

## Impoliteness Strategy In K-Pop Song Lyrics By Blackpink

Monalisa Br Samosir<sup>1</sup>,  
Universitas HKBP Nommensen  
Medan, Indonesia  
[monalisa.smr1006@gmail.com](mailto:monalisa.smr1006@gmail.com)

Rony Arahta Sembiring<sup>2</sup>  
Universitas HKBP Nommensen  
Medan, Indonesia  
[ronyarahta.sembiring@uhn.ac.id](mailto:ronyarahta.sembiring@uhn.ac.id)

Jubilezer Sihite<sup>3</sup>  
Universitas HKBP Nommensen  
Medan, Indonesia  
[jubilezer.sihite@uhn.ac.id](mailto:jubilezer.sihite@uhn.ac.id)

Received: 24<sup>th</sup> December 2024

Accepted: 30<sup>th</sup> January 2025

Published: 1<sup>st</sup> February 2025

### Abstract

This research aims to find out the types of impoliteness strategies and the application of these strategies in Blackpink's song lyrics. The data presented in this research consists of 34 lyrics, gathered from 13 songs on YouTube. This research is qualitative descriptive research, and the data were analyzed based on the impoliteness strategy developed by Culpeper (1996). Types of impoliteness found in Blackpink's song lyrics, 1) Bald impoliteness when recorded 12%; 2) Positive politeness 29% ; 3) Negative impoliteness 53%; 4) Sarcastic or mocking politeness 6% and ;5) Withholding politeness 0%. The researchers do not find withhold impoliteness here because the song withholds impoliteness is rarely used. Culpeper (2005) makes two observations in the realm of impoliteness. First, he believes that language and non-linguistic cues do not imply impoliteness. To put it another way, neither language nor non-linguistic cues are inherently disrespectful. However, according to Culpeper (1996), impoliteness can be conveyed vocally and non-verbally, such as avoiding eye contact. When assessing impoliteness, it is also necessary to examine paralinguistic and nonverbal aspects, which is why . using this type of song is impossible. This finding shows that Blackpink's lyrics use more negative types of impoliteness, which is why the impoliteness strategy is suitable for this research.

**Keywords:** *Impoliteness strategy; Blackpink; YouTube.*

### 1. Introduction

Language has an extremely vital part in human life. In general, language is used to deliver a message, engage with others, express a wide range of thoughts, and achieve the desired objective. Ferdinand de Saussure, a leading figure in modern linguistics, revolutionized our language understanding. He established the idea that language is a sign system made up of two fundamental components: "signifier" and "signified". The signifier is the physical form of the sign, such as sound or writing, whereas the signified is the meaning contained inside the sign. Saussure underlined the significance of the link between these two components and how they interact in a social setting. He contended that meaning in language is determined by variations between signs inside the language system itself, rather than being fixed. In other words, meaning is derived from the interaction between signals rather than from a direct reference to real-world things. Saussure's structuralist method serves as a foundation for modern linguistics research, demonstrating that language is more than just a medium of communication; it is also a social structure that determines how we think and behave. In this manner, language reflects and affects reality, shaping our understanding of the world around us.



Pragmatics is a linguistics discipline that investigates how context influences meaning in communication. According to this approach, language is not merely a collection of signals or grammatical rules, but also a tool employed in social relationships. In everyday encounters, language and pragmatics work together. Language offers the means for communication, whereas pragmatics provides the context required to comprehend deeper meaning. Understanding this link allows us to communicate more effectively and explore each interaction's various layers of meaning. Pragmatics focuses on how language users interact and how meaning can change depending on the situation. When we speak, numerous factors influence what we say and how it is received. The tone of voice, facial emotions, and the context of the speech can all lend nuance to the uttered words. In this setting, pragmatics seeks to comprehend what is stated, why, and how it is conveyed. Impoliteness, or rudeness, is an essential topic in pragmatics. In social interactions, people may use language that is deemed unfriendly or rude. This can happen for various reasons, including asserting power, expressing unhappiness, or even as a sort of fun. In pragmatics, this conduct is regarded as a communication strategy selected based on the context and aim of the contact. By examining impoliteness pragmatically, we can find patterns and methods that people utilize in ordinary interactions. For example, on social media platforms, where conversations are frequently conducted anonymously, By applying pragmatic analysis, we can explain why people feel freer to be impolite in that situation and how it influences communication dynamics. Overall, pragmatics offers crucial insights into how language works in social circumstances. This insight is useful for linguistic enhancing how we communicate in everyday situations. By raising our awareness of context and nuances in communication, we can strive to engage more effectively, avoid misunderstandings, and develop more beneficial relationships. In pragmatic studies, there are several parts, one of which is impoliteness, impoliteness is accompanied by politeness.

Politeness is a concept of polite social behavior in a particular culture. It could be shown by showing good manners towards others. Politeness is not something human beings were born with but something, which was acquired through a process of socialization. In this sense, Politeness is not a "Natural Phenomenon", that existed before mankind but one that has been sociocultural and historically constructed. In general terms, politeness has the same ideas as being tactful, modest and nice to others. The most relevant concept in the study of linguistic politeness, is "Face". In pragmatics, your face is your public self-image. It was the emotional and the social sense of self that everyone had and expected everyone else to recognize. Politeness could be defined as showing awareness and consideration for another person's face. The researcher concludes, politeness is the study how people use their awareness of other people's faces and also consider who they. People could show it by showing the hearer a suitable manner or attitude.

Although there have been various attempts to explain politeness, the opposite phenomenon, impoliteness, has received far less attention. Mills (2005) defines impoliteness as "any type of linguistic behavior that is assessed as intending to threaten the hearer's face or social identity." The interlocutor's intonation while speaking should also be taken into account. Impolite actions or utterances are those that attack the face of another person. Impoliteness is defined by Culpeper (2005) as "communicative strategies designed to attack face and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony." Self-harm is regarded as impoliteness. Culpeper (2005) states, "the phenomenon of impoliteness is to do with how offense is communicated and taken." Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987) opened the door for linguists to investigate the phenomena of impoliteness. According to Watts (in Lambrou and Stockwell, 2007), "(im)politeness is a term that is currently being debated, has been debated in the past, and will almost certainly continue to be debated in the future." Watts' definition implies that experts continue to debate about the concept of impoliteness. The study concludes that impoliteness is a communication strategy intended to attack or threaten the hearer's face, resulting in social conflict.

Culpeper (Al-Mubarak et al, 2023:369) identified five impoliteness strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mimic politeness, and withhold politeness. There are two considerations when discussing impoliteness: first, linguistic and non-linguistic signs do not necessarily imply impoliteness. Culpeper's impoliteness methods were as follows 1). Bald on record impoliteness: the face threatening act (FTA) is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way where face is not irrelevant. 2) Positive impoliteness: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. 3) Negative impoliteness: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. 4) Sarcasm or mock politeness: the FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realization. 5). Withhold politeness: the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. Culpeper (2005) makes two observations in the realm of impoliteness. First, he believes that language and non-linguistic cues do not imply impoliteness. Simply put, neither language nor non-linguistic cues are inherently disrespectful. However, some "are quite difficult to imagine the context in which they are used without being impolite." This concept stems from the reality that specific characteristics, such as power, social relationships, and context, have a role in viewing a language or non-linguistic signal as disrespectful. Second, politeness and impoliteness descriptions concentrate on lexical and grammatical components, with a restricted understanding of the signals that occur throughout communication (Culpeper, 2005). According to Culpeper (1996), impoliteness can be conveyed vocally and nonverbally, such as avoiding eye contact. When assessing impoliteness, it is also necessary to examine paralinguistic and nonverbal aspects.

Bald on Record Impoliteness is commonly used when there is much of face-attacking and the speaker intends to attack the hearer's face. Face-threatening behavior is carried out directly, clearly, unambiguously, and to the point when the face is irrelevant or diminished (Culpeper, 2011). Based on the statement above, the researcher concludes that naked on record impoliteness is when someone does not get along with other people and expresses it directly, clearly, to the point, and even to the point of problems. According to Culpeper (2011), positive impoliteness is the deployment of methods designed to harm the addressee's good image as someone who wishes to be recognized as a member of society. In this context, a positive face represents a person's desire to be responded to and needed by others. According to Culpeper (1996), the output strategies of positive impoliteness are as follows: 1) ignore, snub, or fail to acknowledge the other's existence. 2) remove the other person from an activity. 3) disassociate from the other: for example, avoid sitting together. 4) be detached, uninterested, and uncaring. 5) use improper identifying markers, such as title and surname when referring to a close relationship, or nickname when referring to a distance relationship. 6) use obscure or hidden language: for example, use jargon to confuse the other person, or use a code known to the rest of the group but not the target. 7) encourage controversy, such as by selecting a contentious topic. 8) make the other uncomfortable. 9) Swear or use rude or obscene language. 10) call the other person's names: make disparaging remarks. The study finds that positive impoliteness is using strategy design to harm a positive person, and he or she hopes that society will accept the positive impoliteness made. In this context, a positive face represents a person's desire to be responded to and needed by others. Negative Impoliteness employing of techniques to harm the addressee's negative face desires. Negative face wishes refers to a person's desire not to be disturbed. Negative face is every competent adult member's desire that his or her acts be unhindered by others. It also denotes the longing for freedom of action. Some of the results of negative impoliteness methods are as follows: a) Frighten: create the impression that negative acts will be taken against others. b) Condescend, mock, or ridicule: emphasize your relative power. Be disrespectful. Do not take the other person's threats seriously. Belittle the other (for example, employ diminutives). c) Invade the other person's space: literally (e.g., get as near to the other as the relationship allows) or symbolically (e.g., ask for or speak about information that is too intimate for the connection). d) Explicitly identify the other with bad aspects: personalize, use the pronouns "I" and "You". e) Record the other's obligation Culpeper (1996) uses an excerpt from *Soldier Girl to demonstrate how negative impoliteness methods are conveyed in an interview between Privates*.

Sarcasm is plainly the polar opposite of banter (mock politeness in the name of social peace). Sarcasm is a face-threatening behavior accomplished through the use of politeness approach. Sarcasm can be used to express the opposite feeling, which is not the true meaning of what he or she is saying. It can be inferred that sarcasm is realized through fake politeness. The examples below demonstrate off-the-record impoliteness methods. The example depicts Charlie (CH), who attends a renowned private school and receives student aid. Because he does not come from a wealthy family, he decides to spend Thanksgiving earning money by caring for a blind guy named the Colonel (COL). Withhold Impoliteness is defined as the lack of courtesy at work where it is expected. Impoliteness happens when politeness is not demonstrated at the expected time (Culpeper, 2005). As demonstrated in the following example, failure to express thanks or thank someone for a kindness, may be considered purposeful impoliteness. Before this investigation, the study was conducted three previous studies on the same topic. The two studies are explained below.

Pasaribu, (2021) in his Titled "Hate Speech On Joko Widodo's Official Facebook: An Analysis Of Impoliteness Strategies Used By Different Gender" This research is based on Culpeper's impoliteness strategy. His research employed a descriptive qualitative method. 100 data points were extracted from Joko Widodo's Facebook profile. The data is separated into two categories. Male netizens left 50 comments, while female netizens left 50. This study found that female netizens are more likely to engage in rude behavior, including positive, negative, sarcastic, and bald on record techniques.

Bustan and Alakrash (2020) titled their article "An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Performed by Donald Trump Tweets Addressing Middle Eastern Countries". employing the Culpeper's theory of impoliteness (1996 Their article outlines the various impoliteness strategies used by Donald Trump in his tweets about Middle Eastern countries. The research is qualitative in nature. According to their findings, netizens engaging with Trump's tweets adopt similar impoliteness tactics.

Emeliya Sukma Dara Damanik and Rora Rizky (2020) titled their study "Wandini Impoliteness in Commenting on Instagram 'Kekeyi'." They collected data from the Instagram account of "Kekeyi," a popular beauty vlogger known for her innovative technique of using a water balloon as a sponge, which sparked significant social media debate. They followed the hypothesis proposed by Culpeper (1996). In their research, they employed a descriptive research methodology. They identified three categories of impoliteness as proposed by Culpeper: bald on record impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and positive impoliteness. The study found that Kekeyi's followers predominantly used positive impoliteness tactics.

Zuhra's (2020) analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in American Presidential Debates. used Culpeper's (1996) theory to divide impoliteness. Her study employs qualitative methodologies to categorize examples of rude behavior strategies employed in the presidential debate in the United States in 2020.

Lyatin's (2021) research "Gender and Impoliteness Strategies in The Edges of Seventeen Movie also employs the hypothesis proposed by Culpeper (1996). This research employs descriptive qualitative methods found out that, men and women adopt various impoliteness methods.

This study examines the use of impoliteness strategies among construction workers in Mwanza, Tanzania based on the article "Pragmatics of Impoliteness in Construction Sites: A Case Study of Mwanza, Tanzania" by Farida J. Washokera and Lea Mpobela, which is set to be published in the *European Journal of Language and Culture Studies* in March 2023. The authors used Jonathan Culpeper's impoliteness model as a theoretical framework to investigate how various impoliteness methods are intentionally used to achieve specific communicative goals. The study used qualitative research methods, including observations, interviews, and focus group discussions, to gain a better understanding of the reasons behind the use of rude language use in different circumstances. The findings revealed that workers actively used all five impoliteness strategies identified by Culpeper—bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm, and withholding politeness—to boost morale, provide clear instructions, and foster social bonds, despite the apparent rudeness.

Based on the article "An Analysis of Hate Speech of Indonesian Citizen Commentary on Deddy Corbuzier Podcast" by Monica Chesilya Sinaga, Erika Sinambela, and Jubil Ezer Sihite, published in *Jurnal Scientia (Volume 11, No 2, November 2022)*, this study investigates the types of impoliteness strategies used in hate speech found in YouTube comments by Indonesian netizen regarding the Deddy Corbuzier podcast. The researchers used Jonathan Culpeper's 1996 impoliteness theory as a framework, focusing on identifying and assessing the most common impoliteness methods in the comments. Using a qualitative descriptive approach, the study examined 100 comments from the podcast, and identified four types of impoliteness strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mocking politeness. Among these positive impoliteness was the most prevalent accounting for 35%. The findings indicate that the use of these tactics represents a substantial tendency among Indonesian netizens to express their feelings through pejorative language, often by using derogatory names or labels to disparage others.

Dorcas Oteng Acheampong and Michael Kwarteng of Nanjing Tech University analyze impolite interactions in Ghanaian social contexts in their study, "A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Selected Ghanaian Social Interactions," which is set to be published in March 2021 in *the Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Their research aims to analyze the various types of impoliteness methods used in real conversations, and how these strategies are linguistically represented, with a particular focus on the dynamics of norms, relationships, and power within Ghanaian culture. The study employs Culpeper's theory of impoliteness, which identifies several impoliteness methods such as negative and positive impoliteness, sarcasm, and bald-on-record impoliteness. The authors used a qualitative study method to collect data from ten transcribed conversations, some of which were in the local Twi language, and then analyzed it descriptively. The findings reveal, that negative impoliteness is the most commonly used tactic and responses to impoliteness typically involve acceptance to avoid further disagreement.

In the article titled "Impoliteness Strategies Used by the Baroness in *the Movie Cruella*," authored by Alicia Tandiono and Nani Indrajani Tjitrakusuma from Petra Christian University and published in *Kata Kita* in December 2023, the researchers analyze the impoliteness strategies used by the Baroness, an antagonistic character in the film *Cruella*. The primary goal of this study is to identify the types of impoliteness methods used by the Baroness toward her subordinate, Estella, and her rival, Cruella, and as to investigate the similarities and differences in these interactions. The theoretical framework is based on the impoliteness strategy models of Culpeper and Bousfield, which identify various types of impolite behavior. The researchers used a qualitative approach, examining the Baroness's dialogue during business sequences in the movie, which was obtained from a streaming service. The findings show that the Baroness used all six types of impoliteness strategies when addressing Estella, including bald on record, positive, negative, sarcasm/mock politeness, withhold politeness, and off-record impoliteness, whereas she used only four strategies when addressing Cruella, notably excluding negative impoliteness and withhold politeness. This indicates that the Baroness's use of impoliteness is influenced by the differing social statuses and power dynamics between her and the two characters.

Mohammad Hossein Keshavarz of Girne American University published his research in the *Journal of Pragmatics Research* in March 2022 titled "Impoliteness in Power-imbalance and Power-neutral Relational Contexts: Evidence from a Persian TV Drama." The study examines the dynamics of impoliteness in *Asheghaneh* a popular Persian television show, focusing on the relational settings of power imbalance and power neutrality. Keshavarz applies pragmatic theories, notably those connected to Culpeper's impoliteness methods to analyze the interactions in the show.

The research method employed is descriptive qualitative analysis, which involves examining dialogues from the television series to find instances of impoliteness and responses to these attacks. The findings show that impoliteness is perceived and responded to differently based on the social context, emphasizing the complex interaction between power dynamics and interpersonal communication. Among all the previous research discussed, none has discussed on impoliteness in Blackpink songs, using the Culpeper theory. This is why this theory was applied in this study. The research aims to address two key questions: What types of impoliteness strategies are found in Blackpink's song lyrics? And how are impoliteness strategies applied in these lyrics?

The gap in this study lies in areas where previous research is lacking, particularly the usage of impoliteness strategies in K-pop lyrics, especially in those by Blackpink. Despite extensive research on politeness and impoliteness in other contexts, there has been little focus on K-pop lyrics. This study seeks to fill that gap by conducting a focused analysis of Blackpink's songs.

## 2. Method

This research is a qualitative descriptive study. As Creswell (2009) states: "Research design is the plan and procedures for research as well as detailed data collection and analysis methods." The purpose of study design is to ensure that the evidence gathered effectively addresses initial research question. This study uses a qualitative descriptive design with a case study approach to analyze impoliteness methods in Blackpink song lyrics. Qualitative research is a method where data is presented in words or images rather than numerical values.

This data for this study was gathered from one of the world's most popular social media platforms, YouTube. YouTube is a prominent social media platform in Indonesia, frequently used to display various phenomena. It is a platform where people often gain insights into others' personal lives. Many gossip accounts share negative news to entertain their followers, focusing on specific topics or individuals. These traits often encourages listener to engage with the song. In this research, the data source is the lyrics of Blackpink songs, as they are written materials. The researcher used mass media platforms such as YouTube to gather data. To collect the data, the researcher first subscribed to Blackpink's official YouTube channel, read the lyrics of their songs, and emphasized identifying impoliteness within those lyrics. By narrowing the focus, the researcher was able to collect more precise data. Once all the data was collected, the analysis began. The technique for data analysis involved classifying utterances according to impoliteness strategies: bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or fake politeness, and withholding politeness. The researcher then counted the occurrences of each impoliteness strategy and formed conclusions based on the findings.

## 3. Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents the findings on the impoliteness strategies used in Blackpink's lyrics. The findings section elaborates on the data analysis based on the impoliteness strategy theory proposed by Culpeper (1996). The findings then will be discussed in relation to relevant theories and previous research on impoliteness.

**Table 1.** The Percentage of Impoliteness Strategies.

Types Of Impoliteness Strategies	Frequency of Impoliteness Strategies	Percentages
Bald On Record Impoliteness	4	12 %
Positive Impoliteness	10	29 %
Negative Impoliteness	18	53%
Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness	2	6%
Withhold Impoliteness	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100 %</b>

After the data was collected, the researcher conducted an analysis by identifying the relevant data. The analysis was based on Culpeper's theory of strategic impoliteness. According to Culpeper's theory, there are five types of strategic impoliteness. A total of 34 data points were analyzed. Based on this data, various types of strategic impoliteness analysis were identified in the lyrics of Blackpink songs. The researcher found several instances of impoliteness in the songs, where abnormalities use were observed:

### 1. Bald On Record Impoliteness

**Data 1 :** "*Bring out your boss, Bitch, Yeah-eh-eh-eh, BLACKPINK!*"

This is a highly impolite sentence, where the speaker commands their boss to leave with a bold and confrontational tone. **Bald On Record Impoliteness**, a strategy characterized by direct, unambiguous, and rude language. The straightforwardness of the command without any mitigation makes it a clear instance of impoliteness,

**Data 2 :** "*Your new girlfriend is Stupid.*"

## 2. Positive Impoliteness

**Data 1** “If you’re offended, I don’t care (yeah)”

Although the sentence appears neutral, the speaker clearly expresses indifference to the feelings of someone who might be offended. This lack of concern for the other person's emotions is an example of **Positive Impoliteness**, where the speaker disregards social norms of politeness and empathy, deliberately conveying a message that might hurt or offend. It looks very clear If you're offended, I don't care (yeah) is a positive sentence but the author doesn't think about someone who is offended because of his attitude, he doesn't have any sympathy or care for that person at all, that's why this is called Positive Impoliteness.

**Data 2** “But I don't care 'cause I got what I need “.

While the sentence seems positive, the speaker's clear message is that they only care about their own desires, and once those are fulfilled, they have no further concern for others. This disregard for others' needs or feelings is also an example of Positive Impoliteness, where the speaker's self-centered attitude violates social expectations of consideration and respect for others. But I don't care 'cause I got what I need is a positive sentence but here the sentence is very clear that the author only needs it when he needs it, after getting what he wants he doesn't care anymore that's why this is called **Positive Impoliteness**.

## 3. Negative Impoliteness

**Data 1:** “*Everyone silent, listen to my money talk.*”

The sentence commands silence from the audience, positioning the speaker as superior by showcasing their wealth. The implication is that the speaker's money is so significant that it demands attention, elevating the speaker above others. This disregard for others' status or feelings demonstrates **Negative Impoliteness**, where the speaker's actions belittle others and assert their dominance in an inconsiderate manner.

**Data 2:** “*We look similar, but we are in different classes.*”

In this sentence, the speaker acknowledges a shared similarity but highlights a social divide, implying that they are in a higher class than the other person. While the sentence may seem casual, the underlying message creates a subtle power imbalance, where the speaker positions themselves as more privileged. This reflects **Negative Impoliteness**, as the speaker indirectly draws attention to a difference in social status, using a tone that seems nonchalant but still emphasizes the disparity.

## 4. Withhold Impoliteness

No examples were found in the lyrics showcasing **Withhold Impoliteness**, as this strategy does not apply in the song. **Withhold Impoliteness** involves the use of euphemisms, ambiguous, or unclear statements that deliberately avoid direct confrontation or explicit rudeness. However, the lyrics analyzed do not demonstrate this approach, as they tend to be direct and clear rather than ambiguous or indirect.

## 5. Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness

**Data 1:** “*Really believe you can beat me? Believe me, we be like kiki (Laughs)*”

In this sentence, the speaker questions whether anyone believes they can beat them, followed by a laugh and a dismissive comment. This conveys a sense of superiority, as the speaker mocks and ridicules the other person's attempt. The use of sarcasm, coupled with laughter, highlights a clear example of **Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness**, where the speaker pretends to be polite but is actually expressing contempt or disbelief in a mocking manner.

**Data 2:** “*You wouldn't do it if it ain't stupid, stupid (stupid, stupid)*”

This sentence is a clear example of sarcasm. The speaker is pointing out that something shouldn't be done, but the repeated use of the word "stupid" serves to mock the listener. The repetition and tone imply that the speaker doesn't just disagree with the action but is belittling the person for their choice. This reflects **Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness**, where the speaker feigns politeness but actually insults or ridicules the other person.

The analysis of Blackpink's song lyrics reveals that they contain five types of impoliteness strategies: Bald On-Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Withhold Impoliteness, and Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness. Among these, negative impoliteness occurs most frequently. The analysis of 34 lyrics shows that 53% of the instances involve Negative Impoliteness, 29% involve Positive Impoliteness, 12% involve Bald on Record Impoliteness, 6% involve Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness, and 0% show instances of Withhold Impoliteness. This suggests that Negative Impoliteness is the most commonly used impolite strategy in Blackpink's lyrics.

## 4. Conclusion

After reviewing the data, the researcher identified five different types of impoliteness strategies. This study applied Culpeper's (1996) framework, which includes the following five tactics: Bald On-Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Withhold Impoliteness, and Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness. However, the analysis revealed that only four of these strategies found in the lyrics. Among them, Negative Impoliteness was the most common impoliteness tactic used, appearing 18 times. This method is most commonly used in Blackpink's lyrics. Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness appeared the least, while Withhold Impoliteness was entirely absent. This suggests that the characters in these songs prefer to communicate their impoliteness directly, rather than through sarcasm, mockery, or ambiguous

statements. Furthermore, the research indicates that Blackpink's lyrics often carry critical comments, highlighting the group's tendency to express bold, confrontational attitudes in their music.

## 5. References

- Akter, S. (2023). The Effectiveness of Polite Language in Social Behavior. *British Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 7782, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.34104/bjah.0230108>
- Al-Mubarak, M. R., Wagiati, W., & Darmayanti, N. (2023). Strategi Ketidaksantunan Berbahasa Culpeper Dalam Ancaman Aplikasi Pinjaman Online Melalui Media Sosial Whatsapp. *Fon: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 19(2), 367–377. <https://doi.org/10.25134/fon.v19i2.8288>
- Bustan, E. S., & Alakrash, H. M. (2020). Ari Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Performed by Donald Trump Tweets Addressing the Middle East Countries 1,66-74.
- Brown, P and Levinson, S.C. (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Creswell. (2009). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, And Mixed Methods Approaches*. University Of Nebraska-Lincoln
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. "Towards an anatomy of impoliteness". *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol 25, hal. 349-367.
- Culpeper, J.(2005). "Impoliteness an dentertainment in the television quiz show". *Journal of Politeness*. Vol 1, hal. 35-72. Impoliteness strategies
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness. Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper. (2016). Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, *culture and society*,421-445
- Dewanti, D. (2023). Semiotic Analysis of Ferdinand De Saussure's Structuralism on "Energen Green Bean" Advertisement. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4487450>
- (Hamn, 2019)Hamn, A. (2019). *President Trump 's use of ' Impoliteness Strategies ' in Twitter outputs targeted at U . S . May*.
- Keshavarz, M. H. (2022). Impoliteness in Power-imbalance and Power-neutral Relational Contexts: Evidence from a Persian TV Drama. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 4(1), 41–59. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v4i1.41-59>
- Ningsih, E. A. (2022). An Analysis of Indonesian - English Code Mixing Used on Deddy Corbuzier Podcast. *English Language Education Universitas Islam Riau*, 33(1), 1–12.
- Pasaribu, A. N. (n.d.). Hate Speech on Joko Widodo S Official Facebook: an Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Used By Different Gender. 56-64.
- Richards, J.C. and Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Longman.
- (Rheem & Ahmed, 2022)Rheem, D. S., & Ahmed, T. M. (2022). Impoliteness Strategies In Joe Biden's Speech. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 2022(6), 3282–3291. <http://journalppw.com>
- Washokera, F. J., & Mpobela, L. (2023). Pragmatics of Impoliteness in Construction Sites: A Case study of Mwanza, Tanzania. *European Journal of Language and Culture Studies*, 2(2), 44–59. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejlang.2023.2.2.79>