

## An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in “Close the Door” Podcast by Deddy Corbuzier

Atika Anjani<sup>1\*</sup>, Khairunnisa Azzahra<sup>2</sup>, Novani Elisabeth Lingga<sup>3</sup>, Nurhikmah Siagian<sup>4</sup>, Resa Aquilera Ramadhani<sup>5</sup>, Meisuri<sup>6</sup>  
Universitas Negeri Medan

**Corresponding Author:** Atika Anjani; [atikasan01@gmail.com](mailto:atikasan01@gmail.com)

### ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: *Impoliteness Strategies, Podcast, pragmatics, Dialogue*

Received : 5 February

Revised : 23 March

Accepted: 23 April

©2026 Anjani, Azzahra, Lingga, Siagian, Ramadhani, Meisuri: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

This research examines the application of impoliteness strategies in the Close The Door Podcast led by Deddy Corbuzier, specifically in the episode with Fajar Sadboy and Indra Frimawan. The study seeks to determine the kinds of impoliteness tactics employed in the dialogue and to clarify how these tactics operate within the exchange between the host and the guests. This research employs a qualitative descriptive approach, with data sourced from the spoken dialogues in the chosen podcast episode available on YouTube. The dialogue was documented and examined through the impoliteness framework suggested by Jonathan Culpeper, which encompasses five strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock impoliteness, and the absence of politeness. The results reveal that fourteen statements include impoliteness tactics. Among these, negative impoliteness appears as the most dominant strategy with 29.41%, followed by bald on record impoliteness with 23.53%, while positive impoliteness and withholding politeness each account for 17.65%, and sarcasm or mock impoliteness appears as the least frequent strategy with 11.76%. The findings show that the speakers frequently employ criticism, mockery, pressure, teasing, or brief replies while conversing. In an informal and entertainment-focused podcast, many of these rude phrases serve as playful teasing or impulsive responses instead of genuine insults. This study emphasizes that strategies of impoliteness in digital media, especially in podcast interactions, can fulfill various communicative functions like conveying emotions, generating humor, and enhancing audience engagement in the conversation

## **INTRODUCTION**

Communication among humans primarily relies on language. Individuals utilize language not just for sharing information but also to convey emotions, attitudes, views, and social connections. Speakers can express criticism, agreement, disagreement, support, or even dominance over others through language. Since communication occurs in various social settings, speakers select their vocabulary depending on their goals and the interaction's context. In linguistics, pragmatics examines how meaning is generated and comprehended within context, such as how speakers convey implied meanings and how listeners interpret them. A significant subject in pragmatics is impoliteness, which denotes language actions that undermine or threaten another individual's social face, dignity, and identity. Culpeper (2011) states that impoliteness reflects a negative stance toward specific actions that breach social norms and expectations within a context, with these actions deemed offensive due to their emotional impact on individuals. In digital communication, impoliteness is characterized as the deliberate use of language to offend during online interactions, distinguishing it from incivility or intolerance as it frequently targets individual traits rather than wider political legitimacy (Sikorskii & Carrió-Pastor, 2026; Culpeper, 2021). Rudeness may manifest through criticism, ridicule, sarcasm, exclusion, or unfavorable assessment. It is a normal aspect of authentic communication and frequently takes place in casual or impromptu exchanges where feelings, power dynamics, and social intimacy shape how individuals express themselves. As a result, examining impoliteness aids us in grasping how language can foster tension, humor, or conflict in daily interactions, whether in person or through digital communication.

This study examines the impoliteness strategies employed in a specific episode of the *Close The Door* Podcast, hosted by Deddy Corbuzier, titled "Fajar Sadboy & Frimawan Bergabung." "Gak Lagi Lagi Duhh!!" The focus of this specific research is the comments made by the podcast host and guests, particularly the words, phrases, and sentences that may include strategies of impoliteness. The selection of the analysis subject was determined by criteria including host-guest interaction, the existence of argumentative or expressive content, and the occurrence of statements that may include interruption, sarcasm, criticism, or questions, among other elements, in the speech of the podcast host, which can influence the audience's discourse.

In recent years, digital media has grown rapidly in Indonesia. Numerous individuals view or hear discussions on YouTube, Instagram, TikTok, and Spotify. Deddy Corbuzier's podcast, "Close The Door", ranks among the most popular online talk shows. This podcast is recognized for its powerful, daring, and occasionally contentious discussions. Public figures such as politicians, celebrities, influencers, and experts are generally asked to take part in the podcast. Politics, social challenges, personal controversies, and national matters are just a few instances of the significant, sensitive, or controversial topics that are often discussed. These topics sometimes lead to intense discussions. The host often challenges the guest's assertions, asks pointed questions, or provides a

critical reply to their opinions. These actions might be regarded as discourteous based on the context and the audience's interpretation.

However, rudeness in the media isn't necessarily negative. Culpeper (1996) argues that impoliteness strategies can be deliberately employed to damage an individual's face and provoke conflict in a dialogue. Deliberate rudeness can sometimes enhance discussions, making them more intense, engaging, and intriguing for listeners.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

This study examines the impoliteness tactics employed in a specific episode of the *Close The Door Podcast*, hosted by Deddy Corbuzier, entitled "Fajar Sadboy & Firmawan Bergabung." "Gak Lagi-Lagi Lagi!!". This research analyzes the statements made by the podcast host and guests, particularly focusing on the words, phrases, and sentences that may exhibit impoliteness strategies. The selection of the analysis subject was determined by the criteria of host-guest interaction, the existence of argumentative or expressive material, in addition to the presence of remarks that may include interruption, sarcasm, criticism, or inquiries, among other elements, in the remarks of the podcast host, which can be utilized to mediate the audience's speech.

The subsequent conversation illustrates how impoliteness tactics are expressed in the interaction among the podcast participants.

- Fajar : "Ada aku disitu. Maksudnya ada ada orang disitu"  
Firmawan : "Ya kalau disitu ya ada orang."  
Deddy : "Kan temen lu pada disono semua"  
Fajar : "Yaudah aku disini. Ngapain? Dia nggak ajak. Nggak mau diajak."  
Firmawan : "Nggak ada yang mau ngajak sih kalau lu kayak gini sumpah"  
Fajar : "Ya nggak apa-apa"

The statement "Nggak ada yang mau ngajak sih kalau lu kayak gini sumpah" in the discussion from Deddy Corbuzier's *Close The Door Podcast* falls under the category of positive impoliteness. Because it targets the hearer's desire to be loved and accepted, it is regarded as positive impoliteness. The speaker (Firmawan) offers a negative assessment and implies social rejection by stating that no one wants to welcome him. This puts the hearer's positive façade in jeopardy, particularly his wish to fit in. However, given the casual and lighthearted nature of the exchange and Fajar's composed reply ("Ya nggak apa-apa"), the remark can be interpreted as lighthearted teasing rather than a grave offense. As a result, the amicable exchange between the speakers lessens the impact of the utterance's positive impoliteness.

There is little research on the use of impoliteness in Indonesian podcast media, despite the fact that numerous earlier studies have examined impoliteness tactics in classroom discourse, political debates, television shows, and social media interactions. One way to think of podcasts is as a semiformal digital communication medium where combative discourse is frequently accompanied by spontaneity and fun. Nonetheless, there is still a lack of research on the

pragmatic study of rudeness in this kind of media, particularly in well-known talk programs with direct and forceful communication styles. Therefore, this study aims to fill this research gap by examining the use of impoliteness strategies in the context of contemporary Indonesian podcasts and contributing to the development of pragmatic studies in digital media discourse.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This research utilizes a qualitative descriptive approach to examine impoliteness tactics present in genuine conversational exchanges. The qualitative method is utilized since the data are analyzed through spoken expressions and understood according to their contextual implications, while the descriptive technique seeks to recognize and outline the kinds of impoliteness strategies employed in the communication. The study's data are derived from an episode of the *Close The Door* podcast available on YouTube, featuring remarks made by the host and guest speakers that may include impoliteness strategies, which were then gathered and examined using systematic research methods. The information in this study was gathered through meticulous and repeated examination of the chosen podcast episode to gain a comprehensive understanding of the dialogue context. The verbal exchange was subsequently converted into written format to guarantee organized and precise analysis. Once the transcription was finished, the transcript was carefully analyzed to pinpoint statements that may exhibit impoliteness strategies. These statements were then chosen and categorized as the main data for the research. During the analysis phase, the collected data were categorized according to Jonathan Culpeper's (1996) framework of impoliteness, consisting of five types: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withholding politeness. Every statement was examined by taking into account its contextual factors, such as the speaker, the listener, and the situational context in which it took place.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Language interaction in conversation often reflects various strategies that speakers use to express attitudes, emotions, and social relationships. According to Jonathan Culpeper (1996), impoliteness strategies are communicative behaviors intended to attack the hearer's face and create social conflict during interaction. In conversational settings such as interviews or podcasts, speakers may intentionally or unintentionally produce impolite expressions to show disagreement, frustration, humor, or criticism. In this research, the analysis focuses on the impoliteness strategies used in the *Close The Door* Podcast conversation between Deddy Corbuzier, Indra Frimawan, and Fajar Sadboy. Based on Culpeper's framework, five impoliteness strategies were identified in the data, namely bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock impoliteness, and withholding politeness. Each strategy appears in different conversational contexts and reflects how the speakers express criticism, commands, ridicule, or social distance during the interaction. The results of this research are presented in the following table.

Table 1

No.	Impoliteness Strategy	Number	%
1.	Bald on Record Impoliteness	4	23,53%
2.	Positive Impoliteness	3	17,65%
3.	Negative Impoliteness	5	29,41%
4.	Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness	2	11,76%
5.	Withholding Politeness	3	17,65%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>

***Bald on Record Impoliteness***

Minute : 14.44

- Deddy : “bilkis tau bilkis?”
- Fajar : “ah y aitu malkis kan, maknya bilkis”
- Frimawan : “ayu ting ting”
- Fajar : “iyah”
- Frimawan : “**jangan melotot**”
- Fajar : “iyah”

In this scene, Erimawan says “jangan melotot,” which means “don’t glare at me.” This statement can be identified as bald on record impoliteness since the speaker directly instructs the hearer without employing any politeness tactic. The statement is conveyed in a direct and transparent manner, demonstrating that the speaker promptly responds to the listener’s facial expression. Dengan mengatakan “jangan melotot,” pembicara secara langsung mengkritik perilaku pendengar dan meminta mereka untuk berhenti melakukannya. The command is stated plainly without any effort to mitigate the statement, like employing indirect wording or courteous expressions. Due to this straightforwardness, the statement can jeopardize the listener's dignity and possibly cause them discomfort or embarrassment. Consequently, this remark illustrates blatant on-the-record rudeness as the speaker emphasizes issuing a direct order over upholding politeness in the exchange

Minute: 34.44

- Deddy : “pernah koma juga 13 hari?”
- Fajar : “bukan koma sih”
- frimawan : “trus apa”
- fajar : “pingsan”
- deddy : “pingsan 13 hari itu koma? **Goblok**, kesel gua”
- frimawan : “sabar om sabar om”

In this dialogue, Deddy uses the term “goblok,” meaning “stupid,” in reply to Fajar’s account of being unconscious for 13 days. This phrase is classified as bald on record impoliteness since it serves as a straightforward insult directed towards the listener. The term is employed instinctively to express the speaker’s annoyance during the discussion. Rather than providing a calm explanation, the speaker quickly assigns a negative term to the listener. Such a statement directly undermines the hearer’s positive face, as it conveys disapproval and a lack of

respect for the hearer. The speaker makes no effort to lessen the severity of the statement or lighten it with humor or subtle wording. Since the insult is given openly and directly, it clearly indicates bald on record rudeness in the communication

### ***Positive Impoliteness***

Minute: 0:38

- Fajar : "check check" (check microphone)  
Frimawan : "Kebalik" (he said to Fajar that his headphone terbalik)  
Deddy : (just Laugh)  
Frimawan : "Kan berasa jar kalo terbalik jar"  
Fajar : (try to fix the headphone)  
Frimawan : "**Ribet amat sii ini orang**" (help him)

The statement "*Ribet amat sii ini orang*" can be regarded as positive impoliteness since it challenges Fajar's positive face, which denotes his desire to be liked, valued, and viewed as capable by others. By referring to him as "*ribet*," Frimawan negatively assesses Fajar's actions as he struggles with his headphones. Such remarks diminish Fajar's social worth in the eyes of others, particularly since they are made publicly during the podcast. It suggests that Fajar is turning something easy into something challenging. The idea of positive impoliteness suggests that strategies like criticizing, mocking, or conveying disapproval harm the hearer's positive face. Although Frimawan assists him later, the statement still has a face-threatening aspect. Nonetheless, since the engagement occurs in a casual and amicable environment, and no one takes offense, the remark acts more as lighthearted banter than as a genuine offense

Minute 8:30

- Deddy : "Kan temen lu pada disono semua"  
Fajar : "Yaudah aku disini. Ngapain? Dia nggak ajak. Nggak mau diajak."  
Firmawan : "**Nggak ada yang mau ngajak sih kalau lu kayak gini sumpah**"  
Fajar : "Ya nggak apa-apa"

In the dialogue, the utterance "*Nggak ada yang mau ngajak sih kalau lu kayak gini sumpah*" can be categorized as **positive impoliteness**. It is considered positive impoliteness because it attacks the hearer's need to be liked and accepted. By saying, that no one wants to invite him, the speaker (Firmawan) gives a negative evaluation and suggests social rejection. This threatens the hearer's positive face, especially his desire to belong to a group. However, based on the informal and humorous context of the conversation, and Fajar's calm response ("Ya nggak apa-apa" (ya it's okay), the statement may function as playful teasing rather than a serious insult. Therefore, although the utterance contains positive impoliteness, its effect is softened by the friendly interaction between the speakers.

### *Negative Impoliteness*

Minute 04:38

- Deddy : "pingsan 13 hari itu koma."  
Fajar : "pingsan, pingsan."  
Deddy : "**koma goblok!**"  
Frimawan : "sabar om, sabar om."

In this part, the engagement intensifies concerning the interpretation of medical conditions. Fajar continuously asserts that he experienced "fainting" (pingsan) for 13 days, rejecting the more precise term "coma." In visible frustration with Fajar's obstinacy and irrational reasoning, Deddy loses his cool and yells the word "Goblok!" (Foolish/Moron). This serves as a prime illustration of the "Scorn and Ridicule" tactic since it represents a straightforward verbal assault aimed at embarrassing the audience. By referring to his guest as stupid on camera, Deddy effectively diminishes Fajar's dignity and undermines his "negative face," the inherent desire to be respected and regarded as a capable person.

Minute 05:44

- Deddy : "**Bodo amat 13 hari. Kenapa, kenapa 13 hari? Jawab!**"  
Fajar : "kejadian pertama kali pingsan itu karena pohon di belakang rumah ditebang."

Deddy employs a negative impoliteness tactic by compelling Fajar to provide an explanation on the spot. Negative impoliteness occurs when a speaker endangers the hearer's negative face, which refers to the individual's ability to act or reply without feeling coerced. When Deddy states, "Bodo amat 13 hari. Mengapa, mengapa 13 hari? Jawab!" dia menunjukkan kemarahan dan ketidaksabaran. The expression "bodo amat" indicates that he is indifferent to Fajar's potential reasons or emotions. The recurrence of "kenapa" heightens the tension and compels Fajar to respond swiftly. The command "jawab!" is a straightforward instruction that compels Fajar to reply instantly. Consequently, Deddy restricts Fajar's liberty in the discussion, rendering this exchange a distinct instance of negative impoliteness

### *Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness*

Minute 16:14

- Deddy : Kan katanya dapat yang Korea banget tuh  
Frimawan : Suami mantan suaminya lah. Eh ga tau udah cerai kah?  
Staff : Udah cerai  
Fajar : kayak apa yah..**orang dapat yang Korea malah cari yang korengan sih**

The statement "orang dapat yang Korea malah cari yang korengan sih" is classified as sarcasm or mock impoliteness according to Culpeper's theory since it seems funny but actually expresses mockery. The difference between "Korea" (linked to beauty) and "korengan" (linked to something unappealing) generates an ironic juxtaposition and unfavorable judgment. Even though presented humorously, the remark subtly ridicules the individual being mentioned and undermines their positive image. Thus, it operates as sarcasm or playful rudeness instead of a straightforward affront

Minute: 34:24

- Deddy : Pernah koma juga 13 hari katanya?  
Fajar : Bukan koma sih  
Frimawan : **apa titik? Tanda seru?**  
Fajar : Bukan

The phrase “*apa titik? "Tanda seru?"*” puede clasificarse como sarcasmo o como una falta de cortesía simulada según la teoría de la descortesía de Culpeper. Culpeper describes sarcasm or feigned politeness as situations where a speaker makes a remark that seems funny or lighthearted externally but subtly expresses contempt or questions the remarks of the prior speaker. Dalam percakapan ini, ketika Fajar memperbaiki pernyataan dengan mengatakan “Bukan koma sih,” Frimawan menjawab dengan “apa titik?” “Tanda seru?”, sengaja bermain dengan tanda baca. Even though the reply is presented humorously, it indirectly ridicules Fajar’s correction by amplifying and diminishing the term “koma.” Rather than addressing the clarification thoughtfully, the speaker turns it into a play on words, crafting a comedic disparity and gentle mockery. This ironic overstatement indicates a lack of sincerity and acts as a subtle face threat, as it diminishes the gravity of the earlier remark. Consequently, the statement can be classified as sarcasm or playful impoliteness since it employs humor and irony to subtly confront and ridicule the conversation partner instead of delivering a straightforward insult.

#### ***Withholding Politeness***

Minute 33 : 32

- Firmawan : "Ilang berapa hari?"  
Fajar : "Sekitar... tapi emang niat merantau juga sih."  
Firmawan : "**Gue nanya ilang berapa hari.**"  
Fajar : "Tapi emang niat merantau juga sih."

This dialogue can be interpreted as an example of withholding politeness because the guest does not provide the response that is expected in the conversation. In the impoliteness framework proposed by Jonathan Culpeper, withholding politeness refers to a situation where a speaker deliberately or indirectly fails to perform a polite or cooperative action that is normally expected during an interaction.

In this conversation, the host asks a clear and direct question about how many days the guest was missing. The question requires a specific and straightforward answer, such as mentioning the number of days. In normal conversational norms, when someone asks a factual question like this, the listener is expected to provide the requested information to maintain the flow of interaction. However, instead of answering the question, the question, the host repeats it in order to obtain the missing information. Despite this repetition, the guest again gives the same unrelated response, continuing to avoid the original question.

This behavior shows a lack of cooperative participation in the conversation. By not providing the relevant information and repeatedly diverting the topic, the guest withholds the response that would normally help

the interaction proceed smoothly. As a result, the conversational flow becomes disrupted and the host must make additional effort to continue the discussion.

Minute 39 : 47

Deddy : "Selama 13 hari itu pingsan tuh jatuh berapa lama bangun?"

Fajar : "Gak tau."

Deddy : "Yaudah deh..."

This interaction can also be categorized as withholding politeness because the guest does not provide the type of response that is normally expected in the conversation. In the impoliteness framework proposed by Jonathan Culpeper, withholding politeness occurs when a speaker fails to perform a cooperative or polite response that would usually help maintain the flow of interaction. In this dialogue, the host asks a question to clarify the guest's experience of fainting for thirteen days. The question encourages the guest to give a more detailed explanation, such as describing how long he remained unconscious or how the situation occurred. In everyday conversation, questions like this usually invite elaboration so that the listener can better understand the event being discussed. However, the guest responds only with "Gak tau" (I don't know). This very brief answer does not provide any additional explanation or information that could help the conversation continue. Because the response is minimal and does not address the question in a meaningful way, it limits the development of the discussion.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research examined the application of impoliteness tactics in the engagement between the host and guests in the chosen episode of the Close The Door Podcast. According to the analysis utilizing Jonathan Culpeper's (1996) framework of impoliteness, the results indicate that various forms of impoliteness strategies manifest in the dialogue as elements of the informal and spontaneous communication style in digital platforms. The analyzed data revealed five categories of impoliteness strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcastic or mock impoliteness, and withholding politeness. A total of fourteen statements were identified to include impoliteness strategies. Among these, negative impoliteness emerged as the primary strategy, succeeded by bald on record impoliteness, whereas positive impoliteness and withholding politeness occurred equally often, and sarcasm or mock impoliteness was the least common type.

The findings show that the speakers frequently employ direct criticism, mockery, coercion, teasing, or brief replies during their conversations. These expressions can jeopardize the hearer's face as they may convey disagreement, annoyance, or unfavorable judgment. Nonetheless, the analysis indicates that impoliteness in this podcast does not consistently serve as a grave insult or cause for conflict. In numerous instances, rude phrases arise in a laid-back and amusing dialogue setting where the participants engage informally with one another. Since the podcast serves as an entertainment medium, certain rude remarks are

seen as lighthearted teasing, unplanned responses, or funny observations instead of sincere assaults.

Consequently, this research demonstrates that impoliteness tactics in podcast discussions can fulfill various communicative functions. In addition to serving as face-threatening actions, they can also generate humor, enhance interaction, and render the dialogue more captivating for the audience. This research adds to pragmatic studies by illustrating how impoliteness strategies function in modern Indonesian digital media discourse, especially in podcast interactions, where entertainment, spontaneity, and informal communication significantly impact language use and interpretation.

### **FURTHER STUDY**

This research still has limitations, so it is necessary to conduct further research related to the topic of *An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in "Close the Door" Podcast by Deddy Corbuzier* in order to perfect this research and increase insight for readers.

### **REFERENCES**

- Abdi, M. A. S. (2025). A pragmatic analysis of impoliteness strategies in William Shakespeare's
- Culpeper, J. J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 349-367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3).
- Culpeper, J., & Haugh, M. (2014). *Pragmatics and the English language*. Bloomsbury Publishing
- Dacalanio, M. A. (2024). Impoliteness Triggers and Strategies in Students' Complaints: A SocioPragmatic Analysis. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*.
- del Saz-Rubio, M. M. (2023). Assessing impoliteness-related language in response to a season's greeting posted by the Spanish and English Prime Ministers on Twitter. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 206, 31-55.
- Djohan, M. S. S., & Simatupang, E. C. M. (2022). Impoliteness strategies in Cruella movie:
- Dunggio, A. S., Bay, I. W., & Ali, S. W. (2024). Impoliteness strategies used in the movie Do
- Firmansyah, M. A., Tjahyadi, I., & Aisyah, R. N. (2025). AN ANALYSIS OF IMPOLITENESS
- Hendar, H., Astarina, A. N., Heryono, H., Zuraida, I., & Sujatna, M. L. (2022). Impoliteness strategies on online comments at Kompas TV YouTube

channel: A pragmatic analysis. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 9(2), 659-668.

- Hulu, M. T., & Zebua, E. P. (2024). Analyzing the impoliteness of netizens in commenting on the Deddy Corbuzier Podcast. *Journal of Language Education (JoLE)*, 2(1), 217-224.
- Kapoor, S. (2022). "Don't act like a Sati-Savitri!": Hinglish and other impoliteness strategies in Indian YouTube comments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 189, 4-16. Islami, H. N., Sudana, D., & Gunawan, W. (2024). Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies in Sundanese Language Podcasts on the YouTube Channel Ridwan Remin. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 10(3), 713-729.
- Khafaga, A. (2023). Beyond relational work: a psycho-pragmatic analysis of impoliteness in Shakespeare's *King Lear*. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 539.
- Nuessel, F. (2022). Language, pragmatics, and emotions: The case of impoliteness. In *Exploring the translatability of emotions: Cross-cultural and transdisciplinary encounters* (pp. 255-277). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Omer, H. K. (2022). A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in 'Hamlet'. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities*, 29(12, 2), 20-40.
- Pragmatics study. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCIJournal)*, 5(3), 18931-18938.  
<https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i3.5898>
- Ramdhany, N. J., & Ambalegin, A. (2023). Strategies of impoliteness in the *Keeping Up with the Kardashians* series on YouTube. *ENGLISH JOURNAL OF INDRAGIRI*, 7(2), 343-358.
- Ratu Shafira Nurfitria, & I Dewa Putu Wijana. (2025). Impoliteness Strategies in the Comment
- Revenge. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 14(3), 1-12.  
<http://ejurnal.ung.ac.id/index.php/JBSP/index>
- Rizqi, N. T., & Afriana. (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.  
<https://doi.org/10.61132/sintaksis.v2i4.1106>

Salman, S. M., Al-Saidi, H. S., & Khalaf, A. S. (2022). Pragmatic analysis of impolite speech acts and their verbal responses in Shakespeare's Hamlet. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures*, 14(1), 87-109.

Section of Donald Trump's Instagram Account. *Anglophile Journal*, 5(1), 41-54.

Simanjuntak, H. M., & Simatupang, E. C. (2024). Impoliteness strategies in the third indonesia presidential debate 2024: Pragmatics research. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 10(3), 3064-3073.

Simanjuntak, J. R., & Ambalegin, A. (2022). Impoliteness Strategies Used in the Movie " Easy A". *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, 8(2), 289-296.

STRATEGY IN THE PODCAST MISTERI PERKEMAHAN TERLARANG ON RADITYA DIKA'S YOUTUBE CHANNEL. *Literasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Ilmu*

Suganda, D., Yuliawati, S., & Darmayanti, N. (2022). Expression of emotion as impoliteness markers in Instagram comments section in Indonesia: A pragmatic study. *RENTAS: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Budaya*, 1(1), 117-134.

Titus Andronicus (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim).

Trissya, R. A. (2023). Analysis of verbal impoliteness and non-verbal communication on the 'Happy Hour Podcast' (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim).