

Impoliteness Strategies Used by Main Characters in *Fury* (2014) Movie

Dapa Putra Anugrah^{*1}, Alamsyah², & Muhammad Alim Akbar Nasir³

^{1, 2, 3}English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Cultural Sciences,
Universitas Mulawarman

*Email: anugrahputra475@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Bahasa berperan penting dalam komunikasi manusia sebagai cara untuk menyampaikan ide, perasaan, dan maksud. Akan tetapi, tidak semua orang menggunakan bahasa yang santun ketika berkomunikasi, beberapa orang menggunakan tuturan yang tidak santun yang dapat menyinggung atau menghina orang lain. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mendeskripsikan jenis-jenis strategi ketidaksantunan yang digunakan oleh tokoh utama dalam film *Fury* (2014) serta menjelaskan alasan di balik penggunaannya. Metode deskriptif kualitatif digunakan untuk menganalisis dialog tokoh utama dalam film untuk mengidentifikasi bentuk dan fungsi strategi ketidaksantunan. Data penelitian diambil dari naskah film dan dianalisis berdasarkan konteks percakapan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kelima tokoh utama sering menggunakan strategi ketidaksantunan negatif seperti merendahkan, mengejek, dan melanggar ruang pribadi orang lain. Strategi tersebut digunakan untuk menunjukkan kekuasaan, otoritas, dan tekanan emosional dalam komunikasi. Cara ini digunakan sebagai instrumen agar lawan bicara terprovokasi, merusak konsentrasi, dan pesan superioritasnya.

Kata kunci: bahasa, tuturan, tidak santun, strategi ketidaksantunan, *Fury* (2014)

ABSTRACT

Language is essential in human communication as a way of expressing ideas, feelings, and intentions. However, not all people use polite language when trying to communicate, some use impolite utterances that may offend or insult others. The aim of this study is to describe the types of impoliteness strategies used by the main character in the movie *Fury* (2014) and to explain the reasons behind their use. Qualitative descriptive method is used to analyze the main characters' dialogues in the movie to identify the forms and functions of impoliteness strategies. The data were taken from the movie script and analyzed based on the context of the conversations. The results show that the five main characters frequently uses negative impoliteness strategies such as condescending, mocking, and invading others' personal space. These strategies are used to show power, authority, and emotional pressure in communication. This strategy is used as an instrument to provoke the interlocutor, disrupt their concentration, and convey a message of superiority.

Keywords: language, utterance, impolite, impoliteness strategies, *Fury* (2014)

A. INTRODUCTION

Language serves as a fundamental communication tool, facilitating human interaction and enabling the exchange of ideas, knowledge, and emotions. Language can be used by humans to convey their ideas, ideas, desires, feelings, and experiences to others (Nasution & Tambunan, 2022). Language is an important thing in human life to interact with each other (Nasution & Tambunan, 2022). It could be used as a tool to convey education, advertisement, and others. In order to receive information, people will communicate in their own styles (Fauzia et al., 2023). Every person wants to communicate politely and be very aware of the word choices that they use to not irritate someone's feelings (Hartini et al., 2023). With polite words, they intend to be respected by others, and this makes others have to show their respect too (Hartini et al., 2023).

Contrary to that, some people only speak anything they want and sometimes use impolite words. They do not care about the words, whether it is good to hear or not. The use of impolite words by them is to mock others, and those words are not comfortable to hear by others.

In daily life conversation, people often use polite and impolite words. This thing happens when the speaker is not willing to be polite in their word choice when speaking and writing. As defined by Culpeper (2011), impoliteness refers to a negative attitude towards specific behaviors within a particular context. It is sustained by expectations, desires, and beliefs regarding social organization, particularly in relation to how an individual's or group's identities are shaped by interactions with others. Bousfield and Locher (2008) assert that impoliteness constitutes an action or behavior intended to disregard or provoke someone in a specific context.

The use of impoliteness does not only happen accidentally, and sometimes impoliteness occurs because of the habits of the speaker or the environment in which they have lived since an early age (Wijayanto et al., 2020). According to that, linguistic impoliteness carries meaning from the speaker to attack the hearer's feelings (Culpeper, 2011). The phenomena of attacking faces not only happen in real life but can also be found in movies and other digital media (Ardhy et al., 2024). In this research, *Fury* (2014) is used as the object of the research to analyse the impoliteness strategies by Culpeper that are used by the main character in it. The *Fury* (2014) movie is an American war film written and directed by David Ayer. This film, as one of the literary works, was nominated for the Japan Academy Film Prize for Outstanding Foreign Language Film. This film has several nominations, and it has won several awards, such as from the National Board of Review in the Top Ten Films in 2014 and Best Cast categories in the same year.

In addition, according to *The Buffalo News*, this film was specially made by David Ayer to show how a day in life is for soldiers on the battlefield, and he was fascinated by the end of the war. The specific reason for using this film is that there are many impolite utterances in it, and there are differences in age and position among soldiers in their duties. As is commonly known, soldiers usually follow instructions from seniors, and even juniors would not dare to disobey them. However, because of the difference in placement shown in this movie, the junior dares to speak against his senior's commands. Additionally, this movie illustrates how the soldiers' conditions at that time were poor, necessitating the deployment of soldiers with various prior responsibilities. This difference in the background of job responsibilities is what led to the selection of this movie as the subject of the present study, which focuses on the statements made by the film's *Fury* tank crews. The present study has the same title as the previous research but discusses in more detail why the main character uses impoliteness strategies in speaking and explains whether the impoliteness depicted in the film is part of the character depiction that strengthens characterization. This study provides an analysis related to the influence of the social aspects described in the *Fury* movie on the use of impoliteness in communication. It differs from previous research, which only analyzed the use of impoliteness strategies in communication, as this study links the use of impoliteness with social life factors depicted in the movie. The film was analyzed using qualitative descriptive methods to identify the use of impoliteness and the relationship between social life conditions and language in the script of *Fury*. As outlined by Culpeper (2011), impoliteness strategies can be categorized into five distinct types: explicit impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withholding politeness.

Based on the background of the research above, this research aims to answer the question: how are impoliteness strategies used by the main character in the *Fury* movie? The analysis contributes to the understanding of pragmatics, particularly in exploring the concept of impoliteness within linguistic studies. The findings expand the perspective on pragmatic analysis, especially regarding the use of impoliteness and encounter strategies in communication, as reflected in various literary works. Furthermore, the results offer insights for future investigations related to impoliteness strategies and the relationship between language and social factors. The outcomes also provide a deeper comprehension of how impoliteness strategies operate in social interactions involving differences or conflicts.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Linguistics of Literature

Linguistics is the scientific discipline that explores the intricacies of human language. It delves into the mechanisms of language construction and its functional aspects. Language possesses inherent uniqueness, manifesting in the arrangement of sounds and words, and occasionally, in the adjustment of words to alter their semantic connotations. The sequence of words and the speaker's comprehension of the listener's understanding can significantly influence the interpretation of the language itself (Liu et al., 2025). All of this is studied by linguistics. Bloomfield (1979) states that linguistics is a science, as well as physics and chemistry in a science. Because linguists apply the scientific method to issues regarding the origins and purposes of language, linguistics is a branch of science. These empirical inquiries are what distinguish linguistics as a study of language. Another linguist says that linguistics is the study of language. Referring to Nasr (1980), linguistics is concerned with human language as a universal and recognizable part of human behavior and of human abilities. There are several branches of linguistic study, such as phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, discourse analysis, semantics, pragmatics, historical linguistics, and sociolinguistics. In this research, the researchers use pragmatics as a theoretical approach in completing this research.

2. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a field of linguistics that focuses on how language creates meaning in certain social situations. Yule (1996) identifies four domains of concern within pragmatics. Pragmatics first looks at how the speaker says something and how the listener understands it. This means that pragmatics is the study of what the speaker means. Second, pragmatics is the study of how meaning changes depending on the situation. This kind of research requires figuring out what people mean in a certain situation and how that situation affects what they say. Third, pragmatics is the study of how more information is communicated than is explicitly stated. This kind of research looks at how much of what is communicated but not said is understood to be implicit. The study of how people express relative distance is also known as pragmatics, and it comes in fourth place as the last category. Therefore, the fundamental solution is dependent on the idea of distance. Speakers decide how much needs to be stated based on how close or far the audience is.

3. Politeness

As social beings, we interact with one another on a daily basis. When we speak with other people, we tend to think about being polite, such as when we speak with older people, parents, or people we respect in our lives. Politeness is a pragmatic concept utilized in language and is influenced by social and environmental factors (Nuraini, 2021). People can feel at ease listening to someone who is courteous, and through speech, people may identify who is being polite or rude. Politeness, according to Brown and Levinson (1987), is linked to psychological conditions that can be lost, preserved, or enhanced and must be continually considered in interaction. Being polite involves showing respect to the listener and refraining from endangering other people's feelings (Gunaningtyas & Fitriati, 2021). Furthermore, "face" is defined by Brown and Levinson (1987) as the desired public self-image of the individual, and it is divided into two concepts. The first is the negative face, or the need for independence, and the second is the positive face, or the desire for connection with others (Said Fathi, 2024). According to Brown and Levinson (1987), each member's independence and lack of interruption represent negative politeness, which relates to the right to one's own territory, personal space, and freedom of action. In other words, negative politeness reflects a person's freedom from imposition or hindrance in their actions. The positive face, on the other hand, is the state when a person wants their desires to be accepted and valued by others. Consequently, individuals who seek acceptance, gratitude, and appreciation expect respect and acknowledgment from others. In general, a positive face is expressed through warmth and solidarity toward the hearer (Dewi et al., 2020).

4. Impoliteness

In everyday interactions, politeness keeps communication between speakers and listeners comfortable by showing respect for each other's opinions. Contrary to that, impoliteness makes communication uncomfortable between the speaker and hearer. Impoliteness is an arbitrary act in the choice of words, which can make the listener feel disrespected. In the study of linguistics, the act of analyzing how different attitudes are portrayed through the use of language is impoliteness. According to Bousfield (2008), successful impoliteness occurs when the speaker's or author's intention to offend, threaten, or damage the hearers' faces is understood by the hearers. Bousfield stated that impoliteness will be successfully conveyed when the hearers perceive the speaker's intention to damage face. But if the hearer fails to perceive the speaker's intention, the attempt to be impolite fails. However, it depends on how the hearers respond to the intention. Failing to be impolite does not necessarily mean that hearers who do not respond will result in failed impoliteness. The hearer can respond to the strategy by remaining silent. In addition, according to Bousfield and Culpeper, to attack others' faces, the speaker usually uses or selects offensive language. The term "face" comes from politeness theories by Brown and Levinson (1987). They explained face as an expression of the human feeling of self-worth or good reputation that everyone has. There is face-saving in politeness strategies for maintaining face in a conversation, and there is the face-threatening act for impoliteness. Face in this term is described as a combination of influence, dignity, honor, reputation, and social position. The Face-Threatening Act (FTA) is an attitude intended to reduce social position, reputation, or, in other words, self-esteem. Also, Culpeper implied that impoliteness has been seen as the term that refers to the antonym of politeness strategy. The antonym of impoliteness means that politeness refers to a particular way which can be used to stay away from arguments to be happening in communication, while impoliteness refers to a particular way language speakers

use to bring down the conversation partner. Another statement came from Culpeper in Bousfield (2008), stating that impoliteness strategies are the antonym of the term of orientation to face. These strategies are designed to attack face but are not necessarily opposite in other ways. The five strategies are summarized by Culpeper, such as:

a. Bald On Record Impoliteness

In situations where personal identity is at risk, such as when the speaker intends to insult the hearer's appearance, the term "bald on record impoliteness" is employed. This expression suggests that the speaker is willing to engage in rudeness, even if it risks damaging their own reputation. The hearer, in such circumstances, may not feel comfortable retaliating with a similar level of rudeness. The person is being insulted in a direct, clear, and unambiguous way by saying what they mean. For example, "*Why don't you just do your job and be quiet?*" This statement is considered rude because it is bald on record. The use of the bald on record strategy appears when the speaker uses impoliteness directly, clearly, and unambiguously toward the hearer. The impolite utterances are addressed to the hearers as speech partners when they are doing their job in the same room.

b. Positive Impoliteness

Positive impoliteness is the use of strategies deployed to damage the hearer's positive face wants (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Culpeper (1996) posits that various factors may be categorized as manifestations of positive impoliteness strategies. First, acting when the speakers are ignoring or not paying attention to their speech partner, and intentionally attacking the face or bothering others. The second act is not caring about or feeling sorry for the person they are talking to. The third act is when you change someone's name on purpose to make fun of them or to lower their status. The fourth act uses language that is hard to understand on purpose so that other people can't understand it. The fifth act is being rude on purpose. Using taboo words is the sixth act. Taboo words are words that are not allowed to be said by anyone except in certain situations. The seventh act is using words that don't pay attention to other people. The eighth act is to call someone by their name without using a title like "father" or something else. And the last thing is making other people feel bad about what they do. Examples include: "Ignore and snub the other, I do not care what you do," "Exclude the other from activity," "Disassociate from the other, I don't want you, a reckless individual," and "Use taboo words," such as "What the fuck are you doing? All you have to do is just take the fucking money, right?"

c. Negative Impoliteness

Negative impoliteness refers to the deliberate use of strategies aimed at undermining the hearer's perceived negative attributes or desires (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Speakers use negative impoliteness when they scare, demean, or harass someone, make fun of them, insult them, do not take them seriously, belittle or underestimate them, attack them by taking advantage of them, use negative pronouns for them, or put them in a position of dependence. The examples from Culpeper (1996) include "frighten" *don't you dare to touch my fucking new car*, "condescend, scorn, or ridicule" *well, by pressing the buzzer, that's being babyish, isn't it?*, "invade the other's space," "explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect," *well, so was Hitler just doing his job*, and "put the other's indebtedness on record," among others.

d. Off-record Impoliteness

Off-record rudeness is a superstrategy that takes the place of the metastrategic nature of sarcasm. off-record rudeness, which can be sarcasm or fake politeness, is when the offense is communicated indirectly through an implicature and can be canceled. This strategy assaults the listener's face by employing politeness strategies that are evidently disingenuous, thereby remaining superficial manifestations (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

For example :

A: Do you know how much I love you, from the insects in the ground to the last cloud in the sky?,

B: Oh, you are so sweet.

A: Ya bitch.

e. Withhold Politeness

Withhold politeness, keep silent, or fail to act where politeness is expected. According to Brown & Levinson (1987), the act of face attack by the absence of politeness works where it would be expected by the hearers. As an example, according to Culpeper (2011), "failing to thank someone for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness. I do not thank you at all."

C. METHOD

The aim of the research is to analyze the impoliteness strategies used by the main character in the *Fury* (2014) movie by applying Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategies theory. The method allowed the researchers to explore, describe, and analyze the collected data. The *Fury* movie and its manuscript served as the data sources, while the data consisted of dialogues or sentences containing impolite words spoken by the main character. Moreover, data analysis is one of the critical steps in conducting this research since it helps the researchers formulate answers to the research questions through several stages.

The researchers employed several steps in collecting the data by watching the *Fury* (2014) movie and focusing on identifying utterances that contained impolite words. These utterances were then classified into their respective types based on the impoliteness strategies theory. The researchers subsequently analyzed the data and drew conclusions based on the findings. Through this analytical process, the researchers gained a deeper understanding of the data and were able to answer the research questions effectively.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Findings

The utterances spoken by all the main characters in *Fury* movie are shown in the table below. The utterances are taken as examples to explain how impoliteness strategies are used by realizing how they are deploying the impolite utterances in the *Fury* (2014) movie.

No	Fury movie		
	Time	Impolite Word	Category (Data Coding)

1.	00:04:42,599	Grady : <i>Did you get that fucker?</i>	Bald on Record (BRc)
2.	00:05:18,218	Grady : <i>You got no right to be fucking sore with me. Quit fucking riding me</i>	Positive Impoliteness (Pit)
3.	00:06:38,882	Don : <i>We've been lucky?</i>	Negative Impoliteness (NIr)
4.	00:11:04,648	Don : <i>Boyd, get some chow and do what you can about the mechanical issues.</i>	Negative Impoliteness (NIr)
5.	00:13:55,227	Trini: <i>You're a bastard.</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIia)
6.	00:14:25,290	Grady : <i>Hey, hush up, man. Nobody gives a fuck where you from.</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIid)
7.	00:18:16,137	Don : <i>Bring him through this camp... You see that? He's an SS. You kill every last one you can. They're real assholes.</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIia)
8.	00:19:38,620	Don : <i>War's not going anywhere, sir. You heard him. Mount up!</i>	Off Record Impoliteness (ORi)
9.	00:22:30,667	Boyd : <i>Do I think Jesus loves Hitler? I'd assume so.</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIid)
10.	00:24:57,564	Don : <i>Norman! You cocksucker. Why didn't you take the shot?</i>	Positive Impoliteness (Pit)
11.	00:34:51,908	Trini : <i>How do you know they're dead? Are you a doctor? Hit them!</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIo)
12.	00:34:56,413	Trini : <i>So they don't stand up and shoot us in the ass!</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIia)
13.	00:38:41,221	Don : <i>You are no goddamn good to me unless you can kill Krauts. Put a big fat hole in his back. Put a big fat hole in his fucking back.</i>	Negative Impoliteness (NIr)
14.	00:42:00,170	Trini : <i>Don might be crazier than a shithouse rat, but he's solid.</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIo)
15.	00:44:36,868	Trini : <i>The SS does that. Let them rip themselves to pieces, huh? Fuck them.</i>	Bald On Record (BRc)
16.	00:48:44,738	Trini : <i>You should've let them burn.</i>	Negative Impoliteness (NIIs)
17.	00:51:29,406	Don : <i>Rubbing out those Heinies. You splashed them real good. Wasn't nothing, right?</i>	Bald On Record (BRc)
18.	00:51:49,259	Don : <i>I want to show you something. They knew we were coming. So they got drunk as lords</i>	Negative Impoliteness (NIa)

		<i>and they shot themselves at sunup.</i>	
19.	00:54:41,306	Don : <i>Close the door and lock it. Lock the fucking door.</i>	Bald On Record (BRc)
20.	01:05:06,139	Grady : Norman. What did you do? <i>Norman, you sneaky snail.</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIia)
21.	01:09:03,126	Trini : <i>Y'all were gonna eat like kings and queens over here. And we weren't invited. I wonder why we weren't invited. Guess they too good for us.</i>	Off Record Impoliteness (ORi)
22.	01:16:09,719	Grady : <i>You gonna raise her up, Norman? Get your ass back on the fucking tank.</i>	Off Record Impoliteness (ORi)
23.	01:16:32,951	Grady : <i>Where the fuck you think you are?</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIId)
24.	01:23:59,397	Norman : <i>Fucking Nazi fuck! Fuck you!</i>	Bald On Record (BRc)
25.	01:25:16,600	Boyd : <i>It wasn't me. No, no, I'm the instrument, not the hand. God didn't call us today. You hear me, boys?</i>	Off Record Impoliteness (ORi)
26.	01:25:35,160	Grady : <i>Norman mowed them fuckers down, didn't he, too?</i>	Bald On Record (BRc)
27.	01:33:18,999	Grady : <i>What you mean, you're gonna hold... The tank's busted! The tank's fucking busted, Top!</i>	Negative Impoliteness (NIr)
28.	01:33:32,804	Grady : <i>What you mean fucking fighting positions when we ain't got a tank? How we gonna fight?</i>	Negative Impoliteness (NIa)
29.	01:38:37,792	Boyd: <i>I'm gonna drink it. I know you hate me preaching. I know it. But what we're doing here is a righteous act, gentlemen.</i>	Negative Impoliteness (NIr)
30.	01:40:18,585	Grady : <i>God damn, son. You a fighting, fucking, drinking machine, ain't you?</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIo)
31.	01:42:54,699	Don : <i>Bow gunner, squirt those assholes running for that mill. Cut those fuckers down!</i>	Bald On Record (BRc)
32.	01:53:32,545	Don : <i>What the fuck are you doing? Button up!</i>	Positive Impoliteness (PIt)

33.	01:58:09,364	Don : <i>Please don't. They'll hurt you real bad.</i>	Negative Impoliteness (NIa)
-----	--------------	---	--------------------------------

a. Bald on Record Impoliteness

As elucidated by Culpeper (1996), bald on record impoliteness is a rhetorical device employed by speakers when the addressee's face is in danger. This strategy involves delivering a direct, unambiguous, and succinct critique of the addressee's face. This is the result of the bald on record impoliteness strategy., as shown in the example: "**Don**: Fucker! **Grady**: Fuck him up, Don!"

Don saw the German SS soldiers being led by his friends. Don's anger immediately peaked, and he wanted to beat up the SS soldiers. He was so angry with the SS that he uttered impolite words. Instead of using polite ways such as "Hey you!", Don preferred to use a direct and clear utterance such as "Fucker!" to make Grady answer by giving information about the condition of someone who leads the war at the moment in the movie. The use of "Fucker" was not ambiguous between Don and Grady, so it fits with the realization of the bald on record type of impoliteness strategy.

b. Positive Impoliteness

Culpeper (1996) asserts that this positive impoliteness strategy is employed to undermine the desired positive face of the interlocutor. Positive impoliteness can be shown by ignoring others, saying someone's name wrong, using taboo words, or using an inappropriate identity when talking to someone else. This is the finding of positive impoliteness strategies, as shown in the example:

Don: *God damn it. Ain't you done yet?*

Grady: *You got no right to be fucking sore with me. Quit fucking riding me."*

In this situation, Don asks Grady about his repair. Grady employs positive impoliteness strategies to undermine the interlocutor's social identity and emotional standing. The word "fucking" is an impolite word. Here, Grady is not using it to build a bond, as it sometimes does in friendly mockery, but rather to intensify aggression and express hostility, which contributes to facial disfigurement. The use of the word "fucking" contributes to the hostile tone and signals a deliberate violation of politeness norms, intensifying the aggression in the interaction. By stating, "You got no right to be fucking sore with me," Grady explicitly ignores the other person's emotional response, denying them the right to feel upset and thereby invalidating their subjective experience. Using taboo language, as in Grady's speech, is one of the realizations of the positive impoliteness strategy.

c. Negative Impoliteness

Culpeper (1996) states that negative impoliteness is a strategy used to attack the interlocutor frontally, which is undesired by the recipient or the interlocutor as well. Examples include simply condescending or snubbing, scorning, and ridiculing someone, explicitly associating the other with negative aspects, or invading someone's space. This is the finding of negative impoliteness strategies, as shown in the example:

Don: *We've been lucky?* **Boyd**: *Yes, sir. We're all alive. We're in here.*

Don: *God's grace?"*

Don asked Boyd in an insulting tone and used the sentence with a condescending tone toward him. It made Boyd annoyed because Don did not believe in God's grace. Don used sentences that were included in the negative impoliteness sub-strategy, realized by ridiculing something.

d. Off-Record Impoliteness

Off-record impoliteness is a substitute for the metastrategic quality of sarcasm. Off-record impoliteness happens when the offense is communicated indirectly through an implicature and is subject to cancellation. Using fake politeness toward others can make off-record impoliteness happen. This is the finding of off-record impoliteness strategies, as shown in the example: "**Parker:** *First Platoon, mount up! Move out!* **Don:** *War's not going anywhere, sir. You heard him. Mount up!*"

Don mocked Parker with a clear sentence and a mocking tone. Parker asked their platoon to pick up and mount up at that time. As Don still wanted to rest but was told to go somewhere else next, he mockingly said, "The war isn't going anywhere, sir. You heard him. Get on board!" The utterance fits with off-record impoliteness, using insincere politeness.

2. Discussion

The results indicated that the predominant form of impoliteness exhibited by Don, the main character, is negative impoliteness. Culpeper defines negative impoliteness as the employment of strategies intended to undermine the addressee's negative face wants. Thus, Don, as the main character, employs negative impoliteness strategies. He belittles, mocks, and invades others' personal space as a strategy to gain power when speaking with others. This strategy is used to provoke the other person, disrupt their concentration, and convey a sense of superiority.

A negative face is the desire of every person to not have their actions imposed by others. A negative face is one that wants to be free to act and does not want to be forced to do anything. The two sides of the face are the basic needs in any social situation. The act of scorning or ridiculing someone is often used in deploying the negative impoliteness strategy. The use of taboo words is also commonly found in the speech of the main character, Don, because he has more power than other characters. This aligns with the theory from Culpeper (1996, p. 359), stating that there are two basic reasons for deploying impoliteness strategies in army recruitment. First, in the army, there is a great inequality of power. Second, there is a particular training philosophy in army recruitment. Based on this theory and the explanation about the reasons why negative and positive impoliteness are deployed in the army context, Don as the main character, wants to perform the power he has and does not want to appear as if he has the lowest power among the soldiers.

This study aligns with Dhorifah's (2016) research, which examined the categories of impoliteness strategies through Culpeper's theory (1996) and supplementary theories from Bousfield and Leech regarding impoliteness strategies. Her research findings indicated that the predominant impoliteness strategy employed by specific characters in Boyhood movie transcripts involved powerless participants utilizing more positive impoliteness strategies, whereas powerful participants employed fewer impoliteness strategies. Likewise, Reswara's

(2020) study indicated that the positive impoliteness strategy is the predominant approach employed by the main character in the *Hancock* movie to exhibit impoliteness.

In this research, impoliteness strategies are manifested in various ways with specific realizations. Direct, clear, and unambiguous statements can be employed to express bald on record impoliteness. Positive impoliteness can be achieved by disassociating oneself from others, referring to someone by a different name, utilizing taboo words, or employing inappropriate identity markers. Conversely, negative impoliteness can be expressed in three distinct ways: condescending, scorning, or ridiculing someone; explicitly associating someone with negative attributes; or invading their personal space. On the other hand, off-record impoliteness, or sarcasm/mock politeness, can be realized by employing insincere politeness. Meanwhile, the last type of impoliteness strategy, which is being silent or failing to thank, is called withhold politeness.

However, withhold politeness does not appear in the utterances from the main character. The utterances from Wardaddy/Don, Norman, Grady, Boyd/Bible, and Trini/Gordo use other strategies to emphasize what they want to say in impolite ways. They prefer to use impolite words, not always because they want to attack someone's feelings, but because, in the conditions depicted in the movie, it makes it easier for them to express what they want to convey or to give orders directly to the person they are speaking to. In addition, the realization of being silent or failing to thank does not appear in the movie because all the utterances from the main character do not perform speech acts that require a response of thanks or silence, as defined in the withhold politeness strategy.

The results of this research indicate that the similarities and differences are rooted in the research objectives and the subjects under investigation. Previous researchers used objects in the form of new coming-of-age genre movies and action-comedy superhero genre movies to examine impoliteness strategies for entertaining the audience. The similarity in this research with previous research is that movies and their scripts were used, and impoliteness was analyzed in terms of how it is used to dominate the speech partner. The last dominant type of impoliteness strategy used by the main character in the *Fury* movie is bald on record. Wardaddy, the main character in this study, does bald on record acts when they do not use the politeness that would normally be expected. For example, they do not ask for permission when they borrow someone else's things. This aligns with the research conducted by Chandra (2020), who also examined the various types of impoliteness strategies. The findings of that research indicated that bald on record is the least prevalent strategy, manifested through direct, clear, and unequivocal statements.

The research findings indicate that all manifestations of power exerted through impoliteness, such as projecting superiority, controlling responses, and monopolizing discourse—are evident. This corresponds with the study entitled “Impoliteness Strategies and Power Exhibited by President Donald Trump on Twitter” conducted by Dony (2018). The findings of that study indicate that all objectives of utilizing power are accomplished via impoliteness strategies. In the same way, the main character in this study used rude behavior to show that he was in charge of the other crew.

E. CONCLUSION

This study sought to examine the employment of impoliteness strategies by the protagonist in the film *Fury*, grounded in Culpeper's theory of impoliteness. The results indicate that four of the five categories of impoliteness strategies are utilized by the characters: bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and off-record impoliteness. The strategy of withholding politeness is absent from the data. Among the 18 identified utterances of impoliteness, negative impoliteness was the most frequently used (7 occurrences), followed by positive impoliteness (5 occurrences), bald on record impoliteness (4 occurrences), and off-record impoliteness (2 occurrences). These findings demonstrate that the characters in *Fury* frequently used impolite language not merely to offend but as a communicative tool suited to the wartime context depicted in the film.

The outcomes of these impoliteness strategies differ. Bald-on-record strategies use direct and clear commands or statements. Disassociation, name-calling, using taboo words, and using the wrong identity markers are all ways to show positive impoliteness. Negative impoliteness appears through condescension, scorn, explicit negative associations, and invasion of personal space. Off-record impoliteness is characterized by sarcasm and insincere politeness. Each strategy reflects how the characters use language to express frustration, authority, urgency, or emotional distress in extreme conditions such as war. The absent strategy is withhold politeness, indicating that being silent or failing to show expected politeness behaviors (such as failing to thank) did not prominently feature in the characters' communicative patterns. This may be due to the nature of interactions in *Fury*, which demand explicit and often violent expression rather than implicit or passive behavior.

In summary, impoliteness in the *Fury* movie functions not only as a reflection of the characters' personalities but also as a narrative device that enhances the realism and intensity of military conflict. The findings can also contribute to a broader understanding of how impoliteness is employed in movie dialogues to construct character relationships, assert dominance, and convey emotional states in high-stress environments.

REFERENCES

- Afriana, A., & Mubarak, Z. H. (2024). Impoliteness strategies used by netizens towards Tasyi Athasyia on Instagram. *IdeBahasa*, 6(1), 81–93.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.15294/rainbow.v13i1.3809>
- Bloomfield, L. (1979). *Language*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bousfield, D., & Locher, M. A. (2008). *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*. Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge University Press.
- Cahyono, D. (2018). *Impoliteness strategies and power performed by President Donald Trump on Twitter* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim).

- 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. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511975752>
- Dewi, K. T., Artawa, K., Sutama, P., & Erawati, N. K. R. (2020). The analysis of relationship between politeness and face theory. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 7(4), 36–45.
- Fauzia, A., Octavia, D. G. R., & Hamdani, F. (2023). The urgency of language as a tool for scientific thinking in schools: An approach to communication law. *International Journal of Social Learning*, 3(2), 159–172. <https://doi.org/10.47134/ijsl.v3i2.93>
- Gunaningtyas, M., & Fitriati, S. W. (2021). The use of Brown & Levinson's politeness strategies as a realization of sociocultural competence among adult learners of ELT Surakarta. *English Education Journal*, 11(2), 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v11i1.43117>
- Hartini, N., Arbi, D. K. A., Tharbe, I. H. A., & Sumari, M. (2023). Written language politeness (of short messages on social media) and emotional intelligence: A study in Indonesia and Malaysia. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 16, 1141–1147. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S400783>
- Juanda, J. (2024). Analysis of language structure and its implications in modern linguistics: A study of the understanding and application of structural linguistic concepts. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 14(1), 226. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2024-0019>
- Liu, H., Chen, Z., Ding, Q., Zhang, J., Liu, J., Hu, J., & Lu, W. (2025). Research on paragraph-level functional structure recognition in scientific literature: A data augmentation method based on LLMs and lexical function. *Scientometrics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-025-05355-6>
- Nasr, R. T. (1980). *The essentials of linguistic science: Selected and simplified readings* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Nasution, F., & Tambunan, E. (2022). Language and communication. *International Journal of Community Service (IJCS)*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.55299/ijcs.v1i1.86>
- Nuraini. (2021). Universality of Brown and Levinson politeness theory in collective culture: Redefining power in concept of face. *English Journal of Indragiri: Studies in Education, Literature, and Linguistics*, 5(1), 68–80. <https://doi.org/10.32520/eji.v5i1.1313>
- Said Fathi. (2024). Revisiting Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness. *European Journal of Language and Culture Studies*, 3(5), 137–149. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejlang.2024.3.5.137>
- Sani, F. R. (2020). *Impoliteness strategies used by the main character in the Hancock movie* (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya).
- Wijayanto, A., Halwat Hikmat, M., & Prasetyarini, A. (2020). Impoliteness in EFL complaints: Exploring its intentions and motivating factors. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(1), 97–104. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i1.3635>

- Wolfman, M., Dunagan, D., Brennan, J., & Hale, J. (2024). Hierarchical syntactic structure in human-like language models. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Cognitive Modeling and Computational Linguistics* (pp. 72–80). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.cmcl-1.6>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.