

SPEAKERS' SWEARING IMPACT TO THE INTERLOCUTORS IN *TED* MOVIE

Zuanita Arifin

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Art, State University of Surabaya

11020154021.zuanita@gmail.com

Widyastuti

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Art, State University of Surabaya

wid-unesa@yahoo.com

Abstrak

Kata makian digunakan untuk mengekspresikan perasaan marah, jengkel, atau frustrasi (McEnery, 2006). Hal ini terlihat di film *Ted* yang menggunakan banyak kata makian. Penelitian ini menganalisis dampak penggunaan kata makian tersebut terhadap lawan bicara di film *Ted*. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan mengumpulkan dan menganalisis dialog yang berisi kata makian yang diucapkan oleh delapan pemain di film *Ted*. Instrumen dari penelitian ini adalah peneliti yang menggunakan laptop, GOM player, dan headset untuk membantu mengumpulkan data. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ada tiga dampak dari penggunaan kata makian tersebut terhadap lawan bicara, yaitu positif, negatif, dan netral. Selain itu, dapat diketahui juga bahwa lawan bicara menaati dan melanggar maxim dari cooperative principles.

Kata kunci: *Kata makian, lawan bicara, dan film Ted.*

Abstract

Swearwords are used to express anger feeling, annoyance, or frustration (McEnery, 2006). This could be seen in *Ted* movie which used many swearwords. This research analyzed the speakers' swearing impact to the interlocutors in the movie. It used descriptive qualitative method. The data collection was done by gathering and analyzing the dialogue which contain of swearwords among the eight characters in *Ted* movie. The instrument was the researcher who used a laptop, GOM player, and the earphone to help the researcher collecting the data. The findings showed that there were three impacts of speakers' swearing. They were positive, negative, and neutral. Moreover, the interlocutors were found to invoke and flout the maxims of cooperative principles.

Keywords: *Swearwords, interlocutor, and Ted movie.*

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, swearing is a phenomenon that exists in society. The original meaning of the verb 'swear' is 'to take an oath' or to make a serious declaration, statement, affirmation, promise or undertaking (Allan and Burridge, 2006). According to Timothy Jay (as cited in Ardo, 2001), swearing is thought to be an essential and universal feature of human communication. However, people do not need to be taught how to swear. In school or other formal occasions, swearwords are not taught by the teachers. People

do swearing by learning naturally from daily life. Also, swearwords appear not only in daily life conversation, but also in music, movies or other social media. It makes the society can hear those kind of words easily everyday. However, swearwords are considered to be offensive or shocking by most people. As stated by Wilson (2009), swearing includes using profane oaths or using the name of God to make a statement stronger and believable. For example, if someone says "This place is *fucking* beautiful". The speaker is not trying to cause misfortune toward the listener, but it is the stress of the sentence. Thus,

the speaker wants to emphasize that the place is really beautiful by using the word *fucking*.

According to Pinker (2007), a swearword in an utterance carries an intended meaning according to the context of speaker's saying. The speaker meaning is considered as what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. It is called as an implicature. According to Grice (1981), implicature refers to what is suggested in an utterance, although neither expressed nor broadly implied (that is, entailed) by the utterance (Grice, 1981: 269). What a speaker intends to communicate is characteristically has more meaning than she directly expresses.

Means of communication are social media, include internet, newspaper, magazine, radio, television, even movie. Movie is one of social media which reflect a story, either it is a fiction or a reality. It is effective to reflect accent, dialect, variation experience which exist in society (Coupland, 2007).

Ted movie is a 2012 [American](#) comedy movie, directed by [Seth MacFarlane](#). It tells the story of John Bennett, a Boston native whose childhood wish brings his teddy bear friend Ted to life. Then, miraculously, Ted becomes alive and be friend with John. They are best friend since John was young until he turns 30 years old. In his personal life, he has a beautiful girlfriend, Lori Collins. They live together in an apartment. She feels uncomfortable with the existence of Ted in their life. Because she thinks that a man whose age is already 30 should not bring his teddy bear anymore. Lori and John often fight because of that matter. Until one day their fight is getting worse. And it places John into a hard position because Lori gives him option whether he chooses her or Ted.

Based on the explanation above, this article analyzed the speakers' swearing impact in *Ted* movie. It found out and described the impact of speakers' swearing to the interlocutors. The theory about swearing by Pinker (2007) and by Ljung(2011) were used. Furthermore, the theory about implicature by Grice (1981) was also used.

METHOD

This article used descriptive qualitative method. The data source was taken from *Ted* movie. The data of this research was the swearwords uttered by the eight characters in *Ted* movie. In this article, the instrument was the researcher. Besides, a laptop, a book, and a pen were needed to do this research. The video of *Ted* movie, GOM player, and earphone were also needed in this research. The data analysis technique was done in three steps; 1.Data Reduction; 2.Data Display; 3.Conclusion drawing or verification.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Speakers' Swearing Impact to the Interlocutors

The use of swearwords could impact some different reactions from the interlocutors. The impact could be positive, negative, and neutral. If the interlocutor was not annoyed or angry by the speaker's swearing, the impact was positive. For example in the dialog below:

John : *Lori would hate me for saying this, but she told me how you are at the office. And as one gentleman to another, I just want to say, I really **fucking** hope you get lougehrig's disease.*

Rex : *Wow! I think we need to clear the air here a little. I mean yeah, I'm kind of a fun time boss and what not, but look man, I do that with everybody at the office, I'm a cook. I have no designs on your girlfriend, we work together and that's it. I think you're a great guy. And she's a very lucky girl.*

John : *Well that's good to hear.*

Rex : *Yeah.*

From the dialog between John and Rex above, the impact of swearing was positive because Rex as the interlocutor was not angry by John's swearing and his suspicion. He even explained that he and Lori were only partner in work.

In contrast, if the interlocutor was annoyed or angry by the speaker's swearing, the impact was negative. For example in the dialogue below:

Ted : *(in bad guy's house) You think you're just gonna get away with a kidnapping? It's a nice **fucking** example, your setting.*

Bad guy : *LANGUAGE!...sorry sorry.*

The dialogue above showed that the impact of speaker's swearing was negative. When Ted uttered his swearing, the bad guy replied by yelling. He was angry by Ted's swearing.

And when the interlocutor did not give any response to the speaker, the impact was neutral. For example:

Tammy: *You know what bitch, I gave birth once, I can kick your **fucking** ass. and you better not show your face around quincy, you hear me? Ever!*

(there is no response from Lori)

The impact of speaker's swearing in the dialogue above was neutral because there was no response from the interlocutor. Tammy actually

uttered her swearing to Lori, but she did not give any response.

However, the impact was mostly positive. It was because based on social factor, the participants, John and Ted as the main characters in *Ted* movie knew each other for long time. Also, based on social dimension, the relationship between them was intimate because they were friend for about 30 years.

In addition, the impact could also be seen according to the cooperative principle of conversational implicature of the interlocutors' utterance. The interlocutors were found to invoke or flout the maxims.

First, it was found that the interlocutors invoked or flouted the Maxim of Quantity. For example in the dialogue below is when the interlocutor invoked the maxim:

John : *Oh **shit!** hang on a second. My phone fell under the seat somewhere. Can you call it?*
Lori : *Yeah, (grabbing her phone and dialing John's number)*

Lori as the interlocutor in the dialogue above invoked the Maxim of Quantity. At that time, John produced his swearing when he lost his phone in Lori's car. The swearing made Lori as the interlocutor wanted to help him to find his phone by replying "yeah".

The next example is when the interlocutor flouted the maxim:

Ted : *I've known this guy a long time, I've known him since 9-11. you remember?, I was like, aww **shit** 9-11! I gotta get high. (holding a 'shisha')*
John : *Is it 9:30?*
Ted : *Yeah*

In the dialogue above, John as the interlocutor flouted the Maxim of Quantity because he did not give information as Ted needed.

Second, it was found that the interlocutors invoked or flouted the Maxim of Quality. The dialogue below is example of invoking the maxim:

John : *Lori would hate me for saying this, but she told me how you are at the office. And as one gentleman to another, I just want to say, I really **fucking** hope you get lougehrig's disease.*
Rex : *Wow! I think we need to clear the air here a little. I mean yeah, I'm kind of a fun time boss and what not, but look man, I do that with everybody at the office, I'm*

a cook. I have no designs on your girlfriend, we work together and that's it. I think you're a great guy. And she's a very lucky girl.

John : *Well that's good to hear.*

Rex : *Yeah.*

From the dialogue above, Rex as the interlocutor invoked the Maxim of Quality because he told the truth and explained about his relationship with Lori.

Other example is when the interlocutor flouted the Maxim of Quality, as below:

John : *Do you have any clue? My **fucking** life just ended! (in high tone)*
Ted : *Oh come on, she'll go home, she'll watch Bridget Jones, some asshole, she'll have a good cry. She'll be fine. You'll talk to her tomorrow, come on upstairs.*

From the dialogue above, Ted as the interlocutor flouted the maxim. He said what he did not believe to be true. He told a lie because he wanted John to feel better by saying that Lori would be better after she cried.

Third, it was found that the interlocutors flouted the Maxim of Relation. For example in the dialogue below is when the interlocutor flouted the maxim:

Ted : ***God!** there are some fucked up fish out there. Oh look at that one. Waspy white guy fish. I married the wrong woman, and now I lead a life of regret. Oh look at this guy, I went to New York once in 1981, and I just did not feel safe.*
John : *Ted, you gotta move out. You...*
Ted : *What?*

The dialogue above showed that John as the interlocutor flouted the Maxim of Relation by saying "Ted, you gotta move out. You...". This utterance was not relevant with what Ted said.

Fourth, it was found that the interlocutors invoked and flouted the Maxim of Manner. The dialogue below is example of invoking the maxim:

John's boss : *John, its almost 10 o'clock.*
John : *I know sir, I'm sorry. It wasn't my fault.*
John's boss : *what do you mean?*
John : *Well I.. I guess I wasn't prepared for a follow up question.*
John's boss : *John, all you got to do is not **fuck** up. And you get my job when I go to corporate next*

month, you're the new branch manager. All you gotta do is not fuck up.

John : *I realise now.*

The dialogue above showed that John as the interlocutor invoked the Maxim of Manner. At that time, John's boss was angry because John was late. He even produced swearing. And his swearing affected John felt sorry. He then regretted it by saying "*I realise now*".

The next example is when the interlocutor flouted that Maxim of Manner:

Tammy : *You know, you're a frickin snob you think you're all cool cos you work at some fancy **shit** place, whatever.*

Ted : *Ok take it easy. Nice Lori, real nice.*

Lori : *Me? It's not my fault, she can't speak English.*

The dialogue above showed that Ted as the interlocutor because he said "*Ok take it easy*" to make Tammy calm, but then he added "*Nice Lori, real nice*" to ask Lori be nice to her. It was ambiguous because Lori was actually silent and did not say anything. It was just Tammy who said unkind thing to Lori.

However, the result showed that there was a case where two maxims were in conflict. For example in the dialogue below, the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Relation were in conflict.

John : ***Jesus Guy!** You look like shit man, what happened? (talking to his friend who is messed up)*

John's friend : *I don't know, I got fucking wasted last night. My phone says I texted someone at 3:15, asking them to beat me up. And then, at 4:30, I texted the same person saying thanks.*

From the dialogue above, John's friend gave too much information when he was asked what had happened to him, so it shows that he flouted the Maxim of Quantity. But, he also flouted the Maxim of Relation by adding "*I don't know*" in his utterance in order to inform John that he actually did not really know what exactly had happened with him at the previous night.

In addition, there were some responses from the interlocutors which could be considered as promise and warning. They were categorized based on the felicity conditions. For example:

John : ***Shit!** Is it 9:30?*

Ted : *Yeah.*

John : *I gotta get work. I don't know if I can drive.*

Ted : *I can drive you, I feel fine.*

From the dialogue above, Ted's utterance was considered as a promise. In this case, the content condition occurred in the utterance. The promise would be the future act of Ted because he said that he could drive John to his work.

Another condition was essential condition which was found in the following dialogue:

Ted : ***Jesus fucking Christ!**(63)*

Robert : *I said that word one time. Daddy punished me for it.*

In the dialogue above, Robert remembered that his Dad had ever punished him after saying a swearword. Then, he gave a warning to Ted. In this case, the utterance changed the state from non-informing of a bad future event to informing.

Another condition was sincerity condition which was found in the following dialogue:

Ted : *I'm gonna talk with a whit guy.*

John : *I don't know you want to go to a drug dealer with complaints.*

From the dialogue above, John gave a warning to Ted. In this case, he genuinely believed that complaining to a drug dealer would not have a beneficial effect.

The last condition is preparatory condition which was found in the following dialogue:

Ted : ***God!** there are some fucked up fish out there. Oh look at that one. Waspy white guy fish. I married the wrong woman, and now I lead a life of regret. Oh look at this guy, I went to New York once in 1981, and I just did not feel safe.*

John : *Ted, you gotta move out. You...*

Ted : *What?*

In dialogue above, John gave a warning to Ted because did think that it would occur, but Ted did not think about that.

All in all, beside based on the maxim and felicity condition of the interlocutors' responses, the impact of swearing could be categorized into three impacts, positive, negative, and neutral.

CONCLUSION

Based on result and discussion above, it could be concluded: Firstly, if the interlocutor made contribution as informative as the speaker needed, he/she invoked the Maxim of Quantity. In contrast, when the interlocutor gave too much information or even did not give any information the speaker needs, he/she flouted the maxim. Secondly, if the interlocutor responded by giving a truth, he/she invoked the Maxim of Quality. But, if the interlocutor responded by telling a lie, he/she flouted the maxim. Thirdly, if the interlocutor's response was related to the speaker's, he/she invoked the Maxim of Relation. On the other hand, if the interlocutor's response was not related or does not have connection to the speaker's, he/she flouted the maxim. Lastly, if the interlocutor briefly and was not ambiguous for responding the speaker's utterance, he/she invoked the Maxim of Manner. In opposite, the interlocutor flouted the maxim if he/she was not briefly and ambiguous for responding the speaker's utterance.

REFERENCES

- Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Battistella, E. L. (2005). *Bad Language: Are Some Words Better than Others?* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1968). "Utterer's Meaning, Sentence Meaning, and Word Meaning", *Foundations of Language*, 4. Reprinted as ch.6 of Grice 1989, pp. 117-137.
- Grice, H.P. (1969). "Utterer's Meaning and Intentions", *The Philosophical Review*, 78. Reprinted as ch.5 of Grice 1989, pp. 86-116.
- Grice, H.P. (1981). "Presupposition and Conversational Implicature", in P. Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 183-198. Reprinted as ch.17 of Grice 1989, 269-282.
- Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Second ed.). London: Longman.
- Hughes, G. (2006). *An Encyclopedia of Swearing: The Social History of Oaths, Profanity, Foul Language, and Ethnic Slurs in the English-Speaking World* New York: M.E. Sharpe
- Jay, T. (2000). *Why We Curse: A Neuro-Psychosocial Theory of Speech*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ljung, M. (2011). *Swearing: A Cross - Cultural Linguistic Study*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McEnery, T. (2006). *Swearing in English: Bad language, Purity and Power from 1586 to the Present*. New York: Routledge.
- Mercury, R.-E. (1995). Swearing: A "Bad" Part of Language; A Good Part of Language Learning. *TESL Canada Journal*, 13, 28 - 36.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (Second ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- Pinker, S. (2007). *The Stuff of Thought : Language as a Window Into Human Nature*. New York: Viking.
- Wajnryb, R. (2005). *Expletive Deleted : a Good Look at Bad Language*. New York: Free Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Fifth ed.): Blackwell.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.