

# The Use of Impoliteness Strategies and Gender Differences in The *Whatever* Podcast

Rizqia Amalia Putri<sup>1</sup>, Frans Sayogie<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> English Literature Department, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah  
Jakarta

e-mail: [rizqiaaputri2308@gmail.com](mailto:rizqiaaputri2308@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [frans.sayogie@uinjkt.ac.id](mailto:frans.sayogie@uinjkt.ac.id)<sup>2</sup>

## Abstrak

Penelitian ini membahas tentang penggunaan strategi ketidaksantunan yang berhubungan dengan perbedaan gender yang terjadi dalam percakapan podcast *Whatever*. Data untuk penelitian ini diambil dari percakapan podcast *Whatever* yang diakses melalui *YouTube*. Penelitian ini menggunakan teori ketidaksantunan yang dikembangkan oleh Jonathan Culpeper, yang membagi strategi ketidaksantunan yang berbeda ke dalam lima kategori. Kategori tersebut meliputi ketidaksantunan yang tidak tercatat, ketidaksantunan positif, ketidaksantunan negatif, sarkasme atau kesantunan pura-pura, dan kesantunan yang ditahan. Lebih lanjut, peneliti menggunakan teori Wardhaugh untuk meneliti perbedaan gender dalam penggunaan strategi ketidaksantunan. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa pembicara podcast *Whatever* menggunakan berbagai macam strategi ketidaksantunan. Selain itu, penelitian ini juga menemukan bahwa perempuan lebih sering menggunakan strategi ketidaksantunan ketika berbicara. Kesimpulannya, perempuan lebih dominan menggunakan strategi ketidaksantunan dibandingkan dengan laki-laki.

**Kata kunci:** *Strategi Ketidaksantunan, Perbedaan Gender, Podcast*

## Abstract

This research discusses about the use of impoliteness strategies associated with differences in gender that occur in *Whatever* podcast conversations. The data for this research is taken from *Whatever* Podcast conversations accessed via *YouTube*. This study used the theory of impoliteness developed by Jonathan Culpeper, which divides different impoliteness strategies into five categories, is used in this study. The categories include bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness. Furthermore, researchers employ Wardhaugh's theory to examine differences in gender in the utilisation of impoliteness strategies. This research uses qualitative descriptive method. The result of this research show that the *Whatever* podcast speakers employed a wide range of impoliteness strategies. Furthermore, this study also found that women more often use impoliteness strategies when speaking. In conclusion, women are more dominant in using impoliteness strategies compared to men.

**Keywords :** *Impoliteness Strategies, Gender Differences, Podcast*

## INTRODUCTION

In general, people utilize politeness methods in their communication because they are social beings, but occasionally, someone will use impoliteness. In order for humans to be able to express all of their feelings and ideas through language, communication becomes crucial. Being courteous in a conversation refers to the way one handles certain guidelines that one needs to learn to prevent miscommunications. All people perceive politeness as acceptable behavior, including both positive and negative characteristics, according to Brown

and Levinson (1987). Therefore, in order to foster comfort between speakers and listeners, everyone who communicates must make an effort to talk politely. There are various ways to be disrespectful and nice. Any word, whether said or written, could be seen as disrespectful, particularly if it makes fun of someone else's appearance (Wendy & Rudianto, 2022). As on Culpaper's (2005) findings, impolite speakers intentionally use language that is meant to cause offense or insult the faces of others.

The contradiction of politeness from conception is impoliteness. This is due to the claim that Brown and Levinson only looked at politeness and not impoliteness, hence it was previously thought that studying impoliteness was pointless (Bousfield & Culpeper, 2008). According to Culpaper (1996), being rude can have the opposite effect on someone who is emotionally sensitive because it could be seen as a threat to one's face. Yaseen Hassan (2023) asserted that every person contains both a positive and bad face. Because everyone speaks differently, we are unable to evaluate someone's politeness. Consequently, it can cause misunderstandings when speaking when people don't get the intent of politeness or how to use it correctly. Counterfactual accusations that certain propositions are naturally threatening arise from this irrelevance. Disrespectful behavior can be seen in person as well as through various forms of media.

Having a negative attitude toward particular behaviors that occur in a particular location is what it means to be impolite. However, using polite language is a means of maintaining one's "face" in the presence of others (Simanjuntak & Ambalegin, 2022). The face is known as the self-image in linguistics (Siagian & Simatupang, 2022). However, some people use words as a linguistic strategy to offend or threaten other people's appearance. Face-threatening acts (FTA) are speech acts that disturb the harmony between speakers and listeners (Sayogie, 2022). According to George Yule (2006), when someone says something like "Give me that paper!" in a direct speaking act, they are projecting their social influence to others. The speech can be considered a face-threatening act (FTA) if the speaker does not genuinely possess certain social powers (e.g., holding a higher status). George Yule's (2006) speech act example is seen as an unpleasant strategy since it has damaged the other person's face.

Gender and language are clearly related among the many different linguistic phenomena, especially when it comes to impoliteness strategies. In language studies, gender has been examined from a variety of angles. Linguistically, "gender" refers to something other than "sex." It is impossible to understand gender as anything biological; instead, it must be understood as something socially produced. The research done by Wardhaugh (2009) looks on the distinct ways that men and women use language. One element that might vary is language proficiency because certain case examples might be expressed in a different language. Language impoliteness is linked to gender inequalities because, in various cultures and social realities, men and women are sometimes separated by a division of employment and commitment (Suhandoko et al., 2021). Furthermore, gender enables us to identify and designate a person as either feminist or masculine in their day-to-day interactions (Coates, 2015).

This study aims to analyze Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness model. This study examines five distinct types of impoliteness methods that are employed in the Whatever Podcast: positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, bald-on-record impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness. This study looks into various impoliteness strategies through conversations on the Whatever YouTube podcast. Furthermore, there was a correlation between the classification results and differences in gender in the use of impoliteness strategies.

## METHOD

This research uses a qualitative descriptive method to characterize or provide an overview of the objects sampled using the data that has been collected. Using qualitative research methods, the phenomenon of impoliteness in Whatever podcasts is explained. Furthermore, differences in gender in the use of impoliteness strategies are best explained

by qualitative methodologies. The purpose of qualitative research is to utilize language to highlight a phenomenon by providing definitions and instances, as opposed to quantifying a substantial shift (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This study focuses on speech indicates of impoliteness connected to differences in gender as well as impoliteness strategies identified through utterances or sentences from all speakers who take part in discussions. The Whatever podcast's YouTube channel served as the data source. The purpose of this study's findings is to categorize the various impoliteness strategies employed by speakers and investigate any gender disparities in these strategies on the Whatever podcast. Ultimately, the researcher determines conclusions from the examined data.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this research data, researchers found 50 conversations containing impoliteness strategies in whatever podcast. Based on Jonathan Culpeper's theory (1996), in this study it was found that positive impoliteness is the most common type of impoliteness strategies, accounting for 24 talks. Then, the second is bald-on-record and negative impoliteness, with 11 conversations each. Next in third place is sarcasm or mock politeness, which consists of 3 conversations. Finally, withholding impoliteness is the impoliteness strategy that appears least often in one conversation that can be found. From the 50 data found by the researcher, only 12 data are analyzed in this chapter.

**Table 1. Impoliteness strategies in the *Whatever* podcast**

No	Utterance	Types Impoliteness Strategies
1	<b>"Get out my face bro"</b>	bald on record
2	"Please, Debora. <b>Shut the fuck up</b> when somebody else is talking this entire fucking show."	bald on record
3	"No. <b>We're gonna move on</b> from that."	positive impoliteness
4	"you're <b>the master</b> of cutting off."	positive impoliteness
5	"Maybe to you. But how Chase? <b>I would agree with Chase.</b> "	positive impoliteness
6	"I think that <b>you should bring a girl to McDonald's</b> and she should pay for you."	positive impoliteness
7	"I think potential match <b>if keeko got married one of us (men)</b> would not make it out of the marriage alive probably."	Negative impoliteness
8	<b>"Have you ever fuck someone up</b> who like was like trans people and they were like trying to get well?"	Negative impoliteness
9	"I mean man who's doing that is <b>not going to find high value woman</b> "	Negative impoliteness
10	<b>"Are any of us wearing too much makeup?"</b>	sarcasm or mock politeness
11	"Okay, <b>those are good question.</b> "	sarcasm or mocking politeness
12	(SHIGH)	Withhold politeness

### Bald on Record Impoliteness

Data 1:

Brian : "Have you encountered a guy in your excapades?"  
 Ally : "I mean like i've been out in like I was thinking a guy is cute and then like the second they walked by me and you smell like ass.."  
 Chase : (laugh)  
 Ally : **"Get out of my face bro!"**

In the conversation above, Chase interrupted Ally in the middle of the conversation when she was speaking seriously in response to Brian's question. It made Ally feel

uncomfortable because Chase was deliberately laughing at her, then she unambiguously expressed her annoyance, *"Get out of my face, bro!"*. When saying this sentence, Ally threatened Chase's face directly and explicitly so that the conversation could be identified as impoliteness strategies bald on record. As stated by Culpeper (2005), bald on record is recorded as occurring when the speaker directly attacks or damages the interlocutor's face without any intention to hide his feelings. Threatening language is allowed in situations where the threat to the listener's face is minimal or where the speaker is much stronger than the listener (Kelvin & Rudianto, 2023).

Data 2:

Brian : **"Please, Debora. Shut the fuck up when somebody else is talking this entire fucking show.** Your fucking sidebar conversations with Billy Ray, sidebar conversations with Sam over here, shut the fucked up. Please, go ahead."

In this sentence, Brian expressed his annoyance by using the impoliteness strategies bald on record. Brian attacks Deborah using clear and unambiguous language. Brian took this action so that Deborah would not have a sidebar conversation while someone was talking. The words that Brian used to threaten Deborah's face made her fall silent and realize her mistake. This is done without the need for an endpoint by using insulting language to hurt the listener's face in a way that is immediately noticeable (Elkholy & Ahsani, 2023). When the Face-Threatening Act (FTA) happened in a clear, unambiguous, direct, and also performed briefly to the face, it was called bald on record (Culpeper, 2005). This situation occurs when the rewards are not what they expected (Sambada & Ariatmi, 2024).

### Positive Impoliteness

Data 3:

Brian : "Okay, we're gonna move on from that topics"  
Keeko : "What about ectopic pregnancy, what do you feel about that?"  
Brian : **"No. We're gonna move on from that."**

In the conversation above, Brian as the host was planning to change the subject. Then, Keeko gave a suggestion to discuss the topic of pregnancy. Seemingly disagreeing, Brian did not care about Keeko's topic suggestion to him, coupled with an expression that looked away from Keeko. Because Brian disregarded Keeko's suggested topic, he indirectly ignored Keeko's face, which is why this is included in the sub-strategies of positive impoliteness. Indirectly, the sentence that Brian used has damaged the face of his speech partner by ignoring her for expressing disagreement with other people's ideas. The strategy is described as attacking the positive face of the addressee using the act of excluding another speaker (Culpeper, 2005). It follows that an action may be considered impolite if the speech partner believes the speaker will do harm, lose face, or engage in threatening behaviour (Khotimah & Sawardi, 2023).

Data 4:

Keeko : "He's cut me off a lot of times, Brian."  
Brian : **"Keeko, you're the master of cutting off.** Just let him finish and then you can go."

In the conversation, Keeko complained to Brian, the host of the show, because her conversation was always cut off. But in fact, Brian did not take Keeko's side and blamed her by calling her by the other name, *"You're the master of cutting off."* Brian, as the speaker, directly attacks Keeko's face by using the other name, which can demean the interlocutor. Calling the other person by name is realised by using words that demean the other person (Bustan & Alakrash, 2020).

Data 5:

Brian : "Divorce is not some outlier occurrence that rarely happens like I said."  
Keeko : "Maybe to you. But how Chase? **I would agree with Chase.**"

In the conversation, Brian expressed his opinion on the phenomenon of divorce. But Keeko responded by excluding Brian's opinion, and she said she agreed more with Chase's opinion: *"Maybe to you. But how, Chase? I would agree with Chase."* The words Keeko said to Brian have attacked the interlocutor's face by excluding him from the topic of conversation. This can be identified as positive impoliteness because the speaker has dissociated from the other interlocutor. As Culpeper says, refusing association with others and avoiding sitting together are criteria for being associated with each other (Culpeper, 1996). As social creatures, humans want themselves to be part of or considered by the society around them (Suhandoko et al., 2021).

Data 6:

Brian : "I think that **you should bring a girl to McDonald's and she should pay for you.**"

Keeko : "What? I'm confused"

In the conversation, Brian appears to be using unclear language. Brian uses code in his utterances, but the target does not understand the meaning of the utterance. Keeko, the target of Brian's utterance, replies, *"What? I'm confused,"* which means she doesn't understand the words Brian is using for her. From this conversation, it can be identified as positive impoliteness because the speaker uses obscure or secretive language to attack the hearer's positive face. This gives the impression that the speaker's behavior during a conversation is carried out deliberately with the intention of making the other person feel uncomfortable (Kelvin & Rudianto, 2023). The use of secretive language by speakers can show disrespectful behavior. This can impact social interactions and cause tension (Sambada & Ariatmi, 2024).

### Negative Impoliteness

Data 7:

Brian : "If keeko become a born-again virgin, do you think that theirs.."

Chase : "I think potential match **if keeko got married one of us (men) would not make it out of the marriage alive probably.**"

Keeko : (the expression seems not agree) "I've never touched anyone in my life."

It's evident from their discourse that Brian and Chase are both discussing Keeko. Chase implies that Keeko wouldn't likely survive a marriage to a male, which could be interpreted as a ridicule or mockery of Keeko. By disparaging or making fun of Keeko, Chase has adopted a strategy to attack the negative aspects of her opponent. This strategy is an example of impoliteness used to degrade and humiliate other people. This occurs when an individual believes they are superior to other people (Bustan & Alakrash, 2020). Negative impoliteness techniques reduce the interlocutor's negative facial desirability, according to Culpeper (1996, p. 358).

Data 8:

Chase : "**Have you ever fuck someone** up who like was like trans people and they were like trying to get well?"

Ally : "Noo. If I'm 100 honest like don't give a fuck what people's opinions are like I'm the baddest bich, you can't change my fucking mind yeah maybe because it's delusional, but i don't give a fuck with them again."

It's clear from the chat that Chase is interrogating Ally about too-private stuff. Since there isn't a tight contact between the players, Chase's comments with Ally are customized because they request someone's privacy. Chase has attacked the interlocutor's negative face by using the space type of Invade the Other, which is based on the research findings. Negative impoliteness is employed to assault and harm the opponent's face, as stated by Culpeper (2005). Humans are solitary beings who always want freedom of movement unhindered by others (Suhandoko et al., 2021).

Data 9:



Keeko : "Your problem is you're spending time writing out all your personality traits and best qualities on a podcast like this. **I mean man who's doing that is not going to find high value woman.** I'm telling you right know!"

Brian : "Are you talking shit on the super chatters?"

Keeko : "Yes, I'm"

During the talk, Keeko scares Brian with words. Keeko gives the impression that her interlocutor will suffer the worst by saying, "*Man who's doing that is not going to find a high-value woman.*" By employing the term "frighten," the speaker attacks her opponent's negative demeanor with a negative attitude. They may behave disrespectfully unintentionally because they believe that what they are doing is right (Sambada & Ariatmi, 2024).

### Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Data 10:

Brian : "I would say any plastic surgery or excessive vanity in terms of makeup, so if you wear too much makeup .."

Deborah : "**Are any of us wearing too much makeup?**"

Deborah answers the question in this statement with a tone and facial expression that contradict each other. Deborah's query, "Are any of us wearing too much makeup?" is sarcastic since it attempts to counter Brian's earlier remark, "I would say any plastic surgery or excessive vanity in terms of makeup, so if you wear too much makeup..." since some of the other women in attendance acknowledged that they hardly ever applied eye makeup. When it comes to Brian's comment regarding the women there wearing too much makeup, it is an act of dishonest politeness. Furthermore, the ironic remark makes fun of the opposite of the masculine statement on women wearing excessive amounts of makeup. In actuality, not all ladies wear a lot of cosmetics, based on the admissions made by the female attendees. Women's usage of sarcasm against males is a way for them to tease men as part of their social quest for equality (Suhandoko et al., 2021). The application of blatantly fake politeness techniques to create social discord, which is nonetheless a surface manifestation of sarcasm or mocking politeness (Culpeper et al., 2003).

Data 11:

Keeko : "I just can't believe that the laughing the giggling, it's a joke to you guys, and it's people's live. If they're not bothering you they're not to trap you into sleeping with them just let them live their fucking lives they're not bothering you, why does it affect you so much?"

Chase : "Okay, **those are good question.**"

Keeko : "No! It's ridiculous!"

Keeko and Chase get into a fight in the exchange above. Keeko appears to be debating in order to vent her annoyance that everyone finds her viewpoint ridiculous and wonders why it has such a significant impact on Chase. However, in response to Keeko's argument, Chase says, "*Okay, those are good questions,*" seemingly ridiculing it. Keeko took offense at Chase's remarks because, in stating "*No! It's ridiculous!*", Chase trivialized the situation. Because of this, Chase uses irony or mock politeness in his speech to Keeko. Mocking is an impolite approach in which the other person subtly criticizes the other person's face (Milal & Pramono, 2021). In reaction to Keeko's remarks, Chase mocked with his speech, which was disrespectful. According to Culpeper (2005), sarcasm is evident in statements made explicitly with the intention of upsetting the audience.

### Withhold Politeness

Data 12:

Keeko : "So, what I was saying is the Bible has been Rewritten so many times.."

Chase : "False."

Keeko : "It's been translated so many times.."

Chase : "Faithfully and accurately"  
Keeko : **(SHIGH)**

It's clear from the exchange that Chase constantly cuts Keeko off in their talks. Keeko was offended by Chase's behavior, but she chose to remain silent in order to control her rage. It is disrespectful to not respond to expectations (Milal & Pramono, 2021). Therefore, Keeko's actions are seen as a strategy of withholding politeness. One way to withhold politeness is to remain silent when speaking (Suhandoko et al., 2021). According to Culpeper (2005), failing to be courteous might be characterized as a verbal assault when the recipient is not expected to be nice. Withhold impoliteness is extremely uncommon in this situation since it is ineffective as a means of putting others' faces in danger.

### Gender Differences in The Use of Impoliteness Strategies

The researcher discusses the gender differences in the data regarding the proportion of men and women who use impoliteness methods in this section. The researcher found that 28 of the 50 talks in which impoliteness strategies were employed were voiced by women. Men used 22 impoliteness strategies in the meantime. This data is used as a tool to address the second research question. This table illustrates how the Whatever podcast uses impoliteness strategies differently based on gender.

**Table 2. Data on the percentage of male and female participants in the use of impoliteness strategies**

Impoliteness Strategies	Male	Female
Bald on Record Impoliteness	2	9
Positive Impoliteness	13	11
Negative Impoliteness	5	6
Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	2	1
Withhold Politeness	0	1
Total	22	28

This study provides light on how differences in gender in impoliteness strategies are applied. The previous results make it clear that women use impoliteness strategies more often than men do. According to Wardhaugh (2009), there are distinctions between the jobs that men and women do in social reality. Women typically use speech as a means of expression (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2009). The theory put out may lead researchers to assume that women's roles are more likely to exhibit impoliteness strategies. Women are recognized to put in more effort to create pleasant social relationships, and their language is frequently characterized by openness, passion, and softness (Coates, 2015).

Because various people have different perspectives, it is impossible for everyone to ignore the influence of differences in gender on language use. There are real-world variations in the linguistic patterns employed by men and women. According to Lakoff (2004), women are required by society and culture to speak in feminine terms such as skepticism, respect, modality, tag questions, and so on. On the other hand, there are circumstances in which women are urged to be forceful in order to demonstrate their professionalism and independence; this may be interpreted as a hint that assertive women do not define themselves as feminine. Depending on their gender, men and women are known to be assertive in different ways. Men who are aggressive typically make use of their independence and power, whereas women typically utilize it to take advantage of social media platforms by making rude comments (Suhandoko et al., 2021). Furthermore, the majority opinion is that women prefer to speak softly while men tend to speak harshly. Under certain circumstances, it is essentially thought that women speak with a more polite tone than males do (Suhandoko et al., 2021).

Men and women have distinct linguistic styles, abilities, and behavioral traits. Elements such as voice intonation, face emotions, limb movements, and facial expressions sometimes cause variations in linguistic competence. In the discipline of sociolinguistics,

women are usually more conscientious and sensitive of social norms, according to Wardhaugh (2009, p. 315). On the other hand, men find it more difficult than women to fit in when it comes to language. Sociolinguists suggest that a variety of factors impact women's linguistic choices. For example, women often increase the quantity of words used, make them illogical or hard to understand, and change the tone when they gossip.

Based on the differences in how men and women use language and gender differences in usage, researchers found several facts about gender variances in the application of impoliteness strategies. The linguistic patterns of men and women are substantially different. In this work, researchers investigate the relationship between impoliteness strategies and facial expressions or concepts. The facial notion used in this study is one of the theoretical pillars of the study. Researchers found that women dominated the study's target impoliteness approaches, which consisted making fun of speaking partners' appearances. The study's findings show that women's speech predominates in the exchange of gender representation when it comes to the strategy of attacking the other person's face in order to provoke resistance from them, even though gender representation is typically associated with men.

According to this study, women are more likely than males to employ impoliteness strategies. The prevalence of impoliteness strategies used by women one of which is documented as being bald on record demonstrates how impoliteness is used to attack opponents straight in an effort to feel safer. This strategy is presented as resistance to attack the other person's face without making any attempt to lessen the attack. Deborah attacked Chase on the Whatever podcast for feeling like her Christian identity was being undermined by her allusions to Hitler, as an illustration of this strategy in action. *"Are you asking me that because I'm Jewish?" Deborah retorted, "Fuck you."* With a furious expression on her face, she emphasized taboo words, putting pressure on Chase. These findings suggest that women frequently use social intimacy in speech, even when it means expressing things that are regarded as impolite. The result is therefore consistent with the findings of Alonso-Almeida and Jose Alvarez-Gil (2021), who claim that women's face-threatening gestures are effective when they cause their interlocutors to feel excluded, disregarded, and unsympathetic.

Additionally, there are two types of impoliteness strategies positive and negative that are used to hurt the other person's face during a conversation. Positive impoliteness is the use of impoliteness strategies meant to damage the reputation of the listener. This study shows that male speakers often use positive impoliteness as a strategy to gently undercut other people's positive characteristics in order to make their opponents feel uncomfortable and alienated during conversations. Moreover, negative impoliteness describes the use of impoliteness techniques intended to highlight the negative aspects of the other person. This study indicates that women are more likely than men to use negative impoliteness. By intimidating, insulting, invading their personal space, instilling a sense of obligation, and other means, one might intentionally threaten the negative face wants of others (Suhandoko et al., 2021). These strategies are identical save for their objectives and the response of the speaking partner. Apart than that, they are almost the same.

Sarcasm or mock politeness, as well as withholding politeness, are other impoliteness strategies that do not include demeaning speech partners' faces. Sarcasm or mock politeness is the use of impoliteness practices with words that are clearly fake, manufactured, and seem nice on the surface. By employing the withhold politeness approach in between, the expected impoliteness strategies are prevented. Wardhaugh (1998) asserts that women are more observant, diligent, and conscious of linguistic norms. Men find it more difficult than women to acclimate to language in the interim. The researcher found that men were more likely than women to use sarcasm or mock politeness based on this assessment. Then, it was observed that women would once show impoliteness to their conversation partners in an attempt to hide their feelings.

The Whatever podcast study revealed results that provided light on why women are more likely than males to use impoliteness strategies. This is shown by Wardhaugh's (2009)



assertion that women prefer to converse more than males. This context is not meant to reveal differences in how impoliteness strategies are used by men and women. despite this, as the previous definition made clear, women are more likely than men to resort to impoliteness strategies. The results of the investigation showed that 50 contacts involved the employment of impoliteness strategies. Out of 50 data points, men only used impoliteness strategies 22 times, compared to 28 times for women.

## CONCLUSION

This study found that the Whatever podcast's YouTube channel employed five different impoliteness strategies and influenced by gender differences. Speakers on this podcast frequently utilize this strategy to make light of the faces of people they interview. The justification for this is that the speakers would prefer to own up to their disrespectful behavior than to pretend it never happened. According to the Whatever podcast, women are more likely than men to speak rudely when conversing. This is consistent with Wardhaugh's contention that women speak more than men. Words that involve impoliteness strategies can be very effectively employed by women as a weapon for both attack and defence. Thus, when it comes to employing impoliteness strategies, women tend to be more domineering.

## REFERENCES

- Alonso-Almeida, F., & Álvarez-Gil, F. J. (2021). Impoliteness in women's specialised writing in seventeenth-century English. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 22(1), 121–152. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.20004.alo>
- Bousfield, D., & Culpeper, J. (2008). Impoliteness: Eclecticism and Diaspora An introduction to the special edition. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/JPLR.2008.008>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge University Press.
- Bustan, E. S., & Alakrash, H. M. (2020). *An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Performed by Donald Trump Tweets Addressing the Middle East Countries*.
- Coates, J. (2015). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language*. Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Fifth Edition). Sage Publications.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>
- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10–11), 1545–1579. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00118-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00118-2)
- Elkholy, & Ahsani, N. (2023). Impoliteness in Jeremy Clarkson's humor in the tv series Top Gear. *Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture*, 5(1), 107–119. <https://doi.org/10.12928/notion.v5i1.7637>
- Kelvin, & Rudianto, G. (2023). An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in “Can You Ever Forgive Me?” Movie. *IDEAS Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v11i1.3877>
- Khotimah, K., & Sawardi, F. (2023). Impoliteness in the Talk Show Catatan Demokrasi on YouTube TvOne. *IJLLT: International Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Translation*. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt>
- Milal, A. D., & Pramono, A. C. (2021). Impoliteness Addressed to Different Genders and their Responses in The Kitchen Nightmares, a TV Reality Show. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 3(2), 131–146. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v3i2.131-146>

- Sambada, F. P., & Ariatmi, S. Z. (2024). An Analysis Of Impoliteness Strategies Of Genshin Impact Player In 1st Anniversary Posted On Twitter. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 10(1), 322–332. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i1.3220>
- Sayogie, F. (2022). Framing Face-Saving Behavior on Facebook. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*, 7(2), 554–559. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ijmil.2022.2.554>
- Siagian, J., & Simatupang, E. C. (2022). Positive and Negative Face Analysis in Big Hero 6 Movie: A Pragmatics Study. 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.414>
- Simanjuntak, J. R., & Ambalegin, A. (2022). Impoliteness Strategies Used in the Movie ‘Easy A’. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, 8(2), 289–296. <https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v8i2.1641>
- Suhandoko, S., Lyatin, U., & Ningrum, D. R. (2021). Impoliteness and Gender Differences in the Edge of Seventeen Movie. *NOBEL: Journal of Literature and Language Teaching*, 12(2), 228–242. <https://doi.org/10.15642/NOBEL.2021.12.2.228-242>
- Wardhaugh, R. (1998). *Sociolinguistic*. Blackwell Publisher Inc.
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2009). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (Eight). John Wiley & Sons.
- Wendy, W., & Rudianto, G. (2022). Negative Impoliteness in “Ellen DeGeneres” Talk Show: Pragmatic Approach. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 10(2), 1643–1654. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v10i2.3065>
- Yaseen Hassan, A., Firas Abdullah Al-Rawe, M., Shamel Abdullah, S., & Hlaimi, S. (2023). Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Used in Putin’s Speech at Annexation Ceremony. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 5(2), 153–167. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v5i2.153-167>
- Yule, G. (2006). The Study of Language. In *The Study of Language, THIRD EDITION*. Cambridge University Press.