

A Relevance Theory Analysis of Joe Biden's Interview on ABC's Late-Night Talk Show

Suhair Safwat Muhammed¹ - Aso Ali
Mohammed²

¹English Department, College of Languages,
University of Sulaimani, Sulaimani,
Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

²Garmian preparatory School, Directorate of
Education in Kalar, General Directorate of
Kalar Education, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

Abstract:

This research aims to conduct a relevance-theoretic analysis of an interview with American President Joe Biden on ABC's late-night talk show. Relevance Theory was developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995) as an inference-based

framework for understanding the cognitive interpretation of language. The model posits that in any given circumstance, the recipient must consider what others say relevant. The recipient must consider what others say is as relevant in any given circumstance. The descriptive-qualitative approach was used to illustrate how Biden constructs his sentences to provide the listener with sufficient evidence to grasp his intended meaning and how the listener employs comprehension strategies to understand the speaker's underlying meaning. Therefore, the research first reveals that Biden conveys his communicative goals clearly and gives enough supporting evidence for the receiver to deduce some of his intentions. Second, for effective communication, both parties must share cognitive context.

Keywords: Relevance Theory, Biden, Inference, Cognitive Context.

Article Info:

DOI: [10.26750/Vol\(10\).No\(4\).Paper25](https://doi.org/10.26750/Vol(10).No(4).Paper25)

Received: 04-July-2022

Accepted: 2-Nov-2022

Published: 29-Sep-2023

Corresponding Author's E-mail:

suhair.mohammed@univsul.edu.iq

aso.ali@garmian.edu.krd



This work is licensed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0

Copyright©2023 Journal of University of Raparin.

1. Introduction

Pragmatics is used extensively in interpersonal communication. For the most part, communication has been described as exchanging information between two parties using some linguistic codes. As defined by Sperber and Wilson(1986), the code model includes this traditional notion. This resulted in the development of an inferential model, which can be seen as a possible substitute for the code model. An inferential model known as Relevance Theory explains that the meaning of an utterance cannot be directly mapped to its grammatical meaning. The human capacity for inference fills the gap between a speaker's intended meaning and the meaning encoded into language. Relevance Theory, devised by Sperber and Wilson to encapsulate the general principles that govern the pragmatic interpretation, demonstrates how communication and arriving at the inferred meaning include linguistic and contextual knowledge. Relevance theory in pragmatics explains how the listener perceives a speaker's utterance. In essence, Sperber and Wilson (1986) asserted that when interpreting utterances, people follow the maximisation of relevance. That is true of both general human cognition and the interpretation of speech. The interpretation with the highest level of relevance has a high cognitive impact with little processing effort. According to relevance theory, an utterance's meaning can be broken down into explicatures and implicatures. Explicatures and implicatures are examples of meanings that have been explicitly and implicitly communicated, respectively. To create an explicature from the logical form, several inferential operations, including disambiguation, reference resolution, saturation, free enrichment, and ad hoc concept generation, must be performed. Next, the implicatures must be identified (implicated premises and implicated conclusions).

Relevance Theory is used in many types of research, particularly concerning their shared interest in political discourse. Although this study is also interested in political discourse, its primary focus is on something else. The political interview, a separate form of political discourse, is the primary topic of this article. Since politicians typically express their ambiguous opinions by displaying no cooperation and talking indirectly and evasively, relevance theory as a communicative theory can be used as an appropriate model to analyse political interviews as a particular genre of political discourse. The study establishes that some theoretical hypotheses of Relevance Theory are reasonable for addressing how politicians' evasive language can be explained and interpreted to get at the intended meaning of their statements. In the process of analyzing, Relevance theory is applied to establish the speaker's goals for the interview as well as what they plan to communicate to the audience in order to accomplish their goals.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Relevance Theory

In the 1980s, linguists Deirdre Wilson and anthropologist Dan Sperber developed what is now known as Relevance Theory. Although many others have contributed to its growth, it is most strongly identified with these two names. In an article, titled "On Grice's theory of conversation," was published in 1981, they detailed their agreement and disagreement with Grice and why they think his theory needs to be altered. *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (initially released in 1986 and updated in 1995) detail their theory, which they propose as a cognitive pragmatic alternative to Grice's Corporation-ruled explanation of utterance interpretation in place of sentence meaning.

Relevance Theory is based on relevance's definition and two main principles: cognitive and communicative. Grice coined *relevance* in his communication theory. The idea of "relevance" was developed by Sperber and Wilson. Therefore, in their view, the term *relevance* here is understood from a relevance theoretical notion used in the study of human communication. Assimakopoulos (2008:113–114) cites Sperber and Wilson's definition of relevance as a psychological characteristic of cognitive input to mental processing. This stimulus can be recognised in the given context as a communicated speech whose intended meaning needs to be processed. From a relevance-theoretic standpoint, the balance between cognitive impacts and processing effort determines how relevant a speech is to its receiver and, therefore, how worthwhile it is to process. Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995) proposed relevance principles as another foundation for their theory, which consists of two parts: Cognitive and Communicative. In accordance with Cruse (2006:153), the human cognitive system evaluates utterances to maximise their relevance on the cognitive principle of relevance. According to the communicative principle of relevance, a communicator's mere production of an utterance implicates his/her conception that it is maximally relevant.

2.2 Relevance Theory and Context

Contrary to Code Model, context is fundamental to inferential models. Context dependence appears more consistent with an inferential model than a code-based approach alone. In Gricean's pragmatics approaches, context's function in communication and comprehension has not been thoroughly examined. Blakemore (2002:73) hypothesizes that Grice recognised context in *reference assignment* and *disambiguation*. He didn't acknowledge that its function was constrained by the pragmatic considerations involved in recovering implicatures. In their early critique of Grice's model, Wilson and Sperber presented an example (Wilson and Sperber 1981:157):

1) I refuse to admit them.

Reference assignment and disambiguation lead to the assumption in (2b) when applied to the inquiry in (2a) and leads to the context in (3a) when applied to the context in (3b):

- 2) (a) What do you do when you make mistakes?
(b) The speaker refuses to confess to the mistakes he makes.
- 3) (a) What do you do with gate-crashers?
(b) The speaker refuses to let gate-crashers in.

Relevance Theory has attained popularity in communication studies primarily because it attempts to address the question of the nature and context function in communication. Sperber and Wilson (1986:15) define context as "the set of assumptions the hearer has about the world" rather than "the co-text or context of a situation." They write that a "context is a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer's world assumptions." Each new utterance needs a bit of distinct context by drawing on the same grammar and inferential abilities as previous utterances (Sperber and Wilson, 1987: 698). Pragmatic inference relies heavily on context, and relevance theory views communication as an instance of inference. However, there is much disagreement on how to define or even how far to use the term "context"; therefore, this remains a topic of active research. Though the cognitive context is distinct from the conventional context, relevance theory has made significant strides in this direction.

Meanwhile, several researchers concentrate on particular features of cognitive context. Based on the work of Sperber and Wilson (1982:79), Cai Yun (1997, quoted in Bai and Chen,2010:2), and Matsui (2000:32), it can be said that context is not static nor predetermined but rather the result of an ongoing inferential process. According to Sperber and Wilson (1995:142), regarding verbal comprehension, relevance is taken for granted, while context is viewed as a variable. This is because, according to Austin (1987:106) and Grundy(2008:139), instead of treating context as a preexisting common ground, it is viewed as a collection of more or less accessible pieces of knowledge that are either manifest in the physical world or stored in short-term and encyclopedic memory. All of these observations on the nature of context lead to the rhetorical question: if the context is not provided in advance but is created during the encounter, what factors influence the selection of a particular context from among the many possibilities? According to Sperber and Wilson (1986:144), the answer is the pursuit of relevance. The person has a variety of contexts at his/her disposal for the pursuit of relevance, which is mentally arranged in terms of accessibility. In the same manner that accessing a context needs effort, so does digesting information. As a result, relevance for a person depends on context accessibility as well as consequences and processing effort: "an assumption is relevant to an individual at a given time if and only if it is relevant in one or more of the contexts accessible to that individual at that time." (Sperber and Wilson,1986:144).

Since to Wilson and Sperber (1986b: 593), the relevance of the proposition being processed can be increased or decreased by contextual differences, and the desire to achieve an optimal level of relevance might have an impact on context choice. Grundy (2008:13) agrees with them and states that the relevance-theoretic view holds that an utterance is an instruction to find a context that maximises its relevance. According to Relevance Theory, the whole point is that it takes

several context extensions to get to an optimum relevant interpretation. However, if one interpretation is deemed adequate, further explanation is ended, and no more interpretive hypotheses are considered.

Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995) suggest that the problem of choosing which assumptions, out of a variety of assumptions, are more likely to be made and processed, can be overcome by relying on their conception of manifestation.. According to the co-author, all the information that is made manifest to a person makes up his/her cognitive environment. Individuals' entire cognitive environments are made up of all the environments available to them at any given moment and place, in addition to the information they already know (Sperber and Wilson,1987: 699). One definition of a *manifest fact* is "all the facts in an individual's environment of which that person is capable of becoming aware." They also insist that the idea of manifest facts can be expanded to the concept of *manifest assumptions*. When "sufficient evidence for its adoption" is provided by one's surrounding cognitive environment, an assumption is said to be "manifest" in that environment (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 39). Furthermore, Yus (2009:758) adds that because manifest information is less reliable than available information, relevance theory proposes the concept of *mutual manifestness* in place of the more traditional term mutual knowledge. On Sperber and Wilson's (1995)account, mutual manifestness, unlike mutual knowledge, does not have the same constraints.

2.2.1 Mutual Manifestation

Sperber and Wilson's idea of Mutual Manifestness gets over the problems with concepts like common knowledge and mutual knowledge while also rejecting the idea that there is an infallible method of communication. According to Austin (1987:103), transmitting the speaker's communicative intention may only be plausible under acceptable conditions. Still, it is not guaranteed to take place in any circumstance. In the view of Davies (1987:717), a claim of mutual manifestness develops into an infinite succession of claims of mutual manifestness. This results in an endless stream of manifestness assertions, each of which states that a person is capable of cognitively resembling a specific circumstance. Of course, an infinite list of manifestness claims need not be valid for someone to mentally imagine a large number of different situations at once. For example, a psychological implausibility argument against mutual knowledge does not hold true for mutual manifestness. Cruz (2016:5) claims that people share a mutual cognitive environment if they can build mental models of the same physical or psychological items that are comparable but not identical. A person's cognitive environment, according to Yus (2006:857;2009:767), is the sum of all their manifest assumptions and might change depending on the situation. One's *shared cognitive environment* consists of the underlying assumptions that are common knowledge among a group of people. In other words, the goal of communication is

to make the same assumptions manifest to the speaker and the listener. Andersen (2015:146) also asserts that speakers and listeners share a mutual cognitive environment, which comprises many presumptions about what each party perceives as manifest. As the discourse progresses, this environment is constantly negotiated and renegotiated. To illustrate, let's look at an excerpt from the beginning of the American film *Pretty Lady* (Bai and Chen, 2010:47): Edward and his girlfriend fight over the phone, and she says, "I speak to your secretary more than I speak to you." Then Edward met Susan, his future wife, and they had the following conversation:

4) **Edward** : Did you spend more time talking to my secretary than me on our date?

Susan : She was one of my bridesmaids.

Since Edward only wants a *yes* or *no* response, Susan's response is irrelevant to his question. Susan does not immediately address Edward's question. It is necessary to establish some relevance to comprehend the intended meaning, and based on what Susan said, Edward may make the following assumptions:

- a) To be Susan's bridesmaid, first and foremost, one must know her extremely well.
- b) Susan's bridesmaid was Edward's secretary. Thus, she must be a close friend of Susan's.
- c) Susan had more conversations with Edward's secretary than with him

Edward will understand Susan's relevance and be most optimal in this method. This confirms that the mutual manifestation of communicative speech, situation, and intents is the foundation of Sperber and Wilson's Relevance theory and that the final interpretation is impossible without inference. The speaker and hearer share a common language and context. (Richards, 1985:262; Sperber, 1994:181).

2.3 Ostensive-Inferential Communication

Sperber and Wilson point out that coded communication, in which a message is sent in a coded message, such as through the words of a language so that only the intended recipient can decode it, is just one of many forms of human communication. Coded communication is a subset of a much larger process known as **ostensive-inferential communication** (Sperber and Wilson, 1995: 63). According to Sperber and Wilson, seeing communication as an Ostensive-Inferential process means that the communicator ensures relevance by ostension, while the receiver seeks it out through inference. They offer the following description of ostensive-inferential communication:

“The communicator produces a stimulus which makes it mutually manifest to the communicator and audience that the communicator intends, by means of this stimulus, to make manifest or more manifest to the audience a set of assumptions {I}.” (Sperber and Wilson, 1995: 63)

Sperber and Wilson (1995: 163) and Austin (1987:104) argue that in ostensive communication, the communicator generates a stimulus with two goals in mind:

1. The informative intention: To elicit a specific behaviour from the audience, or, in other words, to make a set of assumptions mutually manifest to the communicator and audience.
2. The communicative intention: To mutually manifest his informative intention, that is, the intention to make the audience recognise that he has an informative intention, i.e., that he wishes to communicate something.

The communicator's communicative intention must be fulfilled for ostensive-inferential communication; as noted by Marquez (2000:43) and Allott (2013:12), the existence of the communicative intent is a condition that can be used to determine whether or not the speaker intends to communicate intentionally and purposefully that we are presently discussing. In addition, the achievement of this goal by itself is sufficient to ensure effective communication. If this purpose is successful, the hearer has, by definition, understood the informative intention. He understands what the speaker wanted him to think, in other words. In contrast, effective communication does not depend on the informational intention's success.

Toews (2019:15) argues that in inferential communication, the speaker intends for the listener to conclude what he/she means. Thus, we get to the central issue that Relevance Theory attempts to address: how do we reach inferences about meaning? He claims that the forms of language employed in communication are not constant enough to understand the intended meaning of a speech outside of its immediate context. Such inferences of meaning require some operation, and we call that process "inferential." It has been shown by Bai and Chen(2010:3) that in communication, the speaker demonstrates his informative and communicative aim by ostensive behaviours, giving the listener the basis for making an inference.

Yus (2011:7) says that Relevance Theory defends a concept of non-demonstrative inference because we are unsure of which cognitive processes result in an accurate inference, nor can we measure, in advance, how well inferences will turn out: "In demonstrative inference, [...] the truth of the premises guarantees the truth of the conclusions." In non-demonstrative inference, the truth of the premises makes it more likely that the conclusions are accurate. The process of inferential comprehension is non-demonstrative. (Sperber and Wilson,1987: 701). Think about the following illustration from (Marquez, 2000:51):

- 5) a) All men are mortal. (premise)
- b) Sócrates is a man. (premise)
- c) Sócrates is mortal. (conclusion)

The illustration in (5) is context-free because it uses a set of premises that can be applied in any situation and is based on a fixed set of premises. According to Marquez (2000:50), the assumptions that go into inferential comprehension are influenced by the addressee's input systems, their encyclopaedic memory assumptions, and the inferences they can draw using their inferential abilities. As an illustration, consider (6):

6) John: Do you plan to attend the conference?

Karen: It is about pragmatics.

The assumptions John makes as part of his overall representation of the universe impact how he should understand Karen's response and interpret it. Therefore, if John's encyclopedic memory assumes that Karen has a significant interest in pragmatics, then he will realise the remark *It is about pragmatics* as affirmative by that assumption. In light of this, the non-demonstrative inference that can be drawn for Marquez (2000:50) is as follows:

7) a) The conference is on pragmatics (premise)

b) If someone is very interested in pragmatics, they will go to a conference on pragmatics (premise)

c) Karen is fascinated by pragmatics. (premise)

d) Karen will attend the conference. (conclusion)

But suppose John does not know if Karen enjoys pragmatics, but he notices how she winces when she says, *It is about pragmatics*. John can deduce that Karen will not be attending the conference owing to the visual clues and stereotypical encyclopedic knowledge that when someone winces, it usually means they do not like anything. This example demonstrates how context affects non-demonstrative inferences; that is why the identical phrase *it is about pragmatics* can have multiple meanings depending on the situation: *I will go to the conference / I will not go to the conference*.

2.4 Principles of Relevance

Though it shares Gricean views on communication as an intentional activity, relevance theory, a post-Gricean model, criticises the veracity of the Cooperative Principle and its tenets because, as Sperber and Wilson(1991:586) note, "they do not seem to have universal validity, and their operation seems to have different effects depending on circumstances." Sperber and Wilson(1995:260)also acknowledge that people frequently use the concept of the Principle of Relevance in both an all-encompassing cognitive sense (The Cognitive Principle) and a more restrictive communicative sense (The communicative principle).

2.4.1 Cognitive Principles of Relevance

The two central claims of Relevance Theory are those concerning cognition and communication. In the realm of cognition, Gaspar (2016:10) asserts that in relevance theory, out of all the inputs accessible at any one time, our cognitive system prefers to process automatically those with the most significant expected relevance and creates a framework that will allow our

inference system to maximise the relevance of the input. According to Gigerenzer et al. (1999:21), there comes a point where too much knowledge and information processing can be detrimental. Cognition is the process of concentrating on the relevant and discarding the irrelevant. This concept is summarised in the First Principle of Relevance or the Cognitive Principle of Relevance which states that "Human cognition tends to be geared to the maximisation of relevance." (Sperber & Wilson, 1995: 261)

Yus(2009:753) believes that for Sperber and Wilson, the capacity to maximise the relevance of the stimuli we process has evolved in humans. Since it is hard to pay attention to every item of information that is presented to us, we have developed a natural ability to filter out information that may be irrelevant and concentrate on information that will likely result in a cognitive benefit at the time. There is continuously more information presented to the mind than it can process. According to Unger(2006:13), to work properly, it must strategically store and process data in a manner most likely to improve one's mental perception of the world.

The core of relevance theory is the cognitive idea of relevance, defined as a trade-off between cognitive benefit and processing cost. Using Sperber and Wilson's language (1995), such information produces positive cognitive effects, where a cognitive effect is an effect that causes the individual to modify some of her preconceived notions. It may involve either strengthening or weakening current premises or acquiring new ones (Carston, 2001: 6). A cognitive effect is also considered positive if it contributes to a meaningful influence on the individual's representation of the cognitive world. False conclusions, on the other hand, will affect cognition. Still, not a positive one because a person should not value false conclusions over relevant information "when it is processing in a context of available assumptions yields a positive cognitive effect." (Wilson and Sperber,2004: 608). According to Austin (1987:105), Wilson and Sperber (2004: 609), and Borg (2004: 47), the more contextual effects an utterance generates during processing, the more relevant it is; conversely, the more relevant it is, the less effort is required during processing. Therefore, two clauses make up the concept of an input's relevance to a specific person:

- (a) Everything else being equal, the greater the positive cognitive effects achieved in an individual by processing an input at a given time, the greater the relevance of the input to that individual at that time.
- (b) Everything else being equal, the smaller the processing effort expended by the individual in achieving those effects, the greater the relevance of the input to that individual at that time (Wilson and Sperber, 2002b: 602).

It seems logical to assume that if one puts in more processing effort, one should anticipate receiving more valuable cognitive effects in return. As was previously stated, the cognitive system of humans typically selects the most pertinent information from the context (Cognitive

Principle of Relevance). As a result, the speaker must ensure that his/her statement satisfies the appropriate criteria for relevance for it to be chosen by the listener as the most relevant input to pay attention to. This claim is the Communicative Principle of Relevance articulated by Sperber and Wilson.

2. 4 .2 Communicative Principles of Relevance

The Relevance Theory suggests a slightly different theory from Grice's concerning the communication claim. They propose that communication with someone draws the addressee's attention and provides her with (relevant) information. Instead of considering communication between people as cooperative information transfers, they argue that communicating with someone catches her attention and gives her (relevant) information. The Cognitive Principle of Relevance, as stated by Jackson (2016:52-53), directs our processing of all information, including that which has not yet been shared. On the other hand, this idea gives evidence for a more specific communication principle that, according to Sperber and Wilson (1995), explains how we handle information that has been ostensibly transmitted. The Communicative Principle asserts:

"Every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its optimal relevance" (Sperber and Wilson,1986, 158; Sperber and Wilson 1995: 260-261).

According to this notion, to talk successfully, the communicator desires full concentration from his/her audience. Assuming the Cognitive Principle of Relevance is true, attention is spontaneously likely to shift to whatever is most pertinent at the moment. In that situation, the audience's perception of the speech as relevant enough to warrant attention will determine whether or not communication is successful. The communicator desires her communication to be successful, and by the very act of communicating, she indicates that she wants the audience to consider her utterance relevant to their needs. As stated by Sinclair and Winckler (1991:24), the relevance argument does assert that a communicator cannot escape having an implicit promise that the audience will find the ostensive stimulus she is presenting to be optimally relevant.

However, as Sperber and Wilson(1995) point out, the addressee of an ostensive-inferential communication act may or may not be able to provide the addressee with the information most relevant to the communication. An ostensive-inferential communication's addressee may be allowed to seek as much information as is relevant, but the speaker might be unable or unwilling to provide it. He is allowed to request whatever available relevant information, though. According to Andersen(2001:20) and Wilson(2011, 203), by simply addressing a person, a speaker establishes an expectation that her utterance will have sufficient contextual effects to be worthwhile for processing for the listener while also causing him no unnecessary processing effort. This assumption is frequently referred to as *the presumption of optimal relevance*:

- a) The ostensive stimulus is relevant enough to be worth the speaker's effort to process it.
- b) The ostensive stimulus is the most relevant one compatible with the speaker's abilities and preferences. (Sperber and Wilson, 1995:270; Wilson and Sperber, 2004:612).

According to Braseth (2010:15) and Ozercan (2016:49), anything communicated is assumed to be most relevant to the receiver. The listener will then have a valid reason to concentrate on the speaker. The presumption of relevance indicates to the listener that it is worth paying effort to the utterance and that it is the most relevant one the speaker could utter. According to Wilson and Sperber (2002a:257-258), communicators "cannot be expected to go against their interests and preferences in producing an utterance." Sometimes, people may be unable or reluctant to disclose relevant information or overt stimuli that would better convey their intentions. Addressing this concern, clause (b) of the concept of optimal relevance states that the ostensive stimulus is the most relevant "that the communicator is WILLING AND ABLE to produce."

Further, according to Braseth (2010:10), "the most relevant one compatible with the communicator's abilities and preferences" is present to ensure that it can take into account circumstances in which the speaker is unable to be relevant (due to a lack of capacity) or does not want to be relevant (by preference). Since clause (b) refers to the speaker's skills and preferences, according to Kasmiril (2016:140), relevance theory, as opposed to the Gricean theory, sees interpretations as delicate to details about the particular speaker and can account for the likelihood that speakers will not cooperate. Consider a scenario in (Romero and Sorio, 2014:3) where a buddy he hasn't seen in a while asks about his pay. Instead of responding with (8a), an utterance that interprets his complex idea, he instead responds with (8b), which loosely examines her thought.

8) a. I earn 797.32 pounds a month.

b. I earn 800 pounds a month.

From (8a) and (8b), the listener can make the same assumptions about his status, standard of living, lifestyle, and anything else the listener may use his salary to indicate, but uttering (8a) takes more effort to understand. So, based on the principle of relevance, the speaker will answer with the most relevant statement that fits his abilities and preferences, the one that gets the same effects in the context for the least amount of effort; the false but economic information (8b). A message might not be understood even if optimal relevance is implicitly guaranteed. Sperber and Wilson provide the following consistency criterion with the principle of relevance in this regard:

“An utterance on a given interpretation is consistent with the principle of relevance if and only if the speaker might rationally have expected it to be optimally relevant to the hearer of that interpretation.” (Sperber and Wilson, 1987:14)

The communicative principle of relevance and the idea of optimal relevance suggest a way to do [certain] subtasks and guess what the speaker means. In the next part of the article, the techniques for understanding are further detailed.

2.5 Relevance and Comprehension

How and when addressees cease processing, why they do not seek more interpretations, and so on, is one of the central questions in pragmatics. According to Moeschler (2007:85), Relevance Theory has proposed a broad assertion known as the comprehension procedure, which asserts that interpretation develops along the path of least effort. Additionally, Braseth (2010:19) explains that the interpreter is not randomly stumbling through the procedure but rather (involuntarily) adhering to a predetermined plan. This tactic has been dubbed "The least-effort strategy (LES)" by Carston (2002). To be more precise, when a person listens to a statement, they are performing the following:

- a. Follow a path of least effort in computing cognitive effects: Test interpretative hypotheses (disambiguations, reference resolutions, implicatures, etc.) in order of accessibility.
- b. Stop when your expectations of relevance are satisfied. (Wilson and Sperber, 2004: 613; Wilson, 2010:396)

There should only be one optimally relevant interpretation; therefore, Cruz(2016:10) argues that it is appropriate for listeners to cease when an interpretative hypothesis satisfies their expectations of relevance. A situation where two or more equally plausible interpretations would reduce relevance since listeners would have to expend more mental effort deciding which one to accept. Yus (2006:855) claims that it takes multiple context extensions before an optimum appropriate interpretation can be reached. However, further investigation into other possible interpretations ceases once one interpretation is accepted as correct.

According to Silveira and Feltes (1997, as cited by Schröde and Perna, 2006:6), different people put in different amounts of effort to find the most appropriate interpretation of a given statement. One person may find his/her needs met quickly, while another may feel the need to keep looking. For this reason, Sperber and Wilson write, "Comprehension is a non-demonstrative inferential process, this hypothesis may well be false, but it is the best a rational hearer can do" (Wilson & Sperber, 2004:16). One example of this is the lexical ambiguity in Laura's statement (9), which is discussed in (Jackson, 2016:51):

9) Dave: I can't take you to Starbucks; I haven't got any cash on me.

Laura: Well, you'd better find a bank!

Dave needs to clarify the bank to determine the proposition Laura was trying to convey (9). In descending order of accessibility, he should examine potential interpretive hypotheses.

Assumptions regarding where *money* is obtained are already somewhat engaged because Dave has already talked about money. Dave will entertain theories concerning *financial organisations* by taking the easiest route. He would have to process information so that suitable cognitive effects would not count if he thought about riverbank hypotheses. Once the *bank* has been clarified, Dave stops looking for other meanings because his desire for relevance has been met. Continued processing would require effort from Dave that the context's cognitive effects would be unable to make up for.

Because language is frequently ambiguous, comprehending utterances requires processing many contextual subtasks. Recovering the original meaning requires numerous steps, starting with identifying the explicature and moving on to the implicatures (implicated premises and implicated conclusions). Wilson and Sperber detail the steps involved in the understanding process in great detail, breaking them down into the following tasks:

- a. Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about explicit content (**EXPLICATURES**) via decoding, disambiguation, reference resolution, and other pragmatic enrichment processes.
- b. Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual assumptions (**IMPLICATED PREMISES**).
- c. Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual implications (**IMPLICATED CONCLUSIONS**). (Wilson and Sperber,2004: 615)

Explicature and implicature are two categories of expressed presumptions or concepts that are essentially differentiated by their respective derivations. In the following section, the researcher will summarize each subtask to illustrate how these notions and their relationship have developed within relevance theory.

2.5.1 Explicature

The notions of explicature and implicature based on Grice's "what is said" and "conversational implicature" are split in Relevance Theory to represent the difference between explicit and implicit communication. According to Sperber and Wilson(1995:182), to describe the speaker's explicit meaning in a way that allows for fuller elaboration than Grice's concept of "what is said," the term "explicature" was entered into relevance theory. For Sperber and Wilson (1986,1995:182), Austin (1987:109), Blakemore (2002:74), and Cruse (2006:154), the recovery of any assumption contains an element of inference; therefore, they disagree with the conventional view that an utterance's explicit content is a collection of decoded assumptions.

Sperber and Wilson (1986, 1995:182) note, "An explicature is a combination of linguistically encoded and contextually inferred conceptual features."

Explicature is defined as:

An assumption communicated by an utterance is an explicature if and only if it is a development of a logical form encoded by that utterance (Sperber & Wilson, 1986:182)

The question that needs to be answered is how to turn the logical form of an utterance into a full proposition. According to Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995:72) and Huang (2007:18), the decoded logical form of an utterance is often an incomplete propositional schema that needs to be inferentially supplemented to achieve full propositional status. In light of this, Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995:72) declare that this enriched proposition—which they call explicature by analogy with implicature—is the only one that may be evaluated for truth or falsity in the current communication. Therefore, they can be helpful to the hearer in interpreting an utterance. Additionally, according to Borjesson (2014:121), it is assumed that an utterance becomes truth-evaluable at the level of explicature. As it has also been stated by Sperber and Wilson:

All conceptual representations have logical properties or 'logical form.' They say that a logical form is "propositional" if it is semantically complete and therefore capable of being true or false, and "non-propositional" otherwise. (Sperber and Wilson, 1986:71)

Explicature is a matter of degree. Sperber and Wilson (1986, 1995:182) state that the more explicit the explicature, the smaller the relative contribution of the contextual qualities is, and the converse is equally valid. There is always a linguistic input, but the extent to which it plays a role in the explicature might range from almost absolute determination to virtually no involvement.

10) A. Mary Jones put the book by Chomsky on the table in the downstairs sitting room.

B. Mary put the book on the table.

C. She put it there.

D. On the table.

Each sentence mentioned above can be used in various settings to express the same idea explicitly (assumption or thoughts). More pragmatic inference can be drawn from statements (10c and 10d) than from (10b). In contrast to (10a), which is sufficiently explicit and leaves no space for pragmatic inferences, (10b) is less straightforward.

For Blakemore (2002:75), truth conditions are essential in differentiating between a statement's explicit and implicit meanings. Sperber and Wilson have broadened the definition of explicit content to include assumptions and explicatures drawn from a more refined semantic representation of a given utterance. Assimakopoulos (2008:315) explains that "relevance theory moves beyond the basic explicature of an utterance, treating illocutionary force as part and parcel of explicitly communicated information." Basic-level explicature and high-level explicature are the two forms of information proposed by Sperber and Wilson. Higher-level explicatures, as

described by Wilson and Sperber (1993:14), Allott (2013:17), and Jackson (2016:60), are embeddings of the basic-level explicature under speech-act descriptors like "promise that" and "ask whether" or under attitudinal descriptors like "regret that" and "be pleased." Higher-level explicatures that indicate the illocutionary force of the speech and the propositional attitude of the utterance, as stated by Moschler(2007:74), might round out the explicit component of the intended meaning.

Wilson and Sperber (1993:5) assert that an utterance often contains many explicatures. Take a look at the samples below from (Feng, 2010:65) for more clarification:

11) Mary to Peter: Unfortunately, I cannot help you find a job.

12) a. Mary can't help Peter to find a job.

b. Mary says she can't help Peter to find a job.

c. Mary believes she can't help Peter to find a job.

d. Mary regrets that she can't help Peter to find a job

For example, (11) can incorporate all of the explicatures in (12). The illustration (12a) is either fundamental or a lower-level explicature. The remaining three (12b-d) are higher-level explicatures.

2.5.1.1 Explicatures Enrichment Processes

In relevance theory, recovering the meaning of explicatures necessitates more pragmatic processes than resolving ambiguities and assigning references. Explicatures, in general, help to complete and enrich conceptual representations or logical forms into propositional forms in the following ways: (i) disambiguation; (ii) reference resolution; (iii) saturation; (Recanati 1989); (iv) free enrichment; and (v) ad hoc concept generation (Carston 2004).

I. Disambiguation

Disambiguation often includes choosing one sense from two or more possible meanings in the linguistic system. By selecting a specific interpretation based on circumstances, explicatures will finish the logical form that is not full. (Huang,2007:189). Take into account the instance below:

13) Dr Martin left the theatre six hours later

The word "theatre" has two possible meanings in the sentence in (13): either "a place for the performance of plays" or "an operating theatre." The most natural reading of (13) is that Dr Martin departed the operating room. Why these preferences exist is the question at hand. The 'operating theatre' interpretation of (13) may be preferred because of the implied familiarity with a doctor. It's also not hard to imagine scenarios in which the preferred interpretation would produce at least passable cognitive effects, for example, in (13), implying that the operation was complex and time-consuming. As a result, the resulting interpretation must be accepted by the listener.

II. Reference Resolution

Because the listener is responsible for deducing the referred object from the surrounding context, reference assignment is the least difficult task. Loukusa (2007:44) believes that the most straightforward task is reference assignment because the hearer must infer the referenced object from the context. Even if this is a simple task, Leinonen et al. (2000 cited in Loukusa:2007:44) confirm that context must be utilised because, for example, without context, pronouns have no sense. Reference resolution is possible when the relevant anaphoric or referential statement is given the proper contextual value on the explicit side. (Huang,2007:189) Consider the example given in (Allott, 2013:17):

14) Peter: I'll get it ready in time.

The preceding utterance involves a significant amount of pragmatic labour to recover the notion that the hearer understands the speaker to have intended; in (14), we need to infer to whom "I" and "it" refers, respectively. (In this sentence, "I" refers to Peter, and "it" refers to the car) The explanation can also include:

15) Peter will get the car ready in time.

III. Saturation

Saturation is a concept borrowed by Relevance Theory from Recanati (1989), whose theory is very close to Relevance Theory. Saturation, as defined by Recanati (1993: 243), is the pragmatic process by which a particular slot, position, or variable in the linguistically decoded logical form gets filled. Murtisari (2013:326) provides several illustrations of saturation, including the following:

16). The pyramid of Giza is much older. [than what?]

17) Anna has left her umbrella. [where?]

The preceding statements do not yet have fully formed logical structures, but the gaps in these structures can be filled by referring to the context of the communication. For example, in (16), the Great Pyramid of Giza is considerably older than the *Temple of Borobudur*, and in (17), Anna has forgotten her umbrella *in the classroom*.

IV. Free Enrichment

Recanati's concept of "free enrichment" was adopted in (2004). According to Huang (2007:191), the logical form of the statement presented must be conceptually enriched in the explicature, even if the linguistically decoded logical form of the sentence does not appear to have an overt indexical or a covert slot. Murtisari (2013:326) shows that in saturation, the slots are given by the language, but in "free enrichment," the slots are hidden. Two types of free enrichment are recognised in the literature on relevance theory. The first type is one in which the concept that the speech encodes is narrowed, and the enrichment concentrates on a specific lexical item within the utterance. (Huang,2007:191). Take a look at the following examples from Huang(2007:191):

18) a. John has a brain.

b. John has a [scientific] brain

In this case, (18a) is a truism or says something obvious. Every person in the world has a brain. On this basis, we can accept explanations like those shown in brackets in (18b). Second, there are types where the description needs to be supplemented with a concept from the context. Consider (19):

19) a. Everyone wore a new wool cardigan.

b. Everyone [at Mary's party] wore a new cardigan.

Again, a process of specifying or narrowing is involved here. In the instance of (19), the quantifier everyone's domain needs to be constrained, which, depending on the context, leads to an explicature like (19b).

V. Ad hoc (online) Concept Construction

Barsalou(1983) inspired Carston's expansion on the concept of ad hoc concepts, which she used in the development of Relevance Theory. According to Huang (2007:192), it is "the pragmatic adjustment of a lexical concept in the linguistically decoded logical form.". The adjustment can be characterised as either narrowing, strengthening, or both. Think about (20) for concept narrowing (Wilson and Sperber, 2012:106) and (21) for concept broadening. (Wilson, 2003: 286).

20) I have a *temperature*.

21) That book *puts me to sleep*.

A sentence like (20), according to Muller (2016:42), would be irrelevant if it were taken literally. Every living thing does have a preferred temperature. *temperature* in this context refers to one above average. Because it relates only to a particular component of the category *temperature*, the concept is regarded as being narrowed. *However, putting to sleep in (21) should not be interpreted as a typical (i.e., limited) sleep concept. The boundaries of sleeping are loosened in this situation, allowing for incorporating similar ideas like "boring."*

2.5.2 Implicature

We are now essentially entering the domain of implicature as we turn to the implicit side of verbal communication. Differentiating between explicit and implied meaning forms the basis of the relevance-theoretic idea of implicature. Relevance theory and Grice approach the topic of explicit and implicit communication in slightly different ways. This opens the question of how linguistic form can influence pragmatic inference. Relevance Theory lets pragmatic inference play a role in its identification, and it does not equate explicitly transmitted information with conventionally encoded information. Another way it differs from the Gricean distinction is that it raises questions about how truth conditions should be used in a cognitive theory of communication (Blakemore,2002:73-74).

Because Grice initially characterised implicature primarily as something else (that is, what is communicated rather than "what is said"), there has been much debate regarding what makes a

good example of an implicature. According to Michael (2002:129), relevant theorists frequently use a separate concept to define implicature (that is, as a communicated assumption that is not an explicature). Unlike Grice, who linked it to the common concept of implying, relevance theorists here instead based it on the dichotomy of implicit and explicit meaning. According to Wilson and Sperber (1986: 383, cited in Yus,1997:316), the definition of implicatures is "those contextual assumptions and implications which the hearer has to recover to satisfy himself that the speaker has observed the principle of relevance." In addition, Sperber and Wilson (1995:182) note that any assumption communicated in a way that is not explicitly is still considered to be communicated; this type of communication is known as an implicature. In line with Sperber and Wilson's definition, Carston (2000: 10) describes implicature as "any other propositional form communicated by an utterance; its content consists of wholly pragmatically inferred matter." Consider the following conversation, which can be found in (Blakemore,1992:58):

22)A: Did you enjoy your holiday?

B: The beaches were crowded, and the hotel was full of bugs.

To be relevant, A must believe B's reaction is affected by insects (rather than hidden microphones) and a large crowd. This leads us to think that the speaker did not have a good time during his trip. Because of its distinct propositional structure, which acts as the argument's conclusion apart from the explicated information, this information is an implicature.

Both implicated premises and implicated conclusions fall under the category of implicatures in relevance theory. The implicated conclusions may correspond to the intended contextual implications, whereas the implicated premises may correspond to the intended contextual assumptions (Wilson and Sperber,2004: 615). As an example, let's look at the exchange (23) in (Yus,2009:764)

23)Tom: So . . Did you buy that table I told you about?

Ann: It's too wide and uneven.

Tom must use inference to transform Ann's utterance's schematic logical form into an appropriate interpretation if he wants to understand her correctly. The contextualised propositional form of the speech given as an explicature will be determined by some inference. Tom must do reference assignment ("it" relates to "the table"), disambiguation ("a table can be "uneven" in numerous ways," including having an uneven surface or having legs that are not correctly levelled," and free enrichment ("e.g., too wide [for what]") in this specific situation. The following statement from proposition (23) might be the result:

(24) Explicature: The table you told me about is too wide to go through the bedroom door, and its surface is uneven.

Tom additionally has to integrate (24) with contextual information (implicated premises) because this isn't the correct response to his query (implicated conclusion). In this information, Tom will consult encyclopedic contextual data to determine how implausible it is for someone to

purchase a table whose surface is uneven and does not fit through the door. Tom can arrive at the desired interpretation using this contextual information.

25) Implicature: I didn't buy the table you told me about (implicated conclusion).

To summarise, explicature is a clearly stated presumption on the one hand. As a result, it incorporates a conceptual element that is both linguistically conveyed and inferred from context. Implicature, on the other hand, is the outcome of inferential procedures.

3. Political Interview

An interview is a meeting between reporters and well-known or contentious guests. Both parties typically prepare for the discussion beforehand. The disputing parties face off. The reporter has to find out more about the guest. On the other side, the guest must reply. (Adams and Hicks, 2009:2). According to Montgomery (1947:147, cited in Hakim, 2017:53), there are two fundamental types of interviews: *news* and *feature interviews*. Included in News Interviews are *the expert interview, the affiliated interview, the political interview, and the experiential interview*.

Political interviews are those conducted with politicians to give the audience a sense of their opinions, policy stances, and, obviously, media presence (Locher and Watts, 2008: 85). According to Sandoval (2010:41), political interviews are a unique subgenre of political discourse in which politicians utilise standardised techniques to accomplish the specific communicative goal of influencing and convincing the audience. It has been stated that a political interview is also a dialogical genre in which actors from different institutions share their thoughts on a specific topic. At the same time, their conversation is mediated by media specialists (Lauerbach and Fetzer, 2007). Political interviews rely heavily on the question-asking process. It allows interviewers to accomplish various linguistic goals, such as obtaining novel information, having interviewees approve of what they reformulate, making indirect requests, or wrapping up contentious topics in political interviews (Fetzer, 2000: 418-420).

4. Research Method

The descriptive-qualitative method was chosen since it was deemed the most suitable interview analysis approach. Sperber and Wilson's relevant theory is also utilized to analyse the interview data. The data set for this study is the interview conducted with President Joe Biden. Jimmy Kimmel hosts the late-night talk show that airs on ABC. This show is an example of an American late-night talk show. He discusses with Joe Biden the 27 school shootings that took place in the United States in 2022, the progress that has been made in the fight against climate

change, Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema's voting records, the extremely high prices of housing, food, and gas, and what he plans to do to combat inflation. The interview took place on August 6, 2022, in New York.

To analyze the efficacy of the research, the researchers will initially watch the videos, after which they will evaluate and comprehend what was communicated in the video. The researchers utilize Sperber and Wilson's Relevance theoretic procedural subtasks to analyze the collected data. Wilson and Sperber (2004:615) suggest that for listeners to understand what the speaker is trying to say, they must do three different sub-tasks. Create a relevant hypothesis about explicit content using decoding, disambiguation, reference resolution, and other pragmatic enrichment techniques (EXPLICATURES). The second phase entails developing a reasonable inference concerning the intended contextual assumptions (IMPLICATED PREMISES). Making an appropriate hypothesis about the desired contextual implications is the third step (IMPLICATED CONCLUSIONS).

5. The Analysis

This section's primary goal is to evaluate an interview with Joe Biden, who took the oath of office on January 20, 2021, to become the 46th president of the United States. The interview transcription was taken from the Rev. website. Since the researchers have completed all of the analyses to this point, not everyone will concur with the conclusions that have been hypothesized and drawn. As Sperber and Wilson (1986:142) wrote, "relevance is relevance to an individual." According to Yus (2002:1307), the paradigm heavily depends on the hearer's ability to access preexisting concepts and presumptions, which create a background against which incoming information is processed. Furnish (2015:31) also says that just as beauty is in the eye of the beholder, truth is in the ear of the hearer.

The interview takes place in the aftermath of the horrific school shooting in Uvalde, Texas, on May 24, 2022, which resulted in the death of 21 people: 19 pupils and two instructors at Robb Elementary School, an 18-year-old suspect, targeted. His interview was also conducted on issues such as climate change, Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema's voting history, housing, food, and gas prices, the harm caused by the CoronaVirus to families, and his opinion on the likelihood that Roe v. Wade will be overturned.

Extract 1

Jimmy Kimmel: We were here in September of 2019, and one of the things we talked about at length was gun violence. And you said that we need to do something about this gun violence, particularly when it comes to our schools. And here we are, a couple of years later, we're halfway through this year already, there have been what, 27 shootings at schools? But just to get into it, why haven't we done anything about this?

Joe Biden: Well, I think a lot of it's intimidation by the NRA. And look, this is not your father's Republican Party, this is a MAGA party, it's a very different Republican Party. And so you find people who are worried, I believe that if they vote for rational gun policy, they're going to be primaried, and they're going to lose in a hard right Republican primary.

This particular segment of the interview will center on the issue of gun violence. When asked about the problem of not doing anything to combat gun violence, particularly school shootings, Biden responded in a way that makes the subject appear irrelevant. The reader or listener must offer some extra background to comprehend the propositional form of Biden's answer and understand what Biden intends to say. It is anticipated that the addressee will inferentially build the logical form by engaging in processes such as reference assignment ('I' refers to President Joe Biden; 'NRA' refers to the National Rifle Association of America, which is a gun rights advocacy group based in the United States; 'your' refers to members of the Republican Party; and 'MAGA' refers to the Republican Party, which stands for Make America Great Again, "you" refers to an indeterminate individual or an option for an indefinite one, 'it' refers to a party, and "they" refers to republican members. Using saturation, the linguistic gap can also be filled, for example, in (...so you find people who are worried [about what]). And through disambiguation, the meaning of "primary" should be clarified; it can be either "principal" or a vote in which individuals who belong to a political organization determine who would lead that party in an election for political office. The second definition is the most straightforward inference one can make from this phrase, given its context. The listener will construct a trustworthy hypothesis regarding the meaning of the statement after completing these pragmatic processes by doing the following:

26) Joe Biden believes that the National Rifle Association is mostly to blame for the intimidation. And this party is not the Republican's father Party"; instead, it is a "Make America Great Again" party, which is significantly dissimilar from the Republican Party. As a result, one finds people who are concerned about gun violence. Biden contends that if members support sensible gun control, republican members will be opposed in the election and lose in a far-right Republican primary.

The explicature in (26) is an effort that satisfies the relevance criterion, but it does not immediately answer Jimmy Kimmel's query and instead requires additional processing on the part of the audience. Despite this, it leaves room for many interpretations incompatible with the answer presented clearly in the statement. For this response to actually be relevant to the topic at hand, the listener must assume the following contextual assumption as in (26):

27) a. NRA is a U.S.-based organization that promotes gun rights.

- b. The NRA is one of the most influential advocacy organizations in American politics.
- c. The Republican Party and the National Rifle Association have become more aligned.
- d. Republicans will face a premarital penalty if they vote against the NRA.

The hearer expects to be rewarded with greater cognitive consequences that benefit their comprehension of the statement to extract its contextual meaning (implied conclusions). The explicature supplied in (26) and the audience can use the contextual presumptions presented in (27a-d) that are mutually manifest to infer the implied conclusion in (28):

28) Biden accuses the Republican Party of blocking the passage of a bill to reduce gun violence.

Extract 2

Jimmy Kimmel: Can't you issue an executive order? Trump passed those out like Halloween candies.

Joe Biden: Well, I did.

Jimmy Kimmel: Isn't that something that could happen?

Joe Biden: Well, I have issued executive orders within the power of the presidency to be able to deal with these... everything having to do with guns, gun ownership, whether or not you have to have a waiting, all the things are within my power, but what I don't want to do, and I'm not being facetious, I don't want to emulate Trump's abuse of the constitution and constitutional authority. And so...And I mean that sincerely, because I often get asked, "Well, if the Republicans don't play at square, why do you play at square?" Well guess what? If we do the same thing they do, our democracy will literally be in jeopardy.

Keeping with the issue of gun violence, Jimmy Kimmel asks President Biden why no executive order has not been issued to prevent gun violence. The interviewer points out that President Trump was able to give executive orders with relative ease throughout his time in office. Although Biden claims that he used his presidential authority to issue some executive orders, such as one restricting gun ownership, in the underlined portion of his response, he is trying to subtly make a point that needs to be clarified by the audience to be understood as a response to the interviewer's question. The audience needs to start processing the communicative cues by searching their encyclopaedias for information relevant to the communicative intention he is trying to express. By going through a number

of explicature enrichment processes, such as reference resolution and saturation, the listener can reach the ideal level of relevance. Some elements of the underlined sentences need to have a value assigned to them through the process known as reference assignment (where 'I' refers to Biden, 'Trump' refers to the former President of the United States of America, 'we' refers to Biden's staff, 'they' refers to Trump's staff, and 'our' refers to Americans). The linguistic gap should be filled through saturation (.....our democracy will literally be in jeopardy [of what]). The word "thing" in the phrase "the same thing.." should have added additional meaning to it through the process of free enrichment. For example, (the same thing [of abusing..]). It is via the use of these explicature enrichment techniques that the listener is led to the following explicature:

29) Biden is unwilling to imitate Trump's mistreatment of the constitution and constitutional power. The American democracy will literally be in danger of regressing if his administrative staff behaves in a manner similar to that of Trump's staff in terms of abuse.

In most cases, listeners will make inferences about the speaker's background and situation beyond the explicature (29). This is due to the fact that understanding why the respondent does not wish to answer the question head-on is crucial to the relevancy of (29) as a whole. Given this, the intended recipient must make the following contextual assumptions:

- 30) a. Before Biden took office, Donald Trump served as President of the United States.
b. Trump had little trouble issuing executive orders, such as the one that directed the launch of hundreds of cruise missiles into Syria during dessert.
c. Some of Trump's behaviors, such as overturning the results of the American election in 2021, attacking the press, and other similar measures, put the American democratic process in jeopardy.
d. In contrast to Trump, Biden is known for his calm demeanour and easygoing nature.

In light of the premises implicated in (30), the evaluation of the explicature offered in (29) will lead to the contextual implication stated in (31):

31) Biden intends to argue, in contrast to Trump, that he is precise in the ordering process and a protector of the constitution.

Extract 3

Jimmy Kimmel: I think a lot of Democrats are frustrated because we got out and voted, we won the House, the Senate, the White House, obviously, and still we have had made very little progress, as far as I'm concerned, when it comes to guns, obviously, reproductive rights, voting rights, climate change, the all these things. And in some ways, we've moved backwards.

Joe Biden:Look, I won by... I got 81 million votes, more than anybody's ever gotten, and thank you for those who you helped [inaudible 00:09:57]. But what's happened is we still only ended up with 50 senators, which means that we have 50 presidents.

During this section of the interview, the interviewer reminds the president about the outcomes of the election in 2021, in which they won the White House, the House of Representatives, and the Senate. The interviewer asserts that there has been little progress noticed in comparison to the results, notably in terms of guns, reproductive rights, voting rights, and climate change. The president begins his response by enumerating some of the things that his administration has been doing to address the issue of climate change. These include the adjustments made concerning solar, wind, and wind pumps. In addition, he mentioned that he had a conversation with the chairman of the board of both General Motors and Ford regarding electric vehicles. However, in the portion of his underlined answer, it appears that he intends to communicate his communicative intention implicitly; therefore, it requires some inference to be made by the addressee to comprehend the implied meaning. To comprehend the statement in its propositional form, the listener must engage in some form of explicature enrichment. The meaning of the utterance needs to be completed through the pragmatic processes of reference resolution (where 'I' refers to Joe Biden, 'anybody' refers to the candidate, 'you' refers to the voters, and 'we' refers to the democratic party), free enrichment (... more than anybody's [in the election] ever gotten), saturation (... more than anybody's ever gotten [what]), and disambiguation (where 'got' has multiple meanings, so its meaning needs to be disambiguated). Within the context of this discussion, it can be understood to mean (succeed in attaining something). The following is what the listener will do to arrive at a hypothesis on the meaning of the utterance once these pragmatic methods have been done:

32) Biden achieved 81 million votes, more than any other candidate in the election in terms of votes, and Biden thanked voters for their support. However, Democrats still only have 50 senators, which means that Democrats have 50 presidents.

However, because Biden refers to the outcomes of the general election that will take place in the United States in 2021, the propositional form in (32) does not immediately respond to the interviewer's query. However, it is crucial to realize that this is merely an attempt to satisfy the relevance principle and necessitates additional processing on the addressee's side. To understand why Biden is reiterating the election results, as stated in the preceding utterance, the reader or listener must first examine the following contextual premises:

- 33) a. There are 100 Senators in the Senate, two from each of the 50 states.
b. There are currently 52 Democrats, 50 Republicans, and 2 Independents in the Senate.
c. Both of the independents are in caucus with the Democrats.
c. A bill needs only a majority vote (51) to pass the Senate.

Extraction of contextual implications, also known as inferred conclusions, such as (34), can be aided by the explicature in (32), as well as the mutually manifested contextual assumptions in (33).

- 34) Biden implies that there are not enough votes to approve the laws addressing the issues raised, and he implicitly blames the Republican Party for this.

Extact 4

Jimmy Kimmel: Just a process question, when you have sensitive documents that you need to flush down the toilet, do you do that? Is that done in your office toilet, or is that done in the bathroom in the personal bathroom area?

Joe Biden: I call Trump. Everybody talks about sensitive documents, and like, I don't destroy anything, but one of the things that I spent more time with Xi Jinping than anybody, any other head of state. And I'd always be, when I traveled it was 17,000 miles, spent 78 hours with him they'd tell me, all told. And I'd have a consecutive interpreter, and he'd have one. And the difference between when I would do that and others would do it. I always handed in all my notes.

To subtly reference the ongoing investigation into suspected inappropriate handling of secret information in the Trump White House, Jimmy Kimmel challenges President Joe Biden about the risk of critical documents being flushed down the toilet. In response to the journalist's inquiry, Joe Biden quips that he dials Trump's number whenever he has to dispose of some paperwork by flushing it down the toilet. The answer does not appear to be relevant. The listener must engage in a chain of pragmatic inferences that culminates in a meaningful

conclusion before they can grasp the importance of the connection between the question and the response. The speech that has been highlighted will be analyzed to determine its propositional form in context so that it can be supplied as an explicature. In the underlined part of the answer, the listener is responsible for reference assignment, disambiguation, and free enrichment. Using reference assignment ('I' refers to Biden, 'Trump' refers to the former president of the United States, and 'everybody' refers to all people) and disambiguation ('call' can mean to telephone someone or to arrange for something to happen at a particular time), the former meaning is more appropriate in this interview setting. Free enrichment should enrich the element 'everybody' (...everybody [worldwide] talks about secret documents and the similar..). The possible explicature is (35):

35) Biden telephones Trump. Everyone worldwide discusses sensitive documents, but Biden doesn't trash anything.

In addition to the clarification that is presented in (35), the listener is required to assume the following cotextual assumptions to comprehend the message that the speaker means to express with their words:

- 36) a. Sensitive documents are kept by every government. America, too has a lot of sensitive documents.
b. Sensitive Documents should be well protected and documented.
c. When former President Trump lived in the White House, staff members frequently found sensitive documents clogging a toilet.
d. His failure to properly secure sensitive documents indicates his incompetence.
e. Biden, in contrast to Trump, is a well-organized and well-protected man.

Together, the explicature provided in (35) and the mutually expressed and declared contextual assumptions in (36) allow us to extrapolate contextual implications such as (37):

3) President Biden hints that he, unlike President Trump, safeguards sensitive government documents.

6. Conclusions

As a result of the fact that the theoretical premises of Relevance Theory apply to how politicians present their messages and how their addressees receive them, the theory is a helpful instrument for analyzing political interviews. The only way to achieve pragmatic interpretation is to access the context and the inferential processes involved. Yet, neither can be achieved without using

some kind of code. The reader's prior knowledge and beliefs serve as a framework for understanding the content they are receiving. One of the instruments that are available to politicians to accomplish their objectives is the use of inference and implication. When it comes to achieving his objectives through the utilization of language, Biden makes use of diplomatic linguistic methods. Biden communicates his communicative goals clearly and provides enough supportive evidence for the recipient to infer some of his intentions to attain maximum relevance. Effective communication also requires the speaker and recipient to be in the same cognitive context.

شیکردنه وهیه ک به پیتی تیۆری په یوه ست بۆ چاوپیکه وتنی جۆبایدن له بهرنامه ی تۆک شهو له که نالی ئه بی سی .

سوهیر سه فوهت محمد^١ - ناسۆ علی محمد^٢

^١ بهشی ئینگلیزی، کۆلیژی زمان، زانکۆی سلیمانی، سلیمانی ههریمی کوردستان، عیراق.

^٢ بهریوبه رایه تی گشتی پهروه ده ی گهرمیان، وزاره تی پهروه ده، ههریمی کوردستان، عیراق.

پوخته:

ئامانجی ئەم توێژینه وهیه به کارهینانی تیۆری په یوه ست بۆ شیکردنه وهی چاوپیکه وتنیکی (جۆبایدن) له بهرنامه ی تۆک شهو له که نالی ئه بی سی. تیۆری په یوه ست له سالی (١٩٨٦/١٩٩٥) ههردوو نوسه ر سپیڤه ر و ویلسن وه ک میتۆدیکی هه لهینجان په رهیان پیداهه بۆ تیگه یشتن به شیوهیه کی درکی له لیکدانه وهی زمان . ئەم تیۆره جهخت له وه دهکاته وه له هه موو بارودوخیکدا پیویسته وه رگر وا هه ستبکات ئه وهی دهگوتریت په یوه ستداره. کیشه که لیره دا ئه وهیه نازانریت ئه وهی وا له توانای که سیک دهکات تیگه یشتنی بۆ لیکدانه وهی زمانیه هه بیت چیه. ریبازی په سنی به کارهینراوه بۆ ده رخستنی ئه وهی که چۆن (جۆبایدن) به لگه ی پیویست ده رخستنی بۆگۆیگر له پیناوه ئه وهی له مه به سنی قسه کانی بگهن و ههروه ها چون گوێگر ستراتیجیکانی تیگه یشتن به کاردینی بۆ تیگه یشتن له مه به سنی قسه که ر. ئەم توێژینه وه به وه ده رئه نجامه گه یشتوه که جۆبایدن ئامانجی وتووێژه که ی به روونی ده گه ینی و به لگه ی پیویست ده گه یه نیت به وه رگر بۆ هه لهینجانی مه به سته که ی. ههروه ها بۆ هینانه ئاراوه ی په یوه ندیه کی کاریگر پیویسته هه ردوو لاینی به شدار خاوه نی ده ورره ریتی درکی هاوبه ش بن.

کللی وشه کان: تیۆری پیوه ست , په یوه ست, هه لهینجان, ده ورره ریتی درکی.

References

- Adams, Sally, and Hicks, Wynford (2009) *Interviewing for Journalists*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Allott, Nicholas (2013) Relevance Theory. In A. Capone, F. Lo Piparo & M. Carapezza (Eds.), *Perspectives on Linguistic Pragmatics*, 57–98. Berlin/Newyork: Springer.
- Andersen, Gisle (2001) *Sociolinguistic Variation: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Language of Adolescents*. John Benjamins B.V.
- Andersen, Gisle (2015) Relevance. In K. Aijmer and Ch. Rühlemann(eds), *Corpus Pragmatics: A Handbook*,143-148. Marburg, Germany. : Cambridge University Press.
- Andersen, Peter (1999) *Nonverbal Communication: Forms and Functions*. Mountain View(California): Mayfield.
- Assimakopoulos, Starvos (2008) Intention, Common Ground, and The Availability of Semantic Content: A Relevance-theoretic Perspective, in I. Kecskes, and J.Mey (Eds), *Intention, Common Ground and the Egocentric Speaker-Hearer*, 105-126. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Austin, Paddy (1987)*The Dark Side of Politeness: A pragmatic Analysis of Non-corporative Communication*. PhD. Dissertation. The University of Cantebury.
- Bai, Limie and Chen, Juanjuan (2010) On Pragmatic Inference and Metaphor from the Perspective of Relevance Theory. *Journal of Cambridge Studies*.5:1-45. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg .
- Blakemore, Diane (2002) *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning. The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blakemore, Diane (1992) *Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Borg, Emma (2004) *Minimal Semantics*. England: Oxford University Press.
- Borjesson, Kirsten (2014) *The Semantics-Pragmatics Controversy*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Braseth, Jane-fredrick (2010) *Relevance Theory and the Problem of Content Sharing*. MA thesis, Universitetet I Oslo.
- Carston, Robyn (2001) "Explicature and Semantics." In S. Davis and B. Gillon (eds.) *Semantics: A Reader*, 1-44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carston, Robyn (2002) *Thoughts and Utterances. The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Carston, Robyn (2004) Relevance Theory and The Saying/Implicating Distinction in L.Horn and G. Ward(Eds), *Handbook of Pragmatics*, 633–656. Blackwell.
- Cruse, Alan .2006. *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Cruz, Manual (2016) Three Decades of Relevance Theory. in M. Padilla Cruz (ed.), *Relevance Theory. Recent Developments, Current Challenges, and Future Directions*,1-29. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Davies, Martin (1987) Relevance and Mutual knowledge. In *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*,10,716-717. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fasold, Ralph (1990) *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fetzer, Anita 2000) Negotiating Validity Claims in Political Interviews. *Revue*. Vol. 20, No. 4: 415-460.
- Feng, Guangwu (2010) *A Theory of Conventional Implicature and Pragmatic Markers in Chinese*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Furnish, Patricia (2015) *Context Matters: Pragmatics and Political Discourse analysis of Presidential Speeches of Michelle Bachelet, Barack Obama, and Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero*. MA Thesis. The University of North Carolina.
- Gaspar, Teresa (2016) Scalar Implicatures: A Gricean vs. a Relevance Theory Approach. *English Studies*,11-23. Department of English and German Philology and Translation and Interpreting.

- Gigerenzer, Gerd, Peter Todd and the ABC Research Group (1999) *Simple Heuristics that Make us Smart*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grundy, Peter (2008) *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Hodder Education.
- Hakim, Hussein (2017) Indirectness in Selected Political Interviews: A Pragmatic Analysis. MA Study. University of Al-Qadisiyah.
- Jackson, Rebecca-Claire (2016) The Pragmatics Of Repetition, Emphasis, and Intensification. PhD. Dissertation. Salford, UK.
- Kasmirli, Maria (2016) Conversational Implicature: Re-Assessing The Gricean Framework. PhD. Dissertation. The University of Sheffield.
- Lauerbach, Gerda and Fetzer, Anita (2007) Political Discourse in the Media: Cross-cultural Perspectives. In G. Lauerbach and A. Fetzer (Eds.), *Political discourse in the media: Cross-cultural perspectives*, 3-28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Locher, Miriam A., and Richard J. Watts (2008) Relational Work and Impoliteness: Negotiating Norms of Linguistic Behavior. In D. Bousfield, and M. Locher (eds). *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, 77-99. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Loukusa, Soile (2007) Use of Context in Pragmatic Language Comprehension by Children with Asperger Syndrom or High-Functioning Autism. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 37 (6): 1049-59, Jul.
- Marquez, Maria (2000) An Inferential Mode of Communication. *Philologica canariensia*, N° 6-7, 139-58.
- Matsui, Tomoko (2000) *Bridging and Relevance*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Michael, Haugh (2002) The Intuitive Basis of Implicature: Relevance Theoretic Implicitness versus Gricean Implying. *International Pragmatics Association*, 12:2.117-134.
- Moeschler, Jacques (2007) The Role of Explicature in Communication and Intercultural Communication. I. Kecskes and L.Horn(Eds.), *In Explorations in Pragmatics. Linguistic, Cognitive and Intercultural Aspects*, 73-94. Berlin. New York. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Müller, Misha. (2016) Plausible Deniability From Gricean Pragmatics to the Insights of Relevance Theory. MA Study. Neuchatel University.
- Murtisari, Elisabeth (2013) A Relevance-based Framework for Explication and Implication in Translation: An Alternative Typology. *trans-kom* 6 [2] 315-344.
- Özercan, Alydar (2016) The Maxims of Relevance Theory for Determining The Referent of a Proper Name. Thesis. The Graduate School of Social Sciences Of Middle East Technical University.
- Recanati, Francois (1989) The Pragmatics of what is said. *Mind and Language*, 4,294-328.
- Recanati, Francois (1993) *Direct Reference: From Language to Thought*. Oxford. Blackwell.
- Richards, Christine (1985) Inferential Pragmatics and the Literary Text. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9,261-285.
- Romero, Esther, and Soria, Belen (2014) Relevance Theory and Metaphor. *Ling. (dis)curso* 14 (3)
- Sandová, Jana (2010) Speaker's involvement in political interviews. Unpublished MA thesis, Masarykova.
- Schröder, K. and Perna, C.(2006) Reading and Processing a Journalistic Text Through Relevance Theory: the Larry Rohter case. *Revista Virtual de Estudos da Linguagem* , V. 4, n. 6.
- Sinclair, Melinda and Winckler, Walter (1991) Relevance Theory: Explicating Verbal Communication. (<http://spilplus.journals.ac.za/>).
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre (1987) *Precis of Relevance: Communication and Cognition. Behavioural and Brain Sciences*(1987)10,697-754. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre (1986) *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. (1st ed). Oxford: Backwell Publisher.

- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre (1995) *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. (2nd ed)Oxford: Backwell Publisher.
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre (1982) Mutual knowledge and Relevance in Theories of Comprehension. In N.V. Smith, ed., *Mutual knowledge*, 61-85. London: Academic Press.
- Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deirdre (2008) Relevance Theory. L Horn, and G.Ward (Eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics*. (Vol.26) 607-632. John Wiley and Sons.
- Sperber, Dan (1994) "Understanding verbal understanding." In J. Khalfa (ed.), *What is Intelligence*, 179–198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toews, Nicholas (2019) *Relevance Theory and Proverbs: Exploring Context Through Explicatures and Implicatures*. MA Study. Faculty of Graduate Studies Trinity Western University.
- Unger, Christoph (2006) *Genre, Relevance, and Global Coherence. The Pragmatics of Discourse Type*. (eBook). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (2012) *Meaning and Relevance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (2002b) Truthfulness and Relevance. *Mind*, 111(443), 583–632.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (2002a) Relevance Theory. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 14, 249-290.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (1981) On Grice's Theory of Conversation. In P. Werth (ed.), *Conversation and Discourse*, 155-178. London: Croom Helm.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (1994) Outline of Relevance Theory. *Links & Letters*, [online], N. 1, 85-106.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (1987) Outline of Relevance Theory. *Notes on Linguistics* 39:5-24.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (1991) Pragmatics and Modularity. In S.Davis(Eds.), *Pragmatics: A Reader*, 583-595. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (2004) Relevance Theory. In L.Horn and G.Ward(Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, 607-632. Blackwell Publishing. USA.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (1986) Sobre La Definición De Relevancia. In L. Valdris(Eds.) *La bt-squeda del significado*, 583-598. Madrid: Tecnos.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan (1993) Linguistic Form and Relevance. *Lingua* 90: 1-25.
- Wilson, Deirdre (2003) Relevance and Lexical Pragmatics. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 15, 273-292.
- Wilson, Deirdre (2010) Relevance Theory. In L. Cummings (Ed.), *The pragmatics encyclopedia*, 393–399. London: Routledge.
- Wilson, Deirdre (2011) Parallels And Differences in The Treatment of Metaphor in Relevance Theory and Cognitive Linguistics. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*. Vol.128.
- Yus, Fransico (2006) *Relevance Theory*. In L. Mey(Eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, 854-861. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Yus, Fransico (2009.) Relevance Theory. In Heine-main-drv Heine-Narrog (Typeset by Spi, Chennai) 753 of 778..
- Yus, Fransico (1997) A Decade of Relevance Theory. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30(3):305-345.
- Yus, Fransico (2002) Humour and the Search for Relevance. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003) 1295–1331.

Appendix: The Interview

<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/president-joe-biden-visits-jimmy-kimmel-live-6-08-22-transcript>

(Access Date: 20/8/2022).