



SIGn Journal of Social Science

E-ISSN: 2745-374X

jurnal.penerbitsign.com/index.php/sjss/article/view/v6n2-026

Vol. 6 Issue 2: December 2025 – May 2026

Published Online: May 22, 2026

Article Title

Resemanticization of Local Swear Words and Social Limits on Their Use in Interactions among Senior and Vocational High School Students in Makassar City

Author(s)

M. Sayful*

Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia // muhammad.sayful@uin-alauddin.ac.id

*Corresponding Author

Nurliah Nurliah

Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia // p20242001956@siswa.upsi.edu.my

Abd. Kahar Muzakkir

Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia // muzakkir.abd.kahar@gmail.com

How to cite:

Sayful, M., Nurliah, N., & Muzakkir, A. K. (2026). Resemanticization of Local Swear Words and Social Limits on Their Use in Interactions among Senior and Vocational High School Students in Makassar City. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 6(2), 622-643. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v6i2.800>



This work is licensed under a CC BY-4.0 License

ABSTRACT

Local swear words in student interactions serve social functions that extend beyond expressions of anger or verbal attacks. Their functions are shaped by the situation of use, relationships between speakers, the purpose of the utterance, and responses that emerge during interaction. This study examines the forms, contexts, social functions, and limits of resemanticization of local swear words in interactions among senior and vocational high school students in Makassar City. The study employed a descriptive qualitative approach with a case study strategy. Twelve schools were selected through systematic random sampling, while 12 informants were purposively selected. Primary data were collected through in-depth interviews, participant observation, and digital observation and were analyzed by coding elements of speech events and comparing findings across sources. The findings show that swear words function as expressions of emotion and affect, markers of solidarity and social identity, and means of conveying complaints containing elements of resistance to authority. Their use also reveals normative ambivalence because swear words may be accepted among peers but restricted within families and schools. Resemanticization occurs when a change in pragmatic function is accompanied by a change in social meaning without eliminating offensive lexical meaning. These findings demonstrate that swearing is a contextual linguistic practice that reflects students' ability to adjust their language choices to social relationships and interactional situations.

Keywords: Local Swear Words; Makassar Students; Normative Ambivalence; Resemanticization; Social Identity.

INTRODUCTION

Language not only conveys information but also regulates social relationships, expresses attitudes, and shapes evaluations of speakers. This function is apparent in swearing because a word that is lexically regarded as offensive may perform different functions depending on its target, the relationship between speakers, the purpose of the utterance, the recipient's response, and the situation in which it is used. Taboo language is associated with social prohibitions and contexts of use (Allan & Burridge, 2006), while community norms and relationships between speakers also shape the meanings assigned to swear words (Goddard, 2015). The emotional consequences of swearing are also influenced by language choice, experience, and interactional circumstances (Stapleton et al., 2022). Thus, offensive lexical meaning remains part of a swear word, while its social function develops through its use within particular relationships.

During adolescence, language choice is associated with group membership, social closeness, and position within peer relations. Linguistic variation acquires value through social practice within a community, allowing language choices to contribute to the formation of style and identity in peer relationships (Eckert, 2000). Adolescent identity development on social media is more closely related to the type and quality of activities than to the duration of social media use (Avci et al., 2025). Slang, nonstandard spelling, language mixing, and visual elements also form part of Generation Z's digital identity practices (Conny et al., 2024). Linguistic identity is therefore constructed through both face-to-face interaction and digital communication, each of which involves different patterns of social acceptance.

This functional diversity is evident when swear words are used to express anger, annoyance, fatigue, humor, closeness, or emphasis. The same word may be accepted as a joke in one relationship but offend another. Swear words in adolescent conversation perform expressive, emphatic, and idiomatic functions that are not necessarily insulting (Love & Stenstrom, 2023). Studies of adolescents and students have likewise identified diverse referents and functions of swearing, including expressions of annoyance, joking, and social closeness (Dewipayani et al., 2017; Meidariani et al., 2025). In multilingual communities, swear-word choice is related to the emotional intensity of language, gender, and interactional situations (Mohammadpour, 2024). These findings underscore the importance of social context in understanding the functions of swearing and demonstrate that similarities in form or function do not necessarily produce identical patterns of use across social groups.

Social media communication adds dimensions of presentation, audience, and visual representation to meaning formation. Swear words may appear in texts, captions, comments, videos, emojis, and stickers directed toward audiences with particular characteristics. Media affordances and audience selection influence how users present experiences and identities (Georgakopoulou, 2017), while slang in adolescents' Instagram interactions undergoes semantic broadening, narrowing, and shifts associated with group solidarity (Madani et al., 2025). Social media also functions as a means of expressing anger (Nova & Winarti, 2024). The function of swearing in digital communication must therefore be understood through its targets, social relationships, and contexts, which distinguish abusive from nonabusive uses (Pamungkas et al., 2023). Social network structures and interactional purposes also affect swearing practices, indicating that social closeness is not the sole factor shaping their use (Laitinen et al., 2025).

Makassar City provides the setting for this study because student interactions bring together Indonesian, local languages, and colloquial varieties. Impolite words among young people in Makassar have been documented in interactions with close friends, family members, and other contexts in which such language is used (Putri et al., 2021). Research on students at SMA Negeri 1 Makassar also identified categories and purposes of swear words that varied according to their contexts of use (Syaiful & Zainuddin, 2020). In this study, local swear words refer to the repertoire of swear words documented and recognized in student interactions in Makassar, including forms originating from local languages, Indonesian, and modified forms used in local practice. These linguistic practices take place within Bugis-Makassar social life, where honor and self-respect, empathy and solidarity, and inherited social knowledge remain relevant values (Idrus, 2003; Rusman et al., 2023; Bustan & Jumadi, 2024). Local cultural practices are also maintained and adapted in response to social change (Khairul et al., 2024), making these values relevant to understanding relationships among honor, social closeness, and appropriateness in interaction.

Differences in how swearing is evaluated among peers, families, schools, and digital communication require a framework that connects language, identity, and power. Language ideology explains the relationship between language choices and group values, interests, and identities (Kroskrity, 2000). Bourdieu (1991) shows that the value of a language choice depends on social context, the speaker's position, and the recognition afforded to the language being used. Butler (2021) identifies repetition and social recognition as elements that sustain utterance force, while Scott (1990) conceptualizes hidden transcripts as expressions of experience and dissatisfaction that differ from discourse stated openly to persons in positions of authority. In the context of social critique, Fetni et al. (2026) similarly demonstrate that language acquires critical force through the relationship among medium, convention, and the community that uses it. These perspectives allow swearing to be analyzed as a social practice according to its concrete functions in speech events.

Previous studies in Makassar have addressed the categories, purposes, and use of impolite words in the social relationships of students and young people (Syaiful & Zainuddin, 2020; Putri et al., 2021). Studies conducted in Bali and Nusa Penida have examined the referents, functions, social relationships, and differing norms associated with taboo language (Dewipayani et al., 2017; Mahayana et al., 2025; Meidariani et al., 2025). Other research has investigated emotional functions, changes in degrees of taboo, the management of social relationships, and distinctions between abusive and nonabusive uses of swear words (Goddard, 2015; Stapleton et al., 2022; Love & Stenstrom, 2023; Pamungkas et al., 2023; Laitinen et al., 2025). Studies of digital communication have connected linguistic change with identity, media affordances, and audience engagement (Georgakopoulou, 2017; Conny et al., 2024; Avci et al., 2025). Przymus (2024) specifically identifies the resemanticization of existing words as part of adolescent linguistic creativity and the formation of social relationships. This literature establishes the importance of context in the social interpretation of swearing but has not specifically connected the resemanticization of Makassar students' local swear-word repertoire with its social functions and limits of acceptance among peers, families, schools, and digital communication.

The novelty of this study lies in its use of resemanticization to explain changes in the social meaning of existing words through changes in pragmatic function within particular speech events. This conceptualization is consistent with the resemanticization of existing words in adolescent linguistic practices (Przymus, 2024), while the characteristics of taboo language indicate that offensive meanings may remain recognizable even when contextual functions change (Allan & Burridge, 2006; Goddard, 2015). Resemanticization in this study therefore does not refer to the disappearance of lexical meaning and is not treated as synonymous with pragmatic refunctioning. A change in pragmatic function becomes part of resemanticization when its use also produces a change in social meaning within a particular relationship and

context. The analysis considers lexical choices, triggers, targets, relationships between speakers, interactional situations, purposes, recipient responses, and consequences of the utterance. Based on this framework, the study examines students' local swear-word repertoire, its contexts of use, social functions, and limits of resemanticization in interactions among senior and vocational high school students in Makassar City, focusing on emotion and affect, solidarity and social identity, complaints containing elements of resistance to authority, and normative ambivalence.

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach with a case study strategy to examine the use and interpretation of swear words in interactions among senior and vocational high school students in Makassar City. The study covered swearing in peer relations, family interactions, school settings, and digital communication. Twelve schools were selected from the population of all public and private senior and vocational high schools in Makassar City. The schools were selected through systematic random sampling by constructing a sampling frame, determining a sampling interval, establishing a random starting number, and selecting subsequent numbers according to the same interval ([Sugiyono, 2025](#)). This procedure resulted in seven public senior high schools, two private senior high schools, two public vocational high schools, and one private vocational high school, thereby providing variation in school settings.

One informant from each school was purposively selected based on active student status, experience using or receiving swear words, and willingness to provide information after receiving an explanation of the interview focus and identity protection. The 12 informants consisted of seven male and five female students, allowing linguistic experiences to be examined across variation in gender, school setting, and social relationships. Their identities were anonymized as Male Student-1 through Male Student-7 and Female Student-1 through Female Student-5, while school names were omitted from publication. Information was collected as part of a single research sequence consisting of an initial research phase from February to July 2025 and a follow-up research phase from January to March 2026. The follow-up phase expanded the range of informants and supplemented information obtained during the initial phase.

Primary data were collected through in-depth interviews, participant observation, and digital observation ([Spradley, 2016](#)). Questions addressed swear-word forms, triggers, targets, relationships between speakers, situations of use, purposes, responses, and consequences, while punctuation in quoted statements was adjusted for readability without altering the informants' words or intended meanings. Participant observation documented swearing in informal interactions by noting who was involved, the trigger, target, function, and response to the utterance. Digital observation conducted through the authors' social media accounts covered texts,

captions, comments, videos, emojis, stickers, audience characteristics, and recorded responses, while account names, photographs, school names, and identifying markers were omitted. Secondary data consisted of foundational books, a dissertation, and journal articles used as conceptual foundations, empirical comparisons, and sources of academic dialogue with the findings.

Analysis was conducted throughout the data collection process through repeated readings of interview transcripts, participant-observation notes, and digital-observation documents. Each unit of information was coded according to the swear-word form, trigger, target, relationship between speakers, situation of use, purpose, recipient response, and consequences of the utterance. Comparisons across informants and data-collection techniques were used to identify similarities, differences, and changes in function (Braun & Clarke, 2021). The coding results were then organized into four analytical themes: emotion and affect, solidarity and social identity, complaints containing elements of resistance to authority, and normative ambivalence. Interpretation employed a critical sociolinguistic approach, with Kroskrity's language ideology and Bourdieu's symbolic power as the principal analytical foundations. Butler's perspective was used to analyze the continuity of utterance force, while Scott's framework was applied to complaints and critique directed toward persons in positions of authority.

Interpretive validity was examined by comparing data sources and collection techniques (Miles et al., 2014). Statements from one informant were compared with those of other informants, participant-observation notes, and digital-observation documents to assess consistency in forms, contexts, functions, and responses to utterances. Differences were retained as part of the variation in experience so that the determination of a swear word's function did not depend solely on the lexical item used. The authors' familiarity with the local linguistic context facilitated recognition of local expressions and interactional circumstances, while interpretations of meaning and function were grounded in the relationship among transcripts, triggers, targets, situations, purposes, responses, consequences of utterances, and observational findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Swear Words as Expressions of Emotion and Affect

Swearing forms part of everyday emotional expression in interactions among senior and vocational high school students in Makassar City. Swear words occur when students experience stress, fatigue, defeat, annoyance, anger, or spontaneous situations requiring brief responses; on other occasions, the same word is used to intensify joking and increase emotional involvement among friends. Participant observation documented that swearing in informal conversation was often followed by laughter or reciprocal swearing, although it could also offend in other

circumstances. Its emotional function therefore depends on the situation, target, relationship between speakers, and how the utterance is received. Syaiful and Zainuddin (2020) likewise found that swear words used by students in Makassar acquire connotative meanings according to context. This shift in function is evident in Female Student-3's use of *telaso*¹ when responding to a friend's joke:

"When a friend suddenly starts joking loudly or acting up, I immediately say, 'Hey, telaso!' But I'm not angry. I just say it to make things more fun."

In this utterance, *telaso* is not used to attack the friend but to heighten the intensity of the joke. The friendship allows the swear word to be understood as an intensifier of the playful atmosphere, strengthening involvement between friends. Meidariani et al. (2025) identified the use of swear words to express annoyance, joking, and closeness in student interactions, while Goddard (2015) emphasizes relationships between speakers and community norms in shaping the functions of swearing. When a change in pragmatic function is accompanied by this form of social acceptance, the use of *telaso* demonstrates resemanticization even though it remains recognizable as a swear word. A different emotional function appears when swearing is used to release tension, as described by Male Student-2: *"when I'm stressed about assignments or tired, sometimes I spontaneously say sundala or tolo. It makes me feel a little relieved."*

The use of *sundala*² and *tolo*³ in this experience is associated with academic pressure and fatigue. Because neither is directed at a particular person, the swear words function as expressions of the tension being experienced, while the reported sense of relief demonstrates their function in spontaneous emotional release. Stapleton et al. (2022) distinguish expressions of personal emotion from the interpersonal functions of swearing, while Nova and Winarti (2024) show that swear words can serve as means of expressing emotion in digital communication. Among students in Makassar, academic pressure and fatigue trigger swearing as an expression directed at a situation rather than an attack on an individual.

A similar pattern with different triggers appears in Male Student-5's experience: *"when I lose a soccer game or my phone falls, I automatically say telaso. I'm not angry; it just comes out."* The exclamation is a spontaneous response to losing a game or dropping a mobile phone, with *telaso* functioning as a marker of an emotional reaction to an unpleasant event. The statement "I'm not angry" distinguishes this use from swearing intentionally directed at another person. This

¹*Telaso* is retained in this study as a lexically vulgar form. Syaiful and Zainuddin (2020) document *telaso* as a Makassar form derived from *tahi laso* and associated with excrement from the male genitalia.

²*Sundala* is a highly offensive swear word whose Indonesian meanings include "perempuan jalang" and "pelacur," roughly corresponding to a disreputable woman or a prostitute. Syaiful and Zainuddin (2020) associate *sundala* with *sundal*, while Putri et al. (2021) document *sundala* as an impolite word used by young people in Makassar.

³*Tolo* is a Makassar form meaning "stupid" in the context of this study. The original linguistic form is retained.

choice demonstrates students' pragmatic competence in using swear words to convey brief responses to particular situations. Love and Stenstrom (2023) show that swearing in adolescent conversation may perform expressive and idiomatic functions without necessarily constituting an attack, while Syaiful and Zainuddin (2020) demonstrate that students' use of *telaso* in Makassar acquires meaning according to the speech-event context.

Swearing also reveals a gendered distribution of expressive freedom. Interviews and observations show that male students have greater social latitude to swear openly than female students, while female students more often adjust their use according to social closeness, situation, and audience. This tendency is evident in Male Student-7's statement: *"boys usually swear more because it seems like it's not a problem. But when girls do it, sometimes even other girls say they're being rude."*

Male Student-7's account reinforces the finding that male students receive greater social tolerance for swearing, whereas female students are more readily judged as rude for using the same words. This difference shows that emotional expression through language remains subject to social norms that regulate appropriateness according to gender. Bourdieu (1991) explains that linguistic practices acquire value according to social position and prevailing forms of legitimacy, while Mohammadpour (2024) identifies relationships among gender, the emotional intensity of language, interactional situations, and swear-word choice in multilingual communities. In the Makassar student context, gender therefore contributes to the degree of social latitude associated with swearing.

This difference becomes clearer in the way female students use swear words in particular emotional circumstances, as described by Female Student-1: *"I use ka'bulamma when my friend starts insulting my parents. It means I'm angry, but I only say it when I'm really offended."* An insult directed at the speaker's parents becomes the trigger that marks an interpersonal boundary and prompts the use of *ka'bulamma*⁴. The swear word intensifies anger and signals that the friend's conduct has crossed an acceptable boundary. Putri et al. (2021) also document this expression in interactions among young people in Makassar, while the language-ideological perspective connects evaluations of utterances with social values recognized within the community (Kroskrity, 2000). Respect for parents therefore forms part of the context that determines when a swear word is used to reinforce an interpersonal boundary.

In addition to triggers and relational boundaries, the function of swearing depends on the alignment between the speaker's purpose and the way a friend

⁴Ka'bulamma is used in the interview data as a swear word contextually meaning "kurang ajar," approximately "insolent" or "disrespectful." Putri et al. (2021) also document ka'bulamma as an impolite expression in interactions among young people in Makassar.

interprets the utterance, as illustrated by Female Student-2: *"I once said telaso to a friend when I was annoyed. She got offended because she thought I was really angry."* This experience demonstrates that the social function of swearing is not determined by the speaker's intention alone. *Telaso*, which may function as joking in one relationship, becomes offensive when a friend interprets it as genuine anger. Stapleton et al. (2022) show that swearing can produce different emotional and interpersonal consequences, while Dewipayani et al. (2017) identify diverse forms and functions of swearing in adolescent interaction. Pragmatic competence therefore involves not only the ability to produce an utterance but also the ability to interpret social relationships and the responses of those who receive it.

Overall, this subsection demonstrates the relationship among lexical meaning, pragmatic function, and social meaning. Pragmatic function is shaped by triggers, targets, relationships, situations, and purposes, while social meaning can be identified through acceptance, reciprocal responses, laughter, or offense. Resemanticization occurs when a change in pragmatic function is accompanied by a change in the social meaning of the swear word being used. Swear words may function as emotional release, spontaneous responses, or intensifiers of joking without losing the characteristics that make them recognizable as swear words. Students' ability to assign different functions to the same word demonstrates their command of the pragmatic norms governing everyday interaction.

B. Swear Words as Markers of Solidarity and Social Identity

Swear words also form part of a linguistic repertoire that marks closeness, group membership, and social identity. Solidarity emerges when friends recognize the word being used, understand the purpose of the utterance, and respond in ways that demonstrate acceptance. Participant observation documented exchanges of swear words followed by laughter or equivalent responses in informal conversations, allowing a word regarded as offensive in other situations to function as a code of shared belonging. In such relationships, knowledge of when, toward whom, and how the word may be used becomes part of the group's shared understanding. This relationship is evident in Male Student-7's statement: *"when I call my friend sundala, it means we're already close. Usually my friend swears back at me with the same word."*

The reciprocal use of *sundala* demonstrates that the swear word can function as a marker of solidarity when used among friends who already share an understanding of its function. Reciprocal swearing becomes part of the group's communicative style while simultaneously marking social closeness. Putri et al. (2021) found the use of impolite words in close relationships among young people in Makassar, while Stapleton et al. (2022) demonstrate that swearing can contribute to the management of interpersonal relationships. In this situation, resemanticization does not remove *sundala* from the category of swear words

but gives it a social meaning associated with closeness. The limits of this function become clearer when peer acceptance is compared with family and school norms, as reflected in Female Student-4's statement:

"My friends usually think it's normal and even swear back, but it's just joking. But if it involves a teacher, I'd definitely get scolded, and especially by my mother. She would scold me really badly. That's why I don't swear very often at home."

Acceptance and reciprocal responses among friends indicate informal rules that allow swearing to function as joking within peer groups. The same words are evaluated differently in relationships with teachers or parents, making social closeness and social position important determinants of language choice. [Kroskrity \(2000\)](#) explains that language ideology connects linguistic choices with values recognized by a group, while [Mahayana et al. \(2025\)](#) show that relationships between speakers and social contexts affect evaluations of taboo language. Solidarity through swearing therefore depends on who is interacting, the nature of their relationship, and the norms governing that relationship.

Beyond marking interpersonal closeness, local swear words also acquire value as expressions of social identity and belonging, as stated by Male Student-2: *"when we speak using Makassar swear words, it feels more authentic. It makes us feel proud of our own language."* The expressions "more authentic" and "our own language" demonstrate a relationship between language choice and recognition of local identity. Local swear words function not only in interpersonal relationships but also as markers of affiliation with a group that recognizes both the words and their social value. [Bourdieu \(1991\)](#) explains that language choices acquire symbolic value through social recognition, while [Khairul et al. \(2024\)](#) demonstrate relationships between local cultural practices, solidarity, and collective pride. [Syaiful and Zainuddin \(2020\)](#) provide a more direct comparison because their study also addresses swearing among students in Makassar. In the present study, symbolic value emerges when the local repertoire is associated with authenticity, pride, and a sense of belonging to a group's linguistic style.

The relationship between identity and social closeness is also apparent when swear words are used as forms of address, as experienced by Male Student-3: *"when I call my friend sundala, they just laugh. That means we're already close."* Laughter, acknowledged closeness, and the use of the swear word as a form of address constitute a single speech event in which *sundala* is accepted within the friendship. [Meidariani et al. \(2025\)](#) identified joking and closeness as functions of student swearing, while [Dewipayani et al. \(2017\)](#) demonstrate the interpersonal functions of swear words in adolescent relationships. Reciprocal responses and laughter in close relationships create a shared understanding of when a swear word is insulting and when the same word forms part of familiar communication. Solidarity is therefore not automatically embedded in the word itself but develops

through social relationships and shared knowledge within the group. These informal rules are expressed more explicitly by Male Student-5: *"guys usually swear at each other, but everyone knows it's just our way of talking. The important thing is not to take it personally."*

Male Student-5's statement shows that reciprocal swearing among male students can be understood as a communicative style when friends share an understanding of its purpose and limits. Offensive words may reinforce closeness because the speakers understand that the utterances are not intended as personal insults. This informal norm reinforces the finding that male students have greater social latitude to swear openly. Nevertheless, the solidarity function still depends on how an utterance is received because differences in interpretation can turn joking into offense. Solidarity is therefore constructed through a shared understanding of how an utterance functions within the group.

Greater selectivity based on closeness and on who is present in the interaction is apparent in Female Student-1's statement: *"I usually only swear when I'm with female friends I'm really close to. If there are a lot of people around, I don't feel comfortable doing it."* This choice demonstrates that female students adjust their use of swear words according to the degree of closeness and the people involved in the conversation. Close friends provide a more permissive situation, while a larger group encourages greater caution. [Laitinen et al. \(2025\)](#) show that swearing is associated with social network structure and interactional purposes. Among students in Makassar, closeness interacts with the interlocutor's identity and the conversational situation in determining the degree of latitude for swearing. This distinction also demonstrates that gendered limits on swearing are related to interactional norms rather than merely individual preferences. The relationship between closeness and linguistic style is also described by Male Student-1 when comparing coarse and overly refined language:

"When we use rough language, it doesn't mean we're being impolite. It's to make things feel closer. If the language is too polite, it feels like we're strangers."

The expression "it feels like we're strangers" demonstrates that linguistic style is associated with group identification. Language regarded as overly formal or refined may create social distance, whereas a style that includes swearing can produce a sense of equality and closeness. [Bourdieu \(1991\)](#) conceptualizes linguistic competence as the ability to use linguistic choices that carry value within particular social contexts. In peer relationships, such competence is reflected in knowing when swearing is acceptable, toward whom it can be directed, and how reciprocal responses should be interpreted. Linguistic style therefore contributes to the construction of closeness and social position within the group. This dimension of self-recognition and equality is also evident in Male Student-6's statement:

"If we keep using formal language, it feels like we're not being ourselves. Sometimes swearing makes us feel braver and more 'equal' with our friends."

This statement shows that language choice forms part of how students recognize themselves within a group. Swearing reduces interpersonal distance and produces a sense of equality with peers, making willingness to use certain words related to acceptance of the group's communicative style. [Eckert \(2000\)](#) explains that linguistic variation acquires meaning through social practice and the formation of style within a community. In peer relationships, swearing therefore becomes one linguistic resource through which students construct recognizable social identities.

Observational findings also reveal variation according to school prestige. Students attending schools with higher social prestige tend to exercise greater caution when swearing, particularly in formal situations and open digital communication, although swearing continues in private conversations or friendship groups. This caution reflects attention to social evaluation and to the image maintained within the school environment. [Bourdieu \(1991\)](#) explains that language choices acquire different values according to the social field and forms of legitimacy operating within it. Differences across school settings therefore reveal relationships among prestige, social-image management, and language choice. Swearing does not occur outside social structures but is adjusted to the speaker's position and the situation in which interaction occurs.

In digital communication, swear words appear in texts, captions, comments, videos, emojis, stickers, and other visual elements. Their use becomes part of identity presentation and social relationships that are no longer dependent on face-to-face interaction but remain influenced by audience characteristics and modes of communication. [Conny et al. \(2024\)](#) show that slang, nonstandard spelling, and visual elements form part of Generation Z's digital identity practices, while [Madani et al. \(2025\)](#) connect changing language use in Instagram interactions with solidarity and identity. [Georgakopoulou \(2017\)](#) identifies media affordances and audience characteristics as important dimensions of experience presentation, while [Avcı et al. \(2025\)](#) emphasize the importance of the quality of digital activities in adolescent identity development. In this study, digital communication extends the contexts in which local swear words are used to express humor, closeness, frustration, and social identity.

Overall, solidarity through swearing is constructed through close relationships, shared knowledge, acceptance, and command of rules governing its use. Social identity becomes visible when language choices acquire value as markers of authenticity, belonging, courage, and group equality. Gender and school prestige also shape the degree of latitude in swearing: male students have

greater social space to swear openly, whereas female students are more selective according to closeness and situation. Students attending prestigious schools also demonstrate stronger self-regulation in formal situations and open digital communication. These variations confirm that the resemanticization of swear words occurs through social practices associated with identity, speaker position, interpersonal relationships, and contexts of use.

C. Swear Words in Complaints Containing Elements of Resistance to Authority

Within the school setting, swear words are used not only to express emotion or reinforce solidarity but also to communicate dissatisfaction with persons in positions of authority. Elements of resistance arise when swearing concerns an action or person occupying an authoritative position and is used to object to circumstances experienced by students. This function appears primarily in peer conversations in which students express evaluations that differ from the formal language used when interacting directly with teachers. Differences between the way students speak to friends and the way they speak to persons in positions of authority demonstrate their ability to adjust language according to social hierarchy. This pattern is evident in Male Student-4's account of assignments given by a teacher:

"Sometimes when the teacher gives us too many assignments, we say behind the teacher's back, 'Anjir, more assignments again.' But we never say it directly to the teacher."

Male Student-4's utterance has a clear target: the teacher's action of assigning what students regard as an excessive amount of work. The phrase "behind the teacher's back" indicates that the objection is expressed to peers rather than directly to the teacher, making the swear word part of a covert complaint about the exercise of authority. [Scott \(1990\)](#) describes hidden transcripts as discourse that develops outside direct interaction with those who hold power. In this event, *anjir*⁵ marks annoyance while accompanying an evaluation of the teacher's decision. The element of resistance arises because students form their own evaluation of the exercise of authority and express it within peer relations rather than through formal classroom communication. A similar evaluative pattern emerges when the target shifts from a teacher's action to the teacher as an authority figure, as described by Male Student-1:

"When a teacher is really fussy or stingy, sometimes behind their back we say, 'Sundala,' or 'That teacher is sialak.' But of course we would never say it directly in front of the teacher."

Male Student-1's account shows a distinction between the language students use in a teacher's presence and the language used among friends. *Sundala* and

⁵Anjir is a modified form associated with anjing (dog) and is also documented by [Syaiful and Zainuddin \(2020\)](#) in swearing among students in Makassar.

*sialak*⁶ operate as negative evaluations of an authority figure while also providing a means of expressing annoyance arising from interaction with the teacher. Kroskrity (2000) explains that language choices carry values and positions associated with group ideologies, while Bourdieu (1991) demonstrates that linguistic relationships are connected with distributions of legitimacy and social position. These contrasting language choices reflect students' ability to regulate expression according to power relations. Within peer relationships, swearing provides a means of articulating evaluations that are not expressed directly to the teacher. The protest element becomes clearer when an objection is directed toward a particular exercise of authority, as shown in Female Student-5's statement:

"Sometimes my friends say telaso or bangke when the teacher suddenly tells us to gather while we're on break. It's kind of like a form of protest, actually."

The teacher's instruction to gather during the break becomes the object of the objection. The expression "kind of like a form of protest" indicates that the use of the swear words *telaso* or *bangke*⁷ is understood as verbal protest against an instruction that disrupts the students' break, while the teacher's position as the person issuing the instruction situates the utterance within a relationship between students and an authority figure. Swearing provides a brief and informal means of communicating objection without formal argumentation. This experience demonstrates that elements of resistance can emerge in everyday linguistic practices when students express disagreement with the exercise of authority. Power relations can therefore be articulated through evaluation and verbal protest without necessarily taking the form of overt opposition.

Comparison with social critique in the *kabhanti modero* tradition further clarifies the character of swearing as a means of expressing objection. Fetni et al. (2026) show that social critique in this tradition has media and conventions recognized by the community, whereas student swearing emerges more situationally in everyday interaction. Their similarity lies in the use of language to communicate evaluations or objections indirectly, while their difference concerns the structure of the social practice and the degree of conventionalization. This comparison situates students' complaints within a broader academic dialogue without equating them with an institutionalized mechanism of social critique. The resistant function of swearing can therefore be understood through its target, the substance of the objection, the mode of expression, and its social context.

Relationships with authority also show that students do not use the same language in every situation. In formal interactions, language choice follows norms

⁶*Sialak* is an expletive associated with *sial*, which lexically refers to being unlucky or experiencing bad luck and may function as a swear word depending on context.

⁷*Bangke* was documented as a swear word in the interviews and is formally associated with the Indonesian word *bangkai*, meaning "carcass."

of politeness and the teacher's position, whereas peer relationships provide greater latitude for using an informal repertoire when evaluating school experiences. This distinction reveals two linguistic domains operating simultaneously. Formal language carries institutional legitimacy, while swearing among peers creates space for evaluations that are not necessarily communicated to teachers. [Kroskrity \(2000\)](#) explains that this situation reflects the relationship among language choice, group values, and the speaker's social position. [Bourdieu \(1991\)](#) further explains how the distribution of authority shapes the possibilities for using particular linguistic styles within the social field of the school.

The resistant function of swearing is also associated with group recognition. Complaints about teachers are often expressed among friends who experience or understand the same situation, allowing swear words to condense annoyance into expressions readily recognized by the group. Expressive and resistant functions can operate simultaneously because an utterance communicates emotion while also evaluating the actions of a person in a position of authority. [Goddard \(2015\)](#) emphasizes the importance of targets and context in determining the functions of swearing, while [Stapleton et al. \(2022\)](#) show connections between emotional and interpersonal functions. [Pamungkas et al. \(2023\)](#) likewise emphasize context in distinguishing the functions of offensive language according to its target and circumstances of use. Among students in Makassar, resistant functions emerge from the relationship among experiences of dissatisfaction, the target of authority, and the social space in which objections are expressed.

Overall, this subsection identifies several forms of complaint containing elements of resistance to authority. Complaints concerning excessive assignments position a teacher's action as the object of objection, negative evaluations of teachers articulate assessments of figures occupying higher positions, and protest against an instruction to gather during break establishes a direct relationship between swearing and the exercise of authority. These three patterns demonstrate that swearing can form part of informal critique of authority without being expressed through formal argumentation. Students adjust their language choices to the status of the people they encounter and to interactional situations while retaining space to express evaluations of their own experiences. The resistant function therefore forms part of students' pragmatic capacity to interpret power relations and position utterances appropriately within social contexts.

D. Swear Words in Normative Ambivalence

Swearing occurs in several contexts governed by different standards of appropriateness. A word accepted as joking among peers may be evaluated negatively within the family or school, while students continue to use it because they understand that its function and reception change according to social relationships. This condition demonstrates normative ambivalence, understood

as the coexistence of several orientations toward linguistic evaluation that are not always consistent with one another but are nevertheless recognized by students. Normative ambivalence does not indicate moral inconsistency; rather, it follows from students' movement among social relationships governed by different rules and structures of authority. Allan and Burridge (2006) demonstrate that taboo language remains connected to social norms even as its functions change. Differences between family and friendship contexts are illustrated by Female Student-3: *"at home, I never say sundala or anjing. My mother would get angry. But with friends, especially close friends, it's not a problem."*

Female Student-3's experience demonstrates an ability to adjust language choice according to the people involved in the interaction. *Sundala* and *anjing*⁸ may be used with close friends but are avoided at home because the speaker recognizes different family norms. Kroskrity (2000) explains that language ideology is associated with values and beliefs that regulate how linguistic choices are evaluated, while Mahayana et al. (2025) identify differences in evaluations of taboo language according to social context. Among students in Makassar, movement between the home and peer group is accompanied by changes in rules of use without eliminating awareness of the character of swear words. This ability to adjust usage demonstrates that students actively interpret the norms governing each social relationship.

Such ambivalence also emerges at the individual level when speakers retrospectively evaluate their own utterances, as Female Student-4 explained: *"sometimes after I swear, I feel guilty too, especially when I'm emotional and say it in front of a lot of people."* The feeling of guilt shows that norms of politeness remain part of the speaker's evaluation even though swearing forms part of everyday communication. Students may accept swearing in particular relationships while judging its use as inappropriate when emotions intensify or when an utterance is produced before a larger audience. Goddard (2015) and Stapleton et al. (2022) show that the consequences of swearing are influenced by context, relationships, and emotional circumstances. Female Student-4's reflection demonstrates that familiarity with swearing does not entail rejection of politeness but instead involves the ability to reassess appropriateness after an utterance has been produced. At the individual level, normative ambivalence therefore appears in evaluations of the fit between language choice and interactional situation. Differences in norms become visible again when peer acceptance of swearing encounters linguistic regulation at school, as described by Male Student-1:

"If we get caught saying anjing or sundala in class, we can be called to the guidance and counseling office right away. Even though sometimes we're just joking with friends."

⁸*Anjing* lexically means "dog." In this study, the original linguistic form is retained in informants' utterances and may function as an insulting expression depending on context.

This statement illustrates the difference between interpreting an utterance as joking among peers and evaluating the use of swearing within the school. Among friends, the same word may function as a marker of closeness, whereas its use in the classroom encounters institutional norms that treat politeness as a standard of communicative behavior. Bourdieu (1991) explains that the value of a language choice depends on social context and on those who possess the legitimacy to evaluate it. Students therefore adjust their language choices to the rules governing different relationships. Normative ambivalence emerges when peer interpretations of an utterance do not fully coincide with the evaluations applied within the school.

The school setting also influences the degree of caution students exercise when swearing. Observations show that students attending schools with higher social prestige are more cautious about displaying swear words openly, particularly in formal situations and digital communication accessible to broader audiences. Swearing continues within private groups, but speakers are more selective about when they use it and who is involved. This pattern reveals a relationship among school prestige, social-image management, and language choice. Bourdieu (1991) associates such caution with differences in the symbolic value assigned to linguistic choices within particular social fields. The stronger the expectation to maintain image and appropriateness, the more carefully students regulate a linguistic repertoire that may be evaluated as offensive.

Digital communication expands the contexts in which swear words acquire social meaning. One post by Male Student-3 stated: “*sundala, my work is all messed up, kacauka⁹!*” The post was accompanied by a skull emoji and a laughing sticker, allowing the combination of verbal and visual elements to frame *sundala* as an expression of frustration accompanied by humor. The swear word is directed not at a person but at the speaker’s situation and forms part of the way the experience is presented. Conny et al. (2024) show that nonstandard spelling and visual elements form part of Generation Z’s digital communication, while Love and Stenstrom (2023) describe expressive functions of swearing that do not necessarily involve attacks. Nova and Winarti (2024) likewise document the use of swear words to express anger and frustration on social media, while Pamungkas et al. (2023) identify target and context as important elements in determining the function of offensive language. The combination of swearing, emojis, and stickers in this post demonstrates how digital presentation can support changes in pragmatic function and social meaning.

⁹*Kacauka* is retained in the form documented during digital observation and indicates that the informant’s work was in a disordered or problematic state.

Observation also documented *suntili*¹⁰ and *sialaki*¹¹ as variants within students' swear-word repertoire. Their occurrence demonstrates linguistic creativity through the development of variants recognizable within the group. Repetition and shared recognition enable a form to acquire social functions because group members understand its relationship to an existing repertoire. Butler (2021) explains the continuity of utterance force through repetition and social recognition. Among students in Makassar, this process demonstrates that the swear-word repertoire is not fixed but develops through use and recognition within the community. Word formation expands the linguistic repertoire, while resemanticization remains determined by changes in social meaning when those words are used in particular contexts.

Normative ambivalence is also connected with broader social values. Rusman et al. (2023) and Bustan and Jumadi (2024) provide a context for the continuity of local values within Bugis-Makassar society, while Khairul et al. (2024) demonstrate that cultural practices may be preserved while simultaneously adapting to social change. This context helps situate students' linguistic practices within social life that brings together local values, school-based peer relations, family relationships, and digital communication. Students adjust their language choices as they move across these contexts without positioning cultural values as a direct cause of swearing. Appropriateness and identity are therefore continually reevaluated according to the interactional situation.

The four analytical themes demonstrate that the functions of swearing are interconnected within students' social practices. Emotional expression may develop into a marker of solidarity when accepted and repeated in close relationships, while solidarity becomes connected with identity when local swear words acquire value as expressions of belonging, authenticity, and equality. Swear words may also form part of complaints containing elements of resistance when directed toward actions or persons associated with authority. All of these functions intersect with different norms among peer groups, families, schools, and digital communication. Resemanticization therefore occurs when changes in pragmatic function produce changes in social meaning according to relationships between speakers, purposes, contexts, reception, and consequences of utterances. Offensive meaning remains recognizable, but social function adjusts to situations and to the rules understood by speakers.

¹⁰In the observational records, *suntili* is directly associated with the expression *sundala tiga kali* (*sundala* three times) and carries a stronger degree of insult than *sundala*.

¹¹In the observational records, *sialaki* retains the element *sial* together with a local speech element. Its degree of offensiveness depends on the context of use.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Swearing in interactions among senior and vocational high school students in Makassar City demonstrates close relationships among language, emotion, solidarity, identity, authority, and social norms. The documented repertoire includes *telaso*, *sundala*, *tolo*, *ka'bulamma*, *sialak*, *suntili*, and *sialaki*, as well as forms such as *anjir*, *bangke*, and *anjing*. Swear words are used to release tension, express spontaneous reactions, intensify joking, reinforce interpersonal boundaries, build closeness, and articulate group identity. Male students have greater social latitude to swear openly, whereas female students are more selective according to closeness, situation, and audience. Greater caution is also evident among students attending schools with higher social prestige, particularly in formal situations and open digital communication. These findings confirm that swearing is a linguistic practice managed according to social relationships, speaker positions, and the rules operating within particular contexts.

Swear words also function as a means of communicating complaints containing elements of resistance to authority. Complaints about assignments, negative evaluations of teachers, and protests against a teacher's instruction during break demonstrate that students use informal language to evaluate authority figures or the exercise of authority. Within peer relations, such complaints may form part of hidden transcripts that create space for evaluations differing from formal communication with teachers. At the same time, peer acceptance of swearing does not eliminate norms operating within families and schools. This normative ambivalence demonstrates students' ability to adjust language according to interlocutors, situations, purposes, and possible social evaluations. Resemanticization occurs when changes in pragmatic function generate changes in the social meaning of existing words without eliminating their offensive lexical meanings.

The limitations of this study concern its scope of 12 informants in Makassar City and its qualitative use of participant and digital observation. This composition provides interpretive depth regarding swearing practices but was not designed to produce statistical measures of usage frequency across the entire student population. Findings concerning gender and school prestige indicate social patterns identified during the research and may be further examined through studies involving greater variation in informants, school settings, and geographic locations. Digital observation also opens opportunities for further research on relationships among content creators' purposes, audience composition, modes of presentation, and recipient responses. Future studies on authority may further examine distinctions among complaints, verbal protest, elements of resistance, and symbolic resistance by observing naturally occurring interactions.

At the practical level, schools and families are advised to evaluate swearing according to its target, relationships between speakers, purpose, recipient response,

and consequences of the utterance. A contextual approach does not diminish the importance of politeness but allows distinctions to be drawn among accepted joking, nontargeted emotional release, complaints about particular actions, and utterances that demean others. Schools may develop language education that connects politeness with an understanding of speech events through dialogue between students and educators and clarification of context before determining appropriate guidance measures. Such an approach can help students understand that linguistic competence involves not only knowing which words may or may not be used but also understanding social relationships, other people's responses, and the consequences of language use. The effectiveness of such guidance models may become a separate object of study in the development of communication policies within educational settings.

REFERENCES

- Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511617881>
- Avci, H., Baams, L., & Kretschmer, T. (2025). A Systematic Review of Social Media Use and Adolescent Identity Development. *Adolescent Research Review*, 10(2), 219-236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-024-00251-1>
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power* (Trans. by G. Raymond & M. Adamson). Harvard University Press. <https://hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674510418>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One Size Fits All? What Counts as Quality Practice in (Reflexive) Thematic Analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328-352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Bustan, B., & Jumadi, J. (2024). Reaktualisasi Siri' sebagai Pembelajaran Nilai Pada Kepemimpinan Masyarakat Bugis-Makassar. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, 4(3), 1100-1110. <https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i3.10588>
- Butler, J. (2021). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. Routledge. <https://routledge.com/9780367705244>
- Conny, C., Yultisa, N., Sagala, R. W., & Rezeki, T. I. (2024). Linguistic Shift among Gen Z in Computer-Mediated Communication. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 12(3), 959-970. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v12i3.10414>
- Dewipayani, N. P. A. S., Suarnajaya, I. W., & Suprianti, G. A. P. (2017). The Analysis of Swear Words Used by the Teenagers in Nusa Penida. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, 5(2), 1-11. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/jpbi/article/view/15254>
- Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*. Blackwell Publishers. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=0oWsbvHxFJoC>

- Fetni, F., Fait, T., Mardiana, M., & Ashari, S. (2026). Social Critique within the Kabhanti Modero Tradition: An Interactional Development Communication Model among the Muna Indigenous Community. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 6(2), 510-525. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v6i2.685>
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2017). Sharing the Moment as Small Stories: The Interplay between Practices and Affordances in the Social Media-Curation of Lives. *Narrative Inquiry*, 27(2), 311-333. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.27.2.06geo>
- Goddard, C. (2015). "Swear Words" and "Curse Words" in Australian (and American) English: At the Crossroads of Pragmatics, Semantics and Sociolinguistics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 12(2), 189-218. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2015-0010>
- Idrus, N. I. (2003). *'To Take Each Other': Bugis Practices of Gender, Sexuality and Marriage* [Doctoral Dissertation, Australian National University]. Open Research Repository. <https://doi.org/10.25911/5d7a29d454fa3>
- Khairul, M., Junaidi, M., Ariyani, R., & Hapsa, H. (2024). Preserving and Adapting the Mappadendang Ritual by the Bugis Ethnicity in the Kaili Indigenous People's Area. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 4(2), 114-126. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v4i2.337>
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2000). Regimenting Languages: Language Ideological Perspectives. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities* (pp. 1-34). School of American Research Press. <https://sarpress.org/regimes-of-language>
- Laitinen, M., Rautioaho, P., Fatemi, M., & Halonen, M. (2025). Do We Swear More with Friends or with Acquaintances? F#ck in Social Networks. *Lingua*, 320, 103931. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2025.103931>
- Love, R., & Stenstrom, A. B. (2023). Corpus-Pragmatic Perspectives on the Contemporary Weakening of Fuck: The Case of Teenage British English Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 216, 167-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.08.008>
- Madani, N. F., Hafisya, S. R., & Halik, A. (2025). The Use of Slang among Teenagers in Interactions on Instagram Social Media: A Semantic Analysis. *The Future of Education Journal*, 4(5), 1418-1426. <https://doi.org/10.61445/tofedu.v4i5.592>
- Mahayana, I. M. A., Netra, I. M., Simpen, I. W., & Sosiowati, I. G. A. G. (2025). A Sociopragmatic Comparison of Taboo Words Use in Tenganan Pegringsingan and Denpasar. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 11(3), 661-670. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ypt9zb20>
- Meidariani, N. W., Widiastika, I. W. W. C., & Nurita, W. (2025). Umpatan dalam Bahasa Pergaulan Siswa SMA di Denpasar. *Alinea: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajaran*, 5(3), 2053-2064. <https://doi.org/10.58218/alinea.v5i3.2613>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (Third Edition). Sage. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=p0wXBAAAQBAJ>

- Mohammadpour, K. (2024). Language Choice in Expressing Swear Words among Multilinguals in an Iranian Azari-Speaking City. *Argumentum*, 20, 464-478. <https://doi.org/10.34103/argumentum/2024/28>
- Nova, I. F., & Winarti, D. (2024). Ungkapan Marah dalam Komunitas Marah-Marah di Media Sosial X (Kajian Sosio-Pragmatik). *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 7(4), 749-760. <https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v7i4.1124>
- Pamungkas, E. W., Basile, V., & Patti, V. (2023). Investigating the Role of Swear Words in Abusive Language Detection Tasks. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 57(1), 155-188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-022-09582-8>
- Przymus, S. D. (2024). Semiotically Deconstructing Parental and Adolescent Failed Communication: It's Not What They're Saying, It's Their Words. *American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 9(2), 98-104. <https://doi.org/10.55284/ajssh.v9i2.1214>
- Putri, S., Syurganda, A., & Halim, N. M. (2021). An Analysis of Impolite Words among Makassarese Youngsters. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, 8(1), 145-154. <https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v8i1.1533>
- Rusman, R., Junaidi, M., Hidayat, R., Badollahi, M. Z., & Hapsa, H. (2023). Cultural Heritage and Social Adaptation: The Internalization of Paddisengeng Values by the Bugis-Bone Ethnicity in Masamba Village. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 4(1), 52-68. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v4i1.334>
- Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. Yale University Press. <https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300056693>
- Spradley, J. P. (2016). *Participant Observation*. Waveland Press. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=q7DlCwAAQBAJ>
- Stapleton, K., Fägersten, K. B., Stephens, R., & Loveday, C. (2022). The Power of Swearing: What We Know and What We Don't. *Lingua*, 277, 103406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2022.103406>
- Sugiyono. (2025). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D* (Edisi Kedua). Alfabeta. <https://cvalfabeta.com/product/metode-penelitian-kuantitatif-kualitatif>
- Syaiful, M., & Zainuddin, A. H. (2020). Syatiimah (Swear Words) among Young Learners: A Case Study of SMA Negeri 1 Makassar. *Jurnal Al-Dustur*, 3(2), 147-173. <https://doi.org/10.30863/jad.v3i2.856>