



Cursing in the American Animated Sitcoms “Family Guy”: A Pragmatic Study

Asmaa Amjad Alwan¹

Asst. Prof. Wafaa Mukhlus Faisal²

¹Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences,
University of Babylon.

²Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences,
University of Babylon

¹asmaa.alwan.humh29@student.uobabylon.edu.iq

²hum.wafaa.mukhlus@uobabylon.edu.iq

الملخص: تتناول هذه الدراسة الوظيفة التداولية للشتائم في المسلسل الكوميدي الأمريكي المتحرك فاميلي غاي، من خلال تحليل كيفية تأثير الأفعال الكلامية واستراتيجيات الوقاحة على تفاعلات الشخصيات ومساهماتها في العناصر الكوميدية والدرامية في العرض. وبالاعتماد على نظرية الأفعال الكلامية لسيرل (1969)، واستراتيجيات الوقاحة لكولبير (1996)، ونظرية التضمين لغرايس (1975)، تُظهر التحليلات أن الشتائم تؤدي أدوارًا تواصلية متعددة، منها التعبير عن الإحباط، وإثبات الهيمنة، وإصدار الأوامر، وتعزيز الطابع الفكاهي. تسهم أفعال مثل الإخبار والتوجيه والالتزام والتعبير في تشكيل كيفية توظيف الشخصيات للشتائم لزيادة الحدة العاطفية والواقعية السردية. كما تكشف استراتيجيات الوقاحة كيف تُستخدم الشتائم كأداة عدوانية تهدف إلى فرض السلطة وتوليد التوتر في العلاقات، من خلال الوقاحة الصريحة، والسخرية، والتهديد بالاستقلالية. وتُبرز نظرية التضمين لغرايس





المعاني الضمنية في تبادلات الشتائم، من خلال الإهانات المبطنة، والمبالغة، والسخرية، مما يعزز من ديناميكية الشخصيات وإيصال الكوميديا. تشير النتائج إلى أن فاميلي غاي يستخدم الشتائم بشكل استراتيجي كوسيلة لغوية تُثري السرد، والفكاهة، وتطور الشخصيات، بينما تعكس في الوقت ذاته تفاعلات اجتماعية مبالغاً فيها. وتساهم هذه الدراسة في فهم دور اللغة البذيئة في المسلسلات الكوميدية المتحركة، وتوضح تأثيرها على تفاعل المشاهدين وبنية الحكبة السردية.

Abstract: This study examines the pragmatic function of cursing in the American animated sitcom Family Guy, analyzing how various speech acts and impoliteness strategies influence character interactions and contribute to the show's comedic and dramatic elements. Through Speech Act Theory (Searle, 1969), Culpeper's Impoliteness Strategies (1996), and Grice's Implicature Theory (1975), the analysis demonstrates that cursing serves multiple communicative purposes, including expressing frustration, asserting dominance, enforcing commands, and reinforcing humor. Speech acts such as expressives, directives, commissives, and assertives shape how characters employ cursing to heighten emotional intensity and narrative realism. Impoliteness strategies further reveal how cursing functions as a tool for aggression, power assertion, and relational tension, intensifying confrontations through bald-on-record impoliteness, sarcasm, and autonomy threats. Grice's Implicature Theory highlights the underlying meaning in curse-laden exchanges, showing how implied insults, exaggeration, and irony strengthen character dynamics and comedic delivery. The findings suggest that Family Guy strategically uses cursing as a linguistic device that enhances storytelling, humor, and character development while reflecting exaggerated social interactions. This study contributes to understanding the role of offensive language in animated sitcoms, demonstrating its impact on viewer engagement and narrative construction.

Keywords: Family Guy, Pragmatics, Speech Acts, Cursing, Animated Sitcoms.

1. Introduction





American animated sitcoms have long been a platform for social commentary, satire, and humor, often pushing the boundaries of acceptable language. Shows like *Family Guy* employ cursing strategically to enhance comedic effect, challenge societal norms, and reflect real-life speech patterns (Sienkiewicz & Marx, n.d.). The use of explicit language in animated sitcoms has sparked debates regarding its impact on audiences, particularly in shaping perceptions of language and humor. *Family Guy*, created by Seth MacFarlane, is known for its irreverent humor and frequent use of cursing. The show's characters engage in profanity-laden dialogue that serves various pragmatic functions, including humor, emphasis, and social bonding (Rafi'i, 2022). Unlike traditional sitcoms, *Family Guy* employs cutaway gags and exaggerated speech styles, making it an ideal subject for an in-depth analysis of how cursing is used in animated television.

Despite extensive discussions on explicit language in media, limited research focuses on how animated sitcoms, particularly *Family Guy*, utilize cursing as a linguistic device. While some argue that profanity strengthens comedic narratives and enhances storytelling, others suggest it reinforces crude humor and negative stereotypes. This study seeks to explore the role of cursing in *Family Guy*, examining how it influences character interactions, humor, impoliteness strategies, and societal perceptions. To address these concerns, the study will explore the following research questions:

1. How does cursing function pragmatically in the American animated sitcoms *Family Guy*, and in what ways do various speech acts influence its use?
2. How do characters in the American animated sitcoms *Family Guy* use impoliteness strategies through cursing, and what impact does it have on their interactions?
3. What implications arise from the use of cursing in American animated sitcoms *Family Guy*?

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. The Role of Pragmatics in Profanity and Impoliteness

Pragmatics is an advanced field in linguistics that examines language use within particular contexts, including such factors as speaker's intention, norms of conversation, and societal conventions (Yule, 2020). Pragmatics is a more complex approach compared to basic definitions of word meaning, with a focus on situational influences on communication. Many analytical questions within





pragmatics specifically focus on how people adjust speech to audience, tone used, and purpose. A particularly complex area of pragmatics involves using profanity, which often conveys meaning beyond strict dictionary definitions. Profanity plays a diversity of functions within media depictions and casual conversations, including expressing sentiment and creating comedic impact. Since language is closely tied with societal and cultural norms, pragmatics explains, among others, the double function of offending language in breaking or engaging interpersonal relationships (Dynel, 2012).

The Speech Act Theory, first presented by Austin (1962) and later developed by Searle (1969), is a theoretical model describing how linguistic expressions communicate meaning through different categories of speech acts. The theory classifies speech acts into five main categories, including assertives, which communicate beliefs or facts, directives, which direct others to do something, commissives, which state intentions or promises, expressives, which convey feelings or attitude, and declarations, which are capable of changing reality by simply being spoken (Searle, 1969). The use of profanity within a theoretical model is complicated because it is used to convey feelings, command, or emphasize certain speech points. In entertainment and media, profanity often occurs within assertive speech acts when characters make strong affirmations, or expressive speech acts when feelings are strongly expressed. When language is evolving, speech acts with profanity are a prime area of study with regards to their impact on social interaction and prevailing discourses on media (Dynel, 2016).

Impoliteness strategies, explained by Culpeper (1996), form a theoretical explanation for how linguistic features infringe upon common social norms. Impoliteness strategies are counterposed to politeness theories focused on co-operative communication by defining speakers who deliberately violate commonly held expectations of courtesy. For Culpeper (1996), impoliteness strategies are classed into five broad categories: bald-on-record impoliteness, which involves direct use of pejorative expressions without any mitigating terms; positive impoliteness, which involves a speaker curtailing a target's desire for acceptance by excluding or mocking him/her; negative impoliteness, which involves infringing upon a person's autonomy or privacy; sarcasm or mock politeness, which involves using insincere polite language for purposes of expressing sarcasm or scorn; and withholding politeness, which is characterized by an intentional lack of expected courteous language. Impoliteness strategies provide explanations for language used for hostile or comedic purposes, which are both context-dependent. Oftentimes linked with



profanity, such language is used for purposes of drawing strongly emotional reactions or intentionally violating acceptable societal norms. In media representation and everyday interaction, impoliteness strategies are commonly applied for reasons of character development, satire, and articulation of societal norms for acceptable language (Bousfield, 2008).

Grice's (1975) Theory of Implicature provides a deeper explanation of profanity's operation beyond its literal interpretation. Implicature refers to meaning conveyed through the contextual structure without being explicitly stated. The pragmatic approach to language allows the show to balance humor with social critique, as viewers interpret curse words not only as direct expressions but also as layered communicative tools.

2.2. Profanity in Media and Its Evolution

The use of profanity in different media channels has had a significant evolution over time, driven by changing societal norms, technological developments, and governmental regulation. Television and film industry productions first underwent strict censorship, which led content developers to opt against using strong language to adhere to broadcast regulations. In the mid-20th century, organizations such as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in the United States imposed regulations on profanity, deeming it inappropriate for public consumption (Montgomery, 2019).

However, as entertainment evolved, particularly with the rise of cable networks and streaming services, the boundaries governing explicit language became more flexible. One notable aspect of this evolution was the growing acceptance of cursing as a linguistic and expressive tool in television and film. By the late 20th century, shows like *The Sopranos* and *South Park* incorporated cursing as a fundamental element of their storytelling, reflecting a more liberal approach to language in media (Dundes & Streiff, 2019). This shift signified a cultural transformation, where cursing and profanity were no longer viewed solely as offensive but rather as mechanisms for realism, humor, and artistic expression.

2.3. Profanity as a Comedic Device

Profanity has long been used as a comedic device, enhancing humor through exaggeration, shock value, and linguistic playfulness. The violation of social norms often generates laughter, as audiences recognize the contrast between expected politeness and the abruptness of explicit language (Goldstein, 2021). Cursing serves as a high-impact comedic tool, punctuating





jokes with abrupt and emotionally charged expressions that increase their humorous effect. Stand-up comedians, television writers, and filmmakers frequently incorporate cursing to heighten comedic timing, reinforce character traits, and create satire (Kapica, n.d.).

The rhetorical function of cursing in comedy is linked to its ability to disrupt conventional speech patterns, making dialogue more engaging and unpredictable. Additionally, vulgar language can serve as a form of social bonding, where shared amusement over taboo expressions strengthens audience connection (Ginsburg et al., 2003). While some critics argue that excessive cursing diminishes the quality of humor, others contend that it reflects the evolving nature of comedic expression in modern entertainment.

2.4. Audience Reception and Censorship of Profanity

The use of profanity within media content is relatively varied based on different audiences, with values, cultural backgrounds, and generations playing a pivotal role. To some audiences, explicit language is taken as a true representation of everyday language, while for others, it is seen as offensive or irrelevant (DeFrank & Kahlbaugh, 2019). A specific form of profanity, or cursing, is often studied for its societal consequences, particularly on audience judgments about attributes such as intelligence, sociability, and trustworthiness. For instance, use of cursing is said to change audience perceptions of characters, with certain audiences rating such characters less respectable, while others find them more attractive (Moura, 2024).

Censorship policies invariably shape the use of profanity on different media outlets as authorities enforce content restrictions based on existing social norms. The modification of profane words in translation and subtitling activities commonly provokes debates on whether the minimization or amplification of vulgar language impacts viewers' engagement (Moura, 2024). Despite the ongoing debate, the use of curse words in entertainment programming remains a common feature in contemporary media, reflecting general shifts in linguistic tolerance.

2.5. Definition and Linguistic Nature of Cursing

Profanity, often simply known as cursing, refers to speech that is inappropriate or offensive and, hence, an infringement of accepted societal norms (Jay, 2009). Such linguistic forms often carry a lot of emotional meaning and serve several functions based on context. In terms of use within communication, profane language often serves as an interjection, an intensifier,



or an independent speech act, hence adding emphasis or increasing the effectiveness of speech (Dewaele, 2018).

Unlike standard vocabulary, the employment of cursing operates within precise cultural and societal contexts, meaning that its comprehension varies across different societies and throughout various historical periods. While commonly considered inappropriate, empirical research reveals that cursing plays an important role in communication, influencing the style of conversation, the emotional tone, and interpersonal relationship dynamics (Vingerhoets et al., 2013).

2.6. Psychological and Emotional Functions of Cursing

The use of cursing as a coping mechanism is a psychological phenomenon commonly used to release tension, frustration, or intense emotions (Stephens & Umland, 2011). Empirical studies suggest that people who use expletives while performing painful tasks experience greater pain tolerance, consequently demonstrating the physiological effects related to cursing (Stephens et al., 2009). Use of expletives is also explainable using emotional regulation, which helps convey anger, surprise, or feelings of belongingness with greater vigor (Jay, 2009). Apart from its personal emotional effects, quantitative studies have shown that profanity use helps promote solidarity, consequently improving cohesion among interactants who use similar linguistic features (Dewaele, 2018). Whether used to affirm interpersonal solidarity or convey defiance against control, cursing is a versatile and effective tool for social interaction.

2.7. Social and Cultural Dimensions of Cursing

The level of acceptance of cursing widely differs based on cultural context and demographic groups, driven by social norms, laws, and language evolution over time (Dewaele, 2018). There are groups that naturally integrate cursing into everyday life, while others place strict rules on using it within media and public speech (Montgomery, 2019). Furthermore, there are prominent differences based on gender, with previous studies demonstrating that male subjects showed greater cursing frequencies compared to female subjects, though that gap has reduced over recent environments (Ginsburg et al., 2003). In addition, people perceive cursing differently, with those who use expletives being judged differently based on criteria including age, profession, or status (DeFrank and Kahlbaugh, 2019). Despite such differences, use of profanities remains an important aspect of linguistic change reflecting wider shifts in cultural norms around communication and expression.





3. Methodology

3.1. The Data Description and Collection

The main data set used in the current research is taken from Family Guy, an American animated sitcom created by Seth MacFarlane. Since it first aired on television in 1999, Family Guy has become infamous for using satirical humor, characteristic cutaway jokes, and unapologetic dealings with sensitive topics (20th Century Fox Television, 2010). The plot is based on a dysfunctional family headed by Peter, Lois, and their children Meg, Chris, and Stewie, together with their anthropomorphized pet dog, Brian. Family Guy is especially known for making extensive use of explicit language, particularly expletives, which is a core aspect of its comedic tone and social commentary. The linguistic features of cursing within the sitcom are strongly highlighted, including hyperbolized dialogue, character dialogue, and explicit violations of societal expectations. As an animated sitcom without the constraints of being broadcast live, Family Guy enjoys a great deal of creative latitude for expressing itself linguistically, using provocative comments to magnify its humor and satirical comments about societal norms.

The television series Family Guy has been selected for analysis because of its widespread use of profanity such as cursing and its consequences for comedy within the field of animated television programming. The episodes chosen are based on a criterion-based approach, focusing on those with frequent use of profanity used in varied interaction scenarios. In order to achieve consistency of linguistic patterns, four episodes from Season 10 were selected: Screams of Silence: The Story of Brenda Q (Episode 3), The Hand That Rocks the Wheelchair (Episode 4), Road to the North Pole (Episode 7), and Patriot Games (Episode 9). These programs reflect high rates of profanity and cursing, thus making them apt for linguistic analysis. In the current study, eight extracts will be analyzed, taken from the above selection of episodes and consisting of prominent cases of cursing spoken by the characters. These extracts are intended to examine the pragmatic functions of cursing within the series, analyzing whether explicitness is used to intensify humour, provide character establishment, and adopt approaches of impoliteness. Through a wide range of episodes being taken from a single season, this research ensures a targeted and extensive linguistic analysis of Family Guy's use of cursing.

3.2. The Analytical Framework





This study adopts Speech Act Theory (Searle, 1969) in combination with Culpeper's Impoliteness Strategies (1996) to examine the role of profanity in the TV show Family Guy. Speech Act Theory classifies speech into five categories: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations, explaining how cursing expresses emotions, issues commands, or alters social interaction. The combination of Grice's Implicature Theory (1975) and Culpeper's Impoliteness Strategies explains five precise modalities by which cursing oversteps social norms: bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm/mock politeness, and withholding politeness. These frameworks strongly shape dialogue, character relationships, and strategically placed comedic moments within a narrative.

3.2.1. The Analysis

Extract 1: "Screams of Silence: The Story of Brenda Q" (Season 10, Episode 3)

Speaker: Peter Griffin

Directed To: Quagmire

Occasion: Heated argument about Brenda's abusive relationship

Episode Time: 12:45

Original Air Date: October 30, 2011

"You're such a fucking idiot! Why do you always have to mess everything up?"

Analysis:

Peter's speech is an expressive speech act with high degrees of frustration and feeling. The bald-on-record use of impoliteness makes the verbal abuse apparent and non-misconstruable, so that it has greater impact. The underlying implication is that Peter sees Quagmire ignoring his duties all the time, adding further depth to their disputes. The exchange makes the confrontation more intense, increasing the emotional sincerity, which is an essential aspect of sitcom comedy and dramatic stories.

Extract 2: "The Hand That Rocks the Wheelchair" (Season 10, Episode 4)

Speaker: Stewie Griffin

Directed To: Brian Griffin

Occasion: Confrontation over manipulation in the episode's plot

Episode Time: 09:30

Original Air Date: November 6, 2011

"Get the hell out of my way before I lose it!"

Analysis:



Stewie's command is a directive speech act based on an authoritative order that requires immediate obedience. His use of positive impoliteness isolates Brian, thus maintaining Stewie's dominance in the interaction. Implication is such that Stewie is affirmatively expressing frustration, but is purposefully seeking control by using linguistic aggression. This interaction is representative of their respective hierarchies, adding to comedic value while enjoyably demonstrating Stewie's past record of superiority in arguments.

Extract 3: "Road to the North Pole" (Season 10, Episode 7)

Speaker: Brian Griffin

Directed To: Santa Claus

Occasion: Frustration over Santa's incompetence

Episode Time: 15:10

Original Air Date: December 12, 2010

"You think you're tough? Well, fuck you, buddy!"

Analysis:

Brian's statement is a commissive speech act, which is a word of challenge given to Santa. His use of sarcasm and pretended politeness gives the rude remark an ironic tone, which enhances its aggressive tone. The implicature is that Brian does not really find Santa powerful, but he uses hyperbole for an ulterior motive of undermining Santa's control. This is an example of how sitcoms use profanity and satirical language for critiquing people in high places, blending comedy with social criticism.

Extract 4: "Patriot Games" (Season 10, Episode 9)

Speaker: Lois Griffin

Directed To: Peter Griffin

Occasion: Argument over Peter's reckless behavior

Episode Time: 07:50

Original Air Date: January 29, 2006

"You're a total asshole, and everybody knows it!"

Analysis:

Lois's statement serves as assertive speech act that emphasizes her judgment of Peter's behavior. The use of negative impoliteness serves to reduce Peter's autonomy, making his criticism absolute. The implicature suggests that she believes Peter's irresponsibility is known far and wide, making her pejorative claim stronger. The exchange supports her dominant status in their relationship, with her exasperation set against Peter's indifference, a dynamic commonly used for comic purposes throughout the series.



Extract 5: "Screams of Silence: The Story of Brenda Q" (Season 10, Episode 3)

Speaker: Glenn Quagmire

Directed To: Brenda's abusive boyfriend, Jeff

Occasion: Emotional confrontation over Brenda's well-being

Episode Time: 19:05

Original Air Date: October 30, 2011

"I swear to God, if you do that again, I'll beat the shit out of you!"

Analysis:

Quagmire's statement is a commissive speech act of making a threat of future action against Jeff's behavior. His bald-on-record rudeness cuts all pretence of politeness, emphasizing seriousness of purpose. The implicature is that Quagmire believes that only violence is an option for protecting Brenda, and with his personal investment, i.e., he has a stake. This creates increased dramatic tension, shifting the sitcom's dominant comedy tone into a tone with increased stakes, and character relationships become more important than jokes.

Extract 6: "The Hand That Rocks the Wheelchair" (Season 10, Episode 4)

Speaker: Brian Griffin

Directed To: Stewie Griffin

Occasion: Debate over Stewie's behavior

Episode Time: 11:20

Original Air Date: November 6, 2011

"Oh, so now you're gonna act like a damn saint? Give me a break!"

Analysis:

Brian's statement serves as assertive speech act, expressing his frustration and skepticism regarding Stewie's behavior. The positive impoliteness disparages Stewie's credibility, thus highlighting Brian's disapproval. The implicature is that Brian does not actually view Stewie as innocent but rather emphasizes the hypocrisy of Stewie's actions. This exchange demonstrates how hyperbolic speech increases character dynamics, making confrontations engaging while also escalating the continual power struggles between Brian and Stewie.

Extract 7: "Road to the North Pole" (Season 10, Episode 7)

Speaker: Stewie Griffin

Directed To: Brian Griffin

Occasion: Mocking Brian's decision-making

Episode Time: 23:40



Original Air Date: December 12, 2010

"That's the dumbest fucking thing I've ever heard!"

Analysis:

The cursing used by Stewie is an expressive speech act, underscoring his criticism of Brian's argument. Sarcasm and mock politeness are combined with over-the-top incredulity, using insulting language, which renders his retort even more powerful. The implicature goes beyond a merely counter-arguing, conveying Stewie's interpretation of Brian's argument as completely ridiculous. This further entrenches their relationship dynamic by emphasizing Stewie's superiority, using linguistic aggression to contrast his intelligence with Brian's presumed ineptness, a theme running throughout the show.

Extract 8: "Patriot Games" (Season 10, Episode 9)

Speaker: Peter Griffin

Directed To: Lois Griffin

Occasion: Argument over Peter's reckless spending

Episode Time: 14:50

Original Air Date: January 29, 2006

"Shut the fuck up before I make you!"

Analysis:

The statement made by Peter is a directive speech act that orders Lois to stop what she is doing. The use of negative impoliteness is a violation of her autonomy and increases the confrontational tone of their interaction. The implicit implicature is that Peter sees himself as dominant or superior to Lois in the exchange and does not respect her goals at all. His over-the-top attitude depicts his unstable personality and is in consonance with his depiction as having unpredictable and often whimsical behavior in the sitcom, converting moments of hostility into humorous elements.

3.2.2. Results and Discussion

The analysis of cursing in Family Guy from the perspective of Speech Act Theory, Culpeper's Impoliteness Strategies, and Grice's Implicature Theory reveals a number of patterns relating to the use of aggressive language throughout the series. In all of the eight extracts under study, cursing is used as a pragmatic tool for expressing frustration, establishing authority, creating humor, and escalating conflict between characters.

The Speech Act Theory describes the deliberate use of cursing in all types of speech acts such as expressives used to express strong emotions, directives used to make direct requests, commissives used to intimidate or express





disagreement and assertives used to support an argument. Each instance of cursing is carefully orchestrated in the hyperbolic framework common to a sitcom and thus increases the authenticity of emotion without losing the comedy effect.

Culpeper's impoliteness strategies demonstrate the varied uses of cursing, including explicit aggression, targeting derogation marked by positive impoliteness, autonomy-threatening acts marked as negative impoliteness, and the employment of sarcasm or mock politeness together with a corresponding of withhold politeness. These impoliteness strategies are used to express authority or hostility, to intensify interpersonal conflict, and to increase exaggerated personality traits.

Grice's Theory of Implicature clarifies how the use of cursing in Family Guy often involves a range of levels of connotation and meaning, raising exchanges above crudeness. Stewie and Brian use sarcasm to express utter contempt as a form of expression, but Peter and Lois invoke cursing to fuel arguments and add to their dysfunctional relationship. In the context of a sitcom, implicature is used to reinforce social hierarchies and serve as a tool to induce laughter and intense emotion.

4. Conclusion

The study concluded that Family Guy's use of cursing is beyond mere shock value and is part of creating character relationships and emotional nuances, and building comedic narrative structure. The Speech Act Theory explains the function of cursing within a given communication structure; however, Culpeper's Strategies of Impoliteness illustrates its use in enforcing social hierarchies and in bringing about humor through submerged aggression. Also, Grice's Theory of Implicature highlights how cursing implies a further meaning in interaction, thus ensuring the coexistence of humor and conflict in aggressive dialogues.

Overall, the use of cursing in Family Guy plays an important role in the presentation of humor and dramatic tension, as a linguistic tool used to build characterization, resolve conflict, and discuss power relations. Scholars argue that animated sit-coms deliberately employ cursing as a technique to sustain entertainment value when creating interactions at once exaggerated and socially relevant.

References





- [1] 20th Century Fox Television. (2010). Family Guy: Volume One. Twentieth Century Fox Home Entertainment. Retrieved from UW-Madison Libraries.
- [2] Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.
- [3] Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness in interaction. John Benjamins Publishing.
- [4] Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of Pragmatics, 25(3), 349–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3).
- [5] Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of Pragmatics, 25(3), 349–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3).
- [6] DeFrank, M., & Kahlbaugh, P. (2019). Language choice matters: When profanity affects how people are judged. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 38(1), 126–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X18758143>.
- [7] DeFrank, M., & Kahlbaugh, P. (2019). Language choice matters: When profanity affects how people are judged. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 38(1), 126–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X18758143>.
- [8] Dewaele, J.-M. (2018). Why do we swear? The paradox of profanity in language. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 39(2), 120–132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1342653>.
- [9] Dundes, L., & Streiff, M. (2019). Realism and profanity in television: A cultural analysis. Journal of Popular Culture, 52(4), 789–805. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpcu.12834>.
- [10] Dynel, M. (2012). Swearing and humor: A cross-cultural perspective. Language and Communication, 32(2), 86–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2011.12.003>.
- [11] Dynel, M. (2016). Impoliteness and cursing in fictional dialogue. Journal of Pragmatics, 91, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.11.001>.
- [12] Ginsburg, H. J., Ogletree, S. M., & Silakowski, T. D. (2003). Vulgar language: Review of sex differences in usage, attributions, and pathologies. North American Journal of Psychology, 5(1), 105–116.
- [13] Ginsburg, H. J., Ogletree, S. M., & Silakowski, T. D. (2003). Vulgar language: Review of sex differences in usage, attributions, and





- pathologies. North American Journal of Psychology, 5(1), 105–116.
- [14] Goldstein, J. (2021). Humor and comedy. In P. Vorderer & C. Klimmt (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of entertainment theory (pp. 439–461). Oxford University Press.
- [15] Jay, T. (2009). The utility and ubiquity of taboo words. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4(2), 153–161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01115.x>.
- [16] Kapica, S. (n.d.). Analyzing stand-up comedy: Laughter, language, and rhetoric. Retrieved from Academia.edu
- [17] Montgomery, J. (2019). Censorship and language regulation in television history. Cambridge University Press.
- [18] Montgomery, J. (2019). Censorship and language regulation in television history. Cambridge University Press.
- [19] Moura, W. (2024). The subtitling of swearing: A pilot reception study. Languages, 9(5), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9050184>.
- [20] Rafi'i, M. N. (2022). Cooperative Principle of Humor in the Sitcoms “Family Guy” and “American Dad!”. Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Retrieved from [Etheses.uin-malang.ac.id](http://etheses.uin-malang.ac.id/39074/1/18320089.pdf).
- [21] Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.
- [22] Stephens, R., & Umland, C. (2011). Swearing as a coping mechanism. Emotion, 11(4), 852–862. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022577>.
- [23] Stephens, R., Atkins, J., & Kingston, A. (2009). Swearing as a response to pain. NeuroReport, 20(12), 1056–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0b013e32832e64b1>.
- [24] Vingerhoets, A. J., Bylsma, L. M., & de Vlam, C. (2013). Swearing: A biopsychosocial perspective. Psychology of Language and Communication, 17(2), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.2478/plc-2013-0011>.
- [25] Yule, G. (2020). The study of language (7th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

