

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with the theories namely relevance theory, explicature and implicature and the previous studies

2.1 Relevance Theory

Relevance theory talks about the communication and inferential process. In line with Unger (2001) relevance theory is communication analyzed by inferential theory, which aims to explain how the audience recognizes the intended meaning of the communicators and it is rooted in account cognition because of the link this provides between communication and cognition (p.1).

Carston defines Relevance theory as the on-line process between utterance interpretations with nature mental system responsible for communicators and relevance theory is responsive in the evolutionary of the psychology of language. (2011, p.1). While Sperber and Wilson (2002, p.250) elaborate relevance theory as:

“The expectations of relevance raised by an utterance are precise enough, and predictable enough, to guide the hearer towards the speaker’s meaning. The aim is to explain in cognitively realistic terms what these expectations of relevance amount to, and how they might contribute to an empirically plausible account of comprehension”

In addition, Grice (1975) argues that human communication needs inferential process if people want to construct the meaning and meanings are frequently implied rather

than stated. Sperber and Wilson (1995), however, think that inferential process is needed to recognize the intended meaning. Therefore, Sperber and Wilson developed the theory of Grice and named it with Relevance theory. In such a case, the communicators must process language with a standing assumption so communicated information are relevant for them in very specific ways (Wilson and Rose, 1997, p.1)

Relevance theory, then, is about communication and cognitive ability. It is because communication needs inferential process so the hearer can get the intended meaning of the speaker. Moreover, relevance theory is a development work of Grice theory in communication about cooperative principle, maxims and implicature.

Grice (1975) is known with his cooperative principle theory. Grundy states it contains four maxims: Quality (utterance appears to satisfy their expectations with respect to informativeness), Quantity (well foundness), relevance (relation), and Manner (clarity) (Grundy, 2000, p.101). In cooperative principles, meaning can be conveyed implicitly by flouting the maxims. The following example is taken in Sperber and Wilson, (1995, p.34)

- (1) Peter : Do you want some coffee?
- Mary : Coffee would keep me awake.

Mary's answer actually is irrelevant to Peter's question because it flouts maxims of relation. There is intention implicature from Mary's answer that she does not want any coffee. From this example of flouting of Gricean maxim, however, this is still rationale for maxim and principle. Then in Grice work, there is no statement made on inference necessary for the recovery of what is said. Grice view those as implicature.

Implicature in Grice's work is to find the particular interpretation chosen without considering whether the interpretation is relevant or not (Wilson and Sperber, 2002, pp258-259).

There are some problems with Gricean theory, Sperber and Wilson (cited in Cummings 2005) state "modify Grice's work by replacing his individual maxims with a single principle of relevance – that the speaker tries to be as relevant as possible in circumstances..." (p.17). Additionally, Unger in his journal argues "utterances raise expectations of relevance not because speakers are expected to obey a Co-operative Principle and maxims or some other specifically communicative convention, but because the search for relevance is a basic feature of human cognition, which communicators may exploit" (Unger, 2001, p.2). Then, Sperber and Wilson in their book revised the principle of relevance become two principles: (i) Human cognition tends to gear the maximization of relevance, and (ii) Every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance" (Sperber and Wilson, 1995, p.260)

Human cognition tends to gear the maximization of relevance is the cognitive principle and for every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance is called communicative principle. From cognitive principle that is stated, it is oriented with cognitive efficiency where cost of cognitive processing effort must be as efficient as possible to aim the maximization of relevant input. In maximization of the relevance by having contextual effects, the greater

contextual effects the greater the relevance. Contextual effect is new and old information used together as premises in an inference process, further new information can be derived, (Wilson and Sperber, 2002, pp. 251-252, Sperber and Wilson, 1995 p.119, Carston, 2011, pp.2-3, Unger, 2001, pp.4-5). The communication principle is explained in the sub chapter.

2.1.1 Relevance and Communication

The ostensive stimulus or intentional behavior has a role in processing effort of speaker. In cognitive principle, human cognition aims to obtain the most efficient relevant information, then the communicative principle has to produce the ostensive stimulus that will seem relevant to the audience in order to her intended interpretation to be understood. Ostensive stimulus is also defined as schematic guide or a set of clue from behavior. The communicator stating the utterances which have a special property of overly communicative acts will raise expectations about the yield and mental effort that will be cost by audience to get the most relevant information (Unger, 2001, p.6, Carston, 2011, p.4)

The way communicator produces the ostensive stimulus to the audience is called ostensive communication. Ostensive communication implies a guarantee of relevance because it provides evidence thoughts. In addition, Sperber and Wilson state "human automatically turn their intention to what seems most relevant to them". (Sperber and Wilson, 1995, p.50). Ostensive communication makes the speaker

obtain her presumption for finding an optimal relevant interpretation to be worth

processing. Two presumptions of optimal relevance according to Sperber and Wilson are (i) the ostensive stimulus is relevant enough for it to be worth the addressees effort to process it, and (ii) the ostensive stimulus is the most relevant one compatible with the communicators abilities and preferences. (Sperber & Wilson 1995, p.270)

Ostensive stimulus which have been produced by communicator create information requiring too much and unnecessary effort. Therefore, Carston provides comprehension procedure to reduce the information to get the possible relevance, namely following a path of least effort in computing cognitive effects by using test interpretive hypotheses (disambiguations, reference resolutions, lexical adjustments, implicatures, etc.) in order of accessibility and stopping when the expectations of relevance are satisfied (Carston, 2011, p.5)

Relevance theory, however, does not guarantee a success of communication because it takes the cognitive abilities to interpret very great contextual assumption.

Relevance theory uses smaller processing effort but needs greater contextual effect.

Sperber and Wilson (cited in Unger) argues "this is because ostensive-inferential communication exploits a general cognitive principle: that the mind tends to attend primarily to information which is relevant in a technical sense" (Unger, 2001, p.4). In

line with this, Pietarinen (2005 p.1769) in his journal says

But this has the unfortunate effect that the power of RT ceases precisely at the point in which an utterance makes the earliest contribution to context, since the theory does not presuppose computing the effects in all contexts- doing so would be cognitively too complex and thus costly. The evolutionarily hardwired principle of least effort will kick in and select the first

and most-accessible contextually-effective interpretation. I believe that acquiring a comprehensive account of the strategic nature of communication compels us to also bring suboptimal relevancies within the scope of the theory. This makes RT bi-directional in terms of accommodating also what the hearer takes to be relevant into the formal framework of computing relevance in terms of possible contextual change instead of actual change.

Therefore, relevance theory a theory that is suitable to analyze for human communication but this theory cannot be the measurement of make a good communication.

2.2 Explicature

According to Grundy, explicature is one of inference series which needs inferential process to make into full propositional (Grundy, 2000, p.103). Grice's theory is branched in what is implicated become, generalized, particularized, conventional implicatures and implicatures. Then explicit meaning is defined as "what is said". Explicature, in relevance theory, "what is said" is minimal enriched then it is recovered by three steps, namely: disambiguation, reference assignment and enrichment. (Pop, 2010, p.406)

This is the example of how to recover explicature via disambiguation that was taken from Sperber and Wilson book (1995, p.184)

- (2) I saw that gasoline can explode
 - (a) I saw that it is possible for gasoline to explode.
 - (b) I saw that can of gasoline explode.
- (3) And a brand new gasoline can it was too.

From this example, the word “can” in (2) contains ambiguity between “can” in the noun or verb form, then if “can” in the verb form, the propositional form is (2a) and if “can” in the noun form, the propositional form is (2b). The hearer, however, still cannot determine which one is the right propositional form. Then when utterance in (3) adds, it is an additional information which may help hearer determine which propositional form that appropriate with utterance in (2). After looking the utterances wholly, it can be concluded that utterance in (2a) has failed to be the interpretation that is suitable with principle of relevance, and (2b) is the right propositional form because it is consistent with principle of relevance.

This is the example of how to recover explicature via reference assignment that was taken from Katz cited in Sperber and Wilson’s book (1995, p.192)

- (4) The man who just asked the stupid question about the relation between the mental and the physical has, thank God, left the room.
- (5) Thank God, he is gone

In utterance in (5) the hearer cannot define who is “He” without knowing the background of the conversation. Then the sentence “he is gone” means he leaves a place. It also cannot be defined if the hearer is not supplied with the background.

Utterance (4) is the recovered of explicature in utterances (5). “He” here refers to the man who just asked the stupid question about the relation between the mental and the physical has. The sentence “he is gone” recovered with he left the room. Actually, the utterance in (4) is not fully propositional. This is the propositional form.

- (6) Thank God, the man x who at time t was in location l has, at time t' , left the room which the man x was in at time t .

Utterance (6) is propositional form of utterance (4) that is made by Sperber and Wilson.

This is the example of how to recover explicature via enrichment that was taken from Sperber and Wilson journal (2002, p.264)

(7) Mary has said to Peter, He forgot to go to the BANK.

In this example “he” means John by recognizing Mary’s ostensive behavior. The propositional form of the example is forgetting to go to the bank may make John unable to repay the money he owed.

2.3 Implicature

According to Carston and Hall, “implicatures can be more or less strongly communicated, depending on the extent to which they can be taken to have been specifically intended by the speaker” (Carston&Hall, 2011, p.21). Moreover Grundy defines implicature as “an inference which provides the addressee with the most relevant interpretation of the utterance” (Grundy, 2000, p.105). In line with this, Sperber and Wilson state “an implicature is a contextual assumption or implication which a speaker, intending her utterance to be manifestly relevant, manifestly intended to the hearer”. Implicature, then, an inference process in which the intention of the speaker is not communicated literally.

Carston explains that “explicatures and implicatures, then, belong to the communicated content of an utterance” (Carston & Hall, 2011, p.21). For example:

(8) A has been devoting her time and energy for many weeks to help B with his dissertation. Finally, she says, It's up to you now.

From A's utterance it is to assumed that she does not want to help B anymore, B should work the dissertation by himself and B should stop for asking her advice and so on. B, then, takes her intention as implicatures utterance and obtains the relevance of A's utterance. This is a kind of weak implicature because speaker's intention is not stated clearly.

2.3.1 Implicated Premises and Implicated Conclusion

Sperber and Wilson have two ways to identify implicature that is by supplying the premises and conclusion. In implicated premises the hearer must follow the interpretation that is suitable, as in principle of relevance. Meanwhile, in implicated conclusion the hearer must deduce from explicature and context, (Sperber and Wilson, 1995 p.195). For example takenfrom Carston and Hall's journal (2011, p.21)

- (9) X: Does John like cats?
- Y: He doesn't like any animals.
- a. CATS ARE ANIMALS.
- b. JOHN DOESN'T LIKE CATS.
- c. DOGS ARE ANIMALS.
- d. JOHN DOESN'T LIKE DOGS

According to the relevance-theoretic account, (a) and (c) are implicated premises and (b) and (d) are implicated conclusion of implicated Y's utterance. Pair of (a) and (b) is the strongest possible implicated premises and implicated conclusion because mutual manifestation with the X's utterance is greater than (c) and (d) pair.

The strongest possible will supply as the implicated premises and implicated conclusion. The pair of (c) and (d) is less weakly communicated because this pair is indeterminate, there is not specifically intended inferences and it cannot be supplied as the implicated premises and implicated conclusion. Sperber and Wilson (1995, p.199) explained why it cannot be supplied as implicated premises and implicated conclusion because “Relevance theory offers a way of getting rid of this fiction without sacrificing clarity of conceptual framework”.

This is another example of recovering implicated premises and conclusion that was taken from Sperber and Wilson book (1995, pp. 194-197)

- (10) a. Peter : Would you drive a Mercedes?
b. Mary: I wouldn't drive ANY expensive car.
- (11) A Mercedes is an expensive car.
- (12) Mary wouldn't drive a Mercedes.

The utterance (11) is supplied as implicated premise of (10b). This is the implicated premise which is accepted because it is relevant with the utterances (10). The utterance (12) as the implicated conclusion of (10b) it is relevant and also consistent with principle of relevance. Moreover

- (13) I wouldn't drive Mercedes.

The utterance (13) is supposition of Mary's answer. Peter cannot supply a premise because it is already stated literary, if Mary answers the Peter question such in utterance (13). Mary must have expected Peter to recover.

- (14) A Rolls Royce is an expensive car
- (15) A Cadillac is an expensive car.
- (16) Mary wouldn't drive a Rolls Royce.
- (17) Mary wouldn't drive a Cadillac.

Recovering the implicature, it needs to supply the premises. Many utterances are potential to be implicated premises. As in utterances (14) and (15), the two types of the car included in expensive car then utterance (14) is concluded in utterance (16) and utterance (15) is concluded in utterance (17). However, those 4 utterances cannot be supplied as the right implicated premises and implicated conclusion because they are not consistent with principle of relevance

(18) People who refuse to drive expensive cars disapprove displays of wealth

(19) Mary disapproves of displays of wealth.

Supplying implicated premise, it could be so far and run over such in utterance (18). Peter only ask would Mary drive a Mercedes, from Mary's answer if peter supply the utterance in (18) and get the conclusion in utterance (19) he completely using extra effort to understand the implicature of Mary's answer. It is not suitable with principle of relevance.

Another example from Pop's work how to recover implicature (Pop, 2010, p.406)

(1) *E TIMPUL SĂ AI FARMEC*
'It's time you had Farmec/charm'.

From the example, according to the theory proposed by Wilson and Sperber (2002, p.261) figuring out the explicature. In doing so, the words *Farmec* needs to be defined. The word "Farmec" means charm which focuses on the presuppositional form rather than invitation. What the advertiser wants to intend to the reader is the readers do not have a charm then from the meaning of "Farmec" is narrowed to the

commodity which is activated, retained as intended, and represents part of logical form. Moreover to know the reference assignment, the reader has exophoric reference with realization the external situational context of the advertisement and is understood to define the reader. Besides, to know the enrichment, the advertiser invites the reader, to have "Farmec". The higher level of explicature and which is defined as indirect invitation in which "Farmec" may be explicates that it is a sincere invitation. Furthermore, to analyze the implicature, the implicated premises and implicated conclusion are figured out. In this case, the implicated premises is if the reader has made a sincere invitation, the product is desirable and it can be concluded that if the product is desirable, it is a good product.

2.4 Previous Studies

Related to the study, there are some previous studies conducted to analyze the phenomena of pragmatics. The first previous study is from Rut-Kluz (2012) entitled **From Realism to Idealism. An Attempt to Grasp the Evolution of Political Speech**. He concerned about a corpus of TV broadcasts of the two leading parties in four political campaigns (1998, 2005, 2007 and 2011). He used qualitative method. The result of his analysis is the implicature that was found in political campaign in TV broadcasts was used as powerful tool of persuasion. He also found the implicature in political campaign was used for showing the weakness of the opponent rather than showing their program

The next previous study, a journal from Sanz (2013) entitled **Relevance Theory and political advertising: A case study**. She, in her journal, analyzed the humorous and text in political advertising. She analyzed the picture in political advertising used incongruity theory and verbal/visual intersemiotics. She, for the text in political advertising, used relevance theory from Sperber and Wilson. In this study, she found that many attempts to produce an implicitly communicated humorous interpretation rest upon assumptions of the viewer's ability to recover contextual information.

There are similarities and differences between previous studies with this study. The similarities are the previous studies focus on communication of relevance and the objects are in politics field. Then the difference is in the object. The object of this study about political campaign in talk show while in the previous studies the objects are political campaign in Political Party Broadcast on TV and political advertisement.

