A Pragmatic Study of Sarcasm in Selected British TV Talk Shows

Asst. Inst. Raneen Waleed Khalid

The directorate general of education of Salahaddin - Ministry of Education-Iraq

ranwkh92@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

An interlocutor may deliver the facts tastefully and softly by applying comedy. This research is an effort to cope with the caustic comments on the British talk shows. The present research tries to find out how " sarcasm is reflected and expressed in the British talk show; displaying the pragmatic devices of humour and discovering similar tactics. It , furthermore, hypotheses the following; talk show extensively depends on tactics of humour to express the sarcastic message; the strategies are : irony, exaggeration, and sarcasm. This study is relevant to students of linguistics and researchers in the area of pragmatics notably in the theories of sarcasm and humour. This article is devoted to the examination of the British talk programmes.

To cite this article:

Introduction

In any setting of interaction, individuals may give a speech in such ways. The language individuals use has to be relevant to the context of the scenario being employed, whether official or in the casual setting of discourse. Context of speech in every encounter needs to be as speakers' concern as they will encounter the communication that is appropriately expressed. The context of language being employed influences the speaker's attitude in expressing thoughts or messages of communication (*Harared and Nurani,* 2020,p.186).

Pragmatics studies the way language is used in context. It is the process of producing meaning as it is conveyed and controlled by persons in a communication situation, rather than being formed by the language system. The two components of pragmatics are separated ; a socio-pragmatic component and a pragma-linguistic component (Barron, 2003,p. 8). In daily life, comedy is absolutely vital. When individuals are conversing in a serious and strict atmosphere, it is frequently acceptable to employ humour. It increases users' casual interactions and relationships. Understanding comedy in modern events is vital as it may be exploited to reduce exhaustion, tension, and stress.

Pragmatics has improved tremendously in the recent thirty years. Linguists have typically been engaged with the analysis of language structure at the levels of phonology, morphology, and syntax, but with the pragmatic movement in the late 1970s and early 1980s, part of the attention turned from language structure to language use. At the onset of this process, pragmatics was usually considered as a jumble of language description (Mey,1998,p.716). Wijana (1995: 8) proposes that linguistics may be used to investigate humour as it includes incongruity and conflict. Linguistics analyses features of incongruity and conflict using pragmatic criteria, both textual and interpersonal. Textually, the incongruity is created by a breach of the

Cooperative Principle, while social incongruity is caused by a violation of the Politeness Principle. For example, Cruse (2000,p.16) defines pragmatics as "aspects of information conveyed through language that (a) are not encoded by generally accepted convention in the linguistic forms used, but (b) arise innately out of and rely heavily on the meanings customarily encoded in the language expressions utilized, taken together with the context in which the forms are used."

According to Shaw (1976,p.241), " sarcasm is a sort of irony; piercing and typically scathing criticism. Sarcasm comprises of sneering or cutting remarks; it is always personal, always jeering, and would constantly aimed to harm." It affects someone's feelings rather than an organization (Martin, 2007,p.13). Parington (cited in Dynel, 2009,p.1289) notes that sarcasm is equivalent to a harsh, corrosive or hurtful phrase. It might be in the form of a harsh gibe or insult. Below is an example of discussion that mixes caustic words or emotion. At a wonderful meal, a stately woman scolded Winston Churchill.

Lady : Sir, you are drunk.

Winston : Yes. And you are ugly. But tomorrow I will be sober and you will still be ugly (Martin, 2007,p.13).

In this encounter, Winston Churchill exhibits sarcasm via his statements. He feels that the following morning he would be in a better state, not intoxicated anymore, but the woman would still be unappealing. This speech, of course, is caustic and degrades a person. In addition to broad pragmatic features, a number of pragma linguistic traits that are connected with sarcasm are listed in the literature. These traits have more to do with the sarcastic speech per se than with the external setting in which it occurs. Their presence may be considered, more or less, a potential evidence that sarcasm is being applied. Among these traits are the following:

A) Context

Sarcasm can be identified by means of context since the recipient of sarcasm can deduce whether the uttered statement is to be taken literally or sarcastically according to previous actions and statements. For instance, a person is voyaging with a friend and several ill-fated things occur to him–his voyage is late, he misses his connection, and after all of that his car breaks down–after all that his friend says:
(1)   I   think   this   is   your   lucky   day.
It is evident that the surrounding events of that statement would make one think that the remark was stated sarcastically rather than literally (Al-Fatlawi,2018,p.8).

B) Positive Wording

This pragmalinguistic feature is intimately tied to false politeness, i.e., it is one way how mock politeness is done. In most cases, sarcastic utterances are worded positively: (1) they either contain lexical items carrying positive semantic meanings (e.g. You are a genius!), or (2) the sarcastic utterance itself can be a formulaic expression associated with doing something polite (e.g. using Could you……? for mocking a polite request).

C) Hyperbole

Leech (2014,p.234) says that exaggeration (or hyperbole in rhetoric terminology) is a way of making the overt meaning of a speech infelicitous and finally encourages ironic interpretation. He adds that exaggeration flouts the Quality Maxim in the sense of overstating the facts.

Sarcastic exaggeration refers to an exaggerated linguistic style the speaker employs to emphasize that sarcasm is in operation (Gibbs, 1993,p.268). On the linguistic level, excessive adjectives may operate as indicators of hyperbolic sarcasm (e.g. That's amazing!). In addition, superlatives may also serve the same aim (You've got the biggest intelligence ever!) On the phrase level, exaggeration could have numerous versions. Hyperbole may emerge by repeating a word in the same utterance (e.g. Thank you very very much!).

The Model of Analysis

The expected model to be applied in this section is an outcome from several pragmatic concepts , such as speech acts, Grice's maxims, Leech theory of politeness, and the pragmatic functions of sarcasm. These concepts can be explained as follows:

The Speech Act Theory and Sarcasm

Speech acts which are provided in the supplied British TV programmes are the fundamental focus in this issue. Sarcasm , as a consequence of using multiple sorts speech acts via diverse patterns. The categories

of speech acts due to Searle's are connected to the literature and more notably those are picked for the proposed study to identify the sarcastic style of British TV programmes. Mey (1993) defined five sorts of speech acts: representatives, commissives, directives, expressives and declaratives. These activities can be conducted efficiently only under particular criteria 'felicity conditions.

Gricean Cooperative Principle and Sarcasm

Grice (1975,p.45) inclines that there is a set of assumptions controlling conversation, and that these assumptions may be defined as criteria for successful and optimal language usage. According to Grice, the principles are four key maxims of interaction that collectively comprise a comprehensive Cooperative Principle. According to the notion, an interlocutor must provide when requested and in line with the situation in which she or he is participating. Quality, quantity, relation, and manner are the maxims which have tow possibilities one is to follow the maxim and the other is to deny the maxim. When the maxim is met, it is regarded that the interlocutor has effectively followed the maxim, which is known as maxim observance. Furthermore, non-observance of maxim refers to when an interlocutor fails to respect the maxim. When a speaker effectively follows four maxims to increase successful communication, this is referred to as maxim observance. Grice (1975,p.45-46) separates four maxims as follows:

1) Maxim of Quality

The Quality maxim bans the interlocutor from declaring anything that is regarded to be incorrect and without acceptable proof. (Grice, 1975,p.46). In other words, the speaker is supposed to be truthful and convey the truth. For example:

A: Why you didn't attend to the party last night?

B: I attended to my niece's wedding celebration.

In this exchange, speaker B explains the truth about the reason why she did not attend to the party, since she must come to her niece's wedding celebration.

2) Maxim of Quantity

According to the Quantity maxim, the speaker's involvement should be as information as required and no more informational than essential (Grice, 1975,p.45). For example:

A: Where are you going

B: I'm heading to the post office.

Here, speaker B delivers acceptable answer to speaker A's inquiry. She/he immediately addresses speaker A's question and makes her/his contribution as informative as necessary.

3) Maxim of Relation

The Relation maxim demands the speaker to say something linked to what has came before (Grice, 1975,p.46). For example:

A: Where is my wallet?

B: It is in your room.

In the example, speaker B's reply pertains to the question. She/he is not talking about anything else.

4) Maxim of Manner

The Way maxim urges the speaker to explain information in an organised and simple manner (Cutting, 2002: 35). It also required that the speaker avoid obscurity of phrase, ambiguity, be succinct, and tidy (Grice, 1975,p.46). For example:

A: Where was Alya this morning?

B: She went to the store and got some stuff for BBQ party tonight.

In the example, speaker B's response obeys the rule of manner: be orderly, since she/he offers a clear explanation where Alya was.

Pragmatic Structure of Sarcasm

Sarcasm may be characterised variously by many researchers. Camp (2012) provides pragmatic classification of sarcasm and groups it into four primary pragmatic forms; propositional sarcasm, lexical sarcasm, 'like'-prefixed sarcasm and illocutionary sarcasm. All of the forms centre on the premise that sarcasm acts as the act of turning meaning, hence each type either contradicts something or appears to imply.

A) Propositional Sarcasm

The propositional sarcasm is regarded as being the most straightforward form of sarcasm among the other four types (ibid). Moreover, The concept of this category of sarcasm is established on the theory of presupposition and entailment suggested by Yule (1996:9), who describes a presupposition as "something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance" and an entailment as "something that logically follows from what is asserted in the utterance" . An example of this style of sarcasm may be the following passage from the TV programme Sherlock:

Anderson: Rache is German meaning Revenge. She might be trying to tell us something.

Sherlock: Yes, thank you for your insight.

In this case Sherlock expresses his sarcastic comment in order to illustrate the contrary of his literal utterance, i.e., he wants to communicate his aggravation to Anderson because it is plain that the word Rache is left to signify something and it is obvious that Sherlock is intelligent and knows that already (Camp,2012).

B) Lexical Sarcasm

"In the usage of lexical sarcasm , the person speaking carries on a general speech act whose illocutionary force is guided by the real sentence syntactic mood in the regular manner, and whose overall theme is a compositional function of the typical meanings of its element terms in addition to "local, lexically-focused pragmatic processes". The main aspect is, clearly, because the operational 'local processes' entail reversing the meaning of , at a minimum, one statement (ibid).

[12] Moreover, occasionally the directed speech conveys a positive value, but most usually it is negative, as in:

(7) If you manage to develop one more half-baked, insignificant thought like that, then you'll get tenure for sure.

In this case the speaker utilises one word to indicate sarcasm which is given as a reward for terrible work (Krenželoková, 2017).

C) Like-prefixed Sarcasm

Like-prefixed sarcasm only enabled different with declarative phrases, and is only aimed at material that is determined by the structure of the component expressions AA "conventional "meanings + lexically-focused pragmatic processes." Additionally, sarcasm is linked with the sarcastic like in a manner that it is evident that the speaker is rejecting his concrete remark. For example, while stating:

(8) Like I've spoken to John in weeks

one makes use of a sarcastic 'like' which flips the connotation and, as a consequence, the statement plainly denies that the speaker has interacted with John in recent times (Yule, 2010)

D) Illocutionary Sarcasm

Camp (2012) thinks that illocutionary sarcasm encompasses not merely some component of the utterance, or some proposition associated with the uttered phrase, but the full illocutionary deed, that a real speech of the relevant sentence would have undertaken." Moreover, this sort of sarcasm generally involves "implicatures that communicate evaluating moods such as sympathy, appreciation, or surprise." For example, when a speaker is in a circumstance where he is going through the door behind someone and that someone closes the door behind him, the speaker, surprised, might remark for instance:

(9)Thanks for holding the door.

This sort of sarcasm is the most effective one as its value rests in the entire conflict between the caustic speech and the true circumstance.

Leech's Theory of Politeness and Sarcasm

Geoffrey Leech is One of the important linguists who contributed to the discipline of pragmatics. He focusses on politeness theory as a pragmatic reality. His model provides a collection of maxims via which politeness theory functions in interactions. Leech outlined his model in three maxims:

1.Tact Maxim (in impositives and commissives): (a)minimize cost to other,(b) maximis advantage to other.

2.Approbation Maxim (in expressives and assertives): (a) minimise dispraise of other, (b) maximum praise of other.

3.Agreement maxim (in representatives): reduce dispute between self and other; [promote agreement between self and other] (Grice,1978).

The Pragmatic Functions of Sarcasm

Sarcastic language is utilised to execute particular purpose and it is varies from one user of language to another according to the speaker's goal. It is determined that sarcasm in its many gadgets may be preformed via different methods :

A) Humour

Sarcastic utterances are more typically perceived as hilarious than non-sarcastic utterances owing to the unanticipated incongruity between utterances and inferred meanings provided by speakers (Dew and Winner,1995). Sarcasm is a type of humour. Moreover, humour in sarcasm may be defined as incongruity as it arises in the difference between the speaker's acceptable words and his hostile intents (Haiman, 1998). An example of sacasm as humour may be:

(10) Sarah: What are these squiggles?

Sherlock: They're numbers. Written in an archaic Chinese dialect.

Sarah: Of course. Yes. Should have known that.

The example above is drawn from the TV series Sherlock when one of the characters who is Sarah replies to Sherlock's extremely excellent remark by asserting that she should know such a thing and it is evident that she stated so sarcastically in order to induce amusement (p.14).

B) Evaluation

Sarcasm as a sub-type of linguistic irony is developed in order to portray unpleasant thoughts towards another. This is related with the declaration of a sentiment, attitude, or assessment. Dews and Winner (1995,p.19) also believe that adopting a pessimistic viewpoint is the objective for adopting sarcasm. A excellent example that may account for the usage of sarcasm as an assessment can be the following:

Leonard: No, no, no. Hang on. I think I'm meant to take you through the threshold.

Penny: Can you?

Leonard: Who do you suppose brings Sheldon to bed when he falls asleep in front of the TV?

The scenario above is drawn from the TV programme Big Bang Theory when Leonard who has just got married with Penny and he struggles while attempting to carry her and Penny questions his capacity to do so. Then, Leonard offers his snarky statement that he carries Sheldon every day because he was upset by his wife (p.20).

Tool for Politeness

Sarcasm may also be used as a tactic to attain civility. It is viewed as the least destructive when it is contrasted to explicit aggressiveness in direct speaking actions. Dews and Winner (1995,p.13) suggest that the application of sarcasm moderates threatening consequences of intended meanings. Additionally, Barbe [21] emphasizes that while utilising sarcasm, a speaker is capable of casting disputes aside for not expressing his emotions in a plainly insulting manner.

The damaging effect of negative thoughts are minimised by civility in the speaker's speech. Therefore, the employment of sarcasm acts as a face-saving measure. This assertion may be validated by discussing the following instance:

(11) Sheldon: Would you pass the mustard?

Leonard: Sure. Hey, want to hear a fascinating tidbit about mustard?

Sheldon: Is it that the glucosinolates which give mustard its taste were developed by the cabbage family as a chemical protection against caterpillars?

Leonard: Yeah.

Sheldon: Well, that was fun. Good for you, Leonard.

(11) Sheldon in this example utilises sarcasm as a method of minimising the fact that what he stated about mustard is not a fun fact as fun facts are intended to be pretty hilarious. However, Sheldon wants to save the face of Leonard and that he has no sense of humour [22].

The Eclectic Model

The model of analysis of sarcasm in the selected British TV series, will be carried out according to an eclectic model to be presented by this study to incorporate numerous pragmatic notions that have been discussed in earlier portions. In this paradigm numerous TV broadcasts are appraised pragmatically. Therefore, for any TV program, the kinds of SAs will be investigated, taking into account their felicity

circumstances. As a matter of fact, Searle's classification of SAs has been adopted for this study because it incorporates all sorts of SAs wherever sarcasm appears in the data.

As regards the pragmatic frameworks of sarcasm, there are four essential structures that are applied in order to generate sarcasm in the selected British TV series. These structures are lexical, propositional, like-prefixed and illocutionary sarcasm. Moreover, Grice's maxims of quantity, quality, relevance and style are investigated to determine how and to which degree a particular sarcastic speech breaks any of these maxims in the selected episodes of the TV series.

Furthermore, the TV episodes are also evaluated according to Leech's maxims of politeness to judge whether the sarcastic phrase is obedient to the tact, acceptance or agreement. This analysis will also assist in recognising the extent to which these sarcastic statements conform or contradict Leech's maxims. Finally, the pragmatic objective of sarcasm comprising humour, evaluation, and tool for politeness are also addressed in order to highlight the roles of sarcasm that are prevalent in British TV programmes. The model of analysis will be the major instrument through which the data of the selected TV shows are analysed.

Data Analysis and Methodology

This part deals with the procedure and data analysis of the current study. It has to do with the sarcastic utterances that are analyzed according to the model of the analysis mentioned below.

It involves instances of sarcasm adopted from British talk shows. The data collection procedure was as follows: the collected sarcastic instances are downloaded from www.youtube.com from different British TV talk shows. The analysis is made in the light of the general pragmatic characteristics reviewed in the literature. The study adopts the pragmatic theories mentioned to reveal the whole potentialities of the speakers. Thus, the strategies are used to reveal the intention of the speaker behind using the mockery situation in British TV talk Shows namely; celebrity juice and Firday night with Jonathan Ross.

Data Analysis

Extract No.1

S1: we're joking great great marvelous marvelous man

S2: we got us to the cost the cost of other sort of ascetic austere

S1: the cost or the cast, you people and your accent ,dialects over here

Discussion

Speech Act : Reporting

The speech act of reporting to others is used.

FCs of reporting to other

1- The PCCs

a. S1is delivering his speech to S2.

b. S1states that and repeats the words "cost or cast" and because

2- The PCs

S1 is criticizing S2 accent by repeating the words said by S2 "cost or cast".

3- The ECs

S1 wants to express his attitude towards S2 and S1 thinks will lead to a potential change in understanding of the accents.

4- The SCs

S1 sincerely feels that it is crucial to criticise S2 accent and his people .

Pragmatic Structure of Sarcasm

Illocutionary

S1 criticism is thought to be illocutionary since he criticizes S2 that is the reverse of the truth because the latter merely mispronunces the word "cost".

Grice's Maxim

1- The Quantity Maxim

There is a violation to this maxim since S1 contribution is more informative than is required.

2- The Quality Maxim

S1 overstates the maxim of quality since he says something untrue , that is repeating the word "cost".

3- The Relevance Maxim

S1 does not adhere to this maxim because he jumps from S2 discussion of the subject to the latter's dialect.
4- The Manner Maxim
There is no violation to this maxim because S1 contribution is brief and devoid of ambiguity
Leech's Maxim
Approbation
S1 does not obey this maxim because he maximizes dispraise of S1 by making fun of his accent and people.
Pragmatic Purpose of Sarcasm
Evaluation
S1 magnifies his critique of S2 by describing his dialcet.
Extract No.2
S1: what find of what kind of ballpark figure we're talking it
S2:250
S1: 250 pounds
S2: 250,000 British dollars ,
S1: a quarter of a million dollars!
Discussion
Speech Act : Stating
The speech act of stating to others is used.
FCs of stating to other
1- The PCCs
a. S1is stating the truth in his speech to S2.
b. S1 asks S2 about the necklace that he wears.
2- The PCs
S1 is asking S2 about the necklace price by repeating the words said by S2 "250 pounds".
3- The ECs
S1 wants to suprise S2 and S1 thinks that the answer will lead to a suprise.
4- The SCs
S1 asks a question and feels that S2 will get surprised.
Pragmatic Structure of Sarcasm
Illocutionary
S1's stating of the words leads to a surprise on the part of S2.
Grice's Maxim
1- The Quantity Maxim
S2 violates the maxim of quantity by providing information less than is required. This leads to sarcastic situation in which the guest illustrates more about the necklace. Again, S1 repeats what S2 says and violates the maxim of quantity and the audience laugh.
2- The Quality Maxim
There is no violation to this maxim.
3- The Manner Maxim
There is no violation to this maxim because S2 contribution is brief and devoid of ambiguity.
4- The Relevance Maxim
There is no violation to this maxim because S2 contribution is related to the context.
Leech's Maxim
Agreement
S2 obeys this maxim because he maximizes agreement between S1 and himself by making things clearer.
Pragmatic Purpose of Sarcasm
Humour
S1 utterance is humorous since it is not surprising that a diamond necklace is worthy of only 250 pounds therefore the audience laughs at S2 speech.
Extract No.3
S1: here's one of Michael's earliest appearances as friendless child

S2: for the first five years of my life my mother dressed me as Noddy what a boy or a girl and she said I want a children's character is that

S3: so that no bully in the area misses you walking

Discussion

Speech Act : Reporting

The speech act of reporting to others is used.

FCs of stating to other

1- The PCCs

a. S2 is reporting the story of his childhood in his speech to the audience.

b. S2 talks about his past and what hos mother used to dress him up.

2- The PCs

S2 is talking about the his childhood and how he used to wear as a child.

3- The ECs

S2 tells the story of his childhood within the show to S1 and S3 who are his friends.

4- The SCs

S2 talks about his childhood and tells the other participant his story.

Pragmatic Structure of Sarcasm

Illocutionary

S2s reporting the story leads to a humorous effect on the part of S1 and S3

Grice's Maxim

1- The Quantity Maxim

S2 violates the maxim of quantity and provides more information than is required.This leads to sarcastic situation in which the guest illustrates more about the necklace. Again, S1 repeats what S2 says and violates the maxim of quantity and the audience laugh.

2- The Quality Maxim

There is no violation to this maxim.

3-The Manner Maxim

There is no violation to this maxim because S2 contribution is brief and devoid of ambiguity.

4-The Relevance Maxim

There is no violation to this maxim because S2 contribution is related to the context.

Leech's Maxim

Agreement

S2 obeys this maxim because he maximizes agreement between S1, S3 and himself by making providing details about his childhood.

Pragmatic Purpose of Sarcasm

Tool for Politeness

S3 utterance is humorous because he tries to diminish the harmful effect of the words.

Extract No.4

S1: It depends on the audience but

S2: what are you talking about

S1: I was like ……..

S2: if you're working up to a joke just fuckin' do it

Discussion

Speech Act : Expressive

The expressive speech act is used.

FCs of stating to other

1- The PCCs

a. S1 is expressing his attitude towards the joke he is trying to tell the others about.

2- The PCs

S1 is talking about a joke he is trying to tell S2

3- The ECs

S1 tries to tell a joke to S2.
4- The SCs
S1 tries to tell the other participant a joke.
Pragmatic Structure of Sarcasm
Like prefixed sarcasm
S2s tries to express what he feels which leads to a humorous effect on the part of S1.
Grice's Maxim
1- The Quantity Maxim
S1 fails to deliver his message to S2 and violates the maxim of quantity. He does not provide sufficient information to S2.
2- The Quality Maxim
There is no violation to this maxim.
3-The Manner Maxim
There is no violation to this maxim because S1 contribution is brief and devoid of ambiguity.
4-The Relevance Maxim
There is no violation to this maxim because S1 contribution is related to the context.
Leech's Maxim
Agreement
S2 obeys this maxim because he maximizes agreement between S1 and himself by completing the details.
Pragmatic Purpose of Sarcasm
Humour
S2 utterance is humorous because he tries to be humorous and make fun of what S1 tries to say.

Conclusions
It can be concluded that:
1- Humour cannot be isolated from irony, sarcasm, and ridicule; there exists a link between those notions and humour.
2- In the TV talk shows , the presenters consciously apply sarcasm and irony in their speech and it is apparent in the utterances and this matches the hypothesis given.
3- Speakers try at expressing their message of mocking and criticism using gentle techniques. It is noticed that the pragmatic notions are powerfully indicated in the samples, among which the most striking are irony and sarcasm.
4- Flouting the pragmatic rules of communication. Basically, humour is a transgression of principles. It appears that this flouting is justified, owing to the assumption that the son and daughter discourse has got good will or purpose to address the public and a message to the people.
5- The main speech act through which sarcasm is carried out in British TV shows is reporting. Accordingly, this outcome verify the first hypothesis which states, there are specific speech acts whereby sarcasm is carried out in British TV Shows.
6- Illocutionary sarcasm is the dominant pragmatic structure that is used by the presenters of British TV shows. Therefore, the second hypothesis which reads, *there is a limited set of pragmatic structures whereby sarcasm is employed British TV Shows, namely illocutionary sarcasm* is proved to some extent.
7- In sarcasm, maintaining the politeness principle is crucial otherwise the speaker will be regarded as being impolite. It has been evident that Leech's maxims of politeness have been adhered in the selected British TV shows. As regards the conversational maxims, the analysis of the data has shown that the conversational maxims are violated in the British TV shows. The maxim that is excessively violated is quantity maxim because it concerns telling the truth and being sarcastic means saying something untrue for some purpose as well as the maxims of quality. Accordingly, these statements verify the third hypothesis which states, *The Politeness Principle and the Cooperative Principle are, in most cases, likely to be violated in   British   TV   Shows*.
8- In this study, the pragmatic purpose of evaluation in British TV shows. This shows that the hosts of British TV shows do not concern themselves with politeness as they do with arousing humour. Consequently, the

fourth hypothesis which recites, *Sarcasm in British TV Shows is mostly used in order to achieve humour and evaluation of situations* is proved.

Acknowledgements

Biodata of the Authors

Asst. Inst. Raneen W. Khalid. She is a lecturer. Her research is focused semantics, pragmati and applied linguistics. **Affiliation:** General Directorate of Salahddin, Ministry of Educatic Iraq. **Email**: ranwkh92@gmail.com Phone: (+964)07710748399

References

1. Al-Fatlawi,. (2018) ."*Online Sarcasm and its Perception by Second Language Learners*: The Case of Iraqi EFL Learners in Iraq and the UK" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation) Lancaster: Lancaster University.
2. B. Krenželoková, (2017). *Sarcasm in the TV Series Sherlock* (Unpublished B.A Diploma Thesis) . Masaryk: Masaryk University.
3. Barron A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics : learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. John Benjamins.
4. Camp,. (2012). *Sarcasm, Pretense, and The Semantics/Pragmatics Distinction*. *Noûs*, 46(4), 587-634.
5. Cruse D. A. (2000). *Meaning in language : an introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
6. Cutting, J. (2000). *Analyzing the language of discourse communities*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
7. Dynel, M. (2009), *Beyond a Joke: Types of Conversational Humour. Language and Linguistics Compass*, 3: 1284-1299. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2009.00152.x
8. Grice, (1975). *Jerry. (Eds.) Syntax and Semantics*. (Vol.3): Speech Acts. 41-58. "Logic and Conversation". In Cole, Peter and Morga
9. Grice, (1978). In P. Cole (Ed.), *Pragmatics* (113-127). New York : Academic Press. Further notes on logic and conversation
10. Haiman, J. (1998). *Talk Is Cheap: Sarcasm, Alienation, and the Evolution of Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
11. Harared, N. and Nurani, S. (2020) Sarcasm: Mock Politeness Performed In The Big Bang Theory. *Elite Journal Vol.7, No 2.*
12. Leech, G. (2014).The pragmatics of politeness. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Martin R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor : an integrative approach*. Elsevier Academic Press.
14. Martin, R., Puhlik-Doris, P.Larsen, G., Gray, J. &Wier, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humour and their relation to psychological well-being: development of the humour styles questionnaire. Journal of Research in Personality, 37, 48-75. Meaning and Relevance (pp.123-145). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Mey J. (1998). *Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics*. Elsevier.
16. Mey, (1993). Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
17. .S. Dew,. and E. Winner,.(1995) Metaphor and Symbolic Ac 10, (1), 3-19 Muting the meaning : A .social function of irony
18. S. Dew,. and E. Winner,.(1995) Metaphor and Symbolic Activity 10, (1), 3-19. Muting the meaning : A social function of irony.
19. Shaw, H. (1976). A Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms. London: Longman.
20. Wijana (1995) Pemanfaatan Teks Humor d alam Peng-ajaran Aspek-Aspek Keba hasaan. Vol, no.2. *Humaniora.*
21. Wilson, & D. Sperber (Eds.), Yule, G. 1996. Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
22. Yule, (2010). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.