions, differences were observed in the semantic domains constructing those emotions. Video 1 from Metro TV, which emphasized clarification and reducing public panic, showed negative-active responses mainly related to skepticism toward the megathrust discourse itself. Several comments questioned the credibility of repeated warnings because similar information had circulated previously without the disaster occurring. Some comments also questioned expert statements by associating them with prediction or speculation rather than scientific information. In terms of shares, negative-active comments were 53.3% in Video 1, 52.6% in

Video 2, and 55.6% in Video 3, whereas Video 1 had the highest share of positive-active (16.3%) and negative-passive (18.5%) comments and the lowest share of positive-passive comments (12.0%), compared with 21.1% in Video 2 and 23.2% in Video 3 (Table 1).

For example, comments containing expressions such as “ramalan” [‘prediction’] (V1-17, V1-49, V1-56, V1-58, V1-65, V1-69, V1-76) or questioning whether the disaster warning would actually occur represent skepticism toward the information source. Video 1 comments also included various spontaneous reactions, including fear, acceptance, criticism, and preparedness responses, and these reactions made up larger shares of the positive-active and negative-passive dimensions than in the other videos. The framing of this video, which simultaneously presented the issue as a potential threat while attempting to reduce excessive public panic, is a possible context for this difference; because this study reads comment expressions and did not measure viewers’ exposure, the difference is described rather than attributed to the framing.

In contrast, Video 2 from Nusantara TV, which presented direct information from an expert figure, generated negative-active responses that were more strongly associated with government responsibility and human behavior. Several comments constructed semantic domains related to government policies, environmental damage, and social conditions in Indonesia. For instance, comments mentioning [koruptor] (V2-1, V2-5, V2-49), [rakyat miskin] (V2-1, V2-28) and [kerusakan alam] (V2-1, V2-4, V2-5, V2-31, V2-62, V2-69) show that disaster risks were interpreted through broader social problems. Compared with Metro TV, the linguistic construction in this video tended to be more closely connected with scientific and institutional discourse.

Video 3 from OneNews produced the largest amount of data and showed the widest variation of negative-active responses. Besides criticism toward information dissemination and disaster preparedness, several comments expanded the discussion into political and social criticism. Examples include comments targeting corruption, government institutions, and specific political groups by using disaster metaphors as a form of criticism or punishment. One such comment addresses officials directly: “Lu para pejabat pada tobat ga usah bahasa bencana mulu” [“You officials, repent, and stop talking about disasters all the time”] (V3-186). This demonstrates that disaster discourse can become a medium for expressing broader dissatisfaction beyond the immediate topic of disaster risk.

Interestingly, positive-passive responses became the second dominant emotional pattern, particularly in Video 2 (21.1%) and Video 3 (23.2%). These responses were mainly constructed through expressions of prayer, hope, and surrender. For example, comments such as *“Hanya bisa berdoa semoga Indonesia baik-baik saja”* [“can only pray that Indonesia will be fine”] (V1-1) represent positive evaluation toward safety but without indicating direct action. Such expressions reflect optimism that is constructed through religious hope rather than practical preparation.

Meanwhile, positive-active responses appeared relatively low across all videos (9.0% overall). Comments representing this category generally involved preparedness actions, such as preparing emergency equipment or increasing awareness. For example, a comment stating that the information encouraged the commenter to prepare a disaster emergency evacuation and education, *“Edukasi gempa agar tau cara menyelamatkan diri sendiri dan keluarga. Bangunan anti gempa, dan posko tsunami di bukit2. Bahan makanan 3 bulan sampai daratan aman tsunami. SayA bantu dzikIr dari surabaya.”* [“Earthquake education to learn how to save oneself and one’s family. Earthquake-resistant buildings and tsunami evacuation shelters on the hills. Food supplies sufficient for three months until the mainland is safe from tsunami threats. I help with dhikr (remembrance of God) from Surabaya.”] (V2-20), represents positive

activation the comment states a concrete mitigation action. The limited presence of this category suggests that expressions of optimism among netizens were less frequently connected with collective preparedness actions.

Affective Intentions of Netizens' Comments

Dominant Affective Types

The analysis of affective types demonstrates that attitudes were the dominant communicative purpose in YouTube comments, with 349 occurrences. This finding indicates that netizens commonly expressed emotions by evaluating a specific target rather than merely describing personal feelings. The targets of evaluation included government institutions, experts, disaster information sources, social groups, and broader societal conditions.

For instance, the comment *"KEREN PAK SUDARYONO BELIAU TETAP MEMBERIKAN EDUKASI TERHADAP MASYARAKAT..."* ["Great, Mr Sudaryono keeps educating the public..."] (V2-4) contains lexical markers such as [keren], [edukasi], and [PAK SUDARYONO] the name of the expert figure, which indicate positive evaluation toward a specific person. Video 2 features Dr Daryono, but the commenter wrote "Sudaryono"; the comment is therefore coded as a positive attitude toward the individual the commenter addresses, without assuming that this referent is the video's speaker. Conversely, comments such as *"BMKG masih selalu membohongi rakyat"* (V3-1) demonstrate negative attitudes directed toward an institution. These examples show that attitudes function as a mechanism through which netizens position themselves toward actors involved in disaster communication.

The second dominant category was interpersonal stances, with 259 occurrences. This category frequently appeared together with attitudes because evaluations were often accompanied by explicit positioning between the commenter and the evaluated target. Table 2 shows that 236 of the 259 comments with an interpersonal stance also carried an attitude. Through interpersonal stances, commenters constructed social boundaries between themselves and institutions, authorities, or other groups. Therefore, emotional expressions were not only individual reactions but also reflected social relations and perceived power differences.

Table 2. Cross-Tabulation of Emotional Dimensions and Affective Types (Number of Comments)

Dimension	n	Pref	Att	Mood	AffDisp	IntStan	Att + IntStan
Positive – Active	42	1	37	3	0	28	25
Positive – Passive	100	1	28	75	0	21	6
Negative – Active	262	0	252	17	0	204	201
Negative – Passive	75	0	32	58	0	6	4
Total	**479**	**2**	**349**	**153**	**0**	**259**	**236**

Description: Pref = Preferences, Att = Attitudes, AffDisp = Affect Dispositions, IntStan = Interpersonal Stances. Att + IntStan = comments carrying both an attitude and an interpersonal stance. Counts indicate co-occurrence within the same comment, so rows do not sum to n.

Preferences appeared only twice in the dataset, while affect disposition was not identified. The limited occurrence of preferences indicates that netizens rarely expressed simple liking or dislike without additional explanation or evaluation targets. Instead, emotional expressions were generally accompanied by reasons, social positions, or specific objects of evaluation. Meanwhile, affect disposition could not be identified because YouTube comments

only represent situational expressions and do not provide sufficient information regarding the stable emotional tendencies or personal characteristics of the commenters.

Affective Differences Across Videos

All three videos showed a similar tendency in which attitudes became the dominant affective type (73.9%, 76.3%, and 71.7% in Videos 1, 2, and 3, respectively; Table 1). However, the evaluated targets varied according to the characteristics of each news source. In Video 1, attitudes were primarily directed toward information sources, particularly Frankie McDonald, the figure associated with the viral warning, and Metro TV's presentation of the megathrust issue. Comments evaluated the credibility of the warning and questioned whether the information should be trusted. For example, one commenter criticized Metro TV's use of the term ramalan (prediction), arguing that Frankie was an observer rather than a fortune-teller (V1-49: “kok bisa narasi judul ramalan, sekelas metro, dia pengamat bukan tukang ramal”). Another explicitly rejected Frankie's prediction, stating, “Gak percaya dg Ramalan frengki” (V1-56). Trust in official information was also questioned, as reflected in the comment, “Terus kami kudu percaya sama siapa pemerintah, BMKG😂😂” (V1-71). These comments illustrate how attitudes were expressed through criticism of media framing, rejection of the warning, and skepticism toward official sources.

In Video 2, attitude expressions were more frequently associated with government responsibility, disaster management, and social conditions. Comments evaluated institutions and societal behavior through semantic domains related to policy, environmental conditions, and national preparedness. Meanwhile, in Video 3, attitudes were more diverse because the larger number of comments allowed broader social issues to emerge. The evaluated targets included government institutions, political actors, corruption issues, and disaster mitigation policies.

Across all videos, government-related domains consistently appeared as important evaluation targets. However, these evaluations were not always limited to disaster management issues. Some comments extended beyond the megathrust topic and connected disasters with broader social concerns, such as corruption, political dissatisfaction, and public distrust toward authorities. This finding suggests that disaster discourse can become a space where existing social evaluations are reproduced and expressed through emotional language.

Integrated Representation of Netizens’ Responses Toward the Megathrust Threat

The combined analysis shows that comments conveyed both emotional evaluation and social positioning. Valence and activation describe how responses were expressed, while affective types indicate their communicative purposes. Thus, the comments functioned as more than personal emotional statements: they also addressed identifiable targets.

The dominant pattern of negative-active combined with attitude and interpersonal stance indicates that negative emotions were frequently accompanied by criticism, demands, and evaluations toward actors perceived as responsible. Table 2 supports this pattern: 252 of the 262 negative-active comments (96%) carried an attitude, 204 (77,8%) carried an interpersonal stance, and 201 (76,7%) carried both. In the context of disaster discourse in Indonesia, uncertainty regarding potential disasters appears to be transformed into active emotional responses directed toward governments, institutions, and society. These responses show that disaster risks are interpreted not only as natural threats but also as consequences related to human behavior, policy decisions, and institutional responsibility.

Conversely, positive responses were more frequently represented through positive-passive patterns, particularly through prayers and expressions of hope. Although these

responses reflect optimism, they rarely contained explicit mitigation actions or collective encouragement. This pattern suggests that optimism among netizens was often constructed through acceptance and surrender rather than through active preparedness. Moods, in turn, were concentrated in the passive dimensions: 133 of the 153 mood comments (86,9%) were positive-passive or negative-passive.

Overall, the findings indicate that language in disaster-related digital communication represents a complex interaction between emotion, social evaluation, and perceived responsibility. The combination of semantic emotional dimensions and affective intentions provides a broader understanding of how netizens construct meaning toward disaster threats, where emotional responses simultaneously reflect personal concerns and broader social critiques. These patterns describe how commenters expressed emotions and positions in their comments; they do not show how the videos' framing affected viewers or whether the stated preparedness intentions were carried out.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals that YouTube comments on the potential megathrust disaster were predominantly represented through negative-active emotions and attitude-oriented expressions. Netizens' responses were mainly constructed through skepticism, criticism, and evaluations toward specific targets, particularly institutions and responsible actors. The integration of emotional dimensions and affective types shows that disaster-related emotions are not only personal reactions but also forms of social positioning. Future research may incorporate broader social media platforms and contextual user information to further examine how disaster emotions develop across digital communities.

REFERENCES

Alinda, Y., Shela, K., Leoni, N., & Nurhaliza, A. A. (2026). Terpaan pemberitaan media dalam mengamplifikasi persepsi risiko bahaya gempa megathrust di Indonesia. *Ganaya: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora, 9*(1), 407–414.

Assaudi, B., & Wahyutama. (2025). Analisis isu gempa megathrust 2024 melalui akun YouTube Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana Indonesia. *Comit: Communication, Information and Technology Journal, 3*(2), 185–204. https://doi.org/10.47467/comit.v3i2.6555

Bromhead, H. (2021). Disaster linguistics, climate change semantics and public discourse studies: A semantically-enhanced discourse study of 2011 Queensland floods. *Language Sciences, 85*, 101381. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2021.101381

Cummins, L. (2016). An approach to the profile of disaster risk of Indonesia. *Emergency and Disaster Reports, 3*(2), 5–66.

Fitriyah, P., Nurhaeni, I. D. A., Rahmanto, A. N., & Kartono, D. T. (2025). Crisis communication in megathrust discourse: Risk preparedness or fear amplification? *SEARCH Journal of Media and Communication Research, 17*(2), 53–69. https://doi.org/10.58946/search-17.2.P4

Fuady, M., Munadi, R., & Fuady, M. A. K. (2021). Disaster mitigation in Indonesia: Between plans and reality. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 1087*, 012011. https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/1087/1/012011

Han, Z., Shen, M., Liu, H., & Peng, Y. (2022). Topical and emotional expressions regarding extreme weather disasters on social media: A comparison of posts from official media and the public. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 9*, Article 421. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01457-1

Hariyani, N., Rahmawati, A. Y., & Azzahra, A. C. (2026). Agenda-setting theory in megathrust disaster communication: A content analysis of coverage in Kompas.com. *Jurnal Mediakita: Jurnal Komunikasi dan Penyiaran Islam, 10*(2), 248–278. https://doi.org/10.30762/mediakita.v10i2.2755

Hossain, I., Puppala, S., Alam, M. J., & Talukder, S. (2024). A visual approach to tracking emotional sentiment dynamics in social network commentaries. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media, 18*, 596–609. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4002183/v1

Khalifatunnisa, N., Kamilah, N., Fauziah, A., & Rohbiah, T. S. (2026). A semantic analysis of emotional and persuasive language in motivational social media comment. *Jurnal Lingue: Bahasa, Budaya, dan Sastra, 8*(1), 160–175. https://doi.org/10.33477/lingue.v8i1.14327

Kovalyshyn, K. V., & Albota, S. M. (2023). Psycholinguistic features of human war perception via social media. *Scientific Bulletin of International Humanities University. Series: Philology, 61*(1), 65–68. https://doi.org/10.32782/2409-1154.2023.61.16

Nida, E. A. (1975). *Componential analysis of meaning: An introduction to semantic structures*. Mouton Publishers.

Rosemary, R., Syam, H. M., & Sartika, M. (2023). Framing disaster coverage of earthquakes and tsunamis on online media. *International Journal of Disaster Management, 6*(2), 141–152. https://doi.org/10.24815/ijdm.v6i2.31867

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Salsabila, F. P., & Hizbaron, D. R. (2021). Understanding community collective behaviour through social media responses: Case of Sunda Strait tsunami, 2018, Indonesia. *E3S Web of Conferences, 325*, 01021. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202132501021

Scherer, K. R. (2005). What are emotions? And how can they be measured? *Social Science Information, 44*(4), 695–729. https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018405058216

Van Kleef, G. A., & Heerdink, M. W. (2015). Emotional influence in social interaction: The role of emotions in communication and decision-making. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 3*, 36–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.02.005

Windupranata, W., Al Ghifari, M. W., Nusantara, C. A. D. S., Shafa, M., Hayatiningsih, I., Mulia, I. E., & Nuraghnia, A. (2024). Probabilistic tsunami hazard analysis of Batukaras Village as a tourism village in Indonesia. *EGUsphere*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2023-2860

Zulqarnain, Sultan, M. I., & Akbar, M. (2025). Analisis sentimen pemecatan Jokowi pada komentar publik YouTube Tempo.co. *Jurnal Kopis: Kajian Penelitian dan Pemikiran Komunikasi Penyiaran Islam, 7*(2), 125–140. https://doi.org/10.33367/kpi.v7i2.6888