UnCollCS
Proceeding of Undergraduate Conference on Literature, Linguistic, and Cultural Studies
E-ISSN: 2985-9476
Published by Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Untag Surabaya

House Atreides characters' impoliteness super-strategies and communicative functions in Dune

BRIAN RAMADHAN SONO
Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia
Email: brianramadhansono@gmail.com

BRAMANTYA PRADIPTA
Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia
Email: bramantya@untag-sby.ac.id

I WAYAN BUDIARTA
Universitas Warmadewa, Indonesia
Email: iw.budiarta@warmadewa.ac.id

Abstract. This study examines the impoliteness super-strategies and communicative functions employed by House Atreides characters in the official movie scripts of *Dune: Part One* (2021) and *Dune: Part Two* (2024), using Culpeper's (1996, 2011) impoliteness framework. A qualitative descriptive approach was adopted, with the official scripts as the sole data source; utterances containing face-threatening acts were identified through repeated close reading, coded, and classified according to Culpeper's (1996) five impoliteness super-strategies and Culpeper's (2011) three communicative functions. The findings show that House Atreides characters employ four of the five super-strategies, Bald on Record, Positive, Negative, and Sarcasm/Mock Impoliteness, while Withholding Politeness does not occur; Bald on Record Impoliteness is the most frequent, reflecting the characters' militaristic and authoritative social roles. Regarding communicative function, coercive impoliteness predominates, followed by affective impoliteness, while entertaining impoliteness occurs only among characters bound by close personal trust. These results indicate that impoliteness operates as a deliberate linguistic resource through which nominally honourable characters negotiate authority, vent emotional strain, and, within intimate relationships, build solidarity through banter. The study extends Culpeper's model to scripted science-fiction political discourse and suggests that a full account of institutional impoliteness requires supplementing Culpeper's taxonomy with power-based perspectives such as Bousfield and Locher (2008). The findings offer a reference point for future pragmatic research on impoliteness, power, and characterization in cinematic narrative.

Keywords: communicative functions, culpeper, impoliteness super-strategies, film discourse, pragmatics

INTRODUCTION

Impoliteness refers to communicative behaviour that intentionally attacks, damages, or disregards another person's face in social interaction (Culpeper, 1996, 2011). Culpeper (1996) classifies this face-attacking behaviour into five impoliteness super-strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withholding politeness. Beyond this classification of linguistic form, Culpeper (2011) further argues that impoliteness also serves three communicative functions depending on the speaker's intention and social context: coercive impoliteness, through which speakers exercise power and control the hearer's behaviour; affective impoliteness, through which speakers vent negative emotion; and entertaining impoliteness, through which speakers create humour, often at another participant's expense, to reinforce solidarity among familiar interlocutors.

This study investigates both dimensions of impoliteness as performed by House Atreides characters, namely Paul Atreides, Lady Jessica, Gurney Halleck, Duncan Idaho, and Radioman, in the official movie scripts of *Dune: Part One* (2021) and *Dune: Part Two* (2024). These films depict a sociopolitical universe defined by noble houses, imperial governance, religious prophecy, and military command, in which political rivalry, succession disputes, and the struggle to control the desert planet Arrakis generate frequent verbal conflict. Within this setting, House Atreides characters repeatedly issue direct commands, criticism, threats, and confrontational remarks that threaten the hearer's face (Brown & Levinson, 1987), producing exactly the kind of face-attacking behaviour that Culpeper's (1996, 2011) framework is designed to classify and explain.

A striking phenomenon underlies this pattern. House Atreides is consistently portrayed as noble, honourable, and virtuous, yet its members frequently rely on impoliteness to command subordinates, discipline trainees, challenge rivals, and manage political crises. This behaviour is not incidental rudeness but reflects their institutional roles as leaders, military commanders, Bene Gesserit members, and political elites. Bousfield (2008) and Archer (2008) similarly show that speakers who occupy positions of institutional authority, such as army instructors or courtroom officials, often employ impoliteness as a legitimate tool for enforcing order rather than as a breakdown of civility. House Atreides therefore provides a compelling case for examining impoliteness as a calculated linguistic instrument used to exercise control, discipline, and influence within a prestigious political institution.

Impoliteness in film dialogue has received considerable scholarly attention, ranging from workplace hierarchy in *The Devil Wears Prada* (Rizqi & Afriana, 2025) to interpersonal conflict in *A Man Called Otto* (Theresia & Nisa, 2024; Khaqqi & Pradipta, 2024) and family tension in *Cruella* (Djohan & Simatupang, 2022). However, these studies predominantly treat impoliteness as interpersonal rudeness or emotional expression rather than as an institutional strategy embedded in ideological, hierarchical, or political structures, and none examines impoliteness within the *Dune* film universe or among House Atreides characters specifically. This study therefore investigates the impoliteness super-strategies employed by House Atreides characters and further examines the communicative functions, coercive, affective, and entertaining impoliteness, that these strategies serve within their interactions. By applying Culpeper's (1996, 2011) framework to this previously unexamined context, the study demonstrates that impoliteness among House Atreides functions not as random rudeness but as a deliberate communicative

resource for exercising power, expressing emotion, and negotiating relationships within a fictional institution otherwise defined by nobility and honour.

Based on this background, the study addresses two research questions: (1) what impoliteness super-strategies are used by House Atreides characters in the official movie scripts of the *Dune* films, and (2) what communicative functions do these impoliteness super-strategies serve in the interactions of House Atreides characters? Accordingly, the study aims to identify the impoliteness super-strategies used by House Atreides characters and to analyze the communicative functions that these super-strategies serve.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study draws upon several interrelated theories to explain the phenomenon of impoliteness in the official movie scripts of *Dune: Part One* (2021) and *Dune: Part Two* (2024). Because impoliteness concerns language use in social interaction, the study is grounded in pragmatics, which examines how meaning is communicated and interpreted in context (Yule, 1996). Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1975; Searle, 1969) explains how utterances function as social actions such as commanding, threatening, or criticizing, which underlies much of the face-threatening dialogue examined here. Face Theory (Goffman, 1967) and Politeness Theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987) provide the conceptual foundation for understanding face-threatening behaviour, describing face as a public self-image that interlocutors cooperatively maintain, and face-threatening acts (FTAs) as utterances that inherently damage that image.

Building on these foundations, Culpeper's (1996) Impoliteness Theory constitutes the primary analytical framework of this study because it specifically addresses communicative behaviour that intentionally threatens or damages face. Culpeper (1996) classifies impoliteness into five super-strategies. Bald on record impoliteness performs a face threat directly and without mitigation. Positive impoliteness damages the hearer's desire for approval, for instance through exclusion, disassociation, or ridicule. Negative impoliteness threatens the hearer's autonomy and freedom of action, for example through condescension or explicit coercion. Sarcasm or mock politeness uses insincere polite forms to ridicule the hearer. Withholding politeness occurs when a speaker deliberately omits an expected politeness behaviour, such as a greeting or an acknowledgement.

In addition to classifying impoliteness according to its linguistic form, Culpeper (2011) argues that impoliteness also serves particular communicative functions depending on the speaker's intention, the relationship between participants, and the social context of the interaction. Culpeper (2011) identifies three primary functions. Coercive impoliteness refers to the use of face-threatening language to exercise power, control the hearer's behaviour, and redress an imbalance of power in the speaker's favour; Bousfield and Locher (2008) similarly explain that impoliteness frequently functions as a strategic resource for negotiating institutional or interpersonal power. Affective impoliteness occurs when speakers use face-threatening language to vent negative emotion, such as anger, frustration, disappointment, or fear, rather than to achieve an instrumental goal. Entertaining impoliteness, by contrast, functions to create humour or amusement at the expense of a willing participant, typically appearing as mock impoliteness between speakers who share a close relationship and mutual understanding (Culpeper, 2005, 2011).

A review of previous studies employing Culpeper's framework in film discourse, including analyses of *The Social Network* and *Bohemian Rhapsody* (Baiti, 2022), *Cruella*

(Djohan & Simatupang, 2022), *The Wrong Stepmother* (Simanjuntak & Johan, 2022), *Can You Ever Forgive Me?* (Kelvin & Rudianto, 2023), *A Man Called Otto* (Khaqqi & Pradipta, 2024; Theresia & Nisa, 2024), and *The Devil Wears Prada* (Rizqi & Afriana, 2025), shows that impoliteness consistently serves purposes such as expressing dominance, resistance, emotional conflict, self-defense, and workplace authority. However, these studies primarily focus on interpersonal relationships, psychological motivation, family conflict, or workplace interaction; limited attention has been given to impoliteness as a strategic instrument for exercising institutional authority and political power, and no prior study examines impoliteness among House Atreides characters or within the *Dune* film universe. The present study addresses this gap by examining how House Atreides characters employ impoliteness super-strategies and communicative functions within contexts of leadership, authority, and political conflict.

METHOD

This study employs an interpretive qualitative research design, in which impoliteness super-strategies and communicative functions performed by House Atreides characters are identified and interpreted through close reading of dialogue and contextual analysis of character interactions (Creswell, 2014). Content analysis is used as the research method: utterances are systematically read, coded, and classified according to Culpeper's (1996, 2005, 2011) framework in order to identify recurring patterns and interpret their pragmatic function (Krippendorff, 2018; Schreier, 2012; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

The data of this study consist of utterances produced by House Atreides characters that contain indicators of Culpeper's impoliteness super-strategies. The sole data source is the official film scripts of *Dune* (2021) and *Dune: Part Two* (2024); the released films were consulted only as a verification aid to confirm that scripted dialogue matched the final cut and to clarify tone or scene context, and no data were extracted from the films directly. The researcher served as the main instrument, responsible for selecting and categorizing relevant utterances, supported by the official scripts as the secondary instrument.

Data collection proceeded through obtaining the official scripts, repeated viewing of both films to verify tone and delivery, selecting House Atreides utterances that potentially contain impoliteness, identifying utterances exhibiting face-threatening features (threats, dismissals, insults, criticisms, or sarcasm), and organizing each utterance into a coding sheet recording the speaker, utterance, and preliminary impoliteness type. Each utterance was assigned a code indicating its sequence, strategy type, and speaker (e.g., *14BoR-LJ4*), summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Data Codes and Explanations of Impoliteness Super-Strategies in Dune: Part One (2021) and Dune: Part Two (2024)

No.	Code	Explanation
1.	BoR	Bald on Record Impoliteness
2.	PI	Positive Impoliteness
3.	NI	Negative Impoliteness
4.	S/MP	Sarcasm/Mock Impoliteness
5.	PA	Paul Atreides
6.	LJ	Lady Jessica
7.	GH	Gurney Halleck
8.	DI	Duncan Idaho
9.	KY	Kynes
10.	RM	Radioman

After the data were collected, utterances were sorted to confirm they demonstrated face-threatening behaviour according to Culpeper's (1996, 2005, 2011) framework; utterances containing no impoliteness were excluded. Each identified utterance was then interpreted to determine its super-strategy and, subsequently, its communicative function following Culpeper (2011), before the findings were synthesized to answer the two research questions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the classification and distribution of impoliteness super-strategies and communicative functions performed by House Atreides characters in *Dune* (2021) and *Dune: Part Two* (2024), based on Culpeper's (1996, 2005, 2011) framework, followed by a discussion of these findings in relation to theory, previous studies, and their implications.

A. Types of Impoliteness Super-Strategies Used by House Atreides Characters

Table 2. Total Findings in Impoliteness Super-Strategies Used by House Atreides Characters in the Scripts of Dune: Part One (2021) and Dune: Part Two (2024)

No.	Type	Total
1.	Bald on Record Impoliteness	23
2.	Positive Impoliteness	15
3.	Negative Impoliteness	9
4.	Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness	6
5.	Withholding Impoliteness	0
	Total	53

According to Table 2, House Atreides characters predominantly rely on direct and explicit face-threatening behaviour. The highest frequency occurs in the most straightforward and overt category, showing that their communication favours clear, unmitigated confrontation over subtle or indirect forms. Positive Impoliteness is the second most frequent, reinforcing the depiction of Atreides figures as assertive and authoritative, while Negative Impoliteness and Sarcasm/Mock Impoliteness occur less often, emerging only in specific political or high-stakes contexts. Notably, the complete absence of Withholding Politeness shows that House Atreides consistently favours overt verbal expression over silence as a means of threatening face.

1.Bald on Record Impoliteness

According to Culpeper (1996), Bald on Record Impoliteness occurs when a speaker performs a face-threatening act directly, explicitly, and without any attempt to minimize its impact on the hearer. The findings show that House Atreides characters frequently employ this strategy during military training, political confrontation, and moments of emotional conflict, reflecting the militaristic culture of House Atreides in which efficiency and authority often outweigh mitigation. For example, Paul Atreides commands Jessica during Voice training with the unmitigated imperative *"GIVE ME THE WATERRRRRR"* (Data 1BoR-PA1), momentarily reversing the expected instructor-student roles to assert control over the interaction. Similarly, after Reverend Mother Mohiam disrespects Lady Jessica, Paul directly confronts her authority with *"You dismiss*

my mother in her own house" (Data 5BoR-PA2), resisting an unwelcome imposition rather than deferring to her institutional rank.

2.Positive Impoliteness

Positive Impoliteness damages the hearer's desire for approval, association, or social value (Culpeper, 1996). This strategy is the second most frequent in the data, frequently occurring when characters attack another's identity or dignity. Paul's remark to Baron Harkonnen immediately after defeating him, *"Grandfather. You die like an animal"* (Data 14PI-PA22), exemplifies this strategy by explicitly denying the hearer's claim to dignity at the moment of his death. Playful instances also occur among close companions, as when Paul addresses Gurney Halleck upon reunion with the informal, teasing address *"I recognize your footsteps, old man"* (Data 11PI-PA20), showing that positive impoliteness can index solidarity as well as antagonism depending on the relationship between speakers.

3.Negative Impoliteness

Negative Impoliteness threatens the hearer's autonomy and freedom of action (Culpeper, 1996). This strategy appears less frequently, surfacing mainly in situations involving political assertion. Paul's declaration to the Fremen after securing political leadership, *"You will call me my Lord or Sire"* (Data 5NI-PA26), uses an obligatory modal to convert political victory into a linguistically enforced hierarchy. Similarly, *"Nobody stays – but me"* (Data 7NI-PA27) illustrates how Paul restricts other participants' freedom of action by unilaterally controlling who may remain during a political discussion.

4.Sarcasm/Mock Politeness

Sarcasm or mock politeness uses insincere polite forms to ridicule the hearer (Culpeper, 1996), though in close relationships it may instead function as playful banter. Paul's sarcastic thanks to Gurney after losing a training match, *"Thanks for the humiliation, old man"* (Data 4S/MP-PA31), is understood by both parties as affectionate teasing rather than genuine complaint, given their long-standing mentor-student bond. In a more antagonistic register, Paul's rhetorical question to Baron Harkonnen's dying opponent Jamis, *"Do you yield?"* (Data 6S/MP-PA33), publicly consolidates Paul's dominance despite its superficially polite interrogative form.

B.Communicative Functions of Impoliteness Super-Strategies Used by House Atreides Characters

Building on the three communicative functions established above, coercive, affective, and entertaining impoliteness (Culpeper, 2011), this section classifies the impoliteness super-strategies employed by House Atreides characters according to the communicative function each utterance performs, drawing on Bousfield and Locher (2008) to explain how these functions relate to power and interpersonal relationships. Of the 24 utterances classified in this section, coercive impoliteness accounts for ten instances, affective impoliteness for nine, and entertaining impoliteness for five, as summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Total Findings in Communicative Functions of Impoliteness Used by House Atreides Characters in the Scripts of Dune: Part One (2021) and Dune: Part Two (2024)

No.	Communicative Function	Total
1.	Coercive Impoliteness	10
2.	Affective Impoliteness	9
3.	Entertaining Impoliteness	5
	Total	24

1.Coercive Impoliteness

Coercive impoliteness occurs when speakers use face-threatening language to exercise power and redress an imbalance of power in their favour (Culpeper, 2011; Bousfield & Locher, 2008). This is the most frequent function in the data because House Atreides characters occupy leadership and military positions in which immediate compliance and clear assertions of authority are institutionally expected. Lady Jessica's unmitigated imperative *"KILL HIM. NOW"* (Data 14BoR-LJ4), issued while a Harkonnen soldier still threatens her and Paul, prioritizes obtaining compliance over preserving the hearer's face. Likewise, Gurney Halleck's correction of Stilgar's informal address toward Duke Leto, *"You will address the Duke as 'Sire' or 'My Lord'…"* (Data 3NI-GH4), regulates another participant's linguistic behaviour to protect institutional protocol rather than to express personal emotion.

2.Affective Impoliteness

Affective impoliteness occurs when speakers vent negative emotion, such as anger, fear, or disappointment, rather than seeking control or compliance (Culpeper, 2011). This function appears predominantly in Paul Atreides' utterances during moments of fear, grief, and identity crisis. After surviving the Gom Jabbar test, Paul confronts Jessica with *"I could have died"* (Data 8BoR-PA4), prioritizing emotional release over any attempt to control her behaviour. Similarly, his insult toward the dying Baron Harkonnen, *"Grandfather. You die like an animal"* (Data 14PI-PA22), functions here as an outlet for accumulated anger and satisfaction rather than a bid for compliance from an opponent who can no longer act.

3.Entertaining Impoliteness

Entertaining impoliteness functions to create humour, typically through mock impoliteness exchanged between participants who share a close relationship (Culpeper, 2005, 2011). This function occurs only among characters bound by long-standing familiarity, namely Paul Atreides, Duncan Idaho, and Gurney Halleck, and is the least frequent function overall. Duncan's playful refusal, *"You do? Oh. Too bad. Because no"* (Data 1S/MP-DI3), is recognized by Paul as teasing rather than genuine rejection, given their close mentor-student bond. Paul's sarcastic *"Thanks for the humiliation, old man"* (Data 4S/MP-PA31) toward Gurney functions similarly, reinforcing rather than damaging their relationship.

C.Discussion of Findings in Relation to Theory, Previous Studies, and Implications

Considered against Culpeper's (1996, 2005, 2011) impoliteness super-strategies, the findings confirm that the taxonomy is broadly adequate for classifying the face-threatening utterances produced by House Atreides characters: every instance identified in the two scripts could be assigned to one of the five categories, and four of the five, Bald on Record, Positive, Negative, and Sarcasm/Mock Impoliteness, are attested. The findings further confirm that Culpeper's (2011) three communicative functions are likewise sufficient to classify why House Atreides characters perform these strategies, with coercive impoliteness accounting for ten instances, affective impoliteness for nine, and entertaining impoliteness for five. This suggests that Culpeper's taxonomy and functional model, although formulated primarily from naturally occurring spoken interaction, remain descriptively robust when applied to fixed, scripted political dialogue

in a science-fiction narrative. However, the model's descriptive taxonomy alone does not fully explain why Bald on Record and coercive impoliteness specifically dominate; explaining this distributional skew requires supplementing Culpeper's taxonomy with power-based accounts such as Bousfield (2008), Bousfield and Locher (2008), and Archer (2008), who argue that institutional rank licenses direct, unmitigated face-threats without the mitigation ordinarily expected in symmetrical relationships.

When compared with previous research employing the same framework, the dominance of Bald on Record Impoliteness found here is consistent with Theresia and Nisa (2024) in *A Man Called Otto* and partially consistent with Djohan and Simatupang (2022) in *Cruella*, suggesting that direct, unmitigated face-threats tend to predominate in narratives involving authority or emotional urgency regardless of genre. However, the underlying communicative function identified in this study diverges from several previous studies: whereas Djohan and Simatupang (2022) and Kelvin and Rudianto (2023) interpret similarly direct impoliteness as rebellion or a defense mechanism concealing insecurity, House Atreides characters use direct impoliteness primarily as coercive impoliteness to assert legitimate institutional authority. This contrast suggests that the same super-strategy can serve markedly different communicative functions depending on whether the speaker occupies a subordinate or a dominant structural position within the narrative.

Several contextual variables plausibly account for the observed distribution. The institutional and military hierarchy of House Atreides creates structural conditions in which direct commands carry legitimate authority rather than social risk; the high-stakes political environment of the narrative generates recurring urgency that reinforces directness and prompts affective venting; and individual relationships, such as Duncan Idaho and Gurney Halleck's long-standing bonds with Paul, explain why entertaining impoliteness appears exclusively among characters who share mutual trust. Theoretically, the study extends Culpeper's (1996, 2011) model beyond its original basis in naturally occurring spoken interaction to scripted political discourse, while showing that a full explanation of institutional impoliteness requires integrating Culpeper's classificatory framework with power-based accounts. Practically, the findings offer a model for understanding how language constructs authority, emotional strain, and solidarity in hierarchical settings, which may be useful for media and scriptwriting studies as well as for pragmatics instruction using popular film dialogue.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the impoliteness super-strategies and communicative functions employed by House Atreides characters in *Dune: Part One* (2021) and *Dune: Part Two* (2024) using Culpeper's (1996, 2011) framework. The findings show that House Atreides characters employ four of the five impoliteness super-strategies, Bald on Record, Positive, Negative, and Sarcasm/Mock Impoliteness, while Withholding Politeness does not occur, with Bald on Record Impoliteness appearing most frequently due to the characters' frequent use of direct commands, accusations, and criticism in political and military contexts.

The findings further show that these super-strategies serve three communicative functions: coercive impoliteness, the most dominant, reflecting House Atreides characters' use of impoliteness to establish leadership and assert or resist power; affective impoliteness, the second most frequent, appearing predominantly in Paul Atreides' utterances as he vents anger, fear, and disappointment during political conflict and

personal crisis; and entertaining impoliteness, the least frequent, occurring exclusively in playful exchanges between Paul Atreides, Duncan Idaho, and Gurney Halleck that reinforce solidarity rather than causing genuine offence. These findings are consistent with Culpeper's (2011) view that impoliteness performs distinct communicative functions and with Bousfield and Locher's (2008) argument that impoliteness is closely related to power, hierarchy, and interpersonal relationships.

Future researchers may examine impoliteness in other literary works, films, or television series to identify similarities and differences across genres and cultural settings, and may combine Culpeper's theory with other pragmatic approaches such as conversation analysis to provide a more comprehensive account of how impoliteness is constructed and interpreted in interaction. Future studies may also investigate the relationship between impoliteness and character development across a narrative. This study is expected to serve as a reference for further discussion of the relationship between language, power, emotion, and interpersonal communication in literary and cinematic discourse.

REFERENCES

Archer, D. E. (2008). Aggression and impoliteness: Related or synonymous? Language Power and Social Process, 21, 181.

Ardhy, M., Yuliasri, I., & Rozi, F. (2024). Impoliteness strategies implied among characters of The Simpsons Movie. Rainbow: Journal of Literature, Linguistics and Culture Studies, 13(1), 55–64.

Austin, J. L. (1975). How to do things with words. Harvard University Press.

Baiti, N. F. N. (2022). A comparative analysis of impoliteness by public figures in The Social Network and Bohemian Rhapsody movie. Arkhais-Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia, 13(2), 117–130.

Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness in interaction. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bousfield, D., & Locher, M. A. (2008). Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice (Vol. 21). Walter de Gruyter.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4). Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. SAGE.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of Pragmatics, 25(3), 349–367.

Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture, 1(1).

Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence (Vol. 28). Cambridge University Press.

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.

Djohan, M. S. S., & Simatupang, E. C. M. (2022). Impoliteness strategies in Cruella movie: Pragmatics study. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal), 5(3), 18931–18938.

Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62(1), 107–115.

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior. Anchor Books.

Kelvin, & Rudianto, G. (2023). An analysis of impoliteness strategies in "Can You Ever Forgive Me?" movie. IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching & Learning, Linguistics & Literature, 11(1).

Khaqqi, A. A., & Pradipta, B. (2024). An analysis of impoliteness strategy used by the main character in "A Man Called Otto" movie. Proceeding of Undergraduate Conference on Literature, Linguistic, and Cultural Studies, 3(1), 115–123.

Krippendorff, K. (2018). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Sage Publications.

Natalia, R. (2024). Impoliteness strategies and social dimensions in Enola Holmes 2 movie: Socio-pragmatics study. JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy), 8(2), 297–308.

Putri, J. J. D. (2021). Strategi ketidaksantunan positif dalam film The Raid dan The Raid 2: Berandal. Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik Dan Sastra (SEMANTIKS), 3, 257–267.

Rizqi, N. T., & Afriana, A. (2025). An analysis of impoliteness strategies in "The Devil Wears Prada" movie. Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature, 11(2), 149–160.

Romadhoni, D. T., Wijaya, R. K. A. R., & Hidayatulloh, A. (2024). Impoliteness strategies used in the movie Pearl Harbor. Sintaksis: Publikasi Para Ahli Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris, 2(5), 349–358.

Schreier, M. (2012). Qualitative content analysis in practice. Sage.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.

Simanjuntak, J. R., & Ambalegin, A. (2022). Impoliteness strategies used in the movie "Easy A". Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature, 8(2), 289–296.

Simanjuntak, J. R., & Johan, M. (2022). The analysis of impoliteness utterances as reflected in "The Wrong Stepmother" movie. EScience Humanity Journal, 3(1), 39–50.

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.

Theresia, A., & Nisa, B. (2024). Impoliteness strategies based on Culpeper's model: A discourse analysis of A Man Called Otto. International Journal of Humanity Studies, 8(1), 67–69.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.