

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter focus on the elements of the main theory such as Pragmatics, Swear Word theory by Wardaugh, Speech Act, and Speech Act theory by Searle.

2.1 Pragmatics

According to (Levinson, 1983: 5), "We can compute out of sequences of utterances, taken together with background assumptions about language usage, highly detailed inferences about the nature of the assumptions participants are making, and the purposes for which utterances are being used. In order to participate in ordinary language usage, one must be able to make such calculations, both in production and interpretation. This ability is independent of idiosyncratic beliefs, feelings and usages (although it may refer to regular and relatively abstract principles. Pragmatics can be taken to be the description of this ability, as it operates both for particular languages and languages in general." (p. 53)

According to (Kecskes, 2013), examines pragmatics from an intercultural pragmatic perspective, and adopts a socio-cognitive approach in intercultural interactions. According to this author, the socio-cognitive approach "emphasizes that language production and comprehension involve both prior experience and knowledge, and emergent, actual situation experience and knowledge co-constructed by interlocutors. It claims that the meaning values of linguistic expressions, encapsulating prior contexts of experience, play as important a role in the meaning construction and comprehension as actual situational context." (p. 7)

According to Indiana University Bloomington, pragmatics dates back to philosophical thinking of the early 20th century and was introduced by the American philosopher Morris (1901-1979) as one of the three components of semiotics, the science of signs. Specifically, Morris defined pragmatics as "the study of the

relation of signs to interpreters” (1938, p. 6). In modern linguistics, pragmatics is broadly defined as the study of language use in context.

Pragmatics can be analyzed from two perspectives, the Cognitive-Philosophical view (or Anglo-American pragmatics) and the Sociocultural-Interactional view (or European-Continental pragmatics) (Haugh, 2008; Huang, 2007). The first is referred to as the ‘component view,’ and it examines the ‘systematic study of meaning by virtue of, or dependent on, the use of language’ (p. 341). It is mainly concerned with central topics such as implicature, presupposition, speech acts, deixis, and reference. The latter is considered a functional perspective and interfaces with disciplines such as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, discourse analysis, pragmatic variation, and other social sciences. This functional perspective is also referred to as ‘empirical pragmatics.’ (cited in Indiana University of Bloomington, 2022)

According to ThoughtCo., Pragmatics has its roots in philosophy, sociology, and anthropology. Morris drew on his background when he laid out his theory of pragmatics in his book "Signs, Language and Behavior," explaining that the linguistic term "deals with the origins, uses, and effects of signs within the total behavior of the interpreters of signs." In terms of pragmatics, signs refers not to physical signs but to the subtle movements, gestures, tone of voice, and body language that often accompany speech. (Nordquist, R. , 2019)

Pragmatics in Action

The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) gives two examples of how pragmatics influences language and its interpretation. In the first, regarding to ASHA :

"You invited your friend over for dinner. Your child sees your friend reach for some cookies and says, 'Better not take those, or you'll get even bigger.' You can't believe your child could be so rude." (Nordquist, R., 2019)

In a literal sense, the daughter is simply saying that eating cookies can make

you gain weight. But due to the social context, the mother interprets that sentence to mean that her daughter is calling her friend fat. The first sentence in this explanation refers to the semantics—the literal meaning of the sentence. The second and third refer to the pragmatics, the actual meaning of the words as interpreted by a listener based on social context. (Nordquist, R., 2019)

According to David Lodge, writer in the *Paradise News*, says that pragmatics gives humans "a fuller, deeper, and generally more reasonable account of human language behavior." Without pragmatics, there is often no understanding of what language actually means, or what a person truly means when she is speaking. The context—the social signs, body language, and tone of voice (the pragmatics)—is what makes utterances clear or unclear to the speaker and her listeners. (Nordquist, R., 2019)

According to Wajnryb (cited in Saffah, D.M., 2020) pragmatically speaking, swearing can be understood in terms of the meaning it is taken to have in specific circumstances and what it is achieved. That is, it is only when a swearword is located in a certain context that it becomes possible to speak of meaning and achievement (Wajnryb, 2005).

According to Jay and Janschewitz (cited in Saffah, D.M., 2020) the communicative act of swearing is influenced by a number of pragmatic contextual variables such as the conversational topic, the speaker-listener relationship, including gender occupation, and status, and the social-physical settings of the communication with regard to whether swearing occurs in a public or private location, and the level of formality of the occasion. Hence, to fully understand swearing, one has to appreciate the contexts and communities in which it takes place (Jay and Janschewitz, 2008).

According to Yule (cited in Sari, K.A., 2014) how people use language to communicate is studied through pragmatics. Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially the choices they make, the constraints

they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication (Crystal in Barron, 2003: 7). In communication indeed, not only do the speakers produce utterances, but they also perform action through the utterances. They are doing things with their utterances when they speak because language is used not only to explain words, but also to perform an action which is intended to have a function and effect on the hearer. Those actions that are performed via utterances are called speech acts (Yule, 1996: 47). Based on my understanding, pragmatics as the part of linguistics in aspect the use of language focuses on conversational implicature.

2.2 Swear Words theory by Wardaugh

There are a bunch of study relating to the topic “Swear Words” a lot of experts has done this type of study, for this one Iam focusing on the theory of swear words by Ronald Wardaugh a.k.a Wardaugh.

According to Wardaugh (2006), there are 7 types of swear words:

Animal term, death term, excretion term, body term, sex term, mother-in-law, religiousmatters.

But in this research I limits the types of swear to 5 types there are :excretion term, animal term, death term, body part term, and sex term.

a. Excretion Term

In this type of swearing, excretion swearing means a swear word that connects to human excretion system or can be called dirt, for example: *piss(urine)* and *shit(feces)*.

b. Animal Term

Animal term swearing is a swear words taken from animals. example : *rats,bitch(female dog)*.

c. Death Term

Death term swearing contains swear word related to the aspects of death

such as *hell and damn*.

d. Body Part Term

Body term swearing is a swear words taken from body parts such as *asshole, cock, dick, pussy, ass*.

e. Sex Term

Sex term swearing is a swear words that contains the aspects of sexual intercourse such as *fuck, fucking, motherfucker*. (Prayuda, E,P, 2019)

2.3 Speech Act

a. Speech Act Definition

Based on my understanding, is a theory that examines the meaning of language based on the relationship between speech and the actions of the speakers.

According to University of Minnesota, define Speech Act as :

A speech act is an utterance that serves a function in communication. We perform speech acts when we offer an apology, greeting, request, complaint, invitation, compliment, or refusal. (University of Minnesota, 2019)

b. Speech Act in Linguistics

According to ThoughtCo. , define Speech Act in Linguistics as :

In linguistics, a speech act is an utterance defined in terms of a speaker's intention and the effect it has on a listener. Essentially, it is the action that the speaker hopes to provoke in his or her audience. Speech acts might be requests, warnings, promises, apologies, greetings, or any number of declarations. As you might imagine, speech acts are an important part of communication. (Nordquist, R, 2019)

c. Speech Act Theory

According to britannica.com, define Speech Act Theory as : Speech Act Theory, theory of meaning that holds that the meaning of linguistic expressions can be explained in terms of the rules governing their use in performing various speech acts (e.g., admonishing, asserting, commanding, exclaiming, promising, questioning, requesting, warning). (Britannica, 2013)

One of the strengths of Searle's theory is its portrayal of speech acts as acts that are not performed in a vacuum. His theory captures the idea that speech acts often have environmental contexts which determine the process of encoding and decoding them. The process of using speech acts to impinge on states-of-affairs inevitably engages dynamic, pragmatic instrumentalities such as implicatures and presuppositions. Linguistic Implicatures (LI) are potent in conveying messages when speech acts are engaged in spoken and written discourses. (Ancoah and Emike, J., 2017)

According to Levinson (1983:226), apart from speech acts, implicature and presupposition are among the central phenomena that any general pragmatic theory must account for. Indeed, linguistic choices and patterning are essentially the process of "crafting" towards achieving illocutionary goals.

2.4 Speech Act theory by Searle

According to StudySmarter, John Searle classified Speech Act under 5 categories :

John Searle classified the purpose of different speech acts under the following 5 categories: Declarations, assertives, expressives, directives, and commissives.

a. Declarations

The speaker declares something that has the potential to bring about a change in the world.

Example : "I now declare you husband and wife." , "You're Fired!".

b. Assertives

The speaker asserts an idea, opinion, or suggestion. The speaker presents 'facts' of the world, such as statements and claims.

Example : “Paris is the capital of France.” , “I watched a great documentary last night”.

c. Expressives

The speaker states something about their psychological attitudes and their attitudes towards a situation. This could be an apology, a welcome, or an expression of gratitude.

Example : “I’m so sorry about yesterday.” , “I really appreciate your help.”

d. Directives

The speaker intends to get the listener to do something. This could be by giving an order, offering advice, or making a request.

Example : “Pass me the salt please.” , “You should not drink that!”.

e. Commissive

The speaker commits to doing something in the future. This could be making a promise, a plan, a vow, or a bet.

Example : “I’ll see you at 6 tomorrow” , “I do!”.

(Cited by StudySmarter)

Searle Speech Act Classification

Assertives

Asserting, claiming, affirming, stating, denying, disclaiming, assuring, arguing, informing, notifying, reminding, objecting, predicting, reporting, suggesting insisting, guessing, swearing, admitting, confessing, accusing, blaming, lamenting.

Commissives

Committing, promising, threatening, vowing, swearing, Accepting, consenting, refusing, offering, bidding, assuring, warranting, contracting, betting.

Directives

Directing, requesting, asking, urging, telling, requiring, demanding, commanding, ordering, forbidding, enjoining, Permitting, suggesting, insisting, warning, advising, recommending, begging, supplicatin, imploring, praying.

Expressives

Apologizing, thanking, condoling, congratulating, complaining, lamenting, protesting, deploring, boasting, complimenting, praising, welcoming, greeting.

Declaration

Declaring, resigning, adjourning, appointing, nominating, approving, confirming, dissaproving, endorsing, renouncing, disclaiming, calling denouncing, repudiating, blessing, cursing, excommunicating, naming consecrating, christening, abbreviating.

(Hilu, A.M., 2019).

2.5 Previous Related Studies

There are three research that I found to have similar topic or related to my research that I used as reference. The first research entitled “The Analysis of Swear Words used by Character in Moonlight.” Written by P.E Prayuda, I.W Suarnajaya, P.A.K Juaniarta (2019). This reseach focuses on finding the types of swear words by using movie as a way to collect the data. The purpose of this research are to find out types of swear words that used in Moonlight movie and to analyze purposes of the characters.

Second related reseach entitled “Swearing in The Wolf of Wall Street: A Pragmatic Study.” Written by Saffah, D.M., (2020). This reseach focus on analyze the function of swearing in The Wolf of Wall Street movie . The purpose of this reseach are pragmatic functions, the reasons underlie the use of swear words and the different categories of swearing used in Martin Scorsese’s The Wolf of Wall Street.

Third related reseach entitled “A Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts of The Main Character In State of Play.” Written by Sari, K.A., (2014). This research applied a descriptive qualitative method. The existence of quantitative data was used to perform the number of occurrences of each type of speech acts. The primary source of this research was State of Play movie. This reseach focuses on speech act analysis in State of Play movie. The purpose of this reseach are describing the types of speech acts in terms of locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts employed by the main character in a movie entitled State of Play.

Based on the three related researches above, there similarities and differences that I found between each of the related reseach, here are the following similarities and differences.

Similarities in those researches and my research are, our research contains relative topic which are around pragmatic and swear words, some of the research using movie script to collect the data, also one of the research using the same analysis theory as mine.

Differences in those research and my research such as, the swear words

analysis in each research using different theory and types of analysis, some of the analysis analyze the function of analysis, some of the analysis speech act in three different term of speech act such as : locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts which are different with theory that I used in my research.

