CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

8.1. Conclusion

After conducting the pragmatic study of profanities found in compliment speech acts on Twitter, four things can be concluded from the research. Firstly, the linguistic forms of the profanities in compliment speech acts were found to be words and phrases. The word classes included adjectives, adverbs, nouns, and interjections. Meanwhile, noun phrases were the only phrase forms of profanities found. Nouns were found to be the most used profanities by Twitter users in compliments with 34%. It was followed by adverbs (30%), interjections (20%), noun phrases (10%), and adjectives (6%).

Next, themes of the profanities found in compliment speech acts on Twitter were ethnic/racial, family, prostitution, animal, religious/supernatural, scatological, sex organ, and sexual activity themes. 49% of the profanities were from religious/supernatural-theme. This number was followed by the profanities from family-theme (12%), sexual activity-theme (11%), sex organ-theme (10%), prostitution-theme (8%), ethnic/racial-theme (5%), animal-theme (4%), and scatological-theme (1%). *Damn* and *bloody* from religious/supernatural theme dominate the findings with twenty and fifteen findings. It was followed by *fucking* from sexual activity theme with eleven findings.

Thirdly, the profanities were found to have utterance meaning. They were meant as 'wow', 'very', 'great', 'girl', 'guy', 'people', 'pick up line', 'cat', 'dog', 'stuff', 'a good...' and to accentuate *why* and the noun. 'Very' dominated the

finding with 30%. It was followed by wow' (26%), 'girl' (16%), 'guy' (14%), to accentuate the Noun and *why* (4%), 'great' (3%) and 'a good…' (3%).

Finally, the pragmatic functions of the profanities were as adjectival intensifiers, adverbial intensifiers, anaphoric use of epithets, emphases, expletives, and noun supports. 30% of the profanities in compliment speech acts were found to function as adverbial intensifiers. This number was followed by expletives (26%), noun supports (24%), anaphoric use of epithets (10%), adjectival intensifiers (7%) and emphases (4%).

In conclusion, there is an indication that a link exists between the linguistic forms, themes, pragmatic meanings, and pragmatic functions of profanities. Profanities from certain word class, for instance, are most likely to have pragmatic meanings and pragmatic function related to the word class. Profanities in the forms of interjections, for example, are most likely to be meant as 'wow' and function as expletives. The same thing also happens to the profanities from other linguistic forms such as nouns, adverbs, adjectives, and noun phrases.

8.2. Suggestion

The sources of the data for this study were limited to the tweets posted publicly during December 2018, except in some profanities where the data considered inadequate. This inadequacy is one of the drawbacks of this research to be mended by future researchers. Future researchers are suggested to take the data for more than one month to make the results more comprehensive. By taking the data for more than one month, future researchers probably will discover different result from this research. Furthermore, it is suggested for future researchers to

obtain the frequency of profanities found in compliments compared to their usage in expressing negative emotions. By finding that comparison, the significance of this study hopefully can be more comprehended. Finally, pedagogical methods and strategies to teach the use of profanities to EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students can be investigated to help the students avoid misunderstanding while communicating with other English speakers on social media, especially on Twitter.