The Influence of Gender in Politeness Strategy Used in "Keeping Up with the Kardashians"

Dian Rahmawati Arief[1]
Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Hasanuddin University,
Indonesia

Abdul Hakim Yassi[2]
Faculty of Cultural Sciences,
Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

Harlinah Sahib[3]
Faculty of Cultural Sciences,
Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

Abstract:- Gender affect language style especially in employing politeness strategy. Politeness and gender role have influenced the social interaction. It has been a concern for many researchers especially in language studies and also considered as one of the important aspect that affect politeness strategy used. This research aims 1) to reveal the influence of gender in using politeness, and 2) to identify the influence of gender in using politeness by employing the framework of Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987). The data is the transcription of utterances which delivered by American, it was taken from American reality show entitled Keeping Up with The Kardashians. The result of this research was gender affect the politeness strategy used by American which American male tend to use in-group markers and notice the hearer's aspect. American female also like to offer help and maintain the relationship by relating one another. They give compliment more often than male.

Keywords:- Politeness strategy, Brown and Levinson Theory, Politeness and Gender

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the crucial dimensions of language is gender. Gender is a social variable in society that affects language style. In general, gender is a difference between men and women, which can be seen in physical characteristics and behavior. It has been considered an essential feature in the interactions between people. In addition, gender is a cultural concept that refers to the characteristic distinguishing between women's and men's behavior, mentality, and socio-cultural. It also refers to psychosocial aspects of maleness and femaleness (Elliott, 2019). It can be concluded that gender is a psychosocial aspect of masculinity and femininity, whereas sex is biologically male and female.

In a study related to American society, Holmes (Phuc, 2014) stated that women are inferior and subordinate to men. Hence, they are not to offend and express themselves politely in their verbal communication. The statement was affirmed by Holmes (Mullany, 2004). She claims that women are subordinate and less powerful. Therefore, they are more polite in their verbal interactions. In English-speaking society, it has become highlighted that women are more polite than men. In addition, (Beeching & Woodfield,

2015).Women have a more comprehensive range of speaking styles than men in the same social groups. In the same study, Beeching also points out that women's speech is more polite generally than men's. Women tend to avoid swearing and stigmatized expressions. In further research, Beeching found that men usually dominate the conversations and tend to interrupt women more often than women interrupt men. It can be concluded that men are considered more impolite than women (Beeching & Woodfield, 2015; Sahib & Rahman, 2021).

Gender and language have long been a topic of interest among scholars. Women and men have different ways in doing communicating. Lakoff stated that women's language has another characteristic. Women tend to use 'empty adjectives' such as lovely, divined, and adorable (Svendsen, 2019). Women also use tag questions and hedges, which indicate uncertainty. Women are very concerned about using grammar and polite forms in their speech and writings. Men and women are raised differently, creating differences in the way they speak (Tannen, 1994). Women mostly speak to seek connection and intimacy, whereas men speak to show their status and independence (Phuc, 2014). Newman found that women's language is centered around discussing people and their activities (Phuc, 2014). In addition, women usually use words that are related to psychological processes, such as emotions (e.g.," anxious"), and social processes, for example, "talk". Men's language has been identified to focus on describing external events, objects, and processes. For example, men tend to use words related to occupation (e.g., "job") and swear words. It is similar to the statement from Cohen that men tend to use discuss an object; money, or occupational-related topics, they also likely to swear. Women use more personal pronouns, intensive adverbs (e.g.," really"," very"," so"), and emotional words and are likely to discuss family and social life. The differences were concluded as reflecting a male tendency towards the object and impersonal topics and a female tendency towards psychological and social processes (Leaper & Ayres 2007). Phuc (2014) stated that men used more assertive language, which is considered a language to influence, such as imperative statements, suggestions, criticism, and disagreements. Women tend to use more affiliative language. It was defined as language affirming the speaker's relationship with the listener, including statements of support, active understanding, agreement, and acknowledgment. In

this sense, men are considered more impolite than women.

Lakoff points out that the difference between swearing and stigmatized expression such as "shit" or "damn" opposed to "oh dear", or "goodness" reflects the contrast between "stronger" and "weaker" expletives in men's and women's speech respectively. Labov (1966:288) stated that women tend to produce more careful speech and use fewer stigmatized forms than men (Phuc, 2014.).

Politeness and gender role have influenced the social interaction, (Sukmawaty et al., 2022; Akhmar et al., 2021). It has been concerned for many researchers especially in language studies and also considered as one of the important aspect that affect politeness strategy used. From the definition of 'politeness' by Lakoff, Lakoff observes that politeness is a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange (Abordonado &Viotti, 1998).Considering the minimum conflict and confrontation for all participants in interaction, Eleni found that the rules of pragmatic competence highly affected by three areas of pragmatics behavior which are the speaker's assumption about his relations with his addressee, his real-world situation as he speaks and the extent to which he wishes to change either or both or to reinforce them. It can be concluded that the addressee's concerns and needs substantiate polite manner, which the speaker always considers (Koohzad et al., 2019; Saleh et al., 2021).

Brown and Levinson introduced the politeness theory in 1987. It focuses on others' face. They define face as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself"). It contains Face Threatening Acts (FTA) and politeness strategy. Brown and Levinson define FTA as something represented by a speaker as a threat to another individual's expectation regarding self-image (Mahmud, 2013). FTA can threaten both positive face and negative faces. In addition, the example of positive FTA such as an expression of disapproval, criticism, felt disgusted, complaining, accusing, insulting, disagreeing, emotionally abusive, mentioning taboo topics, interrupting, and uncooperative. Then, negative FTA includes command, request, suggest, remind, threaten, warn, offer, promise, express jealousy, admiration, hate, anger, passion, etc. They claim that any rational agent will avoid this Face Threatening Acts (FTA) or apply specific strategies to minimize the threat. It can be assumed that the focus is on the hearer, their needs. Brown and Levinson, (1987) offer a framework of politeness with in-depth analysis to distinguish between 'positive politeness' and 'negative politeness' (Sapitri et al., 2020; Hasnia et al., 2022).

Brown and Levinson assume that every society is concerned about their 'face', conceptualized self-image presented to others. Based on the assumption, Brown and Levinson distinguish two aspects of face and refer to two basic desires of any person in any speech situation (Che Ismail, 2018). In this research, the paper will be discussed about the gender role in politeness strategies used by

American. The data will be obtained from the utterances of American reality show and categorized into politeness strategy based on the theory of Brown & Levinson.

> *Previous Study*

Several studies of gender role in politeness have been studied by researchers; these findings from these studies become references to conduct this research.

Ambarita, et al., (2020) conducted a research entitled of the research "*Gender and Language Politeness*". The result of the study showed that gender can influence the way people use language. Men and women have several differences in using language especially in politeness pattern which women are likely to use 'soften words' than men.

The next research by Che Ismail (2018) entitled Politeness Strategies and Gender Differences in the Speech Act of Rejection among the Malys in Malaysia. This study aims to identify the positive and the negative politeness strategies that is used by both genders in making rejection and also compare the differences of both genders in making rejection. This study employed the framework of Brown and Levinson's model of politeness 1987. The researcher gathers all the data through the questionnaire involving nine different situations and formulated based on oral Discourse Complexion Task. The respondent was 50 male and 50 female students of International Islamic University Malaysia. In conclusion, male used more positive and negative politeness strategies than females when making rejection. They choose to more explanative and apologetic when making rejection.

The next research by Hidayat, (2014) also discuss about Politeness and Gender entitled *Variasi Bahasa Berdasarkan Jenis Kelamin di Desa Matangaji Kecamatan Sumber Kabupaten Cirebo*. This research contains differences in language variations between man and woman in Matangaji Village, Kec. Source: Cirebon Regency. This aims of the research are: Want to know the variation of men's language in Matangaji Village Sumber District, Cirebon Regency, Want to know the language variations of women in Matangaji Village, Sumber District, Cirebon Regency, Want to know the difference variations in the language of men and women in *Matangaji Village, Sumber District Cirebon*. Furtheremore, this method used in this research is descriptive analysis, by using a case study approach. This research collected the data by using interview techniques, observation, and documentation. The conclusions from this research are; In terms of language variations, it was concluded that it turned out to be male respondents in the Matangaji Village community everyday life uses non-standard varieties with regional dialect characteristics (Sunda). This is because the language used in everyday life is Sundanese. In terms of politeness and delicacy, the language used is relatively polite and tend to be rough. This is because the people of Matangaji Village are a community border, whose language is influenced by Javanese. This sentence used male respondents tend to be short and use a lot of verbs. Adjective seldom appeared in interviews.

This research use of short and rare sentence patterns emergence of adjectives is caused by male psychology which tends to be rational and realistic, so that the words are not long-winded, short, concise, and clear; mastery. This research language of the female respondents was on average three languages, namely Sundanese, Indonesian and Java. by the three languages mastered, two are actively used communicate, namely Sundanese and Indonesian. Sundanese is used in everyday life, while Indonesian and Javanese are used for activities formal in schools, commerce, and serving outside visitors. In terms of language variations it can be concluded that in fact the female respondent is the Matangaji Village community in everyday life using non-standard variety with dialect characteristics regional (Sundanese). This is because the language used in everyday life is Sundanese language. In terms of politeness and delicacy, the language used is relative polite and refined. This research used by respondents is long and wordy. In the use of words, in addition to verbs, many adjectives are found. language subtlety, the use of long sentence patterns and the emergence of adjectives caused by psychology of women who tend to be feeling and emotional, thus influencing his speech; the difference between male and female language variations lies in subtlety of language, the length of the short sentences, and the types of words used. If men tend to be rude, use short (brief) sentence patterns, as well as more dominant verb, then women tend to be more refined and orderly, longer sentences, and always found adjectives in his speech. Subtlety, length the shortness of sentences, as well as the types of words used is influenced by psychological differences between men and women. Men tend to be rational while women tend to be emotional. Women tend to be more expressive in words. Besides that women are more refined in their language because of the norms that bind them to speak more softly and polite.

The last research by Misai, (2021) Also discuss about politeness and gender entitled Language politeness of netizen comments on Donald Trumps' Instagram: Gender perspective. This research aims to analyze the different types of politeness strategies for positive politeness and negative politeness. This researcher observes the difference between positive politeness and negative politeness between men and women towards Donald Trump's Instagram commenters. Furthermore, there are two objectives in this research; firstly, to identify differences in positive politeness between men and women in Donald Trump's Instagram Comments and secondly, to investigate differences in negative politeness strategies used by men and women in Donald Trump's Instagram Comments.

In addition, this study uses descriptive qualitative because the data collected is in the form of words and sentences. Moreover, this study used a sociopragmatic research approach because this research is based on social phenomena and pragmatic phenomena. And the other hand Data was taken from netizen comments on Donald Trump's posts on Instagram on October 1, 2020. Researchers used Brown and Levinson's theory to analyze commenters on

Donald Trump's Instagram. This finding of this research was obtained from all the data analyzed. Moreover, this researcher found that the positive politeness strategies included fifteen strategies and the negative politeness strategies included ten strategies. Positive politeness was found in the twenty five data explored in the data analysis and negative politeness was found in the twenty five data explored in the data analysis.

This researcher found that the dominant positive politeness shown by males in speaking is the strategy of paying attention, paying attention to listeners. Positive strategies that are only used by men are Assert or Presume S's Knowledge and Concern for H's want and Give Reasons. The dominant positive politeness strategies used by women are Notice, Attend to H and Exaggerate. The strategy in question is giving gifts to H, using identity markers in groups and being an optimistic strategy. The dominant negative politeness shown by men in speaking is to minimize coercion. Meanwhile, the negative politeness strategy used by women is to state FTA as a general rule. The strategy in question is Pessimistic, Minimize coercion and Give Respect

➤ *Literature review*

Gender is a concept to identify the differences between men and women in socio-cultural impressions (Ambarita et al., 2020.). It is also described as the differentiation of roles, functions, and responsibilities between women and men resulting from cultural interpretation. In addition, gender has significant effects on language use between men and women, such as lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic (Kuntjara, 2014; Rahman, & Letlora, 2018). It influences the perspective in using language when participants interact.

Brown and Levinson assume that every society is concerned about their 'face', conceptualized self-image presented to others. Based on the assumption, Brown and Levinson distinguish two aspects of face and refer to two basic desires of any person in any speech situation (Che Ismail, 2018). They propose two types of face: a negative face and a positive face. "Negative face represents the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, and rights to non-distraction, i.e., freedom of action and imposition. Then, positive face represents the consistent positive self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image is appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants." Brown and Levinson suggested five types of politeness strategies in their book which are Bald on-Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, Off-Record, and Do not do the FTA.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study used descriptive qualitative method which suitable for this research, the data will be described by words or sentences rather than numbers. According to Moleong, qualitative research intends to understand the phenomena

experienced by research subjects, such as behavior, perception, motivation, action, etc. (Moelong, 2004). The research described the gender role and politeness strategies used by American. The data was taken from the American reality show entitled Keeping Up With the Kardashians. The writer transcribed the utterances from the conversation of the reality show. The data categorized into types of politeness based on Brown and Levinson theory of politeness and the writer also explained the gender role in politeness used by American.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Data 1 : The interaction between a man (A) and his sister in law (B)
A   :   What's shaking in here?
B   :   Oh, kim's giving us some…
A   Who's pregnant now? You can't be…?

The conversation begin when the speaker ask regarding the situation in the room, he wanted to know what has happening. His utterance "what's shaking in here?" is categorized as a positive politeness. He gives his attention and notice the situation between them.

Data 2 : The interaction between a husband (A) and wife (B)
A   :   This is so beautiful
B   :   This is we're in Italy,honey..
A   :   It is like in Italy, honey

The conversation above is the interaction between a husband and wife, when his wife stated "this is we're in Italy, honey" and the husband answered "it's like in Italy. honey". It can be seen the husband tried to avoid disagreement. He use "hedging opinion" and use "it's like". The wife and husband using the endearment "honey" as she show her respect and love to her husband which show that woman often use a variety of speaking style. (Phuc, 2014.)

Data 3 : The interaction between the soon (A) and his parents & C)
A   :   Hurry up
B   :   Wait, this is just a map..
C   :   That's huge map
A   We have to figure out the way to go there ?

Data 23 is the interaction between a son and his parents, the conversation started when they begin the trip. The son was really excited and said "Hurry up!", it can be categorized as bald on record; maximum efficiency. In case of great urgency or desperation, redress actually decrease the communicated urgency (Brown, 2015).

Data 4 : The interaction between a man (A) and his step brother (B) (same age)
A   :   Bro ! don't you think your pops should come out with me tonight? Try to score some tail? He's a single man!
B   :   Hey where's the tequilla?

The conversation between two step brothers show that they used positive politeness which "use in-group identity markers". The men used 'bro' as address form and implicitly claim the common group with his step brother.

Data 5 : The interaction between a husband (A) and a wife (B)
A   :   I've put zucchini and some grated carrot.
B   :   Perhaps, the baby spinach, you'd blanch it or anything ?
A   You cook the nutrients out of it. it's better like that.

The conversation began when the wife entered the kitchen and saw his husband cook. His wife's utterance "Perhaps, the baby spinach, you'd blanch it or anything ?" is considered as negative politeness; be pessimistic. She used pessimistic Hedges 'perhaps' in order to redress her husband's negative face. The interaction between the husband and wife above is containing politeness markers "giving reasons". The utterance "you cook the nutrients out of it. it's better like that", the husband gave a reasons as to why he wants what he wants by including hearer thus in his practical reasoning and assuming reflexivity. In other words, giving reasons is a way implying (Brown, 2015).

Data 6 : The interaction between a woman and cousin (A & B)
A   :   . I brought us all food
B   :   Oh, it's santa claus
A   I have the best night planned for us. After dinner, we're going to watch clueless.

The interaction above is containing positive politeness which "includes both S and H in the activity". S prefers to use 'us' form which means 'you' or 'me'.

Data 7: The interaction between a mother (A), her daughter (B), and her son in law (C)
A   :   Wow, you look so Fab! I'm so happy Tristan in here.
B   :   Hi, mom
A   Why did I think you were at a basketball?
C   No, Sunday.
A   Glad you are here.

The interaction above is the conversation between a mother, her daughter, and her son in-law, the conversation is very casual and friendly, she employs positive politeness; exaggerate. She gives a compliment to her daughter and very friendly to her son in-law. The utterance "glad you are here" is categorized as positive politeness; give gifts to H. She showed her gratitude to her son in-law that he made a time to attend her party.

Data 8: The interaction between a mother (A), a daughter
A   :   A : Kylie, let's go. Gotta get to Kim's, I don't wanna be late.
B   :   Alright

The conversation above is classified as bald on record;

maximum efficiency. She didn't want to be late to her daughter's party. She uttered the utterance directly and explicitly without ambiguity. The face redress is not required, in case of great urgency of desperation, redress actually decrease the communicated urgency (Brown, 2015).

➤ *The influence of gender role in politeness strategy used by American.*

It can be seen from the data 3, male speaker deliver his utterance without any ambiguity and straight to the point in order to make the conversation short and the information clearly sent. In data 2 and American male speaker use polite marker such as identity marker *Honey,* The function of identity markers by males was to politely address the other speaker (Che Ismail, 2018). This finding contradicts the previous claim by Holmes (1995) women are seen as more sensitive to other people's feeling than men. They also like to put the in-group marker such as *Bro* to make the hearer feel accepted. In addition, men are more interested in 'objects' and 'things' that is why they notice the hearer's aspect such as occupation,etc. it can be seen from data 1, the speakers notice the hearer's occupation and talking about the 'object' and 'things' such as the hearer's condition.

In certain time, women tend to show their higher status even with their child and they do not hesitate to give advice or warnings to their relatives. it can be seen from data 8, they use direct language and straight to the point. Then, most female speakers tend to deliver indecision and uncertainty utterances (Tannen, 1995),(Lakoff, 1975). It can be seen from the data above, female speakers show doubt and uncertainty by using hedge 'I think','perhaps','maybe', and 'I guess' that most female speaker try to build relationship by talking and relating to the hearer. Offer some help and share their personal feeling is a way to maintain harmonious relationship. They nurture the relationship by expressing goodness, love, and caring. For most women, offering help and needing help is not a sign of weakness (Gray, 1992). It can be seen from the data 6, the female speaker tried to build the relationship towards the hearer. In giving compliment, the women speaker choose the 'women's language' which more varieties than men. For instance, data 7 show that women are better in giving compliment than men.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study confirmed that there were several differences between American male and American female in using politeness strategy. American male tend to use positive politeness which make the hearer feel accepted and appreciated. They also use in-group markers such as identity marker to addressee their interlocutors and deliver their utterances straight to the point in order to make the conversation short and clearly sent. They also like to notice the hearer's aspect. American female also tend to choose positive politeness. They mostly use hedges to show uncertainty and indecision, they also like to maintain the relationship by offer help or show their personal feeling. American female are better in giving compliment than male.

REFERENCES

[1]. Abordonado, V. Mariai. V. (1998). *The Effect of Gender on Linguistic Politeness in Written Discourse*. The University of Arizona.

[2]. Akhmar, A. M., Rahman, F., Supratman, H. H., & Nawir, M. (2021). Traditional Ecology Knowledge of To-Cerekang Community and Their Ability to Adapt Changes. In BASA 2020: Proceedings of the 4th BASA: *International Seminar on Recent Language, Literature and Local Culture Studies, BASA, November 4th 2020, Solok, Indonesia* (p. 188). European Alliance for Innovation.

[3]. Ambarita, R., & Mulyadi, M. (2020). Gender and Language Politeness. European *Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, 2*(2).

[4]. Andini, C. (2021). The Use of Honorifics in English and Buginese with special Reference to Bone Language: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 6*(7), 873-877.

[5]. Bachriani, B., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2018). A Comparative Study of Euphemism in English and Buginese: Pragmatic Stylistics Contexts. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 1*(4), 429-440.

[6]. Beeching, K., & Woodfield, H. (Eds.). (2015*). Researching Sociopragmatic Variability: Perspectives from Variational, Interlanguage and Contrastive Pragmatics*. Springer.

[7]. Brown, P. (2015). Politeness and language. In *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences (IESBS),(2nd ed.)* (pp. 326-330). Elsevier.

[8]. Brown, P., Lavinson, S. (1987). *Politenes : Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge :Cambridge University Press.

[9]. Che Ismail, N. A. (2018).Politeness Strategies and Gender Differences in the Speech Act of Rejection among the Malays in Malaysia. *International Islamic University Malaysia. Association of Language Teacher in Southeast Asian (* ALTSA),1(1)

[10]. Elliott, A. (2019*). Social Theory and Psychoanalysis in Transition: Self and Society from Freud to Kristeva*. Routledge..

[11]. Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from Mars and Women are from Venus*: A Practical Guide for Improving Communication and Getting what you want in your Relationship. New York: Harper Collins.

[12]. Hasnia, H., Andini, C., Tahir, M. D., Hunaeni, H., Zulfikariandi, Z., & Muslimin, M. T. (2022). The Ability of 1st Class Students of SMAN 11 Enrekang to Arrange Verbal and Nominal Sentences. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 5*(3), 539-550.

[13]. Hidayat, A. (2014). Variasi Bahasa Berdasarkan Jenis Kelamin di Desa Matangaji Kecamatan Sumber Kabupaten Cirebon. *FON: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 5*(2).

[14]. Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. New York: Longman.

[15]. Kuntjara, E. (2014). Literacy in a Multicultural Indonesian Society: A Feminist Perspective. *Antropologi Indonesia*.

[16]. Koozhzad, A., Ghonsooly, B., Ghapanchi, Z., & Gholami, R. (2019). Relationship between Students' Gender and Their Use of Politeness Strategies in the" Results and Discussions Section" of PhD *Dissertations. Dinamika Ilmu, 19*(1), 75-95.

[17]. Labov, W. (1966). *The Linguistic Variable as a Structural Unit*. Washington Linguistics Review, 3: 4-22.

[18]. Lakoff. R. (1975). *Language and Moman's Place*. New York: Harper and Row.

[19]. Leaper, C., & Ayres, M. M. (2007). A meta-Analytic Review of Gender Variations in Adults' Language use: Talkativeness, Affiliative Speech, and Assertive Speech. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*(4), 328-363.

[20]. Mahmud, M. (2019). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8*(3), 597-606.

[21]. Misai, N. T. (2021). *Language politeness of netizen comments on Donald Trumps' Instagram: Gender perspective* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim).

[22]. Moleong, L. J., & Edisi, P. R. R. B. (2004). Metodelogi Penelitian. *Bandung: Penerbit Remaja Rosdakarya*.

[23]. Mullany, L. (2004). *Gender, Politeness and Institutional Power Roles: Humour as a Tactic to gain Compliance in Workplace Business M* Moleong, L. J., & Edisi, P. R. R. . Metodelogi penelitian. *Bandung: Penerbit Remaja Rosdakarya. seetings.*

[24]. Phúc, T. H. (2014). A Corpus-Based Analysis of Modality Markers as Positive Politeness Strategies in English Discourse. *Tạp chí Khoa học và Công nghệ-Đại học Đà Nẵng,* 99-102.

[25]. Rahman, F., & Letlora, P. S. (2018). Cultural Preservation: Rediscovering the Endangered Oral Tradition of Maluku (A Case Study on" Kapata" of Central Maluku). *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 9*(2), 91-97.

[26]. Saleh, N. J., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2021). Strategy of Apology in Buginese: A Sociolinguistic Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 4*(2), 188-196.

[27]. Sahib, H., & Rahman, F. (2021). Dialogic Speech in Marriage Proposal of Konjonese. *In The 2nd International Conference of Linguistics and Culture* (ICLC-2) (pp. 105-110). Atlantis Press

[28]. Sapitri, P. A., Chasanah, A., Putri, A. A., & Paulima, J. (2019). Exploring Brown and Levinson's Politeness Strategies: An Explanation on the Nature of the Politeness Phenomenon. *REiLA*: *Journal of Research and Innovation in Language, 1*(3), 111-117

[29]. Sukmawaty, S., Andini, C., & Rahman, F. F. (2022). The Shift of Honorifics due to The Promotion As A Government Official: Comparative Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *5*(1), 166-176.

[30]. Svendsen, A. D. (2019). Lakoff and Women's Language: A Critical Overview of the Empirical Evidence for Lakoff's thesis. *Leviathan: Interdisciplinary Journal in English, (4)*, 1-11.

[31]. Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men in the Workplace: Language, Sex and P ower*. New York: Avon Books.