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Abstract
A substantial aim of political communication is to engage specific groups of citizens through pragmatic policies and various media channels to convey messages and gain the audience’s acceptance effectively. This study investigates political communication as a form of discourse that occurs within political contexts, which involves the exchange of messages among political actors to address and resolve political issues. It is an interdisciplinary field encompassing aspects of psychology, economics, culture, society, and linguistics. This paper aims to give a satisfactory explanation for the question concerning effective communication characteristics: how might politicians utilize them in their speech to be more effective? This pragmatic study in discourse is devoted to analyzing the various effective syntactic structures that arise within political interactions according to Sperber and Wilson’s Theory of Relevance. The contribution of this study is evident as guidelines for further understanding the correlation between language and cognition. The researchers find that politicians seek to cognitively take advantage of the tendency of the audience to strive for relevance. In this way, expectations and attitudes are to be recognized and met by either interlocutors. The focal point of the study is the linguistic and inferential aspects of communication (verbal and non-verbal forms), represented in explicatures and implicatures. The study’s findings exhibit the politicians’ efforts in crafting their utterances optimally to meet the audience’s expectations of relevance, which could be used as an influential method for further studies concerning discourse and communication. This research paper aims to pragmatically exploit the effectiveness of the political interactions (extracts) in the House of Commons (UK parliamentary debates).
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Introduction

Since the study of social relations became necessary, more theories appeared on the surface; these theories are what construct a further term for this study, which is Communicology. The study of communication and its related theories is called Communicology (as the name suggests). It could be described as the systematic study of all types of communication with its detailed methods, means, elements, aspects, capacities, subfields, factors, and possible relation to other fields, whether social, political, or economic (Folorunso, 2013). Communication is often used by humans as a sharing process between two or more interlocutors. The roles of hearers and speakers are interchangeably changed throughout the communication process. It is basically about expressing and understanding any communicational cues available. This term is too flexible to pinpoint a specific definition or any limited area (Corbeil, 2014).

The objective of this study is, first, to show the linguistic qualities of effective communication through discourse analysis. Second, formulate a relevance-theoretic oriented approach to political communication, evidently by achieving the required linguistically effective results. The study draws a solid theoretical base of relevance theory focusing on cognitively effective communication in political settings. This study also looks into all forms of effective communication that potentially occur in the UK parliament in the House of Commons. UK debates usually tackle British affairs by employing discourse, which is, critically emphasizing the service of the public, which is the aim of these debates. Some political actors tend to be more effective than others due to communicative cues used by each. The present study takes the debates in the House of Commons as data of analysis since these debates are massively variant and linguistically rich. However, each political actor reflects his linguistic skill in gaining the support and acceptance of the government and the public. In terms of political discourse and cognitively effective communication, this study is a productive, fruitful addition to the pragmatics literature. Political actors assess their political context to provide their hearers with the most suitable utterance for the hearer and the immediate context. Therefore, this study examines the political discourse, mainly live debates between differently ranked interlocutors, to prove their points linguistically. However, approaching the linguistic choices made by political actors keeping in mind the background information of the audience; and the tendency of the speaker to manifest a piece of information that potentially has some cognitive effects to compensate the efforts of the audience in comprehending utterances.

Many recent studies, such as Christie (1993), Seto (1998), Pilkington (1994, 2000), Yus (1998), Sanz (2013), and Allott (2013) have focused on the applicability of relevance theory and its impact on the speaker and the audience perception, comprehension, and interpreting capacity. While there has been much research on Relevance Theory, few researchers have taken the relation between the speech of the politician’s effectiveness linguistically and cognitively combined and the different linguistic mechanisms deployed by political actors to gain the audience’s acceptance. The researchers locate their study along with the new era of cognitive pragmatics, depending on the innovative theory of relevance by Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995). This theory made it possible for the researchers of this study to examine certain extracts from a purely political context and test the linguistic efficacy. The current research analyses the discursive linguistic formulations within the theory of relevance by Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995); it also highlights the various forms of communication and the capacity of the hearer to recognize the different attitudinal interactions between communicators.
This research paper attempts to give a proper answer to the following question:
- What is the relation between effective communication and the cognitive and communicative principle in political discourse?

Literature Review

Political Communication:

According to the view of Folorunso (2013), political communication is a functional part of political sciences. It is used in the political context and consists of communicational elements such as production, distribution, processing, and effects. Meanwhile, Multu (2004) defines political communication as a genuine link between political communication processes. Another broader definition by Aziz (2013) that is political communication involves various kinds of communication for ideological aims and policies by political figures, in particular techniques for specific people, groups, or international masses to act if needed. From an experienced perspective, political communication is carried out by political figures during election periods using professional and highly accurate elements, such as advertising experts, companies, press consultants, and many others who know how to deal with the media (as cited in Çelik, 2021; Grishin, 2012).

The context of political discourse, however, is highlighted by genre and registers, which are involved in linguistics and pragmatics. An obvious example is the different types of genre registers and other public aspects of press and political relations (Chilton & Schäffner, 2002). In the same realm, a view by Van Dijk, discourse is known by its producers, for example, political actors, authors, or politicians in general, whether it is talk or text (spoken or written) in professional or presidential settings by high-status characters at different levels (international, national, local). Political actors or politicians are, in this context, individuals who get payment for their services when they are elected or positioned in an essential status in the political system. Interactional aspects require listeners, readers, or recipients of political discourse used by different political actors and participants on various levels. These recipients are public individuals and citizens (or masses) (Van Dijk, 1997). Van Dijk (1997) adds the case in which political actions and practices are generated by forms of talk (spoken form) and text (textual form). The analysis of political discourse regards these practices as discursive practices with specific functions (purposes) and implications (consequences). Another essential fact about political discourse diagnostic issues is context, this point can be game-changing in most cases, and what decides whether this type of discourse is political (Van Dijk, 1997, p.14). Wodak (2007) defines discourse from a linguistic and pragmatic perspective, which relies on a specific theoretical framework and can clarified or introduced from different perspectives. Politics is mainly the linguistic system used by political actors in a political context.

Amaglobeli (2017) defines political discourse as “a communicative act, participants who try to give specific meanings to facts and influence / persuade others. In other terms, political discourse can be defined as a manipulative linguistic strategy which serves concrete (ideological) goals.” (p.19) Political discourse consists of both formal debates, speeches, and hearings and informal talk of politics between engaged members.

Another critical fact to remember is that the vital base principle is the language of political discourse, which is highly related to cultural aspects connected with society-specific practices (Chilton & Schäffner, 2002). Van Dijk (1989) Many political discourse studies focus on political language. Therefore, researchers analyze the choice of lexical items and specific concepts regarding usage preferences. Analyzing such discourses can get many results related to attitudes,
Ideologies, and possible strategic power. Dunmire (2012) states that political discourse analysis (hereafter PDA) includes inter- and multi-disciplinary studies of such researchers or studies; it is an exciting aspect and the discursive dimension of political discourse or political talk and text, in addition to political discursive practice. Consequently, PDA pays intensive attention to various conditions, ways, and methods of doing politics. The notion of what is potentially political discusses that politics includes the process of politicization by social actors, phenomena, communications, and institutional context. Also, this process could come with, for many functions, “coercion, resistance/opposition dissimulation and legitimation.” (pp.735- 736). Interestingly, Muntigl (2002) argues that the concept PDA is advantageous to the extension of political conceptual limits or borders, affects political discourse developments, and elevate it beyond the fixed nature of political acts and what the media represents of political actions. However, potentially political maintains that politics is political work done through discursive practices (as cite in Dunmire, 2012 ; Van Dijk, 1997).

To attract and hold the attention of the audience, speakers have to make their communicative stimuli relevant and sufficient to be worth processing. The inference component is much more significant than the description of a mental state. The disposition to search for relevance is automatically exploited in human communication by the humans themselves. Since audio systems recognize that listeners will pay attention solely to stimuli that are applicable enough. Generally, on linguistic grounds, it is genuine that some pieces of information are retrieved from such expressions, mainly that the speaker entertains a specific affective state, that s/he thinks it undesirable to keep a more significant class, etc. But these are pieces of information that are only derived and inferred from what the target hearer perceives; it, is the exterior manifestation of an emotional attitude immediately exhibited (Carston, 2002; Horn & Ward, 2004).

**Theoretical Framework**

*Relevance Theory:*

Relevance Theory (henceforth RT) represents a modern pragmatic theory that merges cognitive and pragmatic settings. It inspects any pragmatic phenomena from other different theoretical aspects. According to Sperber and Wilson, communication enables the speaker to affect (influence) the cognitive environment of the hearer, the transmission of thoughts from the speaker to the hearer. Yet, Communication includes much more than a message transition (Corbeil, 2014). A central notion by Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995) is that “Ostensive [behavior] provides evidence of one's thoughts. It succeeds in doing so because it implies a guarantee of relevance. It implies such a guarantee because humans automatically turn their attention to what seems most relevant to them” (p.50) (Wilson &Sperber 1994, 2012; Carston, 2002; Yus, 1998; Huang, 2007). Wilson (1994) states four main primary facts about RT; each utterance has the potential for different possible interpretations. The possible interpretations are linked directly to the linguistic coding. The hearer may need to think of these interpretations deeper to reach the exact one, this requires effort. For the hearer’s benefit, there is a general standard that enables the hearer to assess these interpretations. This single standard (criterion) can isolate only the interpretation that genuinely fits it. This process of interpreting saves the hearer from the efforts of looking for further interpretations (as cite in Yus, 2015).

- The first principle is the Cognitive Principle of Relevance, is stated as follows;
"Human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance" (Wilson & Sperber, 2004, p. 610).

Human beings manage to understand each other fast. Automatically triggered systems come into action and make interpretations rapidly (Carston, 2002; Yus, 1998).

- The second principle is the Communicative Principle of Relevance, is stated as follows; "Every ostensive stimulus conveys a presumption of its own optimal relevance" (Wilson & Sperber, 2004, p. 612; Sperber & Wilson, 1986\1995, p. 260).

The Communicative Principle of Relevance is grounded and enabled by the former, the cognitive principle of relevance, which involves predictions and mental manipulation of other interlocutors. This principle allows for controlling stimulus detection and processing to attract the audience's attention and retrieve contextual effects that lead to specific intended conclusions (Wilson & Sperber, 2004).

Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995; Huang, 2007; Soria & Romero, 2010) state that relevance theory seeks to provide a pragmatic method for interpreting ostensive stimuli, with a particular focus on utterances. According to Sperber and Wilson, Ostensive-inferential communication occurs when a communicator produces a stimulus that mutually manifests the intention to make a set of assumptions manifest or more manifest to the audience (Sperber & Wilson, 1986\1995; 2012; Wilson & Sperber, 1994). The effectiveness of this communicative process depends on the hearer's ability to discern the speaker's intention through ostension accurately. Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995) state that inferential process “starts from a set of premises and results in a set of conclusions which follow logically from, or are at least warranted by, premises” (pp.12-14). It describes comprehension according to pragmatics, since it starts in a group of premises (input) and outcomes in conclusion (output) which follow each other. This process contributes to decoding process and can be part of it as long as the hearer and the speaker share tacit premise, inferential rule and the ability to use them to extract similar ones if they needed.

Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995) classify two types of intentions: informative and communicative intentions. They are defined as follows:

“(a) Informative intention. The intention to make manifest or more manifest to the audience a certain set of assumptions I.”

“(b) Communicative intention. The intention to make mutually manifest to audience and communicator the communicator has this informative intention.” (p.58-61).

Ostension can trigger intentions that result in manifestations which make evidence much stronger to notice inferential communication. Therefore, the hearer would be involved in the inference procedure (Sperber and Wilson, 1986\1995). This is considered a new and different way to approach communication. Informative intention is directed to the cognitive surroundings of hearers or audience to seek control of the hearer’s cognitive possible processes, so the speaker has the ability to construct their informative intentions based on such cognitive environments. Combining both types of intentions is a general view of effective and successful communication (Sperber and Wilson, 1986\1995). As a general mental operation, the effect is decisive to compare two similar amount of effort and vice versa. According to relevance theory communicators consider an input as relevant, the output of hearer’s cognitive processing needs a specific condition, which is, for the input to be relevant, its processing needs to gain some cognitive effects (Sperber and Wilson, 1986\1995).

Relevance theory is a multidisciplinary theory that could be beneficial in explaining all types of communication in various settings. This theory seeks to exploit the different dimensions
of communication: social, cultural, psychological, educational, or political. The link between the cognitive abilities of the political actors (encyclopedic knowledge) and the interpretation is found by relevance theory. The interpretive hypotheses are automatically embedded during stimuli comprehension. The logical forms also function as a derivative tool for the two most accessible contextual assumptions. However, Inference defined by Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995) is "the process by which an assumption is accepted as true or probably true based on the truth or probable truth of other assumptions" (p. 68). They also note that any state of affairs provides direct evidence for various assumptions, even without explicitly communicating those assumptions in an interesting way (Sperber & Wilson, 1987). This study contributes to explaining how politically communicated information is processed cognitively and pragmatically through explicatures and a different range of implicatures. Effective political interaction is achieved through the hearer's and the speaker's capacity for inferential mental representation. Also, it inspects the notion of mental relevance concerning linguistic utterances. Briefly, the argument about the significance of Sperber and Wilson's (1986\1995) notion of 'relevance' becomes apparent. “[C]ognitive resources tend to be allocated to the processing of the most relevant inputs available” (p. 261). As a result the audience approach an utterance with the assumption of its relevance as a basic premise of any inferences they will make.

Explicatures and Implicatures:

Relevance theory proposes a new term to complement Grice’s implicatures. The main aim of Sperber and Wilson behind this proposal is to indicate that pragmatic inferential processes are attributed to both the implied and explicit parts of communication. Sperber and Wilson state the definition of explicatures as: "An assumption communicated by an utterance U is explicit [hence an "explicature) if and only if it is a development of a logical form encoded by U." (p.182). The theorists add that explicatures can be of two subtypes: basic-explicature and higher-level explicature (which is an embedding of the basic explicatures). It also includes descriptions of attitude prepositions and descriptions of speech acts (Huang, 2007).

Grice (1957) suggests that a conversational implicature is a set of non-logical inferences which involve conveyed messages that are meant without being part of what is said, which can be produced from either strictly observing or ostentatiously flouting the maxims (as cite in Yan, 2007, p.27). Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995 ), on the other side, define implicatures as "whatever that is not communicated explicitly." (p.182). They explain that implicatures are assumptions communicated by the utterance that is not made explicit. This lack of explicit communication gives rise to implicatures, which they refer to as implicatures. As a result, this definition establishes the relationship between implicatures and explicatures (Haugh, 2002 ). Sperber and Wilson present their own characterization of implicatures, which appears to differ from Grice's treatment in a reductionist manner (Haugh, 2002). They suggest that fully determined implicatures can be inferred by referencing the speaker's manifested expectations, making the utterance optimally relevant (Sperber & Wilson, 1986\1995 ; Soria & Romero, 2010). Implicatures, or what Huang (2007) calls "r-implicatures," (p.195), are retrieved solely through inference; allowing the hearer to comprehend the intended meaning of the speaker.

Context and Mutual Manifestation

Sperber and Wilson consider that a context is a psychological construct that is a subset of the hearer’s assumptions about the world; each utterance requires a somewhat divergent context
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(Sperber & Wilson, 1987; Assimakopoulos, 2017). Following the theoretical framework presented by Sperber and Wilson, who count on accessibility standards in arranging contexts, in addition to a model of cognition, which operates according to the precept of producing maximum effects for minimal effort. Consider the following instance:

“Peter: I'm tired.”
“Mary: If you're tired, I'll make the meal.”

To comprehend such utterances, assumptions are not enough. More encyclopedic entries combined with the concepts to achieve some contextual effects.

“Mary: What I would like to eat tonight is an osso-bucco. I'm ravenous. I had a great day in court. How was your day?”
“Peter: Not so good. Too many patients, and the air conditioning was out of order. I'm tired.”
“Mary: I'm sorry to hear that. O.K. I'll make it myself.” (Sperber & Wilson, 1986\1995, p.132-142)

To understand Mary’s utterance, Peter needs to go back to her previous remarks about her desire to eat osso-bucco. The interpretation of Mary’s previous utterances and these interpretations need to be converted from the deductive device’s memory to Peter’s short-term memory. If everything went well, to go back in memory for previous utterances’ interpretations, these interpretations need to be retrieved back to the memory of deductive devices. Thus, Peter extends the immediate given context, together with what he has in memory, to conclude that Mary feels sorry for hearing that he is tired because of his bad day at work.

The context can have several extensions to satisfy the search for relevance (not as a goal but as a tool for comprehension) productively. This instance is inferred successfully by extending context to previous assumptions processed deductively. Interpreting utterances that contain a specific context demands extending the interlocutors’ deductive inferring abilities (Sperber & Wilson, 1986\1995).

Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995) give essential definitions for some basic ideas about mutual manifestness in saying that; “A fact is manifest to an individual at a given time if and only if he is capable at that time of representing it mentally and accepting its representation as true or probably true.” (p.39). Sperber and Wilson (2015) explain manifestation and its relation to implicit beliefs. Manifestness relies on belief’s strength and accessibility, representing the relation between epistemic and cognitive aspects. Manifestation degrees ensure the causal role of the evidence in the communicator’s thoughts and behavior. According to the definition of Sperber and Wilson of manifestness, things that are accepted as true mainly refer to facts.

Similarly, the time mentioned in their definition refers to the time span in which a piece of information activates the inferential processes. Manifest is purely perceptual and unobservable. What cognitive environment includes is all the facts and information (different types) that are possible to be perceived and inferred by the individual, not only this, but also all the data that she/he is capable of fitting in his/her awareness in terms of his/her physical environment (Sperber & Wilson, 1986\1995). “A cognitive environment of an individual is a set of facts that are manifest to him.” (p.39).

Christie (1993) also provided a significant study about the audiences’ reception of broadcast communication. Christie uses the relevance theory to analyze audience response as a pragmatic approach to media studies. The aim is to be able to concentrate on the variable interpretations that are inferred by the audience out of the televised program. The study investigates such a problem by applying a cognitive pragmatic theory, which is relevance theory,
to reach the audiences’ response to the communicative act of broadcasting. This is consistent with the scientific results of Pilkington (1994), which accounts for the poetic effects in a relevance-theoretic account of the literary use of rhetorical tropes and schemes. Poetic effects are achieved by the use of tropes and schemes alongside the development of the pragmatic relevance theory. In considering language communication and specifically literary communication that, primarily given in the notion of text-internal linguistic features of social-culture phenomena. By proposing a pragmatic and cognitive basis for literal communication, arguing that the framework of relevance theory may be a significant addition to the study of poetic style and rhetoric. In more political settings, Sanz (2013) argues that the interpretation of these billboards involves a massive reliance on the hearers’ accessibility to the background beliefs and contextual assumptions that interact with the new inputs. The study distinguishes between three main elements explicatures, implicated premises, and implicated conclusions. However, the study includes the analysis of visual metaphors and semiotics spanning to explain explicatures. These studies successfully accentuate the relation between relevance theory and language effect, the cognitive capacities that directly affect the potential interpretations of the linguistic and non-linguistic inputs. Huang (2021) investigates pragmatic ambivalence from the perspective of relevance theory as an “indispensable communicative strategy” to achieve communication. Huang finds that relevance theory give explanatory advantage to be applied in a conductive way to provide further understanding of linguistic phenomena.

Factors of relevance:

Cutting and Fordyce (2021) see relevance is achieved through productivity mechanisms efforts and effects. "The more contextual effects and the less effort it takes to process the text, the greater the relevance” (p.33). Therefore, the hearer should receive some positive cognitive effects in the shape of an implicature to get useful information from it. The roles of the speakers and the hearers are altered rapidly during the interaction. When the old information interacts with the new information, the result is a contextual implication, representing the contextual effects. According to Wilson and Sperber, (2004) "A positive cognitive effect is a worthwhile difference to the individual’s representation of the world” (p.608). According to Sperber and Wilson, there are three main possibilities for how contextual effects are handled by mental processes. Contextual effects could be; strengthening an assumption that already exists, contradicting, which leads to the elimination of the current assumption and contextual implication, and combining where new information follows from the combination of new and existing assumptions. Ultimately, the higher the rate of effort taken (effort into the process of perception, memory retrieval mechanisms, and inference requirements), the higher the unworthiness of the input to be processed. Therefore, it would be unlikely to attract the of the hearer’s attention (audience). From the relevance-theoretic perspective, what the interlocutors are looking for is a balanced equation. What is optimally relevant is taking on accomplish the maximum amount of effects for the minimum amount of effort and gain the most relevant communicative information (Huang, 2021 ; Horn and Ward, 2004).

According to Wilson and Sperber (2002) the speaker wants to be understood, pining such criteria, the utterance is simplified enough for the hearer’s criteria of minimum effort for maximum effect. Much effect for less effort means more relevance. What is manifest is that the speaker wants the hearer to think or presume that this utterance is relevant and worth the effort (p.604).

Effect in language use:
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Practically, this study could model how speech effectiveness can change many political affairs, especially in the most vital point in the UK Parliament, the House of Commons. By studying relevance theory, people can be careful to determine the choice of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences in expressing ideas or meaning in a given context because being relevant and effective is an essential thing in our lives to understand each other. Communicators seek effects behind information processing, and the human brain stores and processes information to achieve communicative efficiency (Zhao, 2001).

One of the crucial concepts proposed by Sperber and Wilson’s theory of relevance (hence after RT) is the interpretive and descriptive use of language. In some cases, explicit contents of utterances are not prepositional forms; language tropes and non-assertive speech acts are examples of such cases. As a result, RT provides a fundamental approach that depends on the distinction between interpretation and description. According to Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995), Utterances represent phenomena in two main ways: first, “It can represent some state of affairs in virtue of its propositional form being true of that state of affairs.” In this case, this type of representation is description or descriptively used (p.228). Second, “it can represent some other representation which also has a propositional form – a thought, for instance- in virtue of a resemblance between two propositional forms” this type of representation is interpretative or interpretively used (p.229).

**Metaphor:**

The relevance-theoretic account of the metaphor comprehension process indicates that metaphor is located among a general treatment for the processes of lexical pragmatics, for concept modulation or adjustment. However, this notion of modulation or adjustment includes narrowing and different types of broadening (which are not considered metaphorical). Still, RT argues for more continuity on metaphor (Wilson & Carston, 2006 ). Relevance theory provides a cognitive framework to exploit the process of utterance interpretation through goal-directed inference. The context of discourse plays an essential role in altering what information is accessible to the encyclopedic entries, and that leads to what context assumptions and implications are derived. Also, this account holds the fact that discourse context sets certain aims or expectations, which directs the inference (from expected conclusions to derivable premises) (Wilson and Carston, 2006 ; Horn and Ward, 2004).

**Irony:**

Among other traditional and classical approaches to irony, Sperber and Wilson (1981, 1986\1995; 2012; Wilson and Sperber, 1992; Wilson, 2006) were the first to propose the technical term of echoic irony, and regardless of the various criticism, they insisted on their approach. Their approach relies on the term echo, like other language trope, as a second-degree interpretation (Sperber & Wilson, 1998\1995 ). Sperber and Wilson (1981) developed this approach from Mention Theory to Echoic Mention; these were the origins of the current approach to echoic irony. Sperber and Wilson (1998\1995) state that irony includes “an interpretive relation between the speaker’s thought and attributed thought or utterances” (p.231), which puts it on the same line as metaphor in relation to the interpretively deployed utterances, which simultaneously falls with the range of any other normal utterance.

According to RT, ironic utterances are interpretation of the speaker’s thought (as an interpretation). Speakers achieve relevance by informing the hearer of what others said or thought in the case of reported speech. Not only this, but what kind of attitude does the speaker hold in his
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mind towards such is, and that is where relevance is mainly achieved. This kind of echoic interpretive mechanism results in the echoic interpretation by Sperber and Wilson (1998\1995 ). Seto (1998) mentions some of the linguistic evidence on irony because these markers often appear as emphatic, such as: actually, certainly, clearly, definitely, evidently, indeed, obviously, of course, real(ly), sure(ly), etc.

- “It's a lovely day for a picnic.”
- “It's a lovely day for a picnic, indeed.” (Seto, 1998, p.239).

The function of these modifiers is to provide a metalinguistic comment to the utterance, which also functions as an echo marker. Adjuncts, like always, perpetually, and constantly, are used to trigger ironic interpretations according, to specific contextual environment (Seto, 1998 ).

Repetition and Parallelism:

Communication consists of different types. Repeated communicative acts could be an utterance, paralinguistic, or extralinguistic cues, which might be a physical gesture or vocal variation. As the speaker aims for optimal relevance, the main reason behind using a particular style is to seek relevance. Emphatic effects work in different ways, but overall, Sperber and Wilson suggest that the cases of repetition should have increased contextual effects by leading the hearer to have an extended context and henceforth yielding further implications. Repetition triggers effects automatically, regardless of the way the utterance is interpreted. The hearer is cognitively (automatically) pushed to have a broader imagination to share the notion of mutually manifesting the intended meaning in deriving suitable assumptions. A psychological state of affairs such as attitudes, emotions, and mental state is associated with resultant effective interpretation. (Sperber &Wilson, 1986\1995).

Syntactic structure and Focal stress:

As mentioned before, the speaker compensates for the hearer’s efforts spent in processing the immediate communicative act (any potential stimuli). After all, these processes are interrelated to complete the process of communication effectively. Although there is much literature about such points, none of them could present a decent explanation of the relation between linguistic structure and the pragmatic effects. And by that, RT steps into an explanatory theory of style. Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995) mention some facts to consider as bases for their explanation; first, given information comes before the new information, which is focally stressed as a way to simplify understanding. Second, vocal stress draws the hearer’s attention to a specific linguistic item, but stress itself is ambivalent. Third, the stress of the declarative is determined by using Wh-question, which is supposed to be answered through it. Last and most important, it is not often a distinction between what is given and what is new or focus and presupposition, according to Sperber and Wilson, it is “a gradient or hierarchical structure”. Sperber and Wilson (1986\1995) endeavor to prove the relation between the linguistic form and the pragmatic interpretation are linked naturally to show how it works among the skeleton of relevance theory.

To avoid the waste of effort, it is crucial when the speaker aims for optimal relevance, s/he should efficiently exploit the temporal sequencing. Sperber and Wilson’s suggestion focuses on what is logically anticipated as hypothesized and is based initially on syntactically anticipated hypotheses that vigorously participate in the comprehension procedure (Sperber & Wilson, 1986\1995 ).
Questions:

According to Sperber and Wilson (1986-1995), interrogatives, however, are constructed along the interpretive use of language, which links the speaker’s thought and some desirable thought. RT is a hypothesis about the process of interpretation from the hearer’s perspective. Simply, the hearer recovers the logical form of the interrogative utterance and fuses it with the form of the speaker is asking ‘Wh-P’, and ‘Wh-P’ is indirectly indicated. The distinction between yes-no questions and ‘Wh-question’ is that, yes-no questions, on the other side, have the logical form with complete logical form, in which P is communicating thought that is interpreted via P as relevant if it is true. In contrast, the ‘Wh-question’ has a logical form with an incomplete prepositional form. In asking Wh-P as a ‘Wh-question’ does not have a complete prepositional form or less than a prepositional form, P is communicating that there is more to the thought to be interpreted by P to develop it into a complete propositional thought, and in this case, it would be relevant if true. Understanding interrogative utterances is greatly dependent on the answers that the speaker would consider relevant if true. The formula where ‘she is asking Wh-P’ is analyzed as a result of an interpretation of the desirable representation (Sperber & Wilson, 1986-1995; Lenci, 1994). This brings the need to mention a type of question and the most relevant assumptions; - Rhetorical question; When did you say you were going to give up smoking? Such questions are usually regarded as reminders; in other words, the speaker intends to let the hearer retrieve specific information that is relevant to the hearer.

Of course, relevance is a trust-based relationship, which might be clear and relevant for one might not be the same for others. Hence, through the process of interpreting questions, some assumptions must assessed by the hearer about what is considered to be relevant to the speaker.

Methodology:

This study draws on a qualitative analysis method, which involves data collection and results in an interpretive data evaluation. This type of analysis is mainly concerned with meaning comprehension that could potentially participate in specific problematic human or social issues. In an attempt to explain the meaning of the data, the researcher highlights particular then general information, that ‘inductive analysis’. A quite outstanding feature of qualitative analysis is the confirmation of meaning, interpretation, and process. Context, as the focus of the qualitative analysis, is used by the leading agent of the analysis (the researcher) to deduce a descriptive product (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Crosby & Salazar, 2020).

Purposeful sampling is the preferred method of analysis by qualitative researchers. However, purposeful sampling gives much space for the researcher to assess, evaluate, and analyze many issues considerably related to the aim or the purpose of the study. Samples exhibit a highly informative, purposeful, and relevant; thus, this study takes purposeful sampling as a case of analysis (Patton, 2015; Fletcher & Plakoyiannaki, 2011).

Data Selection:

The researchers’ chosen data are some selected extracts (samples) from the parliamentary debates in the UK House of Commons 2022-2023. These extracts can be accessed on the following YouTube videos;


https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M3C6sWxlyx4.
The Telegraph. (2022, January 31) In Full: Boris Johnson makes statement on Sue Gray report in House of Commons. [Video file]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iIre5y1q_k


The Independent. (2023, June 7). Watch again: Oliver Dowden faces Angela Rayner at PMQs as UK records highest inflation rates in G20. [Video file]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qrTn5FrzXSE

Or can be accessed on the following the official electronic website in the form of live debates https://www.theyworkforyou.com/.

Data Analysis and Findings:
Due to the place delimitations, the five extracts are analyzed by the researchers by adopting Sperber and Wilson’s theory of relevance (1986). These extracts can be accessed by the reader through the YouTube platform or the official electronic website provided in the data selection section.

Model of analysis:
1. The explicature used by the speakers and identifying what type of procedure would extract the propositional content, whether it is enrichment, reference assignment, or disambiguation.
2. The implicature and its types: implicit premises and conclusion.
3. ‘Cognitive effects’ can be related to context in three main ways:
   - Strengthening, on the one hand, occurs as the new information added supports and functions as evidence for the existing information. There are three types of strengthening:
   - Contradiction, on the other hand, occurs when the evidence provided leads to opposing or abandoning the old assumptions. Also, the varying degrees of strength deduction may result in contradiction (Sperber & Wilson, 1986).
   - Combining a previous assumption to extract more contextual effects and to result in contextual implications.
4. The politicians’ use of language tropes to maximize the effects gained by the audience, hence, to get their acceptance.

The study examines five extracts transcribed from YouTube channels of the UK parliamentary debates in the House of Commons; these debates are held by different politicians led by the Prime Minister of each period.

Analysis:
This section provides a detailed analysis of the political interactions in the House of Commons (chosen political debates), to precisely identify the mechanisms activated by producing linguistic and non-linguistic effective cues. However, this study undertakes a postmodern pragmatic approach to assess and evaluate the various explicatures and implicatures. In addition, this study exploits what the interactions include of different language tropes such as metaphor, hyperbole, question, irony, repetition, parallelism, Syntactic structure, and Focal stress.
Extract 1:

- Theresa May said:
  “The COVID regulations imposed significant restrictions on the freedoms of members of the public. They had a right to expect their Prime Minister to have read the rules, to understand the meaning of the rules—and, indeed, those around him to have done so, too—and to set an example in following those rules.” (The Telegraph, 2022, January 31).

- Boris Johnson said:
  “No, that is not what the Gray report says. [Interruption.] It is not what the Gray report says” (Serious tone of voice) (The Telegraph, 2022, January 31)

In the above extract, the interlocutors, Theresa May (Conservative Maidenhead) and Boris Johnson (The Prime Minister of the UK), are debating the Gary report and COVID regulations. The extract is taken from a lengthy debate moderated by (Mr. Speaker) Lindsay Hoyle in the House of Commons (UK parliament). This extract is analyzed following Sperber and Wilson’s theory of relevance.

The speaker attempts to mutually manifest a contextual assumption about her informative and communicative intentions for the audience (both primary and secondary). Theresa speaks confidently about her thoughts to the public. The speaker is defending the safety of the public in creating a successful cognitive context for the hearers to make anticipatory hypotheses about her utterances and questions. The explicature of Theresa is decoded through reference assignment; the noun phrase ‘right hon. Friend’ refers to ‘Boris Johnson’, the pronoun ‘they’ refers to ‘the rules’ and ‘people around Boris’, and ‘it’ refers to the reason behind this issue.

The higher-level explicature is as follows:
- Johnson and the people around him are incompetent of the fact that the rules should be applied equally to No. 10. (Downing Street, the locale of British prime ministers since 1735)

The hearer has to find a garden path of interpretation that is consistent with the principle of relevance, depending on their encyclopedic entries, to construct the appropriate assumptions as regards the utterance and the overall context of the interaction. The speaker expects her audience to compute relevant hypotheses about ‘No. 10.’ And what it represents to the public and the political system.

The implicit premise:
- Boris Johnson needs to explain himself.

The explicit premise:
- Rules are not applied equally by the Prime Minister and the people around him.

The conclusion is that:
- Theresa May is objecting to Johnson’s management policy.

The speaker uses the modifier ‘indeed’ to express a metalinguistic function to serve as an ironical interpretation, as in “They had a right to expect their Prime Minister to have read the rules, to understand the meaning of the rules—and, indeed, those around them him to have done so, too—and to set an example in following those rules.” Theresa dissociates herself from Johnson’s actions towards the regulations.

The speaker refers implicitly to inequality in safety regulations as follows:
- Boris Johnson does not apply rules equally
- Boris Johnson is unaware of the rules
- Boris Johnson is incompetent in the health regulations
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- Boris Johnson and people around him are not capable of doing their job appropriately.

Johnson replies with a quiet, obvious serious tone of voice, which is a non-linguistic form of communication. Johnson answered to Theresa, “No, that is not what the Gray report says. [Interruption.] It is not what the Gray report says, but I suggest that my right hon. Friend waits to see the conclusion of the inquiry.” The decoded logical form of Johnson’s utterance into a description of Theresa’s ostensive behavior. Johnson’s utterance will be optimally relevant to Theresa because expectations are raised by recognition of Johnson’s ostensive behavior of the presumption of relevance it conveys. Johnson’s utterance will achieve relevance by denying all that is said by Theresa in which expectation raised by Johnson’s optimal relevance, together with the fact that such an explanation would be most relevant to Theresa at this point. The speaker aims for effective communication and seeks to be understood by his hearers. Boris wants to make sure that his hearers’ cognitive environment is improved, but at the same time, they are using the least amount of effort in comprehending his utterances. The speaker uses repetition as follows:
- “No, that is not what the Gray report says.”
- “It is not what the Gray report says.”

Theresa infers that Johnson knows nothing about the rules, and he denies what she accused him of ignorance and incompetence. Plus, background knowledge satisfies the expectation of optimal relevance. The speaker implies that:
- Theresa is against his policy.
- Theresa has some doubts about applications of COVID regulations.
- Theresa rejects inequality.
- Theresa intends to make Johnson give some explanations to the public and the house members.

The speaker aims to affect his audience and to achieve this, he needs to compensate for the wasted efforts in giving a comprehensible utterance. To achieve a contradictory effect, the speaker uses repetitive denial.

Extract 2:
- Keir Starmer said:
  "I have the list here: 45p tax cut—gone; corporation tax cut—gone; 20p tax cut—gone; two-year energy freeze—gone; tax-free shopping—gone; economic credibility—gone.…So why is she still here?" (Challenging eye contact) (The Guardian, 2022, October 19).

- Elizabeth Truss said:
  "I am a fighter and not a quitter" (Challenging eye contact) (The Guardian, 2022, October 19).

In the above extract, the interlocutors, Keir Starmer (Leader of HM Official Opposition) and Elizabeth Truss (The Prime Minister) are engaged in a debate about the Prime Minister's economic plans and achievements. The debate takes place in the House of Commons, with Lindsay Hoyle serving as the moderator. The extract is analyzed following Sperber and Wilson's theory of relevance.

Starmer, representing the opposing side of the house, aims to convey her messages to the primary and secondary audience. His main objective is to provide the audience with specific numbers that reinforce and connect to their existing background knowledge, resulting in a positive cognitive impact. The syntactic, semantic, and phonological structure of his message captures the
attention of the listeners. The secondary audience echoes the same structure used by the speaker, aligning their expressions with his. These factors work together inferentially, harmonized to create a cognitive environment that is mutually manifest in the primary audience (Truss). The strategic use of parallel structures such as "45p tax cut—gone; corporation tax cut—gone; 20p tax cut—gone; two-year energy freeze—gone; tax-free shopping—gone; economic credibility—gone" serves to strengthen the primary audience's comprehension abilities and reduces processing efforts by employing matching structures.

a) 45p tax cut is gone.
b) Corporation tax cut is gone.
c) 20p tax cut is gone.
d) Two-year energy freeze is gone.
e) Tax-free shopping is gone.
f) Economic credibility is gone.

Simple, structured syntactic forms save the hearers from the useless processing cost (effort) and increase the chances of effective communication. Starmer is producing certain higher-level explicatures:

a) Starmer believes that truth causes economic deficiency.
b) Starmer is rejecting the way Truss handles British affairs.

Stamer also implicates:

a) Truss is not the right person for the job of The Prime Minister.
b) Truss should resign.
c) Truss is behaving in the wrong way towards the Labour Party.

Truss’s communicative task is to recognize all that is produced by Starmer and retrieve a schema of relevant assumptions that would enable her to reach the interpretation intended by the speaker. The assumptions are retrieved from encyclopedic entries to back up the logical form of the utterance. A complex process of processing instantly occurs by the speaker’s expectations and the hearer’s potential hypotheses, all combining automatically and optimally to have an interpretation that is consistent with the principle of relevance.

Liz Truss answers Starmer, who questions her as a prime minister and asks her to prove herself due to the economic crisis she caused by ill-planned political strategies. The Prime Minister is using a metaphorical and, at the same time, politically channelled precisely from ‘Peter Mandelson’. "I am a fighter and not a quitter" (Challenging eye contact). Liz Truss takes advantage of mutual manifestation by using a direct political quotation from a former highly influential prime minister in his victory speech. The House of Commons is familiar with such character and such influence, so in comprehending Truss’s utterance, the hearers (primary and secondary) are following the least effort path, which gives a higher possibility of high positive cognitive effects (benefits). An automatic and optimal interpretation results from linguistic and non-linguistic stimuli produced by Truss to pursue the hearer in automatically triggering assumptions retrieved from memory by a simple syntactically structured utterance. The explicatures are assigning references by ‘I’ to Truss herself in this context specifically. In declaring herself as a fighter, she uses the loose meaning of being a good prime minister and of what else the fighter is doing other than continuing fighting until victory is obtained. The higher-level explicature embedded in the propositional form:

a) The Prime Minister is a fighter.
b) The Prime Minister is not giving up on her position.
It also implicates weaker implicatures:

a) Truss rejects Starmer’s utterance

b) Truss is as strong as Peter Mandelson

Truss replies with a quiet, obvious, serious tone of voice, which is a non-linguistic form of communication. Truss has answered to Starmer, "I am a fighter and not a quitter...." the decoded logical form of Truss’s utterance into a description of Starmer’s ostensive behavior. Truss’s utterance will be optimally relevant to Starmer because expectations are raised by recognition of Truss’s ostensive behavior and the presumption of relevance it conveys. Truss’s utterance will achieve relevance by using a direct metaphorical political quotation. Expectations are raised by Truss’s optimal relevance, together with the fact that such an explanation would be most relevant to Starmer at this point. First enrichment of the logical form of Truss’s utterance to occur to Starmer, which accepted as an explicature of Truss’s utterance. Starmer infers that Truss emphasizes that she is going to keep fighting and never quits. Truss is defending her situation by channeling what former Prime Minister Peter Mandelson states, plus background knowledge satisfies the expectation of optimal relevance.

Implicit premise as:
- Truss is capable of bearing responsibilities.

Explicit premise as:
- Truss is fighting just like Peter Mandelson.

The conclusion is that:
- Truss earned her position through hard work.

The metaphor in the quotation is an indirect way to achieve relevance: "I am a fighter and not a quitter...." The hearers will likely give access to their encyclopedic knowledge about the fighter’s features and how it resembles the prime minister. Starmer is expressing that Truss is manifesting to the audience (both primary and secondary audiences) to improve, reconstruct, and add further assumptions to their cognitive environment through the information.

Extract 3:

-Boris Johnson:
“Of course, we gave and are giving people skills, skills, skills.” (hand movements) (Guardian News, 2022, July 18).

-Kevin Brennan:
“It is highly unconventional ... only an unconventional man would want the opportunity to speak at his own funeral.” (Guardian News, 2022, July 18).

In the above extract, the interlocutors, Boris Johnson (Leader of the Conservative Party, The Prime Minister), and Kevin Brennan (Labour, Cardiff West), are debating Confidence in the Queen Majesty’s Government. The extract is taken from a lengthy debate moderated by (Mr. Speaker) Lindsay Hoyle in the House of Commons (UK parliament). This extract is analyzed following Sperber and Wilson’s theory of relevance.

Johnson (the speaker) uses his informative and communicative intentions to construct an appropriate context for the audience. The speaker aims for optimal relevance, and at the same time, his utterances trigger automatic relevance. In his utterance, “Just a moment...Of course, we gave and are giving people skills, skills, skills.” The speaker uses repetition to activate his audience’s pragmatic inferential capacities to convey that he gives them many different skills. This utterance shows that the speaker is emphasizing his thoughts about providing the “skills” that are beneficial
for the public. This is within the preferences and abilities of comprehension, which proves the presumption of optimal relevance. The speaker uses repetition to touch upon psychological and cognitive capacities at the same time to achieve his aim and obtain the support and acceptance of his hearers. The explicit premise is that:
- Johnson and Conservative Party members are supporting the public
The Implicit premise is that:
- Johnson and Conservative Party members worth the public trust.
The conclusion is that:
- The current Prime Minister Johnson and Conservative Party members are making a memorable legacy.

The repetitive lexical item is successfully used to modify the speaker’s explicit aspect of the utterance and, henceforth achieves more extra benefits or positive cognitive effects. The explicature is decoded via reference assignment; the pronoun ‘we’ refers to ‘Johnson and Conservative Party members’, and ‘they’ and ‘them’ refers to ‘the public’. The explicature can be enriched as:
- Johnson and Conservative Party members gave and are giving people educational skills.
- Johnson and Conservative Party members gave and are giving people management skills.
- Johnson and Conservative Party members gave and are giving people health skills.
The higher-level explicature is that:
- Johnson and Conservative Party members gave and are giving the public all lifetime skills, and will continue supporting and developing them until they become adults.

Brennan replies with an ironical utterance, “It is highly unconventional … only an unconventional man would want the opportunity to speak at his own funeral.”, the speaker (Brennan) indicates, by using her utterances, his rejection of what Johnson uttered. Johnson’s ostensive behavior will be optimally relevant to Rayner. Brennan accuses Johnson of being unrealistic by calling him “an unconventional man”. As linguistic communication is the strongest form of communication, the structured form provides ease of access to the contextual assumption in the mutually manifest schema of assumptions. The explicature is decoded via reference assignment; the pronoun ‘it’ refers to Johnson’s speech’, and ‘unconventional man’ refers to ‘Johnson’ in this context and enrichment. Brennan refers to a cultural or social phenomenon mentioned in The Adventures of Tom Sawyer. In The Adventures of Tom Sawyer, Tom and Huckleberry Finn, both presumed dead, walk into the middle of their funeral service. The speaker is using this example without further explanations about such reference, depending on the audience’s background knowledge to activate the pragmatic inferential mechanisms.

Brennan’s utterance is a basic explicature that can be enriched in various ways:

a) Johnson’s speech is highly unconventional
b) Only Johnson would want the opportunity to speak at his own funeral.

The explicit premise is that:
- Johnson is constantly breaking the rules.
The implicit premise is that:
- Johnson is close to his end as a Prime Minister.
The conclusion is that:
- Johnson is just fantasizing, and he confuses the political operation.

Extract 4:
Angela Rayner said:
“Speaking of the last election, the Tory manifesto promised to end the abuse of the judicial review. How is it going?” (Sarcastic tone of voice, slight smile and gaze) (The Independent, 2023, June 7).

Oliver Dowden said:
However, in Wales they also had a pandemic, and what have the Labour-run Wales authorities done there? [NO] independent inquiry in Wales. As ever, it is [ONE] rule for Labour and another for everyone else.” (Smile and hand movements) (The Independent, 2023, June 7).

In the above extract, the interlocutors, Angela Rayner (Deputy Leader of the Official Opposition) and Oliver Dowden (Deputy Prime Minister), debate the elections and the COVID inquiry. The extract is taken from a lengthy debate moderated by (Mr. Speaker) Lindsay Hoyle in the House of Commons (UK parliament). This extract is analyzed following Sperber and Wilson’s theory of relevance.

The speaker (Rayner) conveys her informative and communicative intention in expressing her thoughts about the Conservative Party. The speaker successfully constructs a context for the audience to use as a tool to derive suitable and accessible assumptions. The speaker represents or indirectly reports the Conservatives’ speech: “The Tory manifesto promised to end the abuse of the judicial review (a court proceeding in which a judge reviews the lawfulness of a decision or action made by a public body). How is it going?” The speaker makes a mutual manifestation that the conservatives’ promise is not fulfilled; the speaker uses commissive utterance (speech act promise) to remind the hearers of a previous promise.

Rayner, then, ostensibly asks a rhetorical question, “How is it going?” to trigger automatic and optimal relevance, the hearers’ cognitive environment is improved by the speaker’s utterances. The speaker uses not only linguistic communication but also non-linguistic communication cues to instruct the hearers through the process of finding the right interpretation. It is observed that Rayner shows a sarcastic tone of voice, slight smile, and gaze to reinforce the hearers’ pragmatic inferential mechanisms. The speaker is seeking optimal relevance; she uses political terms in which she knows that everyone in the House of Commons knows them, and so the speaker’s utterance is within the hearer’s abilities and preferences. The speaker succeeded in attracting the hearers’ attention, and that is obvious in the reaction produced by them, which is laughter. The explicature is decoded by reference assignment; ‘the Tory manifesto’ refers to ‘the Conservative Party’, and ‘it’ refers to ‘the ending of the abuse of the judicial review’. And enrichment;
- The Conservative Party promised to end the abuse of the judicial review. But this promise is broken.

The higher-level explicature is:
- The Conservative Party lied just to win the elections.

The speaker implicates that:
  a) The Conservatives are not trustworthy.
  b) The Conservatives are not fulfilling their promises.
  c) The Conservatives are breaking the law.
  d) The Conservatives are corrupted.
  e) The Conservatives are not doing their job in the right way.

The implicit premise:
The Conservative Party lacks obedience.
The explicit premise:
- The Conservatives were not committed to what they say.

The conclusion:
- The Conservatives were not worth winning the previous elections.

The hearers (primary and secondary audience) use both linguistic and non-linguistic communication and encyclopedic entries to retrieve specific facts about the last elections, what the promise was, and whether it was fulfilled or not. As the speaker has some expectations about the hearers’ background knowledge, the hearers also have expectations of what hypotheses are formulated depending on the speaker’s utterance. Given the principle of relevance, the ostensive stimuli enable the hearer to derive an array of weak implicatures, as these stimuli include the speaker’s intentions of being relevant. The speaker seeks to achieve a combining effect in humiliating the Conservative Party. To show the public how the Conservative Party falls short of serving the public because they say things and make many promises to get votes, they deny them later.

Dowden reacts with a smile to what is said by Rayner, which indicates that he recognizes Rayner’s utterances and underestimates her utterances and short questions. The speaker (Dowden) replies with another rhetorical questions, “In Wales, they also had a pandemic, and what have the Labour-run Wales authorities done there?” The speaker indicates, by using explicit utterances, his rejection of what Rayner uttered. Dowden’s ostensive behavior will be optimally relevant to Rayner. Dowden is defending his situation by denying what Rayner states. And her utterance against Dowden’s party plans about the COVID inquiry. The speaker uses both linguistic communication and non-linguistic communication (Smile and hand movements). The structured form provides accessible contextual assumptions (redirecting what Rayner said to defend himself against current accusations and formulates new accusations to Rayner and her Party) to mutually manifest relevant schema of assumptions.

Expectations (on the hearer’s side) are raised by recognition of Dowden’s ostensive behavior and the presumption of relevance it conveys.

The explicit premise is that:
- Rayner and her Party did nothing to the pandemic in Wales

The implicit premise is that:
- Rayner has no right to accuse the Tory manifesto

The conclusion is that:
- Dowden is defending his Party and the Prime Minister’s political decisions

The utterance is decoded on the explicit side by enrichments as expressing that Johnson is manifesting to both primary and secondary audiences to improve and add further assumptions to their cognitive environment through the background information. Dowden’s utterance is a basic explicature enriched in various ways:
  a) Rayner and her Party ALSO did nothing for the pandemic in Wales.
  b) Rayner and her Party are considering themselves as different.
  c) Rayner and her Party ALSO do not comply with the rules.
  d) The Labour Party is not better than the Conservative Party.
  e) Rayner is treating the Conservatives unequally.
  f) Rayner and her Party are authoritarians.
The speaker uses *emphatic focal stress* in certain “[NO] independent inquiry in Wales.” To emphasize the fact that the Labour Party is not doing its job. The speaker intends his hearers (primary and secondary audience) to infer that the Labour Party falls short of protecting their subjects. *the enrichment* of the logical form of Dowden’s utterance to occur to Rayner, which might combine with “it is [ONE] rule for Labour and another for everyone else.” proves Rayner to be wrong to lead to the satisfaction of Dowden emphasizes “what have the Labour-run Wales authorities done there?” Since *automatic relevance* is triggered by his utterance, Rayner assumes that Dowden’s utterance is optimally relevant to her because it successfully drags her *attention*, and it is also within the *abilities* and *preferences* of the hearer and the speaker.

*The first assumption* to occur to Rayner, together with other *appropriate premises*, is counted as the implicit premise of Dowden’s utterance, which might satisfy the expectation that Dowden’s utterance will achieve relevance by *contradicting* Rayner. Dowden’s utterance is decoded as emphasizing Dowden’s defense against what Rayner says. Dowden’s *rhetorical questions* function as a *trigger* and a *reminder* for the audience to activate the *inferential mechanism* to derive the most *accessible assumptions*.

By combining the *implicit premise* and the *explicit premise*, Rayner arrives at the *implicit conclusion* that Johnson is in a state of denial, from which further, weaker implicatures may follow. The resulting interpretation satisfies Rayner’s expectations of relevance. Following the least path of effort by delivering cognitively *economic utterance* but effective for the hearer. The hearer has some *expectations* that need to be satisfied by the speaker’s utterances to formulate suitable *hypotheses* about the speaker’s intended meaning. Those *hypotheses* are considered in order of *accessibility* by the *mutual parallel adjustment*. Recognizing the mood of the utterances and interpreting the *ostensive stimuli* given by Dowden could be used as an *implicit premise* in deriving the expected explanation of Rayner’s behavior. The speaker is using short *emphatic utterances* to prove his point of view against what is said by Rayner.

**Extract 5:**

-Dominic Raab:
The right hon. Lady has flip-flopped. The right hon. Lady has flip-flopped all over the place when it comes to these strikes. First, she said they were “lose-lose”. Then, she tweeted that “workers were left with no choice”. When she was asked by the BBC the straight question—she is normally a straight-shooting politician— “do you like the RMT?” of whether she liked the RMT, she said, “I am going to have to go now, I have a train to catch.” (winks at Rayner, hand pointing at Rayner, slight smile with gloat and challenging eye gaze) (UK Parliament, 2022, June 29).

-Angela Rayner:
Well, well, that says a lot about the Conservative party. I will tell Conservative Members a few things about militancy. It is this Government who are acting in a militant way. ...The Deputy Prime Minister talks about trains. No one can get trains, because of his failed Transport Secretary (Resting posture and sarcastic tone of voice) (UK Parliament, 2022, June 29).

In the above extract, the interlocutors, Dominic Raab (Deputy Prime Minister, The Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice), and Angela Rayner (Deputy Leader of the Official Opposition), debate rail strikes. The extract is taken from a lengthy debate moderated by (Mr.
Speaker) Lindsay Hoyle in the House of Commons (UK parliament). This extract is analyzed following Sperber and Wilson’s theory of relevance.

The speaker takes the responsibility very seriously to express his thoughts about what he intends his audience to manifest. By deploying his informative and communicative intentions to transfer his thoughts successfully to his hearers. His utterances are making some improvements in the cognitive environments of the audience (primary and secondary). Raab intends to make his utterances easy to comprehend by his audience. The speaker sarcastically uses a hyperbolic logical form, ‘flip-flopped’ to indicate how fast Rayner changes her political opinion (sudden change). The speaker is being indirect to achieve most of the effects he needs, and Raab aims for optimal relevance so the hearers can retrieve information from the encyclopedic entries to derive relevant assumptions. So, he used direct and indirect quotations from Rayner’s previous speeches and interviews. In addition to these reported utterances, the speaker expresses his dissociating attitude. The speaker uses linguistic and non-linguistic types of communication (winks at Rayner, hand pointing at Rayner, slight smile with gloat, and challenging eye gaze). He uses both types of communication to reinforce his audience and to seek advantage of Rayner and her Party members’ reputation. Using direct and indirect quotations such as:

- “She said they were “lose-lose”."
- “Then, she tweeted that “workers were left with no choice”.”
- “When she was asked by the BBC the straight question—she is normally a straight-shooting politician—“Do you like the RMT?” of whether she liked the RMT, she said, “I am going to have to go now, I have a train to catch.”

Raab highlights ostensive-inferential communication to describe and interpret Rayner’s utterances but also reflects propositional attitudes. Given the principle of relevance, the communicator chooses the most appropriate communicative act to serve his hearer with the most relevant schema of assumptions. The explication is decoded by reference assignment; ‘The right hon. Lady’ ‘she’, and ‘you’ refers to Rayner, the pronoun ‘it’ refers to ‘empty it’ and the pronoun ‘them’ refers to ‘the strikes’. The speaker also attempts to attract his hearer’s attention and easily perceptual relevant interpretations. And disambiguation to interpret ‘RMT’ (Common term for the National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers, a UK trade union).

The speaker intends to humiliate the Labour Party by implicating that:

- Rayner prefers her good over the public’s.
- Rayner is busy with her life on account of her job.
- Rayner is a hypocrite.
- The whole Party is hypocrites.
- The entire Party is misusing their authority.

The hearers are spending some effort processing these utterances and derive some assumptions about all the above utterances. The speaker succeeded in achieving effects on his audience to gain support and to affect his specific audience for a particular purpose.

The implicit premise is that:
- Rayner is selfish.

The explicit premise is that:
- Rayner and the Labour are Party hypocrites.

The conclusion is that:
- Raab is defaming Rayner and the Labour Party.
Rayner replies with a resting posture and sarcastic tone, “Well, well, that says a lot about the Conservative party. I will tell Conservative Members a few things about militancy”. The speaker (Rayner) indicates, by using explicit utterance, her rejection of what Raab uttered in the previous turn. Rayner’s ostensive behavior will be optimally relevant to Rayner. Rayner is defending her situation by using ‘well’ repetitively to indicate that she is emphasizing a stylistic attitude. The repetition of ‘well’ reflects her attitudes towards Raab, which triggers automatic relevance, and the repetition includes an increase in the positive cognitive effects. Rayner uses Raab’s words against him. It is known that linguistic communication is the strongest form of communication; the structured form provides ease of access to the contextual assumption (redirecting the flow of communication to defend oneself against current accusations) to mutually manifest schema of assumptions. Non-linguistic communication (Resting posture, pointing fingers towards Raab and sarcastic tone of voice), on the same path, provides a massive reinforcement for the utterance propositional content.

Recognizing the mood of the utterance and interpreting the ostensive stimuli given by Rayner could be used as an implicit premise in deriving the expected explanation of Rayner’s behavior. The utterance is decoded on the explicit side by enrichments and reference assignments as expressing that Rayner is manifesting to the audience both primary and secondary audiences to improve and add further contextual assumptions to their cognitive environment. Rayner’s utterance is a basic explicature that can be enriched in various ways:

- Well, well; Conservative Members are acting in a militant way. No one can get trains, because of The Deputy Prime Minister failed Transport Secretary

Enrichments and reference assignment: the pronoun ‘I’ refers to ‘Rayner’, the pronoun ‘It’ refers to ‘Conservative Party’, and ‘The Deputy Prime Minister’ refers to ‘Raab’. Since automatic relevance is triggered by her utterance, Raab assumes that Rayner’s utterance is optimally relevant to him because it successfully drags his attention. It is also within the abilities and preferences of the hearer and the speaker. Expectations (on the hearer’s side) are raised by recognition of Rayner’s ostensive behavior and the presumption of relevance it conveys.

The implicit premise is that:
- Raab and the Conservative Party are being vicious.

The explicit premise:
- The Conservative Party is playing a dirty game against the Labour Party.

The conclusion is that:
- The Conservative Party is busy with hypocrisy and failing to do its job in building train rails.

The speaker implicates that:
- a) Raab’s interaction reflects his vicious intentions towards the Labour Party.
- b) Raab and the Conservative Party are pretending to be good.
- c) Raab and the Conservative Party are not professionals.
- d) Raab and the Conservative Party are hypocrites.
- e) Raab is using violent verbal abuse, which shows his true nature.

Raab (as a hearer) has some expectations in his mind that need to be satisfied by the speaker’s choice of the most suitable hypotheses and the speaker’s intended meaning about both being considered in order of accessibility by the mutual parallel adjustment. Raab is achieving contradictory effects within the cognitive environment of his audience (both primary and secondary audience). By combining the implicit premise and the explicit premise, Raab arrives at
the implicit conclusion that Rayner is in a state of defending, from which further, weaker implicatures may follow. The resulting interpretation satisfies Raab’s expectations of relevance. Following the least path of effort by delivering cognitively economic utterance but effective enough for the hearer.

**Discussion**

Concerning the first question proposed by the researchers, Humans, in nature, are constantly searching for relevance. As the automatic relevance is successfully triggered by the speaker’s input (any ostensive stimulus), the hearer’s inferential processes are activated. This input is deployed by the cognitive processes that could be of potential relevance to the hearer. The hearer’s capability to achieve relevant and, hence effective communication is confirmed via the possibility of merging the background knowledge and whatever input is available at a time. As relevance theory suggests and as this study aims to prove (in political settings), an input is relevant as long as it achieves some benefits or (positive cognitive effects). The input creates expectations and hypotheses that must be satisfied by the presumption of relevance. The resultant modified input is open to several immediate effects, such as strengthening, contradicting, or combining, which could answer the hearer’s question, relieve confusion, deny a fact, or rectify mutated information.

Concerning the second question, the main aim behind communication is to be understood. As the speaker’s ostensive stimuli successfully trigger the optimal relevance, the hearer’s inferential processes are activated. The hearer’s conceptual storage is also activated to decode the stimuli (utterance) to reach the logical form. Ostensive-inferential communication is based upon two primary layers of intentions; the recognition of these intentions by the audience achieves understanding, and another factor that plays a role in intention recognition is mutual trust between the communicator and the addressee. The political actor aims to be understood by his audience and, at the same time, to make his/her ostensive stimuli worth spending some processing efforts by the hearers, which leads them to use utterances within their audience’s mental abilities and preferences. Political messages take different forms but have a common aim, which is to pragmatically take advantage of the other side of the communication regardless of the political position. The political debates are linguistically close to the type of audience they are directed to, political actors use average types of political terms and many of the public’s language. The reason behind such a strategy is to let the hearers understand what the debates are about and to gain their support and acceptance in the election period. However, Political actors use the most familiar contexts and the most familiar linguistic and non-linguistic cues to provide their audience with more explicit, relevant, and effective communication. Most political actors are linguistically capable of debating political issues but at the same time attracting the public’s attention regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, color, affiliation, birth history, social class, or cultural background. This is achieved through proper terms, proverbs, metaphors, etc.

**Conclusion**

The study pragmatically analyzes political interactions as extracts containing different types of communication and contexts as observed in the politicians' speeches in the House of Commons. The researchers adopt Sperber and Wilson’s (1986\1995) Relevance Theory. Therefore, the debates exploit the explicit utterances and identify the implicatures, both intended by the political actors. The audience’s cognitive benefits keep them urged to continue deciphering...
the evidence provided by the speakers. One of the more significant findings to emerge from this study is to highlight the type of effect that results from the politician’s utterance. The primary purpose of this paper is to build a theoretical and practical basis on which effective political communication depends. This study aims to analyze how political actors are able to craft their discourse (messages) to attract their audience’s attention (primary and secondary audience). This study also aims for an inclusive view of effective communication in political discourse. The analysis within the body of the article includes more than one form of communication and more than one linguistic phenomenon. Humans inferential compute the potential possibilities to reach relevant interpretations. The data is evaluated cognitively and analyzed pragmatically. As observed in the previous analysis, linguistically effective speakers, Boris Johnson, Keir Starmer, Angela Rayner, etc., use quite prominent types of syntactic structure and lexical items such as metaphors, ironies, and questions. Varied pitch in their voice quality is considered a phonologically effective method to highlight the intended attitude towards the audience (or one specific hearer from the opposite party). Several kinetic movements are deployed mainly by Boris Johnson, Raab, Oliver Dowden, and Angela Rayner to reflect their attitudes to the audience, who are naturally (cognitively) built to assess and interpret according to the context.

The researchers found that, on the one hand, the political debates are linguistically revised and monitored by linguistic specialists to get the desired reaction from the audience; on the other hand, to linguistically appropriately justify, defend, and attack the opposite party in a way that guarantees the transparency of either Party. Finally, the political actors are successfully capable of manifesting what hearers are optimally capable of comprehending, this is achieved by the different pragmatically strategic ways to penetrate, change, and mutate the audience’s cognitive environment.
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