CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Stickers

The word *sticker* derives from root word *stick, which* is described as one that sticks, as a gummed or adhesive label or patch, according to American Heritage®Dictionary, an online dictionary presented by http://education.yahoo.com. In another online dictionary published in http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary, *sticker* (noun) is defined as (a) one that adheres or causes adhesion, and (b) a slip of paper with adhesive back that can be fastened to a surface.

A more complete meaning and description about sticker can be found in Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. It states that *sticker* (noun – C) is a small piece of paper or plastic with a picture or writing on one side and glue or another similar substance on the other side, so that it will be fastened to a surface. Thus, based on the surface on which it is attached, stickers are known as bumper stickers, window stickers, good or product stickers, etc.

A bumper sticker is a sticker bearing a printed message for display on a vehicle's bumper, as stated in American Heritage®Dictionary. A window sticker is another type of sticker that is attached to windows, usually on houses' windows, shop windows or displays. Another type of stickers can be found as a label on product showing price, size, colour, or trademark, etc.

The displayed picture or writing on the stickers can be various. A sticker may contain only picture or writing separately, or combination of picture and writing. It can exhibit a certain message, meaning, or information, or even, it does not signify anything, but as a kind of decorative tool as a means of art expression only.

2.2. Message

Based on Etymology, the word *message* derives from the word *miss* *ᵃticum* from Middle English, from Old French and from Medieval Latin, and from Latin *missus*, past participle of *mittere*, which means to send. Further, the word *message (Noun)*, *as* stated by the online dictionary American Heritage®Dictionary in http://education.yahoo.com, is described as (1a) a usually short communication transmitted by word, signals, or other means from one person, station, or group to another, (1b) the substance of such a communication; the point or points conveyed, (2) a statement made or read before a gathering, and (3) a basic thesis or lesson; a moral.

Nevertheless, in every communication or expression, there will always be single or various messages or meanings are conveyed. *Meaning* of an expression or communication itself, as opposed to its form, is that feature of it which determines its contribution to what a speaker says using it. Meaning conveyed by a speaker is the speaker's communicative intent in using expression, even if that use departs from the expression's meaning. Accordingly, any discussion of meaning should distinguish speaker's

meaning   from   linguistic   meaning.
(http://cognet.mit.edu/MITECS/entry/horn)

In dealing with message of an expression or communication, according to van Rooy in his paper *Conversational Implicature and Communication Theory* published in http-web.nit.ed.24.954-www-files.vanrooy.implicature, it is worthy noted that natural language is flexible in the sense that a single message can convey different semantic contents in different context. Indeed recent trends suggest that the actual interpretation of an utterance is highly underspecified by the conventional meanings of the sentence that is used.

Thus, in order to understand what is really implied or conveyed by an utterance or communication in certain language, Kroger and Wood (2000:374) noted that language should not be taken simply as a tool for description and a medium of communication, but also as social practice, as a way of doing things. It is a central and constitutive feature of social life.

According to Horn in his paper *Presupposition and Implicature* in http://www.yale.edu/linguist/faculty/blackwell_Final_+_Biblio.doc, the notion of implicature constitutes a non-truth conditional aspect of speaker meaning, part of what is MEANT when S utters Φ within context c without being part of what is SAID by S in that utterance. This contrast between the said and the meant, and thus between the said and the implicated (the meant-but-unsaid).

In term of implicature, Grice's greatest contribution in form of unnamed doctrine of implicature should be used as the guideline in discussing the notion of implicature. Grice was to offer an explicit and general account of what he termed

> .... A distinction ... within the total signification of a remark .. between what the speaker has said (in a certain favored and maybe in some degree artificial, sense of 'said'), and what he has *implicated* (e.g., implied, indicated, suggested, etc.), taking into account the fact that what he has implicated may be either *conventionally* implicated (implicated by virtue of the meaning of some word or phrase which he has used) or *non-conventionally* implicated (in which case the specification of implicature falls outside the specification of the conventional meaning of the words used). (Grice, 1989:118)

In his first notion of implicature, Grice classified implicature into presupposition, conventional implicata, particularized conversational implicature and generalized conversational implicature.

Further, one of Grice's central claims is that an essential feature of most human communication, both verbal and non-verbal, is this expression and recognition of intentions (Grice 1989: essays 1-7, 14, 18; Retrospective Epilogue). Grice laid the foundations for an inferential model of communication, an alternative to the classical code model. According to code model, a communicator encodes her intended message into a signal, which is decoded by the audience using an identical copy of the code. According to the inferential model, a communicator provides evidence of her intention to convey a certain meaning, which is inferred by the audience on the basis of the evidence provided. An utterance is, of course, a

linguistically coded piece of evidence, so that verbal comprehension involves an element of decoding. However, the linguistic meaning recovered by decoding is just one of the inputs to a non-demonstrative inference process that yields an interpretation of the speaker's meaning. (Wilson & Sperber, 2002:249)

As utterances automatically create expectations that guided the hearer towards the speaker's meaning, Grice sought to show how participants in a conversational exchange could compute what was meant (by S's utterance at a given point in the interaction) from what was said. The governing dictum is the Cooperative Principle "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs". This rule in turn is analyzed into the four general and presumably universal maxims of conversational on which all-rational interchange is grounded. Grice described these in terms of Maxims of Conversation (Grice, 1989:368-72) which are, (a) Maxim of Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true. (a1) Do not say what you believe to be false, (a2) Do not say that for which you lack evidence; (b) Maxim of Quantity: (b1) make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange), (b2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.; (c) Maxim of Relation : Be relevant, and (d) maxim of Manner: Be perspicuous (d1) Avoid obscurity of expression, (d2) Avoid ambiguity, (d3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity) and (d4) Be orderly.

However, it should be noted that all maxims are not necessarily created equal. Grice himself has assigned a privileged status to Quality, "Other maxims come into operation only on the assumption that this maxim of Quality is satisfied." (Grice, 1989:371)

Further, Horn in his paper *Presupposition and Implicature* (2002) compressed Grice's Maxims of Conversation and submaxims into two fundamental principles regulating the economy of linguistic information. The **Q** principle is lower-bounding hearer-based guarantee of the sufficiency of informative content ("say as much as you can, modulo Quality and **R**"); it collects the first Quantity Maxim and the first two submaxims of Manner, and is systematically exploited to generate upperbounding implicata. The **R** Principle is an upper-bounding correlate of Law of Least Effort dictating minimization of form ("Say no more than you must, modulo Q"). It collects the Relation maxim, the second Quantity maxim and the last two submaxims of Manner, and is exploited to induce strengthening or lower bounding implicata. Q-based implicature is typically negative in that its calculation refers to what could have been said but was not. R-based implicature typically involves social rather than purely linguistic motivation and exemplified by indirect speech acts (in particular, euphemism) and negative strengthening (including so-called neg-raising).

In correspond to theory of implicature firstly proposed by Grice, Wilson and Sperber (2002) proposed Relevance Theory. Relevance theory views that utterances raise expectations of relevance. Further, 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 (Wilson & Sperber, 2002:250)

In addition, according to relevance theory, utterances raises expectations of relevance not because speakers are expected to obey Cooperative Principles and maxims or some other specifically communication convention, but because the search for relevance is a basic feature of human cognition, which communicator may exploit.

When is an input relevant? Intuitively, an input (a sight, a sound, an utterance, a memory) is relevant to an individual when it connects with background information he has available to yield conclusions that matter to him: say, by answering a question he had in mind, improving his knowledge on a certain topic, settling a doubt, confirming a suspicion, or correcting a mistaken impression. In relevance-theoretic terms, an input is relevant to an individual when its processing in a context of available assumptions yields a POSITIVE COGNITIVE EFFECT. A positive cognitive effect is a worthwhile difference to the individual's representation of the world – a true conclusion, for example. False conclusions are not worth having. They are cognitive effects but not positive ones (Wilson & Sperber , 2002:251)

They added that the type of cognitive effect achieved by processing an input in a context is a CONTEXTUAL IMPLICATION, a conclusion deducible from the input and the context together but from neither input nor context alone.

The Relevance Theory is proposed in accordance with the Principle of Relevance (Wilson & Sperber, 2002: 254-9)

(1) Cognitive Principle of Relevance,

Human cognition tends to be geared to the maximisation of relevance.

(2) Communicative principle of Relevance

Every ostensive stimulus conveys a presumption of its own optimal relevance.

In dealing with inferential communication, Relevance Theory introduces the term of OSTENSIVE-INFERENTIAL COMMUNICATION. It claims that the communication involves the use of ostensive stimulus designed to attract an audience's attention and focus it on the communicator's meaning. It claims that the use of an ostensive stimulus may create precise and predictable expectation of relevance not raised by other stimuli. In short, Ostensive-inferential Communication involves an extra layer of intention:

(a) The informative intention, the intention to inform an audience of something, and

(b) The communicative intention, the intention to inform the audience of one's informative intention.

In notion of ostensive communication, Wilson & Sperber introduced the term of Optimal Relevance and Presumption of Relevance.

An ostensive stimulus is optimally relevant to an audience if: (a) it is relevant enough to be worth the audience's processing effort and (b) it is the most relevant one compatible with communicator's abilities and preferences.

Further, this relevance-theoretic account of cognition and communication has practical implications for pragmatics. A verbal comprehension starts with the recovery of a linguistically encoded sentence meaning, which must be contextually enriched in a variety of ways to yield a full-fledged speaker's meaning. In short, an appropriate set of contextual assumptions may be required.

As in verbal communication, speakers manage to convey a very wide range of meanings despite the fact that there is no independently identifiable basic layer of information for the hearer to pick up, the identification of explicit content is needed. Relevance theory treats the identification of explicit content as equally inferential, and equally guided by the Communicative Principle of relevance, as the recovery of implicatures. The comprehension process can be broken down as follows (Wilson & Sperber, 2002 : 261-3):

(a) Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about explicit content (in relevance –theoretic terms, EXPLICATURE) via decoding, disambiguation, reference resolution, and other pragmatic enrichment processes.

(b)   Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual assumptions (in relevance-theoretic terms, IMPLICATED PREMISES)

(c)   Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual implications (in relevance- theoretic terms, IMPLICATED CONCLUSIONS).

Eventually, in term of implicature, Wilson & Sperber (2002) classified it into two, STRONGLY IMPLICATED (STRONG IMPLICATURE) and WEAKLY IMPLICATED (WEAK IMPLICATURE). A Proposition may be strongly implicated by an utterance if its recovery is essential in order to arrive at an interpretation that satisfies the expectations of relevance raised by the utterance itself. It is weakly implicated if its recovery helps with the construction of an interpretation that is relevant in the expected way, but is not itself essential because the utterance suggests a range of similar possible implicature, any one of which would do (Wilson & Sperber, 2002:269).

As the comprehension of implicature of a proposition cannot be separated from contextual aspects in which the proposition is uttered, the theory of context is in use as a supportive tool to explain implicature of message conveyed in stickers.

The context is often taken to refer in a general way to information that is outside the text that is being analyzed, that is, information about

settings, circumstances, social roles, demographic variables (age, sex, race, etc), and so on. This short information is sometimes referred to as extrinsic context, in contrast to intrinsic context, that it the parts of a text that are outside the particular segment that is analyzed at any particular moment (Kroger & Wood, 2000:127). In addition, context refers to what is "with" the "text" that occurs before and after a specified word or passage or the situational background or environment relevant to some happening (Kroger & Wood, 2000:135).

.

CHAPTER 3

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS