



A Critical Pragmatic Study of Sarcasms in American and British Interviews

Bushra Nima RASHID¹

Keywords

American Interviews, British Interviews, Sarcasms, Critical Pragmatic Study

Abstract

This study intends to present sarcasm in American and British interviews. It begins with the concept of sarcasm. It sheds lights on this phenomenon, its types and functions. It tries to give answers to the following questions: Do people violate a maxim in order to mislead or to deceive someone? Do American people violate the maxims of conversation more than the British? What is the purpose behind using sarcasm? This study aims at: Identifying the term sarcasm as a pragmatic concept, used in American and British interviews for different purposes. Finding out the violation of Grice's Cooperative Principle and its four maxims in interviews. Analyzing the selected words or phrases, employed in this kind of discourse. It is hypothesized that: Grice's cooperative principle is frequently violated in American and British interviews by using sarcasm. All the maxims of conversation, namely, Quality, Quantity, Manner, and Relation are flouted in the interviews. Sarcasm is used to convey additional implied meaning to the audience. The present study is limited to the critical pragmatic analysis of American and British interviews in terms of Grice's maxims (1975) and according to the types and functions of sarcasm. The selected words or phrases are (40) extracted from the interviews.

Article History

Received
3 Dec, 2021
Accepted
15 Mar, 2022

1. Introduction

The word sarcasm is taken from σαρκάζειν (sarkázein) which means "to tear flesh, bite the lip in rage, and sneer" it comes from the Greek σαρκασμός (sarkasmós). The first use of this word in English was in 1579. Though, the word doesn't appear until 1695, which means "Characterized by or involving sarcasm. Derek Bousfield, (2010) states that, it means the use of strategies which are apparently appropriate to the situation, but have opposite meaning. When an utterance appears to sustain or enhance the face of the listener, it attacks and damages the face of the listener. Sarcasm is an insincere form of politeness which is used to offend one's interlocutor to distinguish sarcasm from banter, and the use of irony in sarcasm.

¹ Corresponding Author. ORCID: 0000-0002-2620-850X. Asst. Prof. Dr., Baghdad University, College of Education, Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences, English Department, Bushra.nima@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

1.1. What is Sarcasm

The term comes directly into English from the Greek *sarkasmos*, which in turn derives from the ugly verb *sarkazsein*, "to tear the flesh" (used of dogs). (You may have seen the root *sark-*, "flesh," in *sarcophagos*, a coffin ["flesh-eater" -- delightful idea!]). It's difficult to know whether this originated in the metaphorical idea that someone who uses sarcasm is "cutting up" the person or thing that's the target of his remark, or whether it refers to the more nearly literal idea of his being so angry that he's gnashing his teeth so passionately that he ends up biting his own lips! Either way, the idea that he is in a savage mood. But note that the term sarcasm in the technical rhetorical sense we've constructed (meaning the opposite of what you say) does not necessarily carry the implication that the speaker is being critical or feels hostility, as in the original Greek sense of the term, which carries over into our contemporary everyday sense of the word. Bitter or hostile sarcasm is only a special case of "sarcasm" as we are defining the term here, which is broad enough to cover cases in which the speaker is paying a compliment or being gentle.

When sarcasm is used within the context of a given rhetoric, the main purpose is usually to mock a given idea or position by almost pretending to agree with it and parrot it. For example, if a person says in a snide tone of voice that something was a great idea, then he is using sarcasm, and what he means to say is that it was actually a terrible idea. Another example, a sarcastic indirect request,

- Why don't you take your time washing the dishes?

Which means:

- Hurry up and wash the dishes. (Gibbs, 1993: 264) The effective use of sarcasm is generally premised on some shared cultural understanding of norms.

1.2. The Concept of the Term

Sarcasm is a literary device that uses irony to mock someone or something or convey contempt. Sarcasm can also be defined as the use of words that mean the opposite of what the speaker or writer intends, especially to insult or show irritation with someone, or to amuse others. Sarcasm is generally viewed as cruel and emotionally cutting to its subject. The word "sarcasm" is derived from the French *sarcasme*, from the Late Latin *sarcasmos*, and from the Greek *sarkasmos*, meaning "to tear flesh" "bite the lips in rage," or "sneer." Its first known use was in 1550. Synonyms for sarcasm are *affront*, *barb*, *brickbat*, *cut*, *dart*, *dig*, *dis*, *epithet*, *gird*, *out-down*, and *slight*.

1.3. Sarcasm as a Pragmatic Concept

Because Pragmatics is the study of invisible meaning, what is said and what is meant, it can be said that sarcasm is flouting Grice's maxims, the Standard Pragmatic Model. Sarcasm do not follow the Principle of Cooperation (Grice, 1989). Saying something to mean another. Many theories have arisen to describe sarcasm, since Paul Grice introduced the cooperative principle, but the base of all these theories is the cooperative principle.

However, the cooperative principle sometimes interferes with other principles of pragmatics, such as the politeness theory, speech acts theory and impoliteness theory, etc.

1.4. Types of Sarcasm

The origin of the word sarcasm comes from the French word sarcasme, and also from the Greek word sarkazein, to “tear flesh,” or “grind the teeth.” In other words sarcasm means that, the literal meaning is different than what the speaker intends to say. It is considered as a literary and rhetorical device to mock, the purpose is to amuse or hurt someone. The effective use of sarcasm is generally premised on some shared cultural understanding of norms.

Sarcasm often based on mood and tone of voice. According to Mike Lamb (2011), there are seven types of sarcasm:

1. Self-deprecating: This category of sarcasm uses an exaggerated sense of inferiority and worthlessness. For instance.

a. “Hey Bob, I’m gonna need you to work overtime this weekend.”

b. “Yeah, that’s fine. I mean, I was gonna get married this weekend but, you know, it’s not a big deal, I’ll just skip it. She would’ve left me anyway”

2. Brooding: in which the speaker utters something polite, but in a bitter tone. For instance.

a. “Hey Bob, I’m gonna need you to work overtime this weekend.”

b. “Looking forward to it. I live to serve.”

3. Deadpan: An expression without laughter or emotion, it difficult for the listener to judge whether the speaker is joking or serious. For instance.

a. “Hey Bob, I’m gonna need you to work overtime this weekend.”

b. “Can’t make it. Got a cult meeting. It’s my turn to kill the goat.”

4. Polite: A speaker is said to have delivered a polite sarcasm when his listeners realize that his remark was a little too polite but insincere. For instance.

a. “Hey Bob, I’m gonna need you to work overtime this weekend.”

b. “Ooh, fun! I’ll bring the ice cream!”

5. Obnoxious: This kind of sarcasm makes people feel like punching the speaker in the face. It is not very funny, usually spoken in a whiney tone of voice. For instance.

a. “Hey Bob, I’m gonna need you to work overtime this weekend.”

b. “Oh, well that’s just f*****g great. Just what I wanted to do this weekend. Awesome.”

6. Manic: Manic sarcasm is spoken with unnatural exuberance, and may sound a bit crazy. For example,

“Can you pick up the kids from their second birthday party this weekend?”

“YES!! I absolutely can’t WAIT to do that! Can we do it again next weekend???”

7. Raging: This kind of sarcasm relies mainly on hyperbole and threats of violence. It is usually the hallmark of a psychotic rant; unpredictable and uncalled for. For example, it might include vulgar language and extreme conclusions. For instance.

- a. "Hey Bob, I'm gonna need you to work overtime this weekend."
- b. "Oh, don't worry! I'll be there! Want me to shine your f*****g shoes while I'm at it?! Hell, I'll come to your house tonight and wash your goddamn Ferrari! Actually, you know what? Forget it. I'm just gonna go home and blow my brains out." (<http://www.writerscafe.org/courses/The-Right-Way-to-Write-Wrong/658/The-seven-types-of-sarcasm>)

1.5. A Taxonomy of Sarcasm

Benjamin Carlisle (2010) has put these taxonomies of sarcasm :

- 1. First degree: Saying what you mean, and saying it insincerely
 - a. "Oh! Now that was intelligent!" [Said sardonically after something stupid is done]
- 2. Second degree: Saying what you don't mean, but saying it sincerely
 - a. "Oh, now that was intelligent." [Said in a complimentary way after something stupid is done]
- 3. Third degree: Saying what you mean, but saying it insincerely
 - a. "Yeah, you're a good friend." [Said in a mocking tone of voice to a true friend]
- 4. Fourth degree: Saying what you mean, and saying it sincerely
 - a. "Yeah, you're a good friend." [Said in a matter-of-fact tone of voice to a true friend]

Intent x literal	Insincere	sincere
insincere	1st	2nd
Sincere	3rd	4th

1.6. American and British Sarcasm

According to the Smithsonian Magazine, sarcasm permeates every aspect of modern American culture. It can be seen in movies, on TV, in interviews, and just in general conversation. In fact, it's such an essential skill in modern America that it can be difficult to function socially if you don't understand it. The difference is that Americans don't use sarcasm quite as relentlessly or drily as the British.

The majority of New Yorkers find sarcasm funny and a desirable quality. It's not that they don't get it. It's just that they may not find it particularly appropriate. (10 British and American Stereotypes That Science Says Are Bull - Listverse.htm)

The use of sarcasm in the two cultures is said to be almost similar. But still there are certain differences. For a British in the US the popular wisdom amongst British is that Americans don't get it, and popular wisdom amongst Americans is its 'bad'. So, The British and Americans have different points of view, British people were a bit drier though. In the US, sarcasm is definitely identified by tone of voice, smirks, etc. where with British it seems to be difficult to pick up on the signs always.

Sarcasm in the US, seems to include the blatantly obvious stated in an idiomatic way like the “Not the brightest crayon in the box, are ya?” as well as preposterous statements like “Could you be any stupider?”

The context is very important for most of those comments though. The British generally describe remarks as ‘sarcastic’ when they are saying the opposite of what they mean e.g. ‘Wow, that’s a surprise’ when something was very predictable, or ‘Nice weather, eh?’ when it’s pouring with rain, or ‘Punctual, as always.’ when someone who always comes late finally arrives. So sarcasm can be either nice (a funny joke) or nasty (an unkind remark) but some element of ‘saying the opposite of what you mean’ needs to be involved for something to be labeled sarcastic.

So ‘sarcastic’ seems to be used to describe a wider variety of remarks in American—some saying the opposite of what’s meant, but many not. Depending on context, sarcastic seems to mean something closer to ‘unkind’, ‘insulting’ or simply ‘funny or amusing’ here, it might be just a matter of terminology. Because the US is a multicultural mix of immigrants, the potential for misunderstanding in humour (and thus offence) is larger.

(Sarcasm in the UK and US – Part one%20 what’s sarcastic%20 » Learning to speak 'merican.htm).

2.1. The Critical Pragmatic Approach

According to the Critical Pragmatic approach, Kepa Korta and John Perry (2011) claim that, the main concern of this approach is to deal with the language is a means of doing things with words; the meanings of sentences and utterances are derived from human intentions; and language combines with other factors to allow humans to achieve communicative goals when a speaker utters an utterance, this utterance has some contents. Based on this claim, Korta & Perry show how their approach can handle the difficulties that traditionally arise from the theoretical use of what is said.

2.2. Irony and Sarcasm

It is difficult to set clear the difference between irony and sarcasm. Because sarcasm can be considered as a form of irony. Muecke (1974:51) argues that “if it is a basic requirement of irony that one must feel the force of both the apparent and the real meanings, then sarcasm hardly exists as irony”. So, irony is likely to be confused with sarcasm but it differs from sarcasm in that “it is usually lighter, less harsh in its wording though in effect probably more cutting because of its indirectness” (Holman, 1960:248).

Watts (1981:103-104) distinguishes between the two concepts to say that sarcasm refers to “the use of sharp or bitter remarks, expressed ironically with the explicit intent to hurt another person’s feelings” .When irony is meant to express a negatively critical attitude towards the subject of the ironic utterance, sarcasm is more direct, more cutting, and reveals not only a critical attitude but also an attack with the purpose of wounding the subject’s feelings (ibid.:103). In addition, the sarcastic utterance can be understood as sarcasm by the subject but the speaker who uses irony may aim to exclude the subject of the ironic utterance to understand what is really meant.

2.3. Grice's Cooperative Principle

Paul Grice is English philosopher who is considered to be the "father of pragmatics", was fascinated by how the hearer gets from the expressed meaning to the implied meaning. That is, his aim was to explain how the hearer gets from what is said to what is meant (Thomas, 1995:56).

According to the Cooperative Principle the speaker and hearer converse with the willingness to deliver and interpret a message. The speaker and hearer cooperate and that is why communicating efficiently (Thomas, 1995:63). In 'Logic and Conversation', Grice (1975:45) defines conversation as an essentially interactive and cooperative process. The general principle is called the Cooperative Principle (CP). The CP runs as follows:

Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

In order to illustrate how people interpret meaning, Grice presented, in addition to the Cooperative Principle, four conversational maxims to show how people communicate effectively in the light of certain rules. Thomas (1995:63) says that thanks extend to Grice's maxims, we can interpret and understand the underlying implication of an utterance.

Maxim of Quantity (Informativeness)

- a- Make your contribution as informative as is required
- b- Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Maxim of Quality (Truthfulness)

Super maxim: Try to make your contribution one that is true, more specifically:

- a- Do not say what you believe to be false.
- b- Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of Relation (Relevance)

Super maxim: Make your contribution relevant.

- a- Be relevant.

Maxim of Manner (Clarity)

Super maxim: Be perspicuous... (Be clear), and specifically:

- a- Avoid obscurity of expression.
- b- Avoid ambiguity.
- c- Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
- d- Be orderly.

The central role of the cooperative principle and maxims is to explain how it is possible for speakers to communicate more than they actually say. Speakers may observe all the maxims as in the following example:

Husband: Where is my watch?

Wife: It is on the table in the hall?

The wife has answered the question clearly (Manner), truthfully (Quality) with right amount of information (quantity), and satisfying the goal of the question (Relation).

According to Lindblom (2006: 152), Grice pointed out that there are certain ways in which the maxims of the cooperative principle may go unfulfilled in ordinary conversation.

When some speakers intend their hearers to understand their conversation without observing the maxims, they will flout the maxims but there is no intention of deceiving or misleading the hearers. People can violate a maxim if they are liable to mislead the others. People can also infringe a maxim when they fail to observe a maxim with no intention to deceive someone (Paltridge, 2012: 47).

E.g.:- A. How are you getting to the airport tomorrow?

B. Well.... I'm going with Peter (ibid, 51).

In this example, B is flouting the maxims of relation and quantity because his answer is irrelevant and because A has given less information than is required therefore, he is flouting the maxim of quantity from which B derives that he may have to make their own way to airport. So, a maxim might be flouted in a way that exploits another maxim.

Pragmatically speaking, Grice argues that if people fail to fulfill or observe the maxims of cooperative principle during the exchange of conversation, the participant may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim. This means that the participant does not observe the maxim intentionally for some purposes. Grice states that in the case when one quietly and unostentatiously violates a maxim, "one is liable to mislead". More often than not, people fail to observe the maxims, be it deliberately or accidentally. Two of such failing to observe maxims of the cooperative principle are: violation and flouting of maxims. The violation of maxims is when the maxims are deliberately manipulated so that the speaker mislead the interlocutor. In other word, a speaker can be said to violate a maxim when they know that the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words. They intentionally generate a misleading implicature. A maxim violation is quietly deceiving. The speaker deliberately supplies insufficient information, saying something that is insincere, irrelevant or ambiguous, and the hearer wrongly assumes that they are cooperating (Cutting, 2002: 40).

In struggling to clearly define these notions Partridge puts forward an example as: when a mother tells her children "Mummy's gone on a little holiday because she needs a rest" (Partridge, 2012, p. 47). In this example, the mother has not said she is going away to think about divorce of her husband. But instead, she violates the maxim of quality, meaning that she is not telling the truth. Unlike the violation of maxims, which takes place to cause misunderstanding on the part of the listener, the flouting of maxims takes place when individuals deliberately cease to apply the maxims to persuade their listeners to infer the hidden meaning behind the utterances; that is, the speakers employ implicature.

Levinson also asserts that unlike the violation of maxims, which takes place to cause misunderstanding on the part of the listener, the flouting of maxims occurs when individuals intentionally do not apply the maxims in order to persuade their listeners to derive the hidden meaning behind what is said, that is, the speakers employ implicature. He also believes that when someone is flouting a maxim, they are not deliberately trying to deceive or mislead their interlocutors, but they are deliberately not observing the maxims, in order for the interlocutors to understand another set of meaning (Levinson, 2008:109). Flouting occurs when the speakers appear not to follow the maxims of the cooperative principle but expect hearers to appreciate or understand the meaning implies, as in the case of the dress shop assistant, the romantic date and the chilly room, it can be said that they are flouting the maxims. It is similar to an indirect speech act, in it, the speaker assumes that the hearer knows that their words should not be taken at face value and they can infer the implicit meaning (Cutting, 2002 :37). For Example:

Well, how do I look?

Your shoes are nice (ibid).

In this example, the speaker flouts the maxim of quantity when he gives too little information, he does not mention anything about his or her clothes (ibid). So sarcasm works because it is an apparent violation of the cooperative principle. It makes sense because it relates shared experiences or norms of both the speaker and listener.

In conclusion, sarcasm is a frequently used means of communicating that has proven basis in linguistic theories.

3. Data Collection and Analysis

In this research, a critical pragmatic approach is applied in selected American and British interviews, in order to analyze the violation and flouting of conversational maxims done by the characters in the interviews. Grice's Cooperative Principle and its four conversational maxims theories are applied to examine the types of conversational maxims which are violated and flouted by the characters in order to create humorous situations. The analysis will be arranged in a table, according to the violation of Grice's Maxims and explanation of the implied or intended meaning which has inferred from the context and situation. The number of the text will be mentioned and the sarcastic word or phrase will be underlined. The samples of the full texts will be found in the appendix.

Text (1)

George Bush and Bill Clinton will lead a bipartisan fundraising drive for Haiti, leaving me free to be partisan on more important things!

The people of Haiti need basic foodstuffs, so we will send them arugula from the White House vegetable garden.

I have a nickname for Haiti: Hate It.

4. Obama added, "These two can aid me in the mid-term election."²

Bush added, "Laura went to Haiti to oversee our AIDS effort."²

Clinton added, "I went Haiti and spread AIDS."

Text (2)

Delevingne gave several sarcastic responses to the questions. When asked if she relates to her "Paper Towns" character, Margo, she jokingly replied, "No, I actually hate her."

The interview reached a head when the anchors asked if she's irritated or it's just the news show, and she responded, "No, I think it's just you."

"Some people just don't understand sarcasm or the British sense of humour," she tweeted in reference to the interview.

Text (3)

Television may be more complex than what most people realize, but it seems rarely to attempt to "challenge" or "disturb" its audience, as you've written me you wish to. Is it that sense of challenge and pain that makes your work more "serious" than most television shows?

Text (4)

Los Angeles-based British actor Tim Curry didn't pause for a second when asked what he missed most about the UK. "Irony," he replied.

Then there's Eddie Izzard, recounting how he saw a London Underground guard checking an unattended bag by shaking it: "Oh, Captain Clever! Rattle it, if it doesn't go off it can't be a bomb!"

And the king of sarcasm, Basil Fawlty, when Mrs Richards complains about the view of Torquay: "What did you expect to see out of a Torquay hotel bedroom window? Sydney Opera House perhaps? The Hanging Gardens of Babylon? Herds of wildebeest sweeping majestically...?"

I once worked for an uptight, hyper-organised and over-sarcastic supervisor, and was sent in my first week to an interview. "Still here?" she demanded, shortly before it.

Text (5)

1. "Do you find that it's easier for you to focus because you're so busy? If you had downtime, maybe it wouldn't be so easy for you? What do you think?" Delevingne was clueless on the question, but tried her best to answer it. The Chanel model was met with more strange questions from the anchors. "I saw you in London talking a couple weeks ago on TV and you seemed a lot more excited about it than you do right now. Are you just exhausted?"

Text (6)

1. When asked if she'd read the novel or if she could possibly squeeze it into her hectic schedule, Cara tried to smack on a fake smile but the sarcasm was clear as day.

“When asked if she’d read the novel or if she could possibly squeeze it into her hectic schedule, Cara tried to smack on a fake smile but the sarcasm was clear as day.

“Uh, no I never read the book, or the script. I kind of winged it,” she jests, before claiming very deadpan that John Green was one of her favourite novelists.. I kind of winged it,” she jests, before claiming very deadpan that John Green was one of her favourite novelists.

Text (7)

1. Do Americans understand the meaning of the word 'sarcasm'?

I certainly can speak for all Americans, but I suspect that the real issue is that some of us in the US use the English language (American English) while others use the ever-changing Trumpish language. There are futile attempts by those on the Trump team to interpret Trumpish but the lack of consistent translations leaves me baffled.

Text (8)

1. The GOP nominee tried to dampen controversy over his apparent call Wednesday for Russia to either stage an espionage cyber hack to find Clinton's deleted emails or to publish information it had already stolen.

"Of course I'm being sarcastic," Trump said in a Fox News interview that aired the day after his comments at a news conference in Florida sparked a national furor and offered ammunition for Democrats who claim he's not fit to be president.

Text (9)

When Holmes asked whether he could now pay off his debts, he said, "Are you trying to rubbish me?"

Text (10)

1. Lucy: Do you have any British food or drink that you miss? Or do you get it shipped out to you?

Julian: Scotch eggs! Pork pies! (But I've managed to find McVities Digestives.)

Text (11)

Even today, people try to walk in strange ways when they see him, as he once did in the highly popular sketch "Ministry of Silly Walks." He says it makes him smile, but that he wishes people wouldn't do it. Before beginning our interview, Cleese orders a hot toddy, which, to his mild amusement, never gets served.

I played professor Waldman in the 1994 adaptation of "Frankenstein" and got stabbed to death by Robert De Niro. If you get killed by anybody it should be De Niro. He's a wonderful murderer.

SPIEGEL: It is remarkable, after all. Your relationship with Germany started in Weston-super-Mare during World War II, when German planes were bombing your seaside home town.

Cleese: Why did they do it? It was a waste of bombs, strange for such an efficient country. I like my father's explanation. He said that they did it to prove that Germans do have a sense of humor after all.

Text (12)

1. "What has become a novelty?" Neville interrupted.

"Just simply releasing tax returns," Pierson stated.

"It's been going on since the 1970s," Neville pointed out. "It's a tradition, not a novelty. The voters want to know."

"It's a novelty tradition!" Pierson shot back.

They develop charities, call them foundations. And they do all their dirty work within those boundaries, which is exactly why the FBI wants to investigate the [Clinton Foundation] today."

"It is also not a requirement for a presidential candidate to release his tax returns," Trump's spokesperson replied. "So we can go back and forth on that all day."

Text (13)

Both Trump and controversial ITV Breakfast presenter Morgan offered plenty of ammunition for critics during their "world exclusive interview" on Sunday, January 28: From Trump's "I'm not a feminist" admission to his ideas of climate change.

Text (14)

Fareed Zakaria: "America is Going Down the Toilet, But I Love Living Here"

The only surprise," says Zakaria, "is that the rise of Barack Obama did not end this downward death spiral. Even he, the chosen one, cannot reverse the decline of this evil culture."

Text (15)

"He is finally letting his Muslim roots come out," said Eliot Abrams, a senior fellow for Middle East studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington, D.C. "so the questions is whether he is a Sunni or a Shiite.

Text (16)

"I tell friends who treat their wives magnificently, get treated like crap in return, 'Be rougher and you'll see a different relationship."

Back in 1994, rumors of Trump filing for personal bankruptcy abounded, but he adamantly declared that he hadn't. "There was never a bankruptcy," he told me. "I had in excess of \$5 billion in personal debt, now \$115 million, which I'm going to pay in a very short period. Nobody's bailed me out, I've done a really good job of getting myself out of trouble."

The hardest moment of my life was when I told my parents I was getting a divorce. They couldn't believe it.

How did you tell them?

I went to their house, took a deep breath and said, "Hey folks, guess what? I'm getting a divorce. It's just now working out blah, blah, blah.

4. "They're right — and not. People say, "How can you say such a thing?" but there's a truth in it, in a modified form. Psychologists will tell you that some women want to be treated with respect, others differently. I tell friends who treat their wives magnificently, get treated like crap in return, "Be rougher and you'll see a different relationship.' Unfortunately, with people in general, you get more with vinegar than honey.

Right. Ivana and I were standing near the restaurant putting on our skis when Marla came out of Bonnie's and suddenly, the two women were standing next to each other. You could tell there was conflict, friction, but no hair pulling

7. Still, there'll be scars...

They're so well-adjusted. Properly handled, you don't have scars. (Right, Sigmund Freud?)

Text (17)

1. What do you see as being your main responsibilities as the Prince of Wales and heir to the throne?

Waving's very important – from cars or balconies as circumstances demand. Keeping alive traditional hedge laying methods and taking small talk to strange and exciting places

2. What's the best thing about being the Prince of Wales?

Well I do love a leek!

3. And the worst?

Going to Wales. That bloody language – it's like nails down a blackboard. Of course you can't say that.

4. And what contribution do you think your brothers Andrew and Edward have made to the country?

They've been invaluable. Without Edward there'd have been no It's A Royal Knockout or that documentary series on the Queen Mother. Do you want to live in a world where those things never happened? Because I don't. Andrew though has been a tremendous embarrassment.

I have a tremendous sense of humour. As I mentioned I still listen to the Goons Show, eight or nine times a day. 'Bring it on' that's what I say, we can take it... As long as they don't mention my ears.

Text (18)

1. President Obama was the "founder of ISIS?" Remember when he said this after referring to the President as "Barack HUSSEIN Obama?"

2. "No, I meant he's the founder of ISIS," Trump told Hewitt. "I do. He was the most valuable player. I give him the most valuable player award. I give her, too, by the way, Hillary Clinton."

Table 3.1. Analysis of the Violation of Grice Maxims with Explanation.

TextN	Sarcasm	Violation	Explanation
1	1.Drive	Quality& Relevance Manner	Obama was speaking and mocking from Haiti, as if they will drive their own cars collecting donations.
1	2. So, we will send them arugula from the White House vegetable garden.	Manner	As if arugula is basic for living and from White House garden.
1	3.I have a nickname for Haiti: Hate It.	quality	Replace Haiti with (Hate it)
1	4.I went Haiti and spread AIDS	quality	What is said aids ,what is meant the disease of(acquired immune deficiency syndrome).
2	5. No, I actually hate her.	Quality& manner	She is an actress,asked about a character and she hates this person.
2	6. No, I think it's just you."	Manner	Accusing the interviewer of being irritative.
2	7.don't understand sarcasm	Manner	Accusing the American interviewer of not understanding British sense of Humour .
3	8.as you've written me you wish to	Quality and Manner	To reveal that the interviewer was asking the writer to challenge or disturb his audience .
4	9.Irony	Quality	As if there is nothing worth mentioning in British.
4	10.Oh, Captain Clever!	Quality	Naming the person with an adjective.
4	11.Sydney Opera House perhaps? The Hanging Gardens of Babylon? Herds of wildebeest sweeping majestically?"	Manner	To compare between opposite places.
4	12."Still here?"	quality	The supervisor sent him to an interview and he is still arguing .
5	13."Do you find that it's easier for you to focus because you're so busy?"	Quality & Manner	To say that the actress is not focusing.
6	14."Uh,no I never read the book, or the script.	Quality	The actress was doing a film without reading the novel.
7	15.Trumpish	Quality	The language of Donald Trump

TextN	Sarcasm	Violation	Explanation
8	16. Of course I'm being sarcastic,"	Quality & Manner	When they told him ,it is inappropriate to international relations.
9	17. to rubbish me	Four maxims	The noun used as a verb. Which means to send to trash.
10	18. Scotch eggs! Pork pies!	quality	Egg is found everywhere also pies.
11	19. "Ministry of Silly Walks.	quality	To make silly as ministry
11	20. He's a wonderful murderer	quality	To mean a perfect one.
11	21. He said :that they did it to prove that Germans do have a sense of humor.	Relation	As an answer why German planes were bombing your seaside?
12	22. a novelty tradition!"	Four maxims	When the spokeswoman was asked about releasing tax returns ,she said it's novelty.
12	23. dirty work	Manner	To say they do charities and other dirty work.
12	24. "So we can go back and forth on that all day."	Manner	They were repeating the same question and the same answers.
13	25. I'm not a feminist	Quality	Trump is saying I'm changing my mind according to the climate.
14.	26. America is Going Down the Toilet, But I Love Living Here"	Quality	Who loves living in toilet?
14	27. this evil culture	Quality & Manner	Still he prefers living there .
15	28. "so the questions is whether he is a Sunni or a Shiite.	Four maxims	After letting his Muslim roots come out. The question ,to which sect does he belong?
16	29. 'Be rougher	Quality	Trump advices men to be harsh and violent .
16	30. "There was never a bankruptcy,	Quality & Manner	Trump was lying.
16	31. Hey folks, guess what? I'm getting a divorce.	Manner	Trump was talking with his parents .
16	32. with people in general, you get more with vinegar than honey.	Four maxims	Trump advising people to be violent rather than kind.
16	33. but no hair pulling	quality	As if he wishes to see them do so.
16	34. you don't have scars. (Right, Sigmund Freud?)	Quality & manner	Accusing the interviewer of having Sigmund Freud scars.
17	35. Waving's very important	Relation	The big responsibility of the Prince of Wales.

TextN	Sarcasm	Violation	Explanation
17	36. Well I do love a leek!	Relation	The Prince of Wales was asked about the best thing about being the Prince of Wales?
17	37. That bloody language	Quality & manner	How can a language be bloody?
17	38. They've been invaluable.	Manner	The Prince described his brothers .
17	39. As long as they don't mention my ears	Quality, relation	Because he has long ears.
18	40. "Barack HUSSEIN Obama	Four maxims	Trump accusing Obama of being the founder of ISIS because this suggested links with the Muslim world. Though Obama has been a lifelong Christian and is not a Muslim

4. Conclusion

From the analysis of the data from American and British interviews, there are flouting and violating of the four maxims (Quantity, Quality, Manner and Relation) of the cooperative principle and there is implied meaning, conversational implicature. Speakers use the flouting and violating of the maxims by using sarcasm as a rhetorical figure of speech for many purposes to fulfill social functions in a sense of humour. The use of this type communication depends on two conditions: the situation is acceptable to be sarcastic, for instance, in a job interview, sarcasm should be avoided, also in formal interviews, children also do not understand it. Strangers, from other cultures may do not understand it. The other condition, is the participants themselves accept it, and able to recognize it easily.

The study has presented a critical pragmatic analysis of the interviews to highlight the violation and flouting of the maxims of the cooperative principle by the characters. Hoping that the analysis would improve the reader's knowledge of how the different characters violated and flouted maxims and then they understand quite well the speakers' intended meanings in their conversation, in which the characters mean more than what they utter.

References

- Adegbite, F. & Akindele, W. (1999). *The sociology and politics of English in Nigeria: An introduction*. Ile-Ife: Debiyi-Iwa Publishers.
- Arp, T. P. & Johnson, G. (2012). *Perrine's story and structure* (13th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Attardo, S. (2002). Humor and irony in interaction: From mode adoption to failure of detection. In L. Anolli, R. Ciceri. & G. Riva (Eds.), *Say not to say: New perspective on miscommunication* (pp. 159-179). Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barbe, K. (1995). *Irony in context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Berrendonner, A. (1981). *Eléments de pragmatique linguistique* (Elements of pragmatic linguistics). Paris: Minuit.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bühler, K. (2011). *Theory of language: The representational function of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Carston, R. (1981). Irony and parody and the use-mention distinction. *The Nottingham Linguistic Circular*, 10(1), 24-35.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Dews, S., Kaplan, J. & Winner, E. (1995). Why not say it directly? The social functions of irony. *Discourse Processes*, 19, 347-367.
- Dews, S. & Winner, E. (1995). Muting the meaning: A social function of irony. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10(1), 3-19.
- Finch, G. (2005). *Key concepts in language and linguistics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Giora, R. (1995). On irony and negation. *Discourse Processes*, 19, 239-264.
- Grice, H. P. (1967). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1978). Further notes on logic and conversation. In P. Cole (Ed.), *Pragmatics* (113-127). New York: Academic Press.

- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing pragmatics* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
- Haiman, J. (1998). *Talk is cheap: Sarcasm, alienation, and the evolution of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horn, L. R. (2004). Implicature. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 3-28). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Juez, L. A. (1995). Verbal irony and the maxims of Grice's cooperative principle. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 8, 25-30.
- Kreuz, R., Long, D. & Church, M. (1991). On being ironic: Pragmatic and mnemonic implications. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 6(3), 149-162.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*, (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Myers-Roy, A. (1981). The function of irony in discourse. *Text*, 1(4), 407-423.
- Pettineo, J. F. (2012). *The Ironic Imagination: Redescription and Embedded irony in Selected Works of Edgar Allan Poe and Herman Melville*. Dissertation. Dallas: ProQuest LLC.
- Pop, A. (2010). Implicatures derived through maxim flouting in print advertising: A contrastive empirical approach. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics (TWPL)*, 33, 1-8.
- Radford, A., Atkinson, M., Britain, D., Clahsen, H. & Spencer, A. (2009). *Linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rockwell, P. (2000). Lower, slower, louder: Vocal cues of sarcasm. *Journal of Psycholinguistics Research*, 29(5), 483-495.
- Rillof, E., Qadir, A., Surve, P., De Silva, L., Gilbert, N. & Huang, R. (2013, October). Sarcasm as contrast between a positive sentiment and negative situation. Paper presented at the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Seattle. Retrieved on May 22, 2017, from <http://www.anthology.aclweb.org/D/D13/D13-1066.pdf>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taflinger, R. F. (1996). *Sitcom: What it is, how it works*. Retrieved on December 14, 2016, from <http://public.wsu.edu/~taflinge/sitcom.html>

- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (p. 352). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Whorf, B. L. & Carroll, J. B. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Wray, A., Trott, K., Bloomer, A. & Reay, S. (1998). *Projects in linguistics: A practical guide to researching language*. London: Arnold.



SRA (Science Research Associates) Strategic Research Academy & Academic Publishing®

© Copyright of Journal of Strategic Research in Social Science (JoSReSS) is the property of SRA (Science Research Associates) Strategic Research Academy & Academic Publishing® and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.