

A Pragmatics Analysis of Sarcasm in Selected Interviews

PH D. Student. Hind Abdul-Ameer

Department of English

std2024308.hind.am@uowasit.edu.iq

Abstract:

This study examines pragmatic sarcasm in a subset of interviews where it dominates the participants' discourse. It aims to analyze pragmatic elements—Grice's principles, conversational inclusion, tactful techniques, and dialogue structure—to demonstrate the relationship between the speaker's authority level and their tactfulness. The study employs an inductive approach, reviewing literature related to the pragmatic aspects of interviews. Additionally, a survey of models used in data analysis will be conducted, including the model proposed by Grice (1975). Analysis of the results reveals the following from the literature review of radio interviews:

Since the interviewer has the authority to determine the agenda, its scope, and the topics that can be reasonably discussed, the power dynamic is heavily skewed in their favor. However, jeopardizing the interviewee's position weakens their own.

The balance of power shifts. Specifically, the interviewer employs less tactful techniques due to their greater

authority over the interviewee. Accordingly, the interviewee is more likely to disregard Grice's principles than the interviewer, who is often more direct and seeks to clarify any potential implications in the interviewee's statement.

1. Introduction

Sarcasm displays a "I don't mean this" attitude in which the speaker purposefully mocks or expresses dislike for another individual or viewpoint that "does mean this." The terms sarcasm and irony are used in very similar ways by some authors, such as Capelli et al. (1990), but others, such as Hairman (1998), distinguish them by saying that the former must be communicated by people and must involve intention, while the latter may deal with situations and may lack intention. Furthermore, "attitude" is a crucial component of the concept of sarcasm and needs to be separated from "emotion." While the latter is interpreted directly through speech signals, the former is communicated indirectly through speech cues, necessitating a linguistic analysis of contextual and textual information, intonation, pragmatics, and semantics.

Sarcasm is an aggressive play on words. This attitude's hostility and negativity may be aimed against someone who is not physically present, another speaker in the discourse, or a general viewpoint or attitude regarding a person or thing. It has also been associated with humor, particularly in parodies. Additionally, sarcasm is obviously a type of rude communication that is used with the intention of being interpreted as insulting from the standpoint of etiquette. However, an expression that would typically be

courteous or genuine conveys the insulting nature. Thus, sarcasm is a kind of meta-strategy or mock-politeness that uses civility to convey rudeness. All things considered, sarcasm is common in communication because it is frequently not seen as being as harsh or impolite as more direct types of criticism.

Research Question:

Main Question:

To what degree does the authority of the speaker relate to the level of linguistic rigidity of their responses during radio interviews from a pragmatic perspective?

Sub- Questions:

1. To what extent does the interviewer's use of Griceans (1975) principles influence success in managing dialogue and how does this differ from the host and guest?
2. In the interviewer's agenda for the interview, how does he/she exercise authority over the flow of the conversation?
3. What effect does an unequal distribution of authority between the interviewer and the guest have on their levels of linguistic rigidity?
4. What pragmatic strategies has the guest employed in order to avoid following Grice's principles, and what are the motivations for using them?
5. What are the structural patterns within the dialogues of radio interviews, regarding role distribution and discursive authority?

Research Goals:

Main Hypothesis:

A speaker's level of pragmatic authority has a direct effect on a speaker's level of linguistic rigidity; that is, a higher

degree of authority equals less rigidity in the speaker's use of rigid discursive modes in his or her utterances.

Sub-Hypotheses:

1. The interviewer will possess more dominant discursive authority than will the guest, as evidenced by the interviewer's power to create and control the topics of the conversation.
2. The interviewer uses fewer cohesive devices in their speech than does the guest; therefore, the guest relies on cohesion to maintain his or her social status.
3. Due to the nature of the guests' defensive strategies, they will tend to violate the principles of cooperation promoted by Grice more readily than the interviewer.
4. The interviewer will attempt to eliminate ambiguity and provide clarification of the implications of the guests' words, demonstrating a tendency toward directness and control regarding the audience's perception of the outcome of the discourse.
5. The guest's face (i.e., his or her reputation) is being placed at risk by the authority of the interlocutor; thus, the authority of the interlocutor is also at risky disproving the authority of the interlocutor through excessive face-threatening acts toward the guest, resulting in an implicit balance in the two parties' pragmatic relationship.

Research Importance:

The research described herein is significant due to its overlap among three important related fields (linguistic pragmatics, discourse analysis, and broadcast media), which gives it both theoretical and practical value. The theoretical contribution of this study is to expand the area

of practical investigations by applying Grice's (1975) model throughout the radio interview process in an institutional and dynamic discursive context by identifying the rich dimensions of the connections between discursive power and linguistic cohesion. In addition, this study will provide a new method to analyze the phenomenon of pragmatic sarcasm using critical discourse analysis. Therefore, this study will help provide more knowledge on pragmatic irony within formal contexts. In terms of practicality, the study will help journalists and interviewers enhance their conversations. Additionally, this study will help important public figures and officials better comprehend the pragmatic techniques that interviewers use when asking them questions. In addition, the research findings could be beneficial for language education and/or teaching programs designed to develop oral communication skills. Furthermore, the findings from the research could contribute to the field of forensic linguistics by providing linguistic indicators to employ when analyzing discourse. This study is more important when we consider that radio media discourse is largely unexplored in the Arab research community, making this research a qualitative study that will open up new avenues for research among applied linguists.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Concept of Sarcasm

A significant part of social interaction and discourse is sarcasm. It is a type of indirect speech that is purposefully employed to provide the audience a specific dramatic

effect (McDonald, 1999: 486). Sarcasm is defined by the speaker's deliberate use of overt irony as a linguistic form of hostility. However, there is a significant distinction between the two: sarcasm needs to be deliberate and aware, whereas irony can be used accidentally and unwittingly. Sarcasm is viewed by some as a male-dominated communication style that is primarily utilized among peers.

Sarcasm is a type of sarcastic speech that is frequently used to express implicit criticism with a specific victim as its target. Regardless of whether someone is trying to convey dismay or is just kidding, there is always a victim (ibid. 486-7).

In ordinary speech, negative sarcasm—positively worded statements that communicate negative attitudes—is commonly employed. One could say, "I love James; that jerk slammed the door in my face even though he saw me walking behind him." One expresses his disdain of James and his behavior by using the word "love" in this statement. Once more, this is a play on words since in a sarcastic statement, the speaker uses terms that are completely at odds with his intended meaning; nonetheless, vocal emphasis on these phrases, frequently accompanied by facial movements, suggests that they should not be taken literally (ibid.).

According to Attardo (1994: 11), sarcasm is "an overtly aggressive type of irony, with clearer markers and a clear target." There hasn't been agreement, nevertheless, on whether sarcasm and irony are fundamentally the same thing with only minor variations or whether they differ

greatly. According to Dauphin (2000:7), sarcasm must be deliberate; people can be sardonic, but circumstances cannot. Irony, on the other hand, is unintentional, also situations can be ironic. The degree to which sarcasm is used in ordinary language depends on a variety of conditions, according to Toplak (2000: 14). Exaggeration, the speaker's personality, the speaker's relationship to the victim, the intensity of the criticism, and whether the criticism is being given in secret or in front of an audience are some of these aspects. The essential component of sarcasm, according to Toplak (ibid.), is "with speaker's intent in mind, sarcasm is used as a means of verbal aggression; with victim's reactions in mind, sarcasm is taken as a more severe form of criticism than found when criticism is directly expressed."

Thus, sarcasm is a less combative way to express what is really on one's mind. Additionally, it allows the speaker to be theatrical and employ wordplay that is more captivating than simple statements. It could be a courteous form of criticism that is typically accompanied by certain negative attitudes like derision, ridicule, contempt, and disapproval (ibid. 487).

2.2 Towards Understanding Sarcasm

The fundamental mechanisms required to comprehend sarcastic remarks have not been extensively studied experimentally in psychology. The interest in sarcasm and irony is largely due to linguistic and literary theorists who have been interested in a rationalistic explanation of the components needed to understand sarcasm. In this spirit, various perspectives have been established. The conventional view, referred to as the Standard Pragmatic Model, proposes that a hearer must first consider an expression's literal interpretation before ascertaining its nonliteral, sarcastic meaning, much like indirect requests, idioms, and metaphorical utterances (Gibbs and Colston, 2007: 174).

A sentence like "You are a fine friend" (which means "You are a bad friend") could be interpreted in three ways, according to the Pragmatic Model. Determine whether the literal meaning is the speaker's intended meaning, compute the literal meaning of the statement independently of its context, and, if the literal interpretation is incorrect, calculate the non-literal meaning by assuming the opposite of the literal interpretation. However, this paradigm may not fully capture the mechanisms involved in understanding sarcasm. According to Gibbs and Colston (2007: 175), the model is unable to identify the exact method by which listeners discern the ironic intentions of the speaker.

The Echoic Mention Theory is another theory that might be more adept at explaining the psychological processes

involved in comprehending sarcasm (Sperber and Wilson, 1981: 33). This theory holds that the literal proposition and the speaker's proposal toward it cannot be replaced by a nonliteral proposition. Echoic mention comes in a variety of forms and intensities; some are immediate echoes, while others are delayed; some have real sources, while others have imagined ones; some can be linked to specific people, while others have an unclear origin.

For instance, if Jack tells Bob, "You are a big help," even though Bob hasn't helped Jack, the sarcasm stems from the fact that Jack has reiterated a belief or remark that was previously conveyed, or possibly from an unwritten agreement between Jack and Bob. In other words, Bob may have already offered to assist Jack, or it may be Bob's responsibility to do so. In a way, Jack is paraphrasing this earlier statement when he says, "You are a big help," or he is expressing a shared understanding that Bob's role is to assist Jack (ibid.).

In comprehending sarcastic remarks, speakers and understanders need to share specific pragmatic information, as Gibbs (2007: 188) demonstrates. These statements might be especially memorable if sarcasm has unique pragmatic qualities. Because sarcasm plays a unique role in connecting speakers and hearers through the reference of a previously studied viewpoint or attitude, memory for sarcastic expressions should be especially engaging.

According to Gibb (ibid. 195), people comprehend statements like "You are a fine friend" faster than "You are a bad friend" because the first statement reflects the

societal norm that one should be kind to others. Hearers' recognition of this makes it easier to interpret phrases like "You are a fine friend" as sarcastic. Another theory is that, although though they are known to occur in ordinary conversation, people will remember phrases like "You are a bad friend" that mean "You are a good friend" especially well because they are uncommon examples of sarcasm.

Another theory is that, even if non-normative examples of sarcasm look a little out of the ordinary, people should remember instances of sarcasm that are based on a statement of some social norm, such as "You are a fine friend," more frequently than cases that are not. A norm should be especially memorable due to the echo's influence. In the same context, people should remember "You are a fine friend" far more frequently than "You are a terrible friend," and they should accurately remember "You are a fine friend" more frequently than "You are a terrible friend" (i.e., "You are a good friend").

2.3 Sarcasm and Social Cognition

Sarcasm has been shown to serve a number of social communication purposes, including making criticism seem more courteous, reducing its perceived danger and aggression, and fostering a lighthearted environment (Dews and Winner, 1999: 1579).

It seems that a lack of comprehension of sarcastic statements could be a sign of a poor comprehension of social indicators including intentions, beliefs, and emotions. According to contemporary theories of irony, sarcastic remarks are evaluated according to how relevant they are

to the context. According to relevance theory, understanding ironic statements may include acknowledging the speaker's attitude, which calls for mutual understanding between the speaker and the listener (ibid.).

2. 4 Impoliteness Theory

According to Locher and Watts (2005: 10), politeness is a "discursive concept arising out of the interactants' perceptions and judgements of their own and others' verbal behavior." According to Bousfield (2007: 2186), rudeness is a violation of the politeness principle. According to him, impoliteness is the antithesis of politeness since it involves the deliberate performance of superfluous, confrontational, and face-threatening verbal activities.

When it comes to language conduct, being courteous is reducing the detrimental impacts of one's words on other people's emotions and emphasizing the beneficial ones. Additionally, politeness might be hearer-oriented or speaker-oriented. Speaker-oriented politeness entails refraining from mentioning things about oneself that would put one in a favorable position in relation to the hearer; boasting, for instance, is therefore intrinsically rude. Hearer-oriented politeness includes statements that directly affect the hearer (Cruse, 2006: 131).

Following Brown and Levinson, many theorists believe that rudeness is an assault on the interlocutors' faces and that some behaviors, like reprimanding, threatening, criticizing, and insulting, are carried out by speakers with the inherent

intention of damaging or attacking the hearer's face (Haverkate, 1988: 394). Therefore, reconstructing the speaker's intended intents is the focus of the investigation of impoliteness (Mills, 2003:123).

Norrick (2009:66) asserts that speakers frequently employ both positive and negative impoliteness techniques. Making the other person uncomfortable is the most popular positive impoliteness tactic. Interlocutors often accomplish this by making fun of each other. Because he views scorn or derision as a means of highlighting power disparities between interlocutors, Culpeper (1996: 45) counts it as a negative politeness tactic. Sarcasm, he contends, is a bad politeness tactic. It is a form of mock-politeness tactics.

2.5 Grice's Maxims

The Cooperative Principle was developed by linguist and philosopher Paul Grice. It says, "Make your conversational 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" because understanding requires cooperation and acceptance between speakers and listeners. One of the more intriguing pragmatic methods is Grice's (Levinson, 1983: 97). Grice developed his four Conversational Maxims, which are based on this idea:

1. The quantity maxim: The presenters give as much information as they are able to.
2. The quality maxim: The speaker should be truthful and avoid giving false or untrustworthy information.

3. The relational maxim: The speaker's remarks should be relevant to the topic.
4. The rule of manners: The speaker ought to be clear-cut and straightforward. The wisest course of action is to avoid confusion and obfuscation. Additionally, the maxims overlap. For instance, Chandler's statement, "You have to stop the Q-Tip when there is resistance," can be used to demonstrate that a speaker is sardonic by breaking the Maxim of Relation and Manner. Chandler broke multiple maxims, and it's not apparent which maxim has more weight in determining whether or not his statement was ironic (Mey, 2002, 76–77).

2.5.1 Flouting the Maxims

Disregarding the maxims is the most intriguing example of a breach. Interviewees may take advantage of this option by using a variety of tactics in which they flagrantly violate one or more maxims, presuming that H is aware of this and can thus come up with a suitable explanation for doing so.

2.5.1.1 Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Quantity

This is the informativeness maxim (see Kearns, 2000: 258). When a S clearly provides more or less information than the circumstances call for, it is a violation of the principle of quantity. Consider the following instance from the 2000 "Breakfast with Frost" interview between British Prime Minister Tony Blair (TB) and David Frost (DF), in which Blair disregards Grice's quantity maxim:

DF: *What can you do (to help the NHS) ... now?*

TB: *In the short term [we]'ve got more care beds.*

DF: [mm]

TB: *and we've got to bring more nurses back into the health service (.)*

Frost stops the Prime Minister at this moment, indicating that his response was "more informative than is required" (Grice, 1975). Blair's mention of the cautious borrowing may also violate the Relevance maxim. The conversational implication is that there is no easy solution to the NHS (National Health Security) problem (Yoell: n.d., n.p.). Tautology is another instance of breaking the quality maxim.

2.5.1.2 Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Quality

1. Irony. The literal meaning may be the reverse of the implied meaning. Typically, this process is referred to as irony. Irony might be considered a violation of the quality maxim. In response to B's comment regarding a basic city that A has been to, A can say:

A. *It rivals Florence.*

A. *There is not greater city in the world.* (Verschueren, 1999: 34-5)

Irony is typically indicated by exaggeration and understatement. By violating the Quantity or more the Quality maxim, the S may be dishonest (Leech, 1983:142):

That's all I wanted.

Bill wanted that news like he wanted a hole in the head.

2. Metaphors. These are instances of the sincerity maxim being broken. Inference plays a part in the interpretation of figures of speech, including metaphor, according to pragmatic theory. When a metaphor is understood

inferentially, it is assumed that the S did not mean what he actually stated and that the convention of truthfulness has been deliberately broken. A figure of speech's literal sense is replaced with the inferred figurative sense (Kearns, 2000: 9).

3. Rhetorical Questions. Rhetorical questions don't require an answer, but their structure doesn't indicate whether or not the H is expected to respond. A question may be deemed rhetorical by the H due to a particular aspect of the utterance scenario, such as when the S simply finishes his statement without offering any opportunity for responses (Hudson, 1980).

4. Hyperbole or Overstatement. Grice gives the following example:

Every nice girl loves a sailor.

If the S is "exaggerating or choosing a point on a scale which is higher than the actual state of affairs," he is said to violate the Quantity maxim, according to Brown and Levinson (1978:224). The interviewee may employ this tactic to bolster his position, offer pertinent criticism, draw attention to the flaws in his adversaries, refrain from engaging in face-threatening behavior (FTA), etc.

I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer.

5. Meiosis or Understatement. Saying something that differs from what the S truly wants to express is one method of creating implicatures. As an example, Grice (1975: 53) describes a man who is reported to have destroyed every piece of furniture.

He was a little intoxicated

Brown and Levinson (1978: 222) view understatement as a means of producing implicatures by stating less than is necessary, which is a violation of the Quantity maxim.

2.5.1.3 Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Relation

In certain situations, the adage "Be relevant" appears to have been ignored, but what is stated may only be fully understood by presuming that what appears to be unimportant is actually relevant. However, there are situations in which implicatures are meant to result from discovering that the Relation maxim is being blatantly ignored. In order to show the other conversant or conversants that what was being stated could put the S in an unpleasant (or worse) situation, someone may abruptly shift the topic or blatantly neglect to acknowledge the other person's purpose in posing the question (Green, 1989: 101).

2.5.1.4 Flouts Exploiting the Maxim of Manner

In order to imply that a shorter, more direct manner of speaking would be inaccurate, inconsiderate, impolitic, or something similar, Ss are also purposefully prolix or obscure (sometimes the two co-occur), as in the exchange that took place during a radio interview with an unidentified official from the US Embassy in Port-au-Prince, Haiti:

Interviewer: *Did United States Government play any part in Duvalier's departure?*

Official: *I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion.*

4. Methodology

4.1 Data Collection and Model

This research paper aims to assess the type and importance of the maxim violation in a selected statement from the television show "Friend." It's an attempt to look into the sarcastic remarks. The study's model is Grice (1975). He enumerates a number of sub-maxims that he thinks follow from it. The discourse is outlined by these maxims, which conversational participants should and usually do follow.

4.2 Data Analysis

The data analyses according to Grice's (1975) maxims. These maxims are as the following:

4.2.1 Maxim of quality

In the show, the characters have been violated this maxim a lot to be sarcastic for example:

All: *Hey! Paul! Hi! The Wine Guy! Hey!*

Chandler: *I'm sorry, I didn't catch your name. Paul, was it?*

In order to make light of the situation and show that they had heard of the guest, Chandler asked for their name even though all of the characters in the preceding quote recognized him. Another example of lying and violating this guideline is what Joey said to Monica:

Monica: *(taking a drink from Joey) Are you through with that?*

Joey: *Yeah, sorry, the swallowing slowed me down.*

The One With the Sonogram at the End

Because he fears Monica, Joey is lying to her. He explained to her that he hasn't finished his cup since he is swallowing,

which is quite normal. Another example of lying is what Chandler said to the characters when Ross invited everyone to his place. Chandler gave the following response when Ross said that Joy and Chandler would help him assemble the furniture:

Ross: *Right, you're not even getting your honeymoon, God.. No, no, although, Aruba, this time of year...*

Chandler: *(deadpan) Yes, and we're very excited about it.*

Chandler claims to be passionate about making furniture, which contrasts with what he considers enthusiasm. By displaying to the others his discontent or lack of enthusiasm for assisting his friend with furnishings, he has transgressed the precept.

5.2 Maxim of quantity

Characters in the program the author is studying, like the following, have regularly violated the quantity maxim by providing few facts and are usually irrelevant to the speaker's topic:

Ross: *I'm divorced! I'm only 26 and I'm divorced!*

Joey: *Shut up!*

Chandler: *You must stop!*

Joey and Chander, who are pals, did not provide any words of encouragement to their friend Ross, who appears dissatisfied with his current circumstances. Joey and Chandler, however, advised him to simply quit taking, which is inadequate and contradicts the quantity maxim. By speaking too little, the characters try to convey irony. However, by revealing or giving too much information, characters have broken this rule. Here's an illustration:

Phoebe: *Give her a break, it's hard being on your own for the first time.*

Rachel: *Thank you.*

Phoebe: *You're welcome. I remember when I first came to this city. I was fourteen. My mom had just killed herself and my step-dad was back in prison, and I got here, and I didn't know anybody*

Even if one of her acquaintances appeared to be helping her get by without the assistance of her family, Phoebe, the heroine in the preceding example, disclosed too much about her personal life. By breaking this rule, Phoebe sarcastically shows that Rachel's hardships are insignificant compared to what she went through when her parents abandoned her at the age of fourteen.

5.3 Maxim of relation

The show's characters also violate the relativity maxim to express a satirical viewpoint. As evidenced by the following, Chandler is among the characters who regularly engage in this behavior:

Ross: *I just feel like someone reached down my throat, grabbed my small intestine,...*

Chandler: *Cookie?*

He finds it quite difficult to comprehend that his wife is divorcing him. Chandler gave Ross a cookie as Ross was discussing how difficult his life had been since his wife made the decision to file for divorce. This seems that Chandler took advantage of the situation to let Ross know that he could require a cookie rather than a wife.

Another example of Chandler's persistent violation of the relationship maxim may be found in the following words:

Rachel: *Yeah, well, it's a Mercedes if I move back home. Oh, it was horrible. He called me young lady.*

Chandler: *Ooh, I hate when my father calls me that.*

The One With the East German Laundry Detergent

Rachel told her friends that her father had tried to make her feel uncomfortable by referring to her as a "young lady"—a term used in formal settings—and that he had promised to give her a Mercedes if she moved back in with her parents. Since Chandler claims that his father used the same term to address him, his response had nothing to do with the subject. He wants to mock his friend's issue by saying that his father still calls him a man despite the fact that he is a male. This also alludes to his battle to demonstrate that he is always seen as gay, even by his own father, just because his father is gay.

5.4 Maxim of manner

Characters usually violate these guidelines by being unclear and failing to make their meanings clear. Chandler, one of the main participants in the scheme under investigation, has regularly made fun of his pals by using this offense. Many of the show's non-American viewers were unable to comprehend the following example due to the cultural allusion:

Joey: *Why don't you go see Frankie? My family's been goin' to him forever. He did my first suit when I was 15. No wait, 16.....*

Chandler: *Okay. You have to stop the Q-tip when there's resistance!*

Chandler is telling Joey not to push in this circumstance. the American cotton swab company Q-tip, since it damages the brain. Because of his limited mental capacity, he wants to inform his pal Joey that he is foolish. Another instance from the show is what Ross said to Monica when he began considering dating once more following his terrible marriage:

Monica: *See ya.... Waitwait, what's with you?*

Ross: *I just grabbed a spoon. (Ross exits and Monica has no idea what that means.)*

The One Where Monica Gets a New Roommate

Ross is making reference to a different conversation with Joey in the section that comes before it. Joey advised that Ross start dating someone else and compared women to different types of ice cream. Joey used this analogy without his sister Monica's presence, and Ross failed to convey it to her, thus she was unable to grasp his meaning.

4.3 Result and Discussion

The researcher examined sarcasm as a pragmatic occurrence in a few chosen interviews for this study. Initially, he attempted to define sarcasm and distinguish it from irony. Since the Grice model is the most widely used model among researchers to address an utterance's indirect meaning and no one has previously used it to analyze sarcastic utterances, the researchers decided to use it to evaluate sarcasm.

Making it obvious what the Grice model is about and the primary domains it aims to cover—the maxims—is crucial for analysis. After that, the researcher identifies the different kinds of infractions and chooses the appropriate kind for examination. Finally, the analysis reveals that the characters in the TV interview have broken every rule in order to ridicule their friends or a particular circumstance. These infractions have accomplished their goal and conveyed the utterance's secret meaning.

Recommendation:

1. Scientific Research:

The study recommends that the analysis of how people communicate using language should expand to include other types of interviews including radio interviews, print interviews, and digital interviews. This will create a broader view of the differences in how people use language within various communication contexts. Additionally, comparative studies between multiple languages and cultures should be done to uncover how cultural differences influence the application of Grice's principles and manners of using polite language.

2. Methodology/Theory:

The researcher recommends the development of a more inclusive framework for analyzing politeness in communication. A single analytical model is not sufficient to analyze all the existing factors related to politeness within media communication.

3. In terms of future studies:

This study opens the door to future research addressing the influence of gender, culture, and ideological frameworks on the application of Grice's principles. It also advocates for utilizing artificial intelligence and natural language processing tools to analyze large volumes of media interview discourse to achieve more representative and reliable results.

Conclusion

The research reviewed the way that Pragmatics works with Analysis linguistically in interviews on TV using Grice (1975) and Dialogue Cooperation principles to discover how to conduct analysis of conversation based on observations of the above-mentioned principles. The study developed several findings concerning the ways that television interviews demonstrate unique Pragmatic features of how they are constructed as individual Discourse Institutional Patterns or forms of Discourse. More specifically, the study demonstrated that the participants in a television interview exhibit distinct formal strategies in terms of both their structural arrangement and the formality of their respective Discourse patterns and behaviours, on the basis of implicit agreements about how the parties would fulfil their respective Discourse roles (guest vs. interviewer) and share rights to speak/question. Through the analysis it was determined that participants followed these implicit agreements and used Grice's Quantity to a greater extent by violating his principles intentionally, to avoid directly confronting each other and thereby disturbing the dignity of all involved. On the other hand, the interviewer displays

a tendency towards being more direct and clear in attempting to identify the consequences of participants' utterances, which serves to demonstrate the interviewer's awareness of his/her parties' inferential processes and the nature of the Implicitness of meaning.

References

- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic Theories of Humour*. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing co.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978) "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena." In E. N. Goody (ed.) *Question and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*, pp.56-311. Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, Alan. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cruttenden, A. (1984). *Intonational Misfits: Intonation, Accent, and Rhythm*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness", in *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Dauphin, V. (2000). *Sarcasm in Relationships*. University of Pennsylvania: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/plc/communication/Valerie.htm>.
- Dews, S and Winner, E. (1999). *Obligatory Processing of Literal and Non-literal Meaning of Verbal Irony*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31.
- Gibbs, R. (1981). *Memory for Requests in Conversation*. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 20

- Gibbs, R. and Colston, H. (2007). *Irony in Language and Thought: A Cognitive Science Reader*. New York: Academic.
- Giora, R. (2003). *On Our Mind: Salience, Context and Figurative Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green, G. (1989) *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grice, H. P. (1977). *Further Notes on Logic in Conversation*. In J.L. Morgan (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics: Pragmatics Number 9 in Syntax and Semantics Series*. New York: Academic.
- Grice, P. (1975) "Logic and Conversation." In P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*, pp. 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Haverkate, H. (1988). *"Towards a Typology of Politeness Strategies"*, In Multilingual.
- Hudson, R (1980) *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kearns, K. (2000) "Implicature and Language Change". In Verschueren, J.; J. Ostman; J. Blommaert and C. Bulcaen (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics*. John Benjamins.
- Kearns, K. (2000) *Semantics*. Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locher, M. and Watts, R. (2005). *Politeness Theory and Relational Work*. Journal of Politeness Research (1): 9-33.
- Mey, J. (2002) *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Mills, Sara. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norrick, N. R. (1993).: *Conversational Joking Humour in Everyday Talk*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1981). *Irony and the Use-mention Distinction*. In P. Cole (Ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (2012). "A Deflationary Account of Metaphors", in Gibbs (ed.) *The Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toplak, M. (2000). "On the Uses of Sarcastic Irony." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1467-1488.
- Verschueren, J. (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wichmann, A. (2000). *The Attitudinal Effects of Prosody and How They Relate to Emotions*. www.isca-speech.org/archive-open/archive-papers/speech-emotion/spem.143.pdf.
- Winner, E. (1988). *The Point of Words: Children's Understanding of Metaphor and Irony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Yoell, S. (No date) *The Politeness of Political Interviews*.