



Faculty Publications

---

2009-04-01

## Swearing In The Cinema: An analysis of profanity in US teen-oriented movies, 1980-2006

Dale Cressman  
cressman@byu.edu

Mark Callister  
mark\_callister@byu.edu

Tom Robinson  
tom\_robinson@byu.edu

Chris Near

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/facpub>



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

---

### BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Cressman, Dale; Callister, Mark; Robinson, Tom; and Near, Chris, "Swearing In The Cinema: An analysis of profanity in US teen-oriented movies, 1980-2006" (2009). *Faculty Publications*. 137.  
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/facpub/137>

This Peer-Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@byu.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@byu.edu), [ellen\\_amatangelo@byu.edu](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).

Running head: SWEARING IN THE CINEMA

Swearing in the Cinema: An Analysis of Profanity in Teen-Oriented Movies, 1980–2006

Dale Cressman

Mark Callister

Tom Robinson

Chris Near

Brigham Young University

Accepted for publication in *Journal of Children and Media*

Corresponding author:

Dale Cressman

Department of Communications

Brigham Young University

360 BRMB

Provo, UT 84602

cressman@byu.edu

### Abstract

The exposure of children to profanity continues to be a concern for parents, media researchers, and policy makers alike. This study examines the types, frequency, and usage of profanity in movies directed at and featuring teenagers. A review of relevant literature explores the nature, use, and psychology of profanity, its potential social effects, and its prevalence in the media. A content analysis of movie productions extending from the 1980s to the present shows no change in preferences in types of profanity used over the decades. Teen and adult characters use similar profanity types; however, teens are more likely to use the seven dirty words than adults, while adult characters use mild words. Male and female characters also differ in the use of profanity types and amount of profanity spoken. Finally, the amount of profanity in teen movies has actually decreased since the 1980s and within the ratings categories of PG and PG-13.

**KEYWORDS** content analysis; cultivation; demographic characteristics; family; film; profanity; race; social learning; social reality; swearing; viewing

#### Swearing in the Cinema: An Analysis of Profanity in Teen-Oriented Movies, 1980–2006

A recent poll suggests that Americans are using and hearing profanity more often than ever before. According to the Associated Press (2006), nearly three fourths of poll respondents reported that they hear profanity more often than in years past and some two thirds perceive that swearing has become more prevalent in society. As Hilliard and Keith (2007, p. 117) suggest, “We live in what is generally regarded as a crass culture,” and thus, must “expect that the media in that culture” be equally coarse. While profanity has existed throughout human history, it has recently lost much of its status as a taboo linguistic practice, “becoming more commonplace in everyday discourse as well as on network television” (Kay & Sapolsky, 2004a, p. 911). Fine and Johnson (1984) suggest that the antiwar movement in the 1960s and the women’s movement of the 1970s served as catalysts for changing attitudes toward the use of profanity. Yet, as Sapolsky and Kaye (2005) note, much of the blame for the increase in profanity has been directed at the mass media, with “Music, films, and television. . .[pushing] the boundaries of expletive use” (p. 293).

Jay’s (1992) content analysis of films made between 1939 and 1989 offers some support for this claim, reporting a significant increase in the use of profanity. More recently, Dufrene and Lehman (2002) reported a perception of increased use of profanity in the everyday lives of Americans and in Hollywood films and network television. Hollywood films have a deep influence on American culture, as they are not only shown in theaters but are seen by millions more on television and through video rentals (Waterman, 2005). Teenagers are among those most often exposed—they are a targeted audience segment for movie makers (Stern, 2005) because they comprise a significant and loyal portion of the movie-going public (Smith, 2005). For this

young, impressionable audience, the media serves an important socializing function (Arnett, 1995), and researchers report parental concern that children will adopt coarse language as a result of media exposure (Bushman & Cantor, 2003).

Such concern is supported in part by Cultivation theory, which suggests that heavy exposure to media messages will shape one's view of reality. George Gerbner and his colleagues (1986) see media sources as the dominant symbolic environment for many people. According to this theory, media messages have a significant impact in shaping or "cultivating" people's views of social reality. Cultivation theory is not concerned with the potential influence of a specific TV program or film, but of the patterns or aggregate messages to which groups or communities of viewers are exposed (Signorielli & Morgan, 2001). Applied to adolescents' long-term exposure to media messages, Cultivation theory would posit a cumulative and significant effect on perceptions.

The potential for teens to model coarse expressions from the media is explained in Bandura's (1977) Social Learning theory. Bandura (1994) notes that human learning is not acquired merely through direct experience, but through observational learning, which allows us to change our behavior and thoughts as a result of models we observe in the world around us, be they family, friends, or people viewed in the mass media. The symbolic environment of the media can potentially exercise a strong influence on adolescents' behaviors. Sociologists have also expressed concern that, with heavy exposure, coarse, violent, and sexualized media messages—including profanity, which is considered a form of verbal aggression--can desensitize media viewers (Griffiths & Shuckford, 1989; Martin, Anderson, & Cos, 1997). For young, impressionable viewers, this is especially true. The prevalence of profanity in the media and the

ease with which such utterances can be imitated can influence the likelihood of adolescents adopting such behavior.

This study examines the nature and strength of profanity in movies directed at a teenage audience. A review of relevant literature will explore the nature, use, and psychology of profanity, its potential social effects among teens, and its prevalence in the media. A content analysis of movie productions extending from the 1980s to the present will be conducted. Content analysis is a familiar method of research for studying media programming. Rather than focusing on causal relationships, content analysis is used to examine themes and the frequency of specific variables or categories. This is a central method for recognizing the prevalence, sources, and nature of profanity in teen movies.

### Literature Review

Research on profanity is not confined to the field of communication. Sociologists, psychologists, and pediatricians are among those contributing to the academic literature on the nature, use, and effects of profanity—both in the media and in everyday life. The following sections examine relevant research in these areas.

#### *Nature, Use, and Psychology of Profanity*

What Foote and Woodward (1973, p. 264) delicately characterize as “linguistic taboos” or prohibited “phonemic strings,” Jay (2000) refers to simply as “cursing.” Although Jay allows that the precise meaning of cursing is “wishing harm on a person” (p. 9), he uses the word to describe all types of objectionable words. Further, Jay provides categories of such words, including swearing, obscenity, profanity, blasphemy, name calling, insulting, verbal aggression, taboo

speech, ethnic-racial slurs, vulgarity, slang, and scatology. He also sets forth a theory for why people swear. The neuro-psycho-social (NPS) theory strives to consider neurological, psychological, and sociocultural aspects of human behavior in order to explain and predict how and why people swear. According to NPS, as cited in Jay, swearing is “never chaotic, meaningless, or random behavior,” but rather “purposeful and rule-governed” (p. 22).

Much of the psychological literature concerning profanity focuses on how males and females differ in their use and perception of profanity. Foote and Woodward (1973) found that men use profanity more than women and that all those who use such language claim to do so as a method of emotional release. Fine and Johnson (1984) cite anger as the top motivator for using profanity for both sexes. While males may use profanity with greater frequency, Bate and Bowker (1997) note that women are using course language more than ever before. In addition, use of profanity is mediated by the sex of the receiver in an interaction. For instance, profanity is more prevalent in same-sex interactions than in mixed-sex interactions (Jay, 1992). Additional research shows that profanity is less tolerated when spoken by children to parents or other authority figures and deemed less offensive when used among peers or friends who also use profanity (Mercury, 1996). Others have suggested that the offensiveness of profane words be judged more by the reactions they arouse than by the words themselves (Risch, 1987).

Cohen and Saine (1977) reported that males and females learn and use profanity in different ways. For instance, de Klerk (1991) found a relationship between expletives and social power associated with men. Similarly, Selnow (1985) reported that males were more likely to consider the use of profanity as a demonstration of social power. Males learn at an earlier age to

swear, while females perpetuate the stereotype that males swear more frequently. Females, meanwhile, judge negatively other females who swear.

### *Social Effects of Profanity*

Beyond the nature and use of profanity is the concern that exposure to profanity may carry negative effects. For instance, parents fear that repeated exposure to profanity can desensitize their children. The concern with desensitization is not peculiar to profanity. According to Jay (1992, p. 14), any word that is repeated will induce desensitization. Building on Social Learning theory (Bandura, 1977) and Cultivation theory (Condry, 1989), others have suggested that the desensitizing effects of profanity eventually lead to antisocial behavior. For example, Infante, Riddle, Horvath, and Tumlin (1992) tied verbal aggressiveness to aggressive—even destructive—behavior. Further, Griffiths and Shuckford (1989) found that exposure to profanity, either through media or in everyday life, leads to a dulling of emotional responses. In some cases, viewers did not even notice the use of profanity in certain television entertainment programs.

### *Profanity in Media*

As the American Academy of Pediatrics (2001) puts it, “Children and teenagers continue to be bombarded with sexual imagery and innuendoes in programming and advertising” (p. 423). While Hetsroni’s (2007) meta-analysis of 30 years of television content found that the frequency per hour of sexual content has, with a few exceptions, actually decreased in recent years, others have found a rise in offensive behaviors, such as profanity. Kay and Sapolsky (2004a), for example, found increased use of profanity on television, typically occurring during the 9–10 p.m.



hour and in situational comedies. In addition, they found that profanity was most often spoken by lead characters and directed at other characters, and was met with either neutral or positive reactions. The researchers also reported that profanity was seldom uttered by or directed at characters under the age of 21. Haygood (2007) examined movies that have been remade and reported an increase in profanity over its use in the original film.

In response to increases in objectionable media content and in an effort to ameliorate the effects of profanity, violence, and sexual content, such practices of “bleeping” out offensive words and creating rating systems for television and motion pictures have been implemented. A history of ratings systems for films can be found in Jowett (1990) and in Hilliard and Keith (2007), while those who have examined the content covered by movie ratings systems include Austin, Nicolich, and Simonet (1981); Bushman and Cantor (2003); Haygood (2007); Oliver and Kalyanaraman (2002); Thompson and Yokota (2004); Wilson and Linz (1990); Yang and Linz (1990); and Yokota and Thompson (2000). Many of the studies examine violence and sexual content in movies, including Thompson and Yokota (2004) and Leone and Houle (2006), who found evidence of “ratings creep,” or an escalation of sexual or violent material for PG-13 movies.

Although previous media research has examined profanity, much of the focus has been on prime-time TV (Kaye & Sapolsky, 2004; Kaye & Sapolsky, 2001; Kaye & Fishburne, 1997; Sapolsky & Kaye, 2005). Few studies have examined the prevalence of profanity in film. To date, no studies have examined profanity in teen targeted movies and possible trends over the decades. Examination of profanity in such films would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the media messages to which children are exposed and how those messages

may have changed over time. In addition, American films are watched globally, thus the implications of this research will have relevance beyond the U.S.

The following research questions and hypotheses will guide this study:

RQ<sub>1</sub>: How have the types of profanity in teen movies changed over the last three decades?

RQ<sub>2</sub>: Do adult and teenage movie characters differ in the types of profanity used?

RQ<sub>3</sub>: Do male and female characters differ in the types of profanity used?

H<sub>1</sub>: Profanity has increased over the last three decades in teen movies.

H<sub>2</sub>: Since the inception of the PG-13 rating, profanity has increased in both PG and PG-13 teen movies.

H<sub>3</sub>: Teen movies will contain more male profanity than female profanity across decade and movie rating.

### Methods

For this content analysis, the 90 top-grossing domestic teen films in the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s were selected (30 from each decade) based on domestic gross box-office amounts obtained from [www.boxofficemojo.com](http://www.boxofficemojo.com) (see appendix A). Box-office performance was used because it reflects a film's popularity and is a strong indicator of a film's subsequent distribution in non-theater venues, such as home rentals and downloads (Smith, 2003; Stern, 2005). A film was determined to be a "teen" film if it met the following criteria: (a) the storyline was centered on teens; (b) the film featured a teen (ages 12–17) as the central character; and (c) the film featured teens in major and minor roles.

The sample consists of the most popular films starring teen actors and created for a teen audience. Only G, PG, and PG-13 films were included in the sample because R-rated movies cannot be seen by teens without a parent or guardian and because they are primarily targeted toward older audiences. Moreover, young viewers are more inclined to model younger characters and personalities than older ones (Kaye & Sapolsky, 2004b). Sequels were also excluded. If a sequel contained teen characters, however, and the original movie did not, the sequel most representing teen storylines was included (for example, the first *Harry Potter* film was not used because the characters were not yet 12). Three different decades were chosen in order to obtain a more comprehensive view of the portrayal and representation of profanity longitudinally.

### *Coding Scheme*

Major and minor characters were both coded for profanity use. *Major* characters were defined as those central to the film through dialogue or action and whose presence affected the direction of the film's plot or subplots (Stern, 2005). *Minor* characters were defined as being central to a given scene through dialogue or action but whose presence had little or no bearing on the direction of the plot or subplots in the film. Within each movie, teens were coded for their use of profanity. Adult characters' use of profanity was coded as well, since current studies have shown that youth are commonly influenced not just by peers but also by adults. Adults may serve as heroic role models, no matter the age (Bandura, 1994). Character gender was also coded.

As noted earlier, objectionable words can be precisely defined and categorized. However, similar to Jay (1992), this study will use the word *profanity* to cover all categories of objectionable words. Profanity was categorized into five groups based on Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations as well as previous research conducted by

Kaye and Sapolsky (2004). The categories were broken down further into five groups, starting with the “seven dirty words” (categorized under the heading *seven dirty*) that the FCC deemed unspeakable on television. *Sexual words* were the second group and comprised words that describe sexual body parts or sexual behavior in coarse ways. *Excretory words* were defined as direct or literal references to human waste products and processes. Words that weren’t categorized as seven dirty, sexual, or excretory words were then categorized as either *mild* or *strong*, based on their level of offensiveness. *Mild other words* were compiled from various sources (Jay, 1992, as cited in Kaye & Sapolsky, 2004) and include such words as “hell” and “damn,” and the use of the name of deity in vain (If used in a reverent context, names of deity were not included.). Finally, *strong other words*, including “bastard” and other words that trigger strong emotions and reactions, were considered more offensive than mild words and were given their own category. Offensive gestures, such as the middle finger, were also included in this category.

Coders watched 13 randomly selected films (15% of the sample) in order to assess intercoder reliability. The agreement between coders, using Holsti’s (1969) formula, was 96% for all categories combined. Reliabilities for the five categories of profanity were as follows: *seven dirty* (96%), *sexual* (92%), *excretory* (98%), *mild other* (96%), and *strong other* (96%). Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved. The remaining 77 movies were then divided equally between two coders. Coders were blind to the study’s hypotheses.

### Results

From the selection of 90 teen films there were 2,311 instances of profanity. Since the genre was teen movies, not surprisingly teens were involved in the vast majority of instances of

profanity (n = 1,596, 69.1%), while adults (n = 715, 31.4%) accounted for slightly less than one third of the total profanity used. When profanity totals were broken down by gender, profanity totals for males (n = 1,662, 72.2%) exceeded by more than double the totals for their female counterparts (n = 649, 28.1%). When broken down by age groups, teen males (n = 1091, 47.1%) accounted for the majority of profanity used, followed by adult males (n = 571, 24.7%), then teen females (n = 505, 22.1%), and lastly adult females (n = 144, 6.2%).

The most common uses of profanity fell under the *mild* category (n = 1,317, 57.1%); the next most common category coded was the *seven dirty* (n = 508, 22.1%); the third highest category of profanity was *strong other* (n = 332, 14.4%); the fourth category was *sexual* profanity (n = 113, 5.1%); and the fifth category, which was least prevalent in the films, was *excretory* (n = 41, 2.7%).

The first research question asks how the types of profanity in teen movies have changed over the last three decades. A two-sample chi square analysis indicated no significant difference in profanity type across the decades. The greatest differences occurred with a slight increase in the use of *excretory* words from the 1980s to the 2000s and a slight decrease in the *seven dirty* words during that time period (see Table 1).

Table 1: *Percentages of Profanity Types Over Three Decades*

Decade	Excretory (%)	Mild (%)	Sexual (%)	Seven Dirty (%)	Strong (%)	Total (%)
1980s	0.006	55	4	25	15	100
1990s	3	59	5	19	14	100
2000s	3	58	6	19	14	100

Total instances of profanity = 2,311

Research question 2 asks if adult and teenage movie characters differ in the types of profanity they use. Results indicate a significant difference in the types of profanity used by adult and teen characters ( $\chi^2 [4, N = 2,311] = 64.63, p < .001$ ). The percentages within each profanity category in Table 2 indicate how adults and teens differ in their profanity use. *Mild* profanity is the most prevalent among adults and teens, with adults using *mild* profanity more frequently. Teens are more likely to use one of the *seven dirty* words or *strong other* compared to adults.

Table 2: *Percent of Profanity Types for Age Groups*

Profanity Type	Adult		Teen		$\chi^2$
	%	n	%	n	
Excretory	.8	6	2	35	
Mild Other	69	494	51	823	
Sexual	3	21	6	92	
Seven Dirty	16	112	25	396	
Strong Other	11	82	16	250	
Total	100	715	100	1, 596	64.63**

\*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p \leq .001$

Research question 3 looks at whether there is any difference in the types of profanity used between male and female characters within the studied teen movies. A chi-square test ( $\chi^2 [4, N = 2,311] = 24.34, p < .001$ ) shows a significant difference between males and females in profanity use (see Table 3). While both sexes frequently use mild profanity, females show a higher percentage for this type and males have a higher percentage for the seven dirty words.

Table 3: *Percent of Profanity Types for Gender*

Profanity Type	Male		Female		$\chi^2$
	%	n	%	n	
Excretory	2	26	2	15	
Mild Other	55	921	62	396	
Sexual	4	73	6	40	
Seven Dirty	25	408	15	100	
<u>Strong Other</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>234</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>98</u>	
Total	100	1,662	100	649	24.33**

\*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p \leq .001$

Hypothesis 1 posits that profanity has increased over the last three decades. A one-way ANOVA was run to test for differences in the amount of swearing across each decade. To find support for hypothesis 1, this study looked at the means for total profanity use in each decade and compared the three decades in question. Overall profanity use actually decreased steadily from the 1980s ( $M = 35.6$ ) to the 1990s ( $M = 25.31$ ) to the 2000s ( $[M = 16.21]$ ,  $F [2, 87] = 6.49$ ,  $p = .002$ ). Post hoc analysis identified the decades of the 1980s and 2000s as containing the greatest difference, showing an overall decrease in usage. Thus, the hypothesis as stated was not supported. A closer examination shows that no significant difference in the use of *excretory* language, but in *mild*, *sexual*, *seven dirty*, and *strong other*, all differences were significant. The total number of profanities in each decade (30 films per decade) was 1,068 in 1980s, 758 in 1990s, and 485 in 2000s. While the numbers have decreased, profanity is still very prevalent in

teen movies. In the current decade, the mean across all 30 movies was 16.17 (SD = 18.3), for PG-13 movies the mean was 32.2 (SD = 16.8), and for PG movies the mean was 4.4 (SD = 5.0).

Another one-way ANOVA showed that differences in profanity over the decades for only teen characters were significant, but also in the opposite direction. Teen profanity decreased significantly from the the 1980s (M = 25) to the 1990s (M = 16) to the 2000s ([M =12], F [2, 87] = 4.74, p = .011). Post hoc analysis of this outcome also identified the decades of the 1980s and 2000s as containing the greatest difference, again showing an overall decrease in usage.

Hypothesis 2 states that since the inception of PG-13 ratings, profanity has increased in both PG and in PG-13 teen movies. The results showed a significant difference but not in the direction hypothesized. For PG movies, only movies produced after 1984 were used, since the PG-13 rating was first introduced 1985. Means show that profanity in PG movies has steadily declined since 1985, and a one-way ANOVA indicated a significant decline in total profanity in teen-oriented PG movies (F [2, 35] = 7.075, p < .03). A series of one-way ANOVAs were run to test for differences within the various profanity types. With the exception of excretory, all other profanity types demonstrated significant differences. The results are reported in Table 4 below.

Table 4: *Profanity in PG Films After 1984*

Profanity Type	N	M'80s	M'90s	M'00s	F	Sig.
Excretory	38	.4	.3	.5	F(2, 35) = .107	.889
Mild Other	38	15	6.5	3.6	F(2, 35) = 5.717	.007**
Sexual	38	.6	.2	0	F(2, 35) = 4.342	.021*
Seven Dirty	38	4	1	.2	F(2, 35) = 7.860	.002**
Strong Other	38	3	1	.1	F(2, 35) = 3.956	.028*



Profanity Total 38      22      9      4       $F(2, 35) = 7.075$       .003\*\*  
 \* $p \leq .05$  \*\* $p \leq .01$

A one-way ANOVA was also run on PG-13 films (1985–2006), which—with the exception of the excretory profanity ( $F [2, 41] = 3.333, p < .046$ )—showed no significant change over the decades in profanity use among the various types (see Table 5). Examination of the means does show a trend toward less profanity, similar to the trend found in PG movies.

Table 5: *Profanity in PG-13 Films After 1984*

Profanity Type	N	M'80s	M'90s	M'00s	F	Sig.
Excretory	44	0	1	.5	$F(2, 41) = 3.333$	.046*
Mild Other	44	20	21	17.5	$F(2, 41) = .470$	.628
Sexual	44	2	2	2	$F(2, 41) = .043$	.958
Seven Dirty	44	12	8	7	$F(2, 41) = 2.069$	.139
Strong Other	44	7	5	5	$F(2, 41) = .427$	.427
Profanity Total	44	41	37.5	32	$F(2, 41) = .608$	.549

\* $p \leq .05$  \*\* $p \leq .01$  \*\*\* $p \leq .001$

Our third hypothesis states that across the three decades and including all ratings, teen movies will include more males who use profanity than females. This hypothesis was correct. By running a paired samples T-Test ( $T [89] = 5.645, p < .001, d = .595$ ), a significant difference was found in profanity usage between males ( $M = 18.4667$ ) and females ( $M = 7.211$ ) in teen movies (means reported are per movie).

Discussion

While the use of profanity on television continues to rise (Kay & Sapolsky, 2004a), this study provides evidence that in the realm of teen-oriented movies, the trend has been surprisingly downward. Although profanity is certainly still prevalent in teen movies (in the current decade, the mean for instances of profanity per film was 16.7, with a median of 10), especially in PG-13 films, the trend over the last three decades shows a decrease in usage across nearly all profanity types. Further, while teen movies still contain teen profanity, the decrease in usage more closely reflects levels of teen profanity usage on television, where, as previously mentioned, Kaye and Sapolsky (2004) reported that profanity was seldom uttered by or directed at characters under the age of 21 on television.

Although the distribution of profanity across profanity types is similar for teens and adults (mild profanity is most common for both groups), the prevalence with which characters are likely to use profanity within each type differ. Teen characters are more likely to use the seven dirty words than adults, while mild words make up a larger portion of adult profanity than teens. In addition, both male and female characters use mild profanity most often, a finding consistent with Sapolsky and Kaye's (2005) content analysis of profanity among prime-time characters. The percentage of female characters using mild profanity is higher than for males, while the percentage of male characters using one of the seven dirty words is higher than for females. These frequencies reflect societal attitudes toward profanity. As mentioned, profanity types used often depend on the gender of the person using the profanity. Males consider the use of profanity a demonstration of social power (Selnow, 1985), while females are generally less accepting of profanity, especially among their own sex (Cohen and Saine, 1977). In examining

gender differences, males, regardless of age, used profanity more often than females, a finding consistent with actual language use (De Klerk, 1991; Jay, 1992), and with prime-time television (Sapolsky & Kaye, 2005).

A potential limitation of this study is the lack of contextual information. A study examining contextual elements in which teen characters typically use profanity and the potential function it serves would give additional insight into motives for using profanity. For instance, was the profanity used in a humorous or non-humorous context and with what effect? Was profanity used as a means of provoking, escalating conflict, asserting power, jesting, gaining attention, lowering tension? Was the profanity expressed in a same-sex or mixed-sex interaction and does that impact the types of profanity employed? In addition, what impact did the profanity have on the target(s)? Was the result greater social power, increased conflict, laughter, relief?

Further study is needed to understand why the amount of profanity has declined in teen targeted movies. Future studies may, for example, examine whether political pressure or a higher public awareness of and heightened concern for the use of profanity in the public sphere has pressured filmmakers to somewhat limit its use. Additionally, the increased use of DVD and video rentals has brought movie viewing into homes; has this development caused filmmakers to limit the use of profanity in movies aimed at teens? Finally, future studies may ascertain whether there is an increase in the prevalence of sexual and violent content in popular teen movies. Perhaps directors, in an effort to keep teen movies from obtaining an R rating, trade profanity for increased violent and sexual content.

## Appendix A

(Domestic box office gross is in millions.)

2000s Movies

1. Spider Man	\$403,706
2. Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire	\$290,013
3. Remember the Titans	\$115,645
4. Freaky Friday	\$110,230
5. The Princess Diaries	\$108,248
6. Save the Last Dance	\$91,057
7. Mean Girls	\$86,058
8. Bring It On	\$68,379
9. Holes	\$67,406
10. Sky High	\$63,946
11. Friday Night Lights	\$61,255
12. Snow Day	\$60,020
13. Cinderella Story	\$51,438
14. Big Fat Liar	\$48,360
15. Fat Albert	\$48,116
16. Agent Cody Banks	\$47,938
17. Napoleon Dynamite	\$44,540
18. The Lizzie McGuire Movie	\$42,734
19. A Walk to Remember	\$41,281
20. Orange County	\$41,076
21. John Tucker Must Die	\$41,011
22. You Got Served	\$40,636
23. Sisterhood of the Traveling Pants	\$39,053
24. Clockstoppers	\$36,989
25. What a Girl Wants	\$36,105
26. She's the Man	\$33,741
27. Bend It Like Beckham	\$32,543
28. The New Guy	\$29,760
29. Stick It	\$26,910
30. Confessions of a Teenage Drama Queen	\$26,331

1990s Movies

1. Casper	\$100,328
2. She's All That	\$63,366
3. Clueless	\$56,634
4. Rookie of the Year	\$53,165
5. The Mighty Ducks	\$50,752
6. Little Women	\$50,083
7. The Brady Bunch Movie	\$46,576

## Swearing in the cinema 20

8. Romeo + Juliet	\$46,351
9. Encino Man	\$40,693
10. Mighty Morphin' Power Rangers	\$38,187
11. 10 Things I Hate About You	\$38,178
12. Richie Rich	\$38,087
13. October Sky	\$32,547
14. First Kid	\$26,491
15. Can't Hardly Wait	\$25,605
16. Don't Tell Mom the Babysitter's Dead	\$25,196
17. Good Burger	\$23,712
18. Flipper	\$20,080
19. Drive Me Crazy	\$17,845
20. Buffy the Vampire Slayer	\$16,624
21. Mad Love	\$15,453
22. School Ties	\$14,453
23. Excess Baggage	\$14,515
24. Class Act	\$13,272
25. Little Big League	\$12,267
26. Drop Dead Gorgeous	\$10,571
27. Cry-Baby	\$8,266
28. Hackers	\$7,536
29. Dick	\$6,262
30. Mystery Date	\$6,166

### 1980s Movies

1. Back to the Future	\$210,609
2. Honey I Shrunk the Kids	\$103,724
3. Dead Poets Society	\$95,860
4. Karate Kid	\$90,815
5. Footloose	\$80,035
6. WarGames	\$79,567
7. Ferris Bueller's Day Off	\$70,136
8. The Goonies	\$61,389
9. Bill & Ted's Excellent Adventure	\$40,485
10. Pretty in Pink	\$40,471
11. Red Dawn	\$38,376
12. Taps	\$35,856
13. Adventures in Baby Sitting	\$34,368
14. Teen Wolf	\$33,086
15. Can't Buy Me Love	\$31,623
16. The Outsiders	\$25,697
17. Weird Science	\$23,834
18. Sixteen Candles	\$23,686

## Swearing in the cinema 21

19. My Bodyguard	\$22,482
20. License to Drive	\$22,433
21. Say Anything	\$20,781
22. Young Sherlock Holmes	\$19,739
23. Some Kind of Wonderful	\$18,553
24. One Crazy Summer	\$13,431
25. She's Out of Control	\$12,065
26. Just One of the Guys	\$11,528
27. Better Off Dead	\$10,297
28. Lucas	\$8,200
29. Girls Just Want to Have Fun	\$6,326
30. Hot Pursuit	\$4,215

Sources

- Social learning theory*. American Academy of Pediatrics. (2001). Children, adolescents, and television. *Pediatrics*, 107(2), 423–426.
- Arnett, J. J. (1995). Adolescents' uses of media for self socialization. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 24(5), 519–533.
- Associated Press. (2006, March 29). Poll: Americans see profanity worsening. Retrieved June 26, 2007 from <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/12063093/>
- Austin, B. A., Nicolich, M. J., & Simonet, T. (1981). MPAA ratings and the box office: Some tantalizing statistics. *Film Quarterly*, 35(2), 28–30.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura. (1994). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects : Advances in theory and research* (pp. 61-90). Hillsdale, NJ : Erlbaum.
- Bate, B., & Bowker, J. (1997). *Communication and the sexes*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Bushman, B. J., & Cantor, J. (2003). Media ratings for violence and sex: Implications for policymakers and parents. *American Psychologist*, 58(2), 130–141.
- Cohen, M., & Saine, T. J. (1977). The role of profanity and sex variables in interpersonal impression formation. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 2(5), 45–52.
- Condry, J. (1989). *The psychology of television*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- de Klerk, V. (1991). Expletives: Men only? *Communication Monographs*, 58(2), 156–169.
- Dufrene, & Lehman. (2002). Persuasive appeal for clean language. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65 (1), 48- 55.

- Fine, M. G., & Johnson, F. L. (1984). Female and male motives for using obscenity.. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 3(1), 59–74.
- Foote, R., & Woodward, J. (1973). A preliminary investigation of obscene language. *Journal of Psychology*, 83(2), 263–275.
- Griffiths, M.D., & Shuckford, G. L. (1989). Desensitization to television violence: A new model.. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 7(1), 85–89.
- Haygood, A. (2007). *The climb of controversial film content*. Unpublished master's thesis, Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia.
- Hetsroni, A. (2007). Three decades of sexual content on prime-time network programming: A longitudinal meta-analytic review. *Journal of Communication*, 57(2), 318–348.
- Hilliard, R. L., & Keith, M. C. (2007). *Dirty discourse: Sex and indecency in broadcasting*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Infante, D. A., Riddle, B. L., Horvath, C. L., & Tumlin, S. A. (1992). Verbal aggressiveness: Messages and reasons. *Communication Quarterly*, 40(2), 116–126.
- Jay, T. (1992). *Cursing in America: A psycholinguistic study of dirty language in the courts, in the movies, in the schoolyards and on the streets*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jay, T. (2000). *Why we curse: A neuro-psycho-social theory of speech*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.



- Jowett, G. S. (1990). Moral responsibility and commercial entertainment: Social control in the United States film industry, 1907–1968. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 10(1), 3–31.
- Kaye, B. K., & Sapolsky, B. S. (2004). Watch your mouth! An analysis of profanity uttered by children on prime-time television. *Mass Communication & Society*, 7(4), 429–452.
- Kaye, B. K., & Sapolsky, B. S. (2004a). Talking a “blue” streak: Context and offensive language in prime time network television programs. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(4), 911–927.
- Kaye, B. K., & Sapolsky, B. S. (2004b). Watch your mouth! An analysis of profanity uttered by children on prime-time television. *Mass Communication & Society*, 7(4), 429–452.
- Krcmar, M., & Sohn, S. (2004). The role of bleeps and warnings in viewers’ perceptions of on-air cursing. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 48(4), 570–583.
- Leone, R., & Houle, N. (2006). 21st century ratings creep: PG-13 and R.. *Communication Research Reports*, 23(1), 53—61.
- Mercury, R. (1996). Swearing: A ‘bad’ part of language: A good part of language learning. *TESL Canada Journal*, 13(1), 28-36.
- Oliver, M. B., & Kalyanaraman, S. (2002). Appropriate for all viewing audiences? An examination of violent and sexual portrayals in movie previews featured on video rentals. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 46(2), 283–299.
- Risch, B. (1987, September). Women’s derogatory terms for men: That’s right, ‘dirty’ words. *Language and Society*, 16, 353–358.

- Sapolsky, B. S., & Kaye, B. K. (2005). The use of offensive language by men and women in prime time television entertainment. *Atlantic Journal of communication*, 13(4), 292-303.
- Selnow, G. W. (1985). Sex differences in uses and perceptions of profanity. *Sex Roles*, 12(3-4), 303-312.
- Smith, C. (2003). Theorizing religious effects among American adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42(1), 17-30.
- Smith, C. (2005). *Soul searching: The religious and spiritual lives of American Teenagers*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.
- Stern, S. R. (2005). Self-absorbed, dangerous, and disengaged: What popular films tell us about teenagers. *Mass Communication & Society*, 8(1), 23-38.
- Thompson, K. M., & Yokota, F. (2004). Violence, sex, and profanity in films: Correlation of movie ratings with content. *MedGenMed*, 6(3) [online journal]. Retrieved August 25, 2007, from <http://pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1435631>.
- Waterman, D. (2005). *Hollywood's road to riches*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, B. J., & Linz, D. (1990). Applying social science research to film ratings: A shift from offensiveness to harmful effects. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 34(4), 443-469.
- Yang, N., & Linz, D. (1990). Movie ratings and the content of adult videos: The sex-violence ratio. *Journal of Communications*, 40(2), 28-42.
- Yokota, F., & Thompson, K. M. (2000). Violence in G-rated animated films. *JAMA*, 283(20), 2716-2721.

Dale L. Cressman is an Assistant Professor of Communications at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah where he teaches courses in Broadcasting, Communication History, and Mass Communication. He received his BA and MA at Brigham Young University and his PhD at the University of Utah in Communication. His research interests focus on communication history. Correspondence to: Dale Cressman, Department of Communications, Brigham Young University, 360 BRMB, Provo, UT 84602, USA. Tel.: (801) 372-9554; E-mail: [cressman@byu.edu](mailto:cressman@byu.edu)

Mark Callister is an Associate Professor of Communications at Brigham Young University where he teaches courses in Advertising, Mass Communications, and Consumer Behavior. He received his MBA at Brigham Young University and PhD in Communication at the University of Arizona. His research interests focus on visual rhetoric in advertising and family portrayals in the media. Correspondence to: Mark Callister, Department of Communications, Brigham Young University, 360 BRMB, Provo, UT 84602, USA. Tel.: (801) 422-6143; E-mail: [Mark\\_Callister@byu.edu](mailto:Mark_Callister@byu.edu)

Tom Robinson is an Associate Professor of Communications at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah. He teaches courses in Advertising and Mass Communications. He received his PhD at the University of Southern Mississippi in Mass Communications. His research focuses on the portrayal and stereotyping of older people in the media. Correspondence to: Tom Robinson, Department of Communications, Brigham Young University, 360 BRMB, Provo, UT 84602, USA. Tel.: (801) 422-3977; E-mail: [Tom\\_Robinson@byu.edu](mailto:Tom_Robinson@byu.edu)

Chris Near is the Director of Research for KDPaine & Partners, a PR measurement firm in Berlin, New Hampshire. He received his BA at Utah Valley University and his MA from Brigham Young University. His research and work interests focus on media effects and social media measurement. Correspondence to: Chris Near, KDPaine & Partners, 177 Main St., 3rd Floor, Berlin, NH 03570, USA. Tel.: (603) 294-4687; E-mail: [cnear@kdpaine.com](mailto:cnear@kdpaine.com)