

Profanity in Social Media: An Analysis of Pragmatic Functions and Politeness Maxims Violation

Gil Emanuel A. Mejia¹, Cristy Grace A. Ngo^{2✉}

¹² College of Teacher Education, The University of Mindanao, Davao del Sur, Philippines

✉ email: cngo@umindanao.edu.ph

Received:

July 23, 2024

Revised:

July 26, 2024

Accepted:

July 29, 2024

Published:

August 1, 2024

ABSTRACT

This corpus-based study employed sociopragmatic analysis to identify the role of profane linguistic expressions on social media, specifically Facebook and Instagram, in terms of their pragmatic functions and politeness maxims violations. The pragmatic functions identified are cathartic, abusive, and social functions; while the politeness maxims violations are tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy maxims. This study not only illustrates the functions of profanity on social media but also reveals a pattern of profanity-violating maxims that are more focused on the other than the self-indicating offensive pragmatics behind profanity. However, it is important to note that the findings may not be generalizable to all social media platforms or cultural contexts, and further research is needed to explore these aspects.

Keywords: *education; linguistics; internet users; profanity; pragmatic functions; politeness maxims violation; social media*

INTRODUCTION

Exposure to social media for a long time undoubtedly exposes users to harmful content such as profanity. Ismail and Shafie (2019) buttressed that social media sites are prevalent among teenagers and young adults nowadays, and they are exposed to such technologies for an extended period (Samat et al., 2020). This swearing phenomenon requires understanding of its pragmatic functions and how it violates politeness maxims in social media discourse because incivility is often associated with harmful content. Although some argue that sometimes profanity signals affinity toward others, swearing in communication is a marker of offensive language (Song et al., 2021).

One major issue with the use of profane language in discourse is politeness. Findings from the study of Jumanto and Sulistyorini (2019) show that swearing utterances can be literal and creative in meaning. These swearing utterances can be offensive, profane, or obscene. As many teenagers and young adults increasingly communicate online, profanity has become bolder (Amin, 2021). However, Jay (2018) pointed out that not all types of swearwords are problematic. At times, examples from everyday communication using profanity may not express deep emotions and some may use profanity with the intent of fitting in, especially in the context of social media (Pamungkas et al., 2020).

Kwon and Gruzd (2017) mentioned that swearing affects people's perception as using profanity in discourse can be perceived as rude; however, it may promote camaraderie to some. DeFrank and Kahlbaugh (2018) clinched that using profanity made the listeners' impression of a speaker's trustworthiness, politeness, and likability less favourable when compared to individuals who did not use profanity. Such impressions play a part in the pragmatic functions of swearing and how it violates the politeness maxims. Likewise, these nuances illustrate how profanity can build and break social bonds, reflecting its duality as a tool for social groups.

This study examined the pragmatic functions of swearing and how it violated the politeness maxims, specifically in the context of Facebook and Instagram (Meta). Gultom and Rahmadini (2022) argued that present-day social media users are less interested in the ethics of using words. Hence, most users post anything they have in mind without restriction. Additionally, Banguis et al. (2023) explained that the absence of restrictions when communicating online ensues conflict and impoliteness. Therefore, it is vital to shed light on the role of profane language in social media discourse to understand its pragmatics and how it violates politeness.

Although previous studies (Coats, 2021; Hahn et al., 2021; Song et al., 2021; Teh & Cheng, 2020; Wang et al., 2020) on profanity in the context of social media already exist, the majority of these studies focus on the discourse found within Twitter. Despite the growing social media platforms like Facebook and Instagram, literature needs to be more robust within these platforms, indicating a gap. This gap in the problem posed an urgent need to pursue this research study because of the ever-rising popularity of Facebook and Instagram.

The institution, teachers, and students could make significant implications from this study. Teachers and students alike have most certainly used social media at one point. Samat et al. (2020) argued that most if not all, have used or encountered profanity. This study provides insights into the role of profanity and its influence on behavior and social dynamics. Insights regarding profanity on social media would also give an understanding of the users' real-life language use. As asserted by Feldman et al. (2017), social media is an extension of the real-world social context. Furthermore, this enables the institution to consider how and when profanity is allowed as opposed to the conventional strict views against profanity. As a result, teachers would be aware of the person's intent if one chooses to use profanity.

METHOD

In this section, the researchers delineate the parts of the method which cover research data, research design and procedures, and data analysis.

Research Data

The data of this study are profane linguistic expressions uttered by users on Meta, specifically Facebook and Instagram. These profane linguistic expressions, as described by Jay (2000), refer to obscenity, blasphemy, name-calling, insulting, verbal aggression, taboo, ethnic-racial slurs, vulgarity, and slang. Utterances from social media discourse

are the foci of the study because the researcher aimed to analyze the pragmatics of profane linguistic expressions and how they violate politeness. Four hundred posts and comments, specifically from 2023, containing profane linguistic expressions from Facebook and Instagram, were collected to form a corpus for the research data analysis. Moreover, Ngo and Cubelo (2024) highlighted that there is no specific range for the number of corpora in a corpus-based study because it is more relevant to acquire sufficient data that answers the research question and the particular requirements of the analysis.

Research Design and Procedures

This qualitative corpus-based study analyzed the pragmatic functions of profane linguistic expressions gathered on Meta. The qualitative approach gave the researchers a complex, detailed understanding of the issue (Cresswell, 2013). Furthermore, the study will implement Leech's (1983) sociopragmatic approach to analyze the corpus of profane linguistic expressions on Meta. It allows the researcher to interpret the underlying role of profanity in social media.

The filtered data collected was grouped into a corpus of 10 profane linguistic expressions uttered by users on Meta and ranked according to their frequency. The analysis of the corpus would be according to its pragmatic functions, which provide the necessary information to understand its pragmatics. Furthermore, the corpus was analyzed using Leech's (1983) Theory of Politeness Maxims to determine how it violates various contextual maxims. Findings of these violations shed light on the role of profanity and the underlying reasons and implications of its use.

Data Analysis

This qualitative research utilized a sociopragmatic approach to analyze the pragmatic functions and politeness maxims violations of the profane linguistic expressions gathered on Meta. The researcher used the corpora to identify users' profane linguistic expressions on Meta. Consequently, the researchers used Wajnryb's (2005) model of pragmatic functions of swearing to examine the contextual use of these profane linguistic expressions. Finally, the researchers analyzed the corpora using Leech's (1983) Politeness Maxims Theory to comprehend how these expressions violate politeness.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the profane linguistic expressions in Facebook and Instagram are determined and the politeness maxims they violated. The discussion of the findings then follows contextualization with existing literatures.

Profile of Profane Linguistic Expressions

Presented in Table 1 is the profile of profane linguistic expressions that were culled and classified from random 400 Facebook and Instagram posts and comments in the year 2023. Specifically, it presents the 10 most utilized profanities with their codes and frequencies.

Table 1. Profile of Profane Linguistic Expressions

Code	Profane Linguistic Expression	Frequency
F	Fuck	266
Sh	Shit	144
St	Stupid	30
Ng	Nigga	24
A	Ass	17
Bi	Bitch	16
G	Gay	15
D	Damn	10
H	Hell	7
Di	Dick	6

Fuck. This group of profane linguistic expressions is the most frequently used on Facebook and Instagram, appearing 266 times in posts and comments. Corresponding to the data gathered, it is worth noting that the expression comprises variations used differently by users. Some examples of variations include *af (as fuck)*, *effing*, *fking*, *fucker*, *mother fucker*, and *what the fuck*. Additionally, according to Gauthier (2017), the word *fuck* has been identified as the most popular swear word used across all age groups and genders. The key reason for its popularity is the variations that branch off from the root word *fuck*. It is for this reason that it comes as no surprise that the expression *fuck* is the most frequently used profanity (Love, 2021) by users on Facebook and Instagram in 2023.

Shit. This group of profane linguistic expressions comes as the second most frequently used expression on Facebook and Instagram, appearing less than half of the expression *fuck*, 144 times in posts and comments. The swear word *shit* generally refers to *poop*—an act of bodily function. Much like the word *fuck*, the word *shit* also has a fair share of variations that make it a popular choice of a swear word. Some examples include *BS (bullshit)*, *crap*, *dipshit*, *dogshit*, and *holy shit*. Kassem (2023) explained that this popularity stems from the gradual increase of the words' usage on television and movies. For that reason, it is not surprising to see *shit* as one of the most frequent profane linguistic expressions on social media.

Stupid. This group of profane linguistic expressions comes as the third most used profanity on Facebook and Instagram. Data shows that the group of words appeared 30 times. Unlike *fuck* and *shit*, where the meaning is often sexual or a body function, the word *stupid* functions more like an insult that attacks people's intellect (Sari & Haristiani, 2024). Observation also shows some variations like *retard*, *idiot*, and *faggot*. However, despite the multiple forms of the word, a drastic drop in frequency from the previous two expressions can be observed because the word *stupid* is abusive in function.

Nigga. This group of profane linguistic expressions comes as the fourth most profanity users use on Facebook and Instagram, amounting to 24 times. Sinclair (2017) defines the word *nigga* or *nigger* as a term for dark-skinned people in Africa or Asia, often deemed as an inoffensive word; however, this term refers to black slaves when slavery was still prominent, thus shifting the connotation of the word to something

offensive. Today, most people refer to the word *nigga* as the N-word, allowing the word to be acceptable in a social setting. This conventional use of the word *nigga* makes it a popular choice for people in their discourse.

Ass. This group of profane linguistic expressions comes as the fifth most used profanity on Facebook and Instagram, appearing 17 times, significantly less than the first two. Dennis (2019) defines the word *ass* as a body part which is the buttocks or the anus. Much like the expression *shit*, this expression became popular through televisions and movies. However, according to Kassem (2023), there has been a decrease in the word frequency use in the 2000s and 2010s. With the expression being the fifth most used, a decrease is apparent compared to what the study, as mentioned above, observed.

Bitch. This group of profane linguistic expressions is the sixth most-used profanity on Facebook and Instagram, counting 16 uses. Vinter (2017) describes the word *bitch* as a term that initially referred to a female dog in heat and was later metaphorically applied to describe a sexually active woman. Traditionally, it is an insult when applied to a woman. However, it is worth noting that in the data gathered, using the expression *bitch* was also observed when referring to a man. In this case, the expression refers to a man's cowardly or weak trait, implicitly making it abusive in function by belittling people (Gauthier, 2017).

Gay. This group of profane linguistic expressions is the seventh most used profanity on Facebook and Instagram, with 15 uses. The word *gay* is a term that refers to a homosexual person. However, the term becomes a type of profanity when used as an epithet to call homosexual people. This homophobic epithet of the word then becomes an insult, which classifies as a type of profanity (Fasoli et al., 2016). The usage of the word as a profane linguistic expression stems from the idea of men using it to reinforce masculine gender norms. Fulcher (2017) describes that males mostly use this expression to maintain a social hierarchy of gender status and privileges.

Damn. This group of profane linguistic expressions is the eighth most frequently used expression on Facebook and Instagram, with 10 uses. According to Dennis (2019), the word *damn* refers to the action of cursing someone to fate, often expressing condemnation and annoyance. The word *damn* was once one of the most used expressions for hundreds of years, sitting alongside *fuck* in terms of popularity. However, during the 18th and 19th centuries, censorship and substitutes for the word caused its decrease in use (Šindelářová, 2016). Nowadays, the word *damn* is relatively perceived as mild profanity as supposed to be offensive.

Hell. The penultimate expression on the list that was used seven times by users on Facebook and Instagram. The profane expression *hell* refers to the religious context of hell. Consequently, the word evokes negative feelings such as annoyance or frustration (Johnson, 2019). The figurative meaning of the word *hell* corroborates the idea that swearing can have literal or creative meaning (Jumanto & Sulistyorini, 2019). However, the symbolic sense of the word associated with religion, in general, makes it an unpopular choice of profanity amongst people.

Dick. The least used profane linguistic expression on Facebook and Instagram appeared six times. Figuratively, the word refers to a man's genitalia, medically called 'penis' (Simon et al., 2021). The semantics of the word *dick* makes it vulgar and obscene when used. Moreover, the obscenity of the word makes it relatively unpopular to people. Accordingly, observation of the use of the word *dick* was consistently low in the 2000s and 2010s. The low usage of the word reflects the data gathered, suggesting adherence to censorship guidelines of explicit language.

The identified profane linguistic expressions are comparatively similar to the findings of Love (2021) and Kassem (2023) where they noted *fuck, shit, crap, ass, dick, bitch, bastard, bloody, fanny, twat, and cunt* as the most utilized and most popular profanities. This study could observe congruence; however, unlike this study, Love (2021) and Kassem (2023) sampled their data from British National Corpus, Spoken British National Corpus, television, and movies. While the words *fuck, shit, ass, dick,* and *bitch* are present in their study, the words *stupid, nigga, gay, damn, and hell* in this study are not.

Pragmatic Functions of Profane Linguistic Expressions

In Table 2, the pragmatic functions of profane linguistic expressions are presented. Several studies (Abayon et al., 2024; Saffah, 2020; Khalaf & Rashid, 2019) on profanity and its pragmatic functions used Wajnryb's (2005) model of pragmatic functions of swearing to investigate the use of profanity or swearing in context. Likewise, this study employed the same model of pragmatic functions of swearing to find out the context of the profanities. Accordingly, the pragmatic functions of swearing are cathartic, abusive, and social.

First, the cathartic function is the most common type of swearing function. It is often associated with the emotional venting of a person or an expressive and psychological response of a person when subjected to emotions concerning pain, anger, frustration, and misfortune (Pamungkas et al., 2020; Saffah, 2020). In a sense, venting out emotions reduces their stress levels. Expressions uttered by a person do not necessarily require an audience to be effective. A person could aim their swearing at themselves.

Meanwhile, abusive function of swearing is just as emotional with the cathartic function. However, unlike cathartic, where the person is venting out expression as a result of a psychological response to reduce stress levels, abusive swearing attacks an audience with the intent of ridicule or harm (Finn, 2017). Abusive swearing is often used as a substitute for physical attacks.

Finally, the social function of swearing is drastically different from cathartic and abusive. Social swearing leans more on the social aspect of building rapport in a relaxed and controlled environment. This type of swearing accounts for conversational instances not characterized by confrontation, rudeness, or aggression (Fägersten, 2017b).

Cathartic Functions. The persona in (F5) declares that they love profanity. The user who posted this Facebook post is expressing their love about using profanity,

using the word *fuck* to emphasize their passion for profanity further. This expression of feeling can be interpreted as cathartic because the statement suggests that the person is letting loose their emotions (Finn, 2017), a characteristic of the cathartic function of swearing as observed in the excerpt below:

“I love profanity. Always have.. Always the **fuck** will.” (F5)

Similarly, (Sh1) can be characterized as an expressive statement about the user’s current emotional state. It can be interpreted as a form of frustration because the person is showing regret for their actions from 2016 to 2020. This frustration is observed in the second half of the statement, where the user used the word *holy shit* to emphasize frustration. Accordingly, the feeling of frustration exhibits the cathartic function of swearing (Wulandari, 2017) as shown in the statement below:

“oh **shit** nag flashback akong mga cringe na gipangbuhat sa

2016–2020 **holy shit** aaauugh get out of my head” (Sh1)

[Translation: Oh **shit** I’m having flashbacks of all the cringeworthy

things I did from 2016–2020 **holy shit** aaauugh get out of my head. (Sh1)]

Additionally, (St1) is a declarative statement of a user commenting on a Facebook video. The first sentence states the impression of the user. Here, the user used the word *stupid* to refer to the incident, presumably because it is what the user thinks the incident is. The remark is followed by the second sentence, which suggests the user is relieved from seeing a situation where karma manifests (Fägersten, 2017b). However, despite the statement not showing forms of emotional anger or frustration, the resulting emotion felt by the user, which is a relief, can still be classified as cathartic as it functions by reducing the stress level of the persona as displayed below:

“That straightened that **stupid** shit out. I love seeing karma stand up.” (St1)

Contrastingly, the persona in (A3) expresses their disappointment and frustration. The Facebook post is about a user expressing their thoughts on the year 2023, suggesting an inevitable disappointment that happened in the year. The expression of disappointment is followed by frustration which the user emphasizes by using the word *ass* (Simon et al., 2021) in the statement:

“This year was so **ass**” (A3)

In a similar vein, the persona observed in (G1) expresses their displeasure and frustration. The user commented on Facebook about a presentation that contained homosexual imagery. It is here that the user expresses their displeasure by calling out the presentation as *gay*, suggesting a hint of frustration (Saffah, 2020). Because it implies that the user does not like the presentation, specifically the homosexual imagery within, the comment can be classified as a cathartic function of swearing because it conveys the psychological emotion of the user as observed in the statement:

“3 slides in an I only been seeing **gay** shit” (G1)

Moreover, (Bi2) is an assertive statement that indicates sarcasm in the form of a question. The Facebook post is a reaction to the idea of profanity being low-class. The user delivers their response in the form of a question, addressing the receiver by using the word *bitch*. Kreuz (2020) explains that using profanity promotes sarcasm. Consequently, they exhibit a feeling of frustration, which is a characteristic associated with the cathartic function of profanity as manifested in:

“Profanity is so low class. Me: “Apologies, my good **bitch**, but what seems to be the fuck?” (Bi2)

The analyses discussed the six profane linguistic expressions—*fuck*, *shit*, *stupid*, *ass*, *bitch*, *gay*—that were used cathartically. The analyses show their usage to convey frustration and disappointment which conform with Wulandari's (2017) findings that cathartic swearing occurs when the persona is incited with frustration, stress, or anger.

However, the analyses on *fuck* and *stupid* adhere with Khairunnisa (2017) who ideated that using swear words express feelings of pleasure.

Nevertheless, the expressions *nigga*, *damn*, *hell*, and *dick* were not used cathartically. First, according to Sinclair (2017), the use of *nigga* posits an offensive statement, often characteristically used by racists, and displays an abusive connotation which is the opposite of being cathartic. Second, Osborne (2020) explains that *damn* is intertwined with the concept of cursing someone which then posits the likelihood of the word being used in an abusive manner. Next, for the word *hell*, although it can be used to express frustration, a characteristic of cathartic function, it has not been observed to be used so. A possible reason for this is its meaning often associated with religious contexts (Johnson, 2019) and its unpopularity. Lastly, the word *dick*, described as a man's genital with its nature being vulgar and obscene. Simon et al. (2021) classified the word as a taboo violating society's value and this taboo disposition of the word makes it offensive and somewhat abusive in meaning—hence the lack of cathartic uses.

Conclusively, six out of ten profane linguistic expressions were used cathartically. Their uses conveyed emotional reactions to specific situations and their contexts vary but still can be seen to be literary and creative in meaning (Jumanto & Sulistyorini, 2019).

Abusive Functions. (F1) is a comment on Facebook that seemingly attacks a user about a post of a particular literature. Here, the user used the word *fuck* multiple times to emphasize their strong antipathy towards the post. The overall statement significantly suggests aggressive behaviour towards the receiver (Wene & Ena, 2020), hence listed as an example of the abusive function of swearing. Additionally, (Sh2) is an expressive comment that shows dislike about a food video on Instagram. The user used the word *shit* to refer to the food while being blunt. The use of *shit*, along with the phrase used at the end, suggests a form of hostility (Feldman et al., 2017), indirectly showing abusive behaviour, which in this case is a form of abusive swearing function. Whereas (St3) is an Instagram comment about a SpaceX video. The user used the word *idiots* in a combination of *fuck*ing to respond to a video about SpaceX rocket test failures. Yet, it can be observed that the statement is not aimed at the video but rather at the people supporting it. The user opposes SpaceX's rocket development and its supporters by calling them *idiots* and saying, "make our world better." This is manifested when the persona tries to assert authority by showing opposition (Chase, 2017) and hints aggression with how it is worded. These are observed in the following statements:

“**Fuck** the author, **fuck** his gay ass manga, bro should stop while he can” (F1)

“this **shit** looks way better than mid bro don't lie to my face” (Sh2)

“Fucking **idiots**, make our world better, leave that fucking shit rocket” (St3)

Interestingly, (Ng2) is a Facebook post that shows racism, stereotypes, and satirical subjects. In the first sentence, the word *niggers* were used. This word's usage seemingly displays racism, which the user admits in the second sentence. Following this, the user labels black people as thieves in a stereotypical fashion. Lastly, the fourth sentence is a satire about black people being the "kings of sex." Mudambi (2019) explains that the elements of racism, stereotypes, and satire prompt insults and abuse, which, negatively speaking, aims to inflict harm on black people on Facebook.

“I hate all **niggers**. Yes, I identify as a racist. Literally black people come in and steal all kinds of races of women. That's why BBC is a genre and they're glorified to be the kings of sex.” (Ng2)

Meanwhile, (A3) is an Instagram comment replying to another comment. The user used the word *ass* in combination with *fuck* to reinforce the user's disagreement. It can be observed that the user is showing hostility by attacking another user's opinion in the form of disagreement and rejection (Chase, 2017). The same is illustrated in (Bi1), a comment on Facebook that displays a mockery of someone's weight. It can be observed that the user who posted this comment is laughing, as indicated by the expression "hehe." The insult then follows the user's laughter, "-get fat bitch," indicating a case of insult through fat shaming (Hamid et al., 2018). It can be noted that the statement attacks another user through insults, harming the receiver verbally, and manifesting the abusive function of swearing. They are illustrated in the statements below:

“nobody asked for ur fuck **ass** opinion” (A3)

“hehe, get fat **bitch**” (Bi1)

Moreover, (G6) is an antisemitic statement that calls out and attacks a person as *gay* and Jewish. A user on Instagram posted this comment on a video related to the Israel-Hamas war. The user starts their statement by showing agreement with another user, followed by hostile discrimination against Jewish people. The line "-that mf over there is a **gay** Jewish or something” highlights the antisemitism of the user against Jewish people. Furthermore, the user calls them *gay*, insinuating insult to the receiver. Jikeli et al. (2022) explain that antisemitism is recognized as a manifestation of hostility. The hostility, along with the hint of insult, inflicts harm and abuse on the subject, exhibiting an abusive function of swearing. Also, (H2) is a Facebook comment about a video demonstration. This comment is a statement by a user responding to another user who requested English subtitles for said video. Here, they used the word *hell* to express annoyance. It can be perceived that the user is annoyed by the idea of requesting English subtitles for a video demonstration. After this is the question, "Are you retarded?" which can translate as an insult to the receiver. The expression of annoyance and intent of insult is explained by Wulandari (2017), where the speaker's intention is a response to specific stimuli. Such stimuli manifest the abusive function because the statement intends to inflict harm. (Dk3) as well is a humorous, sarcastic statement that intends to insult pet owners who insist that dogs can get allergies. A user on Instagram posted this comment on an informational video about dogs contracting environmental allergies. The user used the word *dildo*, a variation of the word *dick*, to call out people promoting awareness for dog allergies. Following this is the humorous, sarcastic remark, “-is the reason I can't eat peanuts on a god damn airplane anymore.” It can be observed that the user jokingly used peanuts to refer to the peanut allergy that most people contract as a sarcastic statement to dogs contracting allergies. Wene and Ena (2020) argue that sarcasm may promote social cohesion. In this case, however, humorous aggression is observed because the statement intends to insult (Kreuz, 2020). Noted below are the statements:

“I agree with you 100000% my friend, that mf over there is a **gay** Jewish something 🐼 🐼 🐼 🐼 🐼 🐼” (G6)

“why **the hell** would you need a video demonstration with English subtitles? Are you retarded?” (H2)

“All these **dildos** talking about the dog having allergies is the reason I can't eat peanuts on a god damn airplane anymore. Weak genes.” (Dk3)

On another note, (D1) is a directive statement that urges a person to stop doing reckless and dangerous activities. A user on Instagram posted this comment about a video showcasing reckless driving. Here, the user used *damn* to indicate condemnation, expressing their disagreement with careless driving. Following this is the second sentence in which the user explains how people who drive model cars are negligent and irresponsible. Mulki et al. (2019) describe that the expression of disapproval reflects an agreement with abuse.

“Stop being so **damn** stupid And reckless. Effing idiots making the ppl that drive model cars get judged from others stupidity” (D1)

Based on the analyses, all 10 profane linguistic expressions were used as abusive functions. The contexts for their use vary from antipathy, opposition, racism, satire, rejection, insults, and annoyance. These findings relate with Husna (2020), where the use of swear words is relative to negative feelings. Furthermore, according to Jumanto and Sulistyorini (2019), using profanity is rude and offensive, often exploited to express anger, adding to the idea of profanity used in abusive functions. Additionally, Finn (2017) asserts that abusive swearing is used to humiliate someone, and such humiliation can be expressed through metaphors, advice, and accusations, respectively. Pamungkas et al. (2023) add that abusive occurrences express hatred, causing harm and offense, especially when exploited in spontaneous writing found on social media.

Social Functions. (F2) is a declarative statement that posits agreement to the receiver. This statement was a comment posted by a user on Facebook. Here, a variation of the word *fuck* was used, as in *motherfucker*. The word *motherfucker* was used to refer to the subject of the original post; however, this is not necessarily negative. Moreover, the overall sentence implies that the user connects to the original post to an astronomical degree, hinting that the statement can be interpreted as a positive remark (Finn, 2017). The context of the user showing a form of empathy by relating to the post shows the social function of swearing because the word *motherfucker* is not derogatory. Also, (H3) is a Facebook post agreeing with a particular subject. The word *hell* was used combined with *fucking* to emphasize the user's agreement. Contrary to the definition of *hell*, it does not evoke negative feelings like frustration or annoyance but a positive one like satisfaction and relief (Baruch et al., 2017). The context of the statement being in a state of agreement reflects the feeling of satisfaction that posits the effective use of the social function of swearing. Shown below are the statements:

“How can this **motherfucker** be astronomically relatable holy shit I cannot.” (F2)

“**Hell** fucking yea” (H3)

While (Sh6) is a cheerful statement that suggests the user is comfortable. A user on Instagram posted this comment on a meme video they think is funny. The word *shit* was used to refer to the words said in the video. However, in this context, the word *shit* is not harmful, as observed in line “-they be saying be funny asf.” Consequently, the line suggests that the user finds the context humorous, expressing profanity to show amusement (Fägersten, 2017a). The positive statement manifests the social function of swearing because it does not attack or hurt the target audience. Similarly, (St4) is a comical statement in which the user says they cannot stop laughing. A user on Facebook posted this comment in response to a video they found amusing. Here, the word *stupid* was used to refer to the subject of the video. Although the word *stupid* is often an insult, it was used jokingly to express laughter and enjoyment in this context. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the emoji *Face with Tears of Joy* (😂) was used

multiple times. Pamungkas et al. (2020) explain that the presence of the emoji (😂) helps readers understand the actual context of the statement. Hence, the statement shows the social function of swearing because the context is not derogatory but rather humorous. These are demonstrated in the statements below:

“hahaha the **shit** they be saying be funny asf” (Sh6)

“Why does **stupid** shit like this make me laugh so much? 😂😂😂” (St4)

More so, (Ng1) is a statement that uses the word *nigga* to call out people on an Instagram video. The line “-white boys don’t say nigga like that” points out the black people on the video trying to impersonate white people. Here, it can be observed that the user comfortably used the word *nigga* not to offend but to communicate to identical groups of people, such as black people. Humor within the statement is also observed in the expression “lmfaoooo.” In this, the user finds the act of black people impersonating how white boys act amusing. Sinclair (2017) observed that the word *nigga* is sometimes used to indicate fellowship, which in this case is confirmed as the statement is not derogatory but rather an example of social function. While (A2) is an ironic statement that implies the user’s antic toward the target audience. A user on Instagram posted this comment to express their shock at a food video. The statement’s context is about the user ironically asking if the person in the footage finally made regular edible food. Here, the word *ass* was used to emphasize their shock and irony towards to video. According to Farias and Rosso (2017), irony could be interpreted as something positive, which is observed in the context of the statement as it does not seem to be derogatory but more in a joking manner. Because of this, the statement exhibits the social function of swearing. These are demonstrated below:

“lmfaoooo on g we both know they black 🍆 white boys don’t say **nigga** like that” (Ng1)

“Wait HE FINALLY MADE NORMAL ASS FOOD?” (A2)

On the other hand, (D3) is a Facebook post showing protest towards the user’s friends being in a romantic relationship. A user on Facebook posted this statement to express playful teasing towards their friends. The user seemingly cannot handle the public display of affection their friends express. Here, the word *godamnnit* expressed frustration and protest towards their friends. However, this is not necessarily derogatory, as Wen et al. (2021) explained that swearing can be seen as playful teasing between individuals. Hence, the statement manifests the social function of swearing.

“**Goddamnit** stop being lovey dovey” (D3)

Seven out of ten profane linguistic expressions appeared as social functions based on the observations presented. These are *motherfuckers*, *shit*, *stupid*, *nigga*, *ass*, *godamnnit*, and *hell*. The expressions were observed to convey agreement, amusement, irony, and playful teasing. The feelings behind the contexts of these expressions indicate a familiar ground between the users and their target audience, promoting social cohesion (Abayon et al., 2024). Additionally, most of the statements include some form of humour behind them, indicating a positive context that confirms friendship or camaraderie (Jumanto & Sulistyorini, 2019).

However, the analyses show that three profane linguistic expressions—*bitch*, *gay*, *dick*— did not serve social functions. First, according to Sandén (2020), the word *bitch* is a derogatory term, primarily when referring to a woman. The nature of the word being derogatory makes it abusive, the opposite of social. The absence of *bitch* in the social function of swearing suggests that users of social media use the word to call out people in an insulting manner. Second, the word *gay*. Fasoli et al. (2016) regarded the word as a form of profanity, mainly when used to demean individuals based on their sexual orientation. This homophobic epithet attacks homosexual communities,

leading to instances of abuse. Third, the word *gay* was notably absent from the social function of swearing which conveys that users on social media use the term not to foster social cohesion but rather to inflict harm or offense on others. Finally, the word *dick*. It adheres to the idea of Simon et al. (2021) that the word constitutes a taboo, rendering it offensive and abusive. The vulgar connotation implies that individuals employ it rather to insult others to cause offense or harm.

Politeness Maxims Violation of Profane Linguistic Expressions

Abayon et al. (2024) mentioned that swearing is not always used negatively but serves various purposes according to several pragmatic functions. However, politeness still needs to be observed and improved in discourse. Studying how profanity violates politeness maxims further provides valuable insights into the dynamics of its pragmatics which allow us to understand how profane linguistic expression on social media plays a role in politeness.

Leech (1983) enumerated six maxims namely tact maxim which aims to minimize the cost to other and maximize the benefit to other; generosity maxim which aims to reduce the benefit to self and maximize the cost to self; approbation maxim, to minimize the dispraise of other and maximize the cost to self; modesty maxim, to minimize praise of self and maximize the praise of other; agreement maxim, to minimize disagreement between self and other and maximize agreement between self and other; and sympathy maxim, to minimize the antipathy between self and other and maximize sympathy between self and other.

Tact Maxim. (F3) is a directive statement that points out the receiver to do an action. A user on Facebook posted this comment as a response to his question from a previous comment. Here, the use of the word *fucking* indicates that the user was in a rush for answers. Leech (1983) explained that direct illocutions to the other tend to be more impolite in maximizing cost to others. In this context, a direct illocution can be observed, which maximizes cost to the receiver. Hence, flouting the tact maxim of politeness. Below is the statement:

“Just answer the **fucking** question” (F3)

(Sh3) is a statement that indicates criticism to the receiver. This statement is a Facebook comment posted by a user as a response to a cooking video. In this, the word *shit* was used to refer to the dish made in the video, implying that the user criticizes the food by calling it *shit*. Culpeper and Hardaker (2017) asserted that impolite language, such as profanity, is associated with rudeness. The user's remark maximizes the cost to the other through rude criticism, thus flouting the tact maxim of politeness. This statement is observed below:

“Looks like **shit**” (Sh3)

(St1) is a Facebook comment that states the impression of the user on a video. As aforementioned in the analysis of the cathartic functions of swearing, the statement exhibits the relief the user feels after watching the video. While Fägersten (2017b) explained the feeling of relief upon seeing a situation where karma manifests, it can also be interpreted that this act of relief in seeing another's misfortune minimizes the benefit to the other, thus violating the tact maxim of politeness. Refer to the statement below:

“That straightened that **stupid** shit out. I love seeing karma stand up.” (St1)

(Ng5) is an Instagram comment that seeks to maximize the cost to the other. A user on Instagram posted this comment as a response to another user. Here, the word *nigga* was used to refer to the receiver. It can be observed that the user tells the other to be quiet, suggesting extreme irritation that is considered impolite. Such a remark

indicates the cost maximization to the receiver while not giving them a benefit, thus flouting the tact maxim of politeness. This statement is observed below:

“shut it **nigga**” (Ng5)

(A2) is a directive Instagram comment that states the opinion of the user who posted the comment. The statement is about the user responding to another user, criticizing their opinion by saying it is wrong. Here, the word *ass* was used to emphasize the subject of the commenter, which is the opinion of another user. Furthermore, Etaywe's (2017) study supports the user's utterance, in which criticism is direct. The directness found within the utterance exhibits a maximization of cost to the other, thus violating the tact maxim of politeness. The statement appears below:

“nobody asked for ur fuck **ass** opinion” (A2)

(Bi4) is a Facebook comment that openly expresses annoyance and anger. The first sentence states the user's emotional mood, followed by the second sentence, where the user expresses an imperative. In this, the word *bitch* was used to refer to the receiver of the comment while imposing them to stop talking and instead continue reading. Leech (1983) argued that a degree of optionality should be observed to exercise the tact maxim. However, in this context, the user's statement implies that the receiver has no choice. Hence, it maximizes the cost to the other and violates the tact maxim of politeness. This statement is observed below:

“You're fucking annoying. Just read the manga and shut yo **bitch** ass up. You're ruining my reading” (Bi4)

(G2) is a Facebook comment that attacks the receiver by telling them to stop talking and, at the same time, calling them *gay*. It can be observed in the statement that the user who posted this is outspoken with their words by telling the receiver to “-shut the fuck up,” as in to stop talking, and calling them “-gay ass bitch”, attacking their sexual identity. Purwanti and Herbiyanto (2021) explained that the cost is maximized if no degree of optionality exists. Similar to the previous sample, this statement is observed to do so. Hence violating the tact maxim of politeness. This statement is observed below:

“Just shut the fuck up **gay** ass bitch” (G2)

As previously observed in the abusive function of swearing, (D1) showcases the persona's disagreement with reckless driving. While the overall statement is lengthy, the main focus here is the first sentence. The first sentence is a directive statement that tells the receiver to stop the foolish actions related to driving. Leech (1983) explained that this kind of directive utterance suggests a similar severity to military instruction, indicating a maximization of cost to the other, thus flouting the tact maxim of politeness. The statement is below:

“Stop being so **damn** stupid And reckless. Effing idiots making the ppl that drive model cars get judged from others stupidity” (D1)

(Dk1) is a directive comment that targets a Facebook post about prostitution. A user on Facebook posted this comment on an informational post about prostitution. Here, the term “*dick wetter*” was used to refer to the prostitutes. It can be observed that the user who posted this comment is implying that sex workers need to do their “true job,” suggesting a tactless and unmitigated remark. Oboko (2021) explained that violations of the tact maxim can prompt direct and unmitigated expressions. Therefore, this directive and unmitigated remark maximizes the cost and minimizes the benefit of the other, violating the tact maxim of politeness. This statement is observed below:

“The **dick** wetter needs to do her true job” (Dk1)

Based on the observations, 9 out of 10 profane linguistic expressions were used to flout the tact maxim of politeness. These are *fuck, shit, stupid, nigga, ass, bitch, gay,*

damn, and *dick*. These profane linguistic expressions indicate a firm attitude toward someone (Jumanto & Sulistyorini, 2019) and have been observed to be used bluntly more often than not. Since social media is an extension of the real-world social context (Feldman et al., 2017), users can post anything they have in mind, so it is not surprising that most communicate informally and bluntly. However, the word *hell* was not observed to flout the tact maxim of politeness. This is due to the utterances not employed as impositions. Instead, the corpus for the word *hell* was used to function as expressive and metaphorical, thus being shy of flouting the tact maxim of politeness.

Generosity Maxim. (F4) is a Facebook post about a user who voiced their opinion about reading a particular piece of literature. The first half of the statement highlights the user's opinion, but the second half is where the observation needs to be made. Here, one may argue that the line “-do yourself a giant favor” adheres to the generosity maxim. However, when read as a whole, the expression “-fuck off” is observed. This indicates a disrespectful tone to the receiver. Purwanti and Herbiyanto (2021) explained that the maxim of generosity is violated when the speaker is maximizing disrespect to others while maximizing the benefit to themselves. The statement disrespects the receiver by telling them to go away while implying a benefit to the speaker when the receiver complies with the imposition. Therefore, (F4) violates the maxim of generosity and politeness. Below is the statement:

“If you somehow stumbled upon this trash, do yourself a giant favor and **fuck** off.” (F4)

In this section, the only profane linguistic expression observed to flout the generosity maxim of politeness is *fuck*. This result is not surprising considering that word *fuck* has established itself as the most popular swear word (Gauthier, 2017), often used in most situations. Despite this, people or users on social media generally do not often express profanity in the context of generosity. The act of generosity encompasses kindness and respect without expecting anything in return, frequently involving open-heartedness and empathy towards others. Conversely, profanity is often not classified as offensive (Weigand et al., 2018). This offensive language opposes generosity because of its disrespectful connotation, thus emerging the trend of users not associating profanity with generosity. Supported by the results showing nine profane linguistic expressions not being used to adhere to let alone flout the generosity maxim of politeness.

Approbation Maxim. (F1) is a Facebook post where a user utters an offensive remark towards an author. This statement indicates that the user is strongly displeased with the literature to the point that they are expressing their displeasure to the book's author. Here, the word *fuck* was used multiple times, emphasizing the emotion of the user. The multiple use of the word not only emphasizes displeasure but can also indicate anger. Feldman et al. (2017) explained that hostile emotions like anger can be interpreted as harmful and abusive. The abusive nature observed within the statement then exhibits a maximization of dispraise towards the receiver, thus demonstrating a violation of the approbation maxim of politeness. The statement is below:

“**Fuck** the author, **fuck** his gay ass manga, bro should stop while he can” (F1)

(Sh2) is an Instagram comment that indirectly shows abusive behavior. Observed within the statement is the use of *shit* to refer to the dish cooked in the video. It can be noted that the use of *shit* indirectly displays abusive behavior because it maximizes dispraise towards the receiver of the comment. Ewurum et al. (2018) supported this observation based on their findings that abusive functions violate the

approbation maxim when an individual abuses another, directly or indirectly. This statement is observed below:

“this **shit** looks way better than mid bro don't lie to my face” (Sh2)

As previously stated in the abusive function section, (St3) is an Instagram comment that shows opposition in the form of aggression by calling the receivers of the comment *idiots*. Given the context, this use of the word delivers an unpleasant message by maximizing dispraise to its receivers. According to Leech's politeness theory, an utterance is considered polite if it positively affects the receiver. In this context, however, an adverse effect is observed because the user is maximizing dispraise, thus violating the approbation maxim of politeness. Below is the statement:

“Fucking **idiots**, make our world better, leave that fucking shit rocket” (St3)

As established in the analysis section of abusive function, the statement (Ng2) intends to inflict harm in the form of racism, stereotypes, and satire. The overall statement is packed with abusive behavior, which Fitriana and Pratama (2023) explained that utterances violate the approbation maxim by exerting maximum abuse. It can be said that this exertion of abuse is the same as dispraise because of its intent to harm. Therefore, the statement is a violation of the approbation maxim. This statement is observed below:

“I hate all **niggers**. Yes, I identify as a racist. Literally black people come in and steal all kinds of races of women. That's why BBC is a genre and they're glorified to be the kings of sex.” (Ng2)

Observed in the section on the social function of swearing, (A1) is a sarcastic remark aimed to express amusement in a friendly manner. However, despite the joking demeanor of the statement, it still implies a form of dispraise through sarcasm. This is similar to the findings of Tarwiyati et al. (2022), where sarcasm violates the approbation maxim because it can lead to negative criticism if interpreted by the receiver. Regardless of the statement not being abusive, it can still be classified as a violation of the approbation maxim of politeness. This statement is observed below:

“Wait HE FINALLY MADE NORMAL ASS FOOD?” (A1)

(Bi1), as observed in the section on abusive function, is a form of insult toward someone's weight. The statement exhibits the intent of the speaker to maximize the dispraise of the other through body shaming. Hamid et al. (2018) explained that social media posts containing body shaming aim to humiliate or insult people. Because of this, the statement violates the approbation maxim of politeness. This statement is observed below:

“hehe, get fat **bitch!**” (Bi1)

Following the analysis of (G1) in the cathartic function of swearing, the statement suggests a form of dispraise. The observation of the statement points out the expression of displeasure and frustration of the user. Such expressions, as mentioned by Dewi and Rukuk (2022), violate the approbation maxim because they lack respect, which results in an unpleasant reaction from the receiver. The statement is below:

“3 slides in an I only been seeing **gay** shit” (G1)

(D2) is a Facebook comment expressing a user's reaction towards an explicit video. It can be observed that the user is expressing their reaction to the woman in the video, as indicated by the pronoun “she.” The user then shows a displeased reaction, indicated by the line “-serves you right you horny motherfucker, sofa is a place for lazing around not for breeding goddamnit.” Besides the displeased reaction, the statement's intent can also be interpreted as unpleasant. In Leech's theory of politeness, he explains that the approbation maxim avoids saying unpleasant things about others,

which, in this case, is the opposite. Therefore, the statement violates the approbation maxim because it implies a maximization of dispraise. Below is the statement:

“so she basically got bonked right? serve you right you horny motherfucker, sofa is a place for lazing around not for breeding **goddamn**it.” (D2)

As observed in the section on abusive functions, (H2) is a Facebook comment that intends to insult the receiver because they request English subtitles on the video. Highlighted within is the use of the word *hell* to express annoyance which is further heightened with the follow-up question, “Are you retarded?”. Hence, the remark is an example of verbal abuse that violates the approbation maxim of politeness (Ewurum et al., 2018). This statement is observed below:

“why **the hell** would you need a video demonstration with English subtitles? Are you retarded?” (H2)

(Dk4) is a Facebook comment that denotes a sarcastic tone while implying dispraise. The statement starts with the abbreviation *Lmao* which means “laughing my ass off.” Using slang suggests that the user finds the subject funny; however, this can also be interpreted as sarcastic. Furthermore, the expression “dick move” has been observed to be used. This indicates that the user finds the action of the subject to be, in a sense, foolish. Tarwiyati et al. (2022) mentioned that sarcasm violates the approbation maxim when criticism and disrespect are present. The expression “dick move” is, in a sense, a form of criticism that implies disrespect. Therefore, the statement maximizes dispraise and violates the approbation maxim of politeness. Presented below is the statement:

“Lmao this mf really pulled a **dick** move” (Dk4)

Based on the observations, all 10 profane linguistic expressions flouted the approbation maxim of politeness. Most of these are returning statements observed to be abusive in manner. However, some statements, specifically (A1) and (G1), are used socially and cathartically. This suggests that whether profanity is abusive (Abayon et al., 2024), it still implies a form of displeasure toward something. It entails that profane linguistic expressions on social media embrace the idea of saying unpleasant things toward the other. Furthermore, according to Pamungkas et al. (2023), swearing is commonly present in the day-to-day interactions of people, whether spoken or written, and is often observed in social media discourse. Hence, there are abundant violations in the approbation maxim of politeness.

Modesty Maxim. (F5) is an expressive and, in some way, arrogant statement. Here, a Facebook user posted their thoughts about profanity. In the first sentence, they express their love for profanity. To which they make clear that they always have loved profanity, even going as far as saying *fuck* to reinforce their statement. However, this expression in context presents a feeling of arrogance. Pratrama Putri and Wijayanto (2018) explained that intentions containing arrogance violate the modesty maxim because it maximizes praise to the self. This statement is observed below:

“I love profanity. Always have.. Always the **fuck** will.” (F5)

(Sh5) is a Facebook comment that shows agreement and satisfaction. The user uttered, "That's the shit," to refer to the post's subject. Meanwhile, the phrase "-signed up for" implies an agreement. It is worth noting that the use of *shit* does not denote negativity but rather implies something desirable. If read as a whole, the context of the statement indicates satisfaction. However, as positive as the statement may be, it suggests a form of boasting. Analysis of Oboko's (2021) study showed that boasting maximizes the praise to oneself. Therefore, the statement flouts the modesty maxim of politeness. Refer to the statement below:

"That's the **shit** I signed up for" (Sh5)

As previously observed in the cathartic function of swearing, (Bi2) is an assertive statement that indicates sarcasm. This sarcasm can appear in the second line of the statement, and it is in this line that the ego of the Facebook user manifests. The user's ego manifests in the feeling of arrogance, which, as Oboko (2021) mentioned, violates the modesty maxim because it maximizes praise toward the self. Observe the statement below:

"Profanity is so low class. Me: "Apologies, my good **bitch**, but what seems to be the fuck?" (Bi2)

According to the findings, three profane linguistic expressions flouted the modesty maxim of politeness. These are *fuck*, *shit*, and *bitch*. However, seven profane linguistic expressions, namely *stupid*, *nigga*, *ass*, *gay*, *damn*, *hell*, and *dick*, were not observed to flout the modesty maxim of politeness. A reason for this could be the self-image that users on social media want to maintain. According to Gao and Feng (2016), individuals on social media post content for image control. This means that users are self-aware when using modesty, as the act of arrogance may damage their reputation. Hence, the circumvention of using profanity with modesty. That said, online bragging or "flexing" is commonly known online. Solikhah (2023) stated that flexing is a strategy to build one's image online. Because of this online culture, some users boast or attempt to mitigate their boasting to sound more virtuous (Matley, 2018).

Agreement Maxim. (F6) is a Facebook comment that suggests a refusal to adhere to policies. Here, the user tells the people to not comply with the policy. Suggesting that the user finds the newly issued policies unfair to the public. Furthermore, the expression "fuck that" was used. This expression heightened the opinion of the user, who refused to follow the policy. Fitriana and Pratama (2023) mentioned that if speakers and listeners do not fulfill the conditions for compatibility and agreement, it would violate the agreement maxim. Therefore, the statement exhibiting refusal manifests the maximization of disagreement, flouting the agreement maxim of politeness. Displayed below is the statement:

"Don't comply **fuck** that" (F6)

(Sh4) is an Instagram comment that questions the authenticity of a particular video. Here, the user openly expresses their doubt by using the word *bullshit* indicating doubt. The user clarifies their statement in line, "I doubt this will work." According to Dewi and Rukuk (2022), a violation of the agreement maxim happens when a person

doubts an opinion, leading to refusal or disagreement. Therefore, the statement violates the agreement maxim because the persona has been observed to show doubt. Manifested below is the statement:

“**Bullshit** I doubt this will work” (Sh4)

(St2) is a Facebook post where the persona discusses how to respond to social invitations. The first and second sentences state how to respond when invited. Following this is the third sentence, where the user argues to the receiver that the given example is how one should respond. The user even calls the receiver an *idiot* because, to them, a poor response ruins the mood, indirectly denying the receiver their opinion. Nursanti et al. (2023) describe denying another person’s opinion as a violation of the agreement maxim because of the lack of consideration for the interlocutor’s opinion. Hence, the statement violates the agreement maxim of politeness. This statement is observed below:

“Sorry I can't join you guys as I already have plans. Perhaps next time?”
That's how you respond. No need to go into all that bullshit about ruining the mood. **Idiot.**” (St2)

(Ng3) is an Instagram comment that insults the receiver for having difficulties understanding the context of the video. Here, the user calls the receiver a *nigga* and, at the same time, poses an argument as observed within the lines “-did you not watch the video? Are you slow?.” This argumentative connotation is explained by Puruhito and Nababan (2022), where arguments tend to oppose the receiver. Consequently, the statement violates the agreement maxim because it suggests a form of opposition that maximizes disagreement. Refer to the statement below:

“**nigga** did u not watch the video? Are u slow?” (Ng3)

Observed in the cathartic function of swearing, (A3) is a statement that displays disappointment and frustration. However, aside from these expressions, it can also be interpreted as a form of complaint that addresses explicitly more to the self than others. In the same study by Puruhito and Nababan (2022), they also pointed out that complaining is another form of violating politeness maxims, which in this case is the agreement maxim. The overall statement implies a complaint that indicates a disagreement, violating the agreement maxim. Observe the statement below:

“This year was so **ass**” (A3)

(Bi3) is a directive Facebook comment that exhibits an offensive connotation. Here, the user tells the receiver to be quiet, observed in the line “Just shut the fuck up,” while also calling them a *bitch*. Moreover, the line “Just shut the fuck up” can be interpreted as the speaker cutting off the receiver. According to Chaniago and Amri (2023), a violation of the agreement maxim happens when no compatibility suggests agreement. Furthermore, they also mention that cutting off someone does not promote compatibility, which, in this case, the sentence violates the agreement maxim of politeness. Observe the statement below:

“Just shut the fuck up gae **bitch**. Go read some BL shits” (Bi3)

(G3) is a Facebook comment that targets a user by insulting their Facebook profile picture. The statement starts with the line “stfu lil bro,” indicating a directive order to be quiet. The line follows this “-you got that gay ass flag as your pic,” which

seemingly insults users for having a rainbow flag as their picture. It can be observed that the user insults the receiver twice, first with the "stfu lil bro-" and second with "-you got that gay ass flag as your pic." It indicates that the user adds insult to injury, which worsens their utterance. Fraser (2020) described that adding insult to injury could spark disagreement. While the statement explicitly expresses disagreement, it promotes one to a maximum degree. Therefore, the statement violates the agreement maxim of politeness. Below is the statement:

"stfu lil bro you got that **gay** ass flag as your pic" (G3)

Observed in the social function of swearing, (D3) is a Facebook post that expresses frustration and protest. However, the expression is not derogatory but merely a playful teasing within friends. Despite this, it can still be interpreted as violating the agreement maxim. The study by Puruhito and Nababan (2022) classified protesting as a violation of various maxims, including the agreement maxim. Protesting violates the agreement maxim because it implies an intention of disapproval, which, in this context, is the disapproval of the public display of affection that the user's friends do. Notice the statement below:

"**Goddamn**it stop being lovey dovey"

(H1) is an expressive statement that indicates an exclamation of disbelief towards a particular video. Here, the user utters the expression "the hell?" to show surprise or disbelief, showing a strong reaction against the video. Furthermore, the user then utters, "This is dark af," indicating that the user finds the video to be negative. Pratama and Wijiyanto (2018) explained that the expression of disbelief violates the agreement maxim because it suggests a disagreement between the self and the other. Hence, this implication of disagreement flouts the agreement maxim of politeness. Found below is the statement:

"**the hell?** this is dark af" (H1)

The final statement (Dk2) is an Instagram comment that responds to a video about making fun of people in crutches. Here, the user used *dick* to refer to foolish people who make fun of others. Observation shows that the statement opposes ridiculing people, especially those injured. Al Kayed and Al-Ghoweri (2019) indicate that speakers employ specific strategies when highlighting issues with the actions of the hearer. One strategy involves disapproval, where the speaker communicates their unfavorable opinion of the listener, which this strategy is observed in the statement. Contextually speaking, the user's disapproval implies a maximization of disagreement towards the other, violating the agreement maxim of politeness. This statement is observed below:

"not a karen, just not a **dick** that laughs if a guy with crutches falls, i had to use them for a bit and it's not funny" (Dk2)

Overall, all 10 profane linguistic expressions were used to flout the agreement maxim of politeness. Findings within the previous sections of this study indicate that profanity, in the context of social media, is mainly used to express negative connotations that often result in offensive and abusive interactions. Pamungkas et al. (2023) mentioned that spontaneous writing exhibits abusive occurrences, especially on social media. It is in these occurrences that disagreements manifest. Although not all

statements speak strongly of disagreement, most of them imply one. Rossini and Maia (2021) mentioned that disagreement is linked to communication characteristics often seen in deliberative conduct, such as directly interacting with others and justifying one's perspectives. Such characteristics are manifested within the statements as most assert profane linguistic expressions that align with the context, leading to implications of disagreement that flout the agreement maxim of politeness.

Sympathy Maxim. Previously observed in the abusive function of swearing (Dk3) is an insult towards pet owners who insist dogs can get allergies. The overall statement is sarcastic and exhibits abusive behavior because it intends to inflict harm on the audience. Furthermore, this sarcastic expression by the user highlights a form of mockery towards pet owners. According to Puruhito and Nababan (2022), mockery is a form of expressive communication aimed at making fun of someone else, which is the pet owners. This mocking expression indicates a maximization of antipathy because it intends to insult, thus violating the sympathy maxim of politeness. Below is the statement:

“All these **dildos** talking about the dog having allergies is the reason I can't eat peanuts on a god damn airplane anymore. Weak genes.” (Dk3)

Like the generosity maxim of politeness, only one profane linguistic expression appears to flout the sympathy maxim, which is *dildos* (classified under *dick*). Gao and Feng (2016) asserted that users on social media want to maintain their image, as their social media identities reflect their real-life selves. While profanity may often be classified as offensive language (Weigand et al., 2018), social media users avoid using it to express sympathy. Suggesting that users should not associate using profanity with showing sympathy because it is offensive and may damage their social image.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study have only investigated 400 posts and comments on Facebook and Instagram. This means that further research could be done with a larger corpus size that could further expound on the pragmatic functions of swearing and its maxim violations of politeness. The findings support this implication as some expressions were not observed to be used in specific functions and violate certain maxims; a larger corpus could have a more diverse result. It suggests the possibility of conducting additional research on the topic. If other researchers wish to undertake a similar study, they must take into account the following:

First, focus on a more specified scope that would encapsulate idiosyncrasies of profanities found in different types of English, e.g., British English and Australian English. This study focused on American English data on profane linguistic expressions uttered by users on Facebook and Instagram. Furthermore, social media profanity gathered using another type of English could pose different results. Consequently, the specifics of profanity on a country-language basis should differ, prompting results that could be more applicable in their context. Lastly, language is ever-changing, especially on the internet and social media. This implies that the role of

profanity and how users use it may change over the years. Future researchers may consider the shift in language use, especially regarding profanity and social media.

This study revealed the pragmatic functions and politeness maxims violations of the profane linguistic expressions on Facebook and Instagram. Pragmatically speaking, most of the profane linguistic expressions were used cathartically and socially, not derogatory but to vent out emotions and promote social cohesion. However, despite this, all profane linguistic expressions were used in an abusive manner. Regardless of its function, it agrees with profanity being rude and offensive in most situations. Supported by the findings of politeness maxims violations where most, if not all, profane linguistic expressions violated the tact, approbation, and agreement maxims of politeness—revealing a pattern of profanity-violating maxims that are more focused on the other than the self.

Throughout the study, the researcher recognized the importance of understanding and grasping the intricacies of profanity within social media. The norms of the people vary depending on the environment they are living in. These norms also apply to language and other aspects of a person's life, especially in social media. Differences in this aspect may result in misunderstandings and disagreement based on how profanity or words were used for communication. Therefore, the significance of evaluating the implications behind the words used substantially influences the approach to properly comprehending profane linguistic expressions and formulating appropriate responses equivalent to the expression.

REFERENCES

- Abayon, B. A., Saro, R., Moda, N., & Ngo, C. G. (2024). Presidential profanity of PRRD: The pragmatic functions of swearing in public discourse. *Science International*, 75-84.
- Al Kayed, M., & Al-Ghoweri, H. (2019). A sociopragmatic study of speech act of criticism in Jordanian Arabic. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 153(1), 105-117.
- Amin, N. (2021). English profanity on social media: Linguistic preferences and reasons for use. In C. s. Mustaffa, M. K. Ahmad, N. Yusof, M. B. Hadza, & N. Tugiman, *Breaking the Barriers, Inspiring Tomorrow* (pp. 1-497). European Publisher.
- Banguis, J., Fortes, P., Divino, H., & Syting, C. J. (2023). Students' e-complaints on the promises and pitfalls of blended learning: A socio-pragmatic analysis. *Journal Corner of Education Linguistics and Literature*, 205-221.
- Chaniago, S. N., & Amri, Y. K. (2023). Analysis of networker's language disability in the comments column Instagram account @ medantalk. *Britain International of Linguistics Arts and Education (BioLAE) Journal*, 5(1), 38-48.
- Chase, D. K. (2017). Are you fucking me?: Oppositional stance taking and authority through profane assessment. (*Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder*).

- Coats, S. (2021). 'Bad language' in the Nordics: profanity and gender in social media corpus. *Acta Linguistica Hafnensia*, 53(1), 22-57.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry research design: choosing among five approaches*. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Culpeper, J., & Hardaker, C. (2017). Impoliteness. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, & D. Z. Kádár, *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness* (pp. 199-225). Palgrave Macmillan London.
- DeFrank, M., & Kahlbaugh, P. (2018). Language choice matters: When profanity affects how people are judged. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 126-141.
- Dennis, T. (2019). The etymology of the top 7 curse words. SCRIBENDI. Retrieved from https://www.scribendi.com/academy/articles/etymology_of_curse_words.en.html
- Dewi, R., & Rukuk, S. (2022). Violations in language in learning process at Toraja Christian University of Indonesia. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 14(2), 2499-2506.
- Etaywe, A. S. (2017). A pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic study of praise and criticism in academic writing: The case of Arabic academic book reviews. *International Journal*, 4(2).
- Ewurum, R. N., Njoku, N. J., & Umeh, I. J. (2018). A pragmatic analysis of verbal abuse as face-threatening acts. *24th Annual Conference of the National Association of Teachers of Languages in College of Education and Polytechnics (NATELCEP)*.
- Fägersten, K. B. (2017a). English-language swearing as humor in Swedish comic strips. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 121, 175-187.
- Fägersten, K. B. (2017b). The role of swearing in creating an online persona: The case of YouTuber PewDiePie. *Discourse, context & media*, 18, 1-10.
- Farias, D. I., & Rosso, P. (2017). Irony, sarcasm, and sentiment analysis. pp. 113-128. In Elsevier eBooks. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-804412-4.00007-3>
- Fasoli, F., Paladino, M. P., Carnaghi, A., Jetten, J., Bastian, B., & Bain, P. (2016). Not "just words": Exposure to homophobic epithets leads to dehumanizing and physical distancing from gay men. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 237-248.
- Feldman, G., Lian, H., Kosinski, M., & Stillwell, D. (2017). Frankly, we do give a damn: The relationship between profanity and honesty. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 816-826.
- Finn, E. (2017). Swearing: The good, the bad & the ugly. *Ortesol journal*, 17-26.
- Fitriana, S. A., & Pratama, H. (2023). The violation of Leech's politeness maxims and interlocutor's responses in Enola Holmes 2020 Movie. *English Education Journal*, 13(2), 191-208.
- Fraser, N. (2020). *Adding insult to injury: Nancy Fraser debates her critics*. Verso Books.

- Fulcher, K. (2017). That's so homophobic? Australian young people's perspectives on homophobic language use in secondary schools. *Sex Education*, 290-301.
- Gao, Q., & Feng, C. (2016). Branding with social media: User gratifications, usage patterns, and brand message content strategies. *Computers in Human Behavior*.
- Gauthier, M. (2017). Age, gender, fuck, and Twitter: A sociolinguistic analysis of swear words in a corpus of British tweets. *Université Lumière Lyon*.
- Gultom, M. A., & Rahmadini, N. F. (2022, January 2). The relation of the use of language in social media to politeness among students.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/dq8wy>
- Hahn, V., Ruiter, D., Kleinbauer, T., & Klakow, D. (2021). Modeling profanity and hate speech in social media with semantic subspaces. In A. M. Davani, D. Kiela, M. Lambert, B. Vidgen, V. Prabhakaran, & Z. Waseem, *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Online Abuse and Harms (WOAH 2021)* (pp. 6-16).
doi:[doi:10.18653/v1/2021.woah-1.2](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.woah-1.2)
- Hamid, A., Ismail, H., & Shamsuddin, C. M. (2018). Haters will hate, but how? The language of body shaming cyberbullies on Facebook. In T. K. Hua, *Stop Cyberbullying* (pp. 79-100). UKM Press.
- Husna, N. (2020). University students' perception in using English swear words. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Islam, Science and Technology (ICONIST 2019)* (pp. 29-34). Atlantis Press.
- Ismail, I., & Shafie, N. H. (2019). English informal language learning through social networking sites among Malaysian university students. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 221.
- Jay, T. (2000). *Why we curse: A neuro-psycho-social theory of speech*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jay, T. (2018). Swearing, moral order, and online communication. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 107-126.
- Jikeli, G., Axelrod, D., Fischer, R. K., Forouzesh, E., Jeong, W., Miehling, D., & Soemer, K. (2022). Differences between antisemitic and non-antisemitic English language tweets. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory*, 1-35.
- Johnson, P. (2019). On swearing in TIME: A corpus-based diachronic study (Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:kau:diva-71015>.
- Jumanto, J., & Sulistyorini, H. (2019). The pragmatics of swearing: How it contextually counts. *3rd English Language and Literature International Conference* (p. 10). Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia: FACULTY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SEMARANG.
- Kassem, H. (2023). FUCK THIS SHIT: Swearing in different varieties (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/106572>.

- Khairunnisa, U. H. (2017). The curse word in the novel *Out* by Natsuo Kirino: Sociolinguistic review. *Doctoral dissertation, Andalas University*. Retrieved from <http://scholar.unand.ac.id/28113>.
- Khalaf, A. S., & Rashid, S. (2019). Pragmatic functions of swearwords in the amateur subtitling of American crime drama movies into Arabic. *International Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies*, 97-131.
- Kreuz, R. (2020). *Irony and sarcasm*. MIT Press.
<https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12503.001.0001>
- Kwon, K., & Gruzd, A. (2017). Is offensive commenting contagious online? Examining public vs. Interpersonal swearing in response to Donald Trump's YouTube campaign videos. *Internet Research*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IntR-02-2017-0072>
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics (1st ed.)*. Routledge.
[doi:https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315835976](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315835976)
- Love, R. (2021). Swearing in informal spoken English: 1990s-2010s. *De Gruyter*.
- Matley, D. (2018). "This is not a #humblebrag, this is just a #brag". *Discourse, Context & Media*, 22(1), 30-38.
- Mudambi, A. (2019). Racial satire, race talk, and the model minority: South Asian Americans speak up. *Southern Communication Journal*, 84(4), 246-256.
- Mulki, H., Haddad, H., Ali, C. B., & Alshabani, H. (2019). L-hsab: A levantine Twitter dataset for hate speech and abusive language. *Proceedings of the third workshop on abusive language online*, 111-118.
- NGO, C. G., & Cubelo, R. R. (2024). The epistemic modality in the inaugural speeches of Philippine presidents. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 3(4), 410-423. Retrieved from <https://journal.jcopublishing.com/index.php/jcell/article/view/284>
- Nursanti, E., Andriyanti, E., & Wijaya, I. A. (2023). (Im)politeness employed by multilingual Indonesian EFL learners in argumentative conversations. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(2), 1000-1021.
- Oboko, U. (2021). Exploration of impoliteness and violation of politeness maxims among undergraduates of Madonna University, Nigeria. *Studies in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*, 2(2), 63-72.
- Pamungkas, E. W., Basile, V., & Patti, V. (2020). Do you really want to hurt me? predicting abusive swearing in social media. *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, (pp. 6237-6246).
- Pamungkas, E. W., Basile, V., & Patti, V. (2023). Investigating the role of swear words in abusive language detection tasks. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 155-188.

- Pratama Putri, D., & Wijayanto, A. (2018). Violations of Leech's maxims in Harry Potter and the chamber of secrets movie (2002) (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta). Retrieved from <http://eprints.ums.ac.id/id/eprint/59379>.
- Puruhito, G. G., & Nababan, M. (2022). A translation study on speech acts violating politeness maxim in Gerald's game novel. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 5(1), 146-156.
- Purwanti, E., & Herbianto, H. (2021). Politeness principles violation of "mind your language" comedy series: A pragmatic analysis. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Innovation Track Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICSIHES 2021)* (pp. 79-87). Atlantis Press SARL.
- Rossini, P., & Maia, R. (2021). Characterizing disagreement in online political talk: Examining incivility and opinion expression on news websites and Facebook in Brazil. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 17(1), 90-104.
- Saffah, M. D. (2020). Swearing in the wolf of wall street: A pragmatic study. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 122.
- Samat, M. F., Awang, N. A., Hussin, S. N., & Nawi, F. A. (2020). Online distance learning amidst Covid-19 pandemic among university students. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 220-233.
- Sandén, J. (2020). You know who pop the most shit?: A study of profanity and gender differences in modern pop music.
- Sari, A. Y., & Haristiani, N. (2024). Contrastive analysis of profanity expression in Japanese and Indonesian languages on Twitter. *7th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education 9ICOLLITE 2023*, (pp. 16-24).
- Simon, O., Ahmad, S., & Dako, R. T. (2021). Taboo words in main characters of death proof movie. *TRANS-KATA: Journal Of Language, Literature, Culture And Education*, 1(2), 47-57.
- Sinclair, S. (2017). You can't say that! A semantic and historical analysis of nigger and nigga. A Senior Honors Thesis. *New York: University: Department of Linguistics*.
- Šindelářová, B. L. (2016). When it's damn good: A morphosyntactic analysis of damn and a corpus-based study of its semantic prosody. Retrieved from https://theses.cz/id/s4e9er/?zoomy_is=1.
- Solikhah, P. (2023). The effect of flexing and personal branding on social media on the lifestyle of millennial Islamic students in Yogyakarta Indonesia. *Nusantara Islamic Economic Journal*, 2(1), 54-65.
- Song, Y., Kwon, K. H., Xu, J., Huang, X., & Li, S. (2021). Curbing profanity online: A network-based diffusion analysis of profane speech on Chinese social media. *new media & society*, 23(5), 982-1003.
- Tarwiyati, P. A., Prayitno, H. J., Huda, M., & Rahmawati, L. E. (2022). Sarcasm of news headlines on national electronic mass media and its relevance to learning

Indonesian. *International Conference of Learning on Advance Education (ICOLAE 2021)* (pp. 324-338). Atlantis Press.

- Teh, P. L., & Cheng, C. B. (2020). Profanity and hate speech detection. *International Journal of Information and Management Sciences*, 31(3), 227-246.
- Vinter, V. E. (2017). You call me a bitch like it's a bad thing: A study into the current use and semantic properties of the noun bitch.
- Wajnryb, R. (2005). *Expletive deleted: A good look at bad language*. New York: Free Press.
- Weigand, M., Siegel, M., & Ruppenhofer, J. (2018). Overview of the GermEval 2018 shared task on the identification of offensive language. *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften*.
- Wen, S. T., binte Hassan, N. M., De Jun, L., & Kasara, N. A. (2021). The influence of social swearing on in-group dynamics of Singaporean youth. *Pioneer Road: Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 141.
- Wene, I. W., & Ena, O. T. (2020). Cursing, sexual harassment, profanity, obscenity and epithet in Dallas buyers club movie. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, 5(1), 71-87.
- Wulandari, O. (2017). The use of swear words in Pewdiepie's YouTube videos. *Elite: English and Literature Journal*, 4(2), 1-24.