

PRESUPPOSITIONS IN THE SLOGANS OF INDONESIAN UNIVERSITIES

Atika Puspasari
Dosen Universitas Bina Darma
Jalan Ahmad Yani No.12, Palembang
Sur-el: atika@mail.binadarma.ac.id

Abstract: *The objectives of the study were to identify and analyze the presuppositions implied in the slogans of Indonesian universities which are listed in the General Directorate of Higher Education website, and to discuss pragmatic transfer found in the English version of those slogans. The objects of the study were slogans of Indonesian universities. The writer used documentation technique in collecting the data. Then, qualitative method with triangulation was applied by the writer in analyzing the data. The findings showed that existential, factive, and lexical potential presuppositions were implied in the analyzed slogans. Then, actual presuppositions provide clearer and better ideas of the implied messages in the slogans. Meanwhile, the writer did not find any pragmatic transfer in the English version of the slogans.*

Keywords: *Slogans, Presuppositions, Pragmatic Transfer*

Abstrak: *Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengidentifikasi dan menganalisis praanggapan yang terkandung dalam slogan universitas-universitas di Indonesia yang terdaftar pada website dirjen Dikti. Objek penelitian ini adalah slogan dari universitas-universitas yang ada di Indonesia. Penulis menggunakan teknik dokumentasi dalam pengumpulan data dan analisis data dilakukan dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif ditambah dengan triangulasi. Temuan dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa praanggapan yang terkandung dalam slogan tersebut adalah praanggapan eksistensial, factive, dan lexical. Kemudian, praanggapan aktual lebih memberikan ide yang lebih baik dan lebih jelas mengenai pesan yang terkandung di dalam slogan-slogan tersebut. Sedangkan temuan lainnya yaitu pragmatik transfer tidak ditemukan di dalam slogan-slogan universitas di Indonesia.*

Kata kunci: *Slogan, Praanggapan, Pragmatik Transfer*

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is essential for the foundation of our daily life: we talk, we listen, we read and we write. We need language to learn at school, at home, in our work, or even during our leisure time. Language also gives a great contribution for our jobs or professions and in our everyday experience when we deal with other people. We need language to manage them, teach them, persuade them or bargain with them. It is the language that enables us to tell stories, to explain things, to consult a problem, to make friends, and ultimately to communicate. In other words, language plays a vital role in our human relationships.

Every language has different levels of structure. It is composed of sounds, words, grammar and so forth that can be studied from numerous points of views. The study which attempts to understand language from the point of view of its structure is known as linguistics.

Semantics is one of the areas of linguistics that focuses on the language meaning. According to Mey (1993:13), semantics concerns with the condition under which sentence is true or false. It is also related to the interpretation of the sentences and how those interpretations are related to things spoken about or the proposition. In understanding an utterance, the speakers and the listeners need to share background knowledge. However, Saeed (2003:193) argues

that there is another thing more important than just background knowledge as it sometimes still creates ambiguity. The thing is called mutual knowledge. Having a mutual knowledge means the producers (speakers or writers) and the addressee (listeners or readers) are in the same context. Saeed (2003: 193) gives an example of a proposition that might be a mutual knowledge;

A: *Shall we go and get some ice cream?*

B: *I'm on a diet.*

A: *Oh, okay*

From the above example, we can take a mutually known proposition *p* to be something like 'Diets usually prohibit ice cream (because it's too fattening)'. So *B* knows this and relies for her implication on *A* knowing it. Since *A* seems to understand the refusal correctly, then *A* did know *p*, and also knows that for *B* to imply it, *A* must have known it. From a semantic point of view, as Saeed (2003:193) asserts, this kind of 'mutual knowledge discussion' remains a debate. He further explains that the discussion on background knowledge is best elaborated in pragmatics (the study of language meaning based on the context).

Pragmatics is the study of how context affects meaning. According to Fromkin (1993:159), pragmatics concerns with the interpretation of linguistic meaning in the context as communicated by a speaker (or a writer) and interpreted by a hearer (or a reader). It also deals with the relationship between linguistic forms and the users of those forms as well as unresolved problems in analyzing language meaning that cannot be captured in semantics (the condition of true or false).

In pragmatics, we can study about people's intended meaning, their assumptions, their purposes, and the kinds of actions that they are performing when they communicate. They may imply or assume something more than what is said. The hearer (the reader) still gets the meaning clearly based on the context even though that something uttered is not explicitly elaborated. Something about the background information of utterance that is assumed that it has already been understood or accepted by the participants (readers or hearers) is called presuppositions.

Presupposition is involved in any form of communication (Lam, 2009:2). One example is slogan. Slogan, as one type of advertisement, can be found everywhere. Even at home, we can still see and hear it in the magazine, on TV, internet or radio. People may not be aware of the presupposition in slogans, but it is an important component of messages, as meaning only exists within the context of what it is in the person's mind that provides the meaning. For example, a slogan of one of washing machine brands: Hitachi "*Inspire the next*" (www.hitachi.com). Although that they might be many other brands of washing machines with more sophisticated features, the above statement presupposes that *Hitachi* will always be inspiration of a more modern technology.

As technology and mass media develop, slogans have been increasingly common nowadays (Bolter, 2003). The visual content of an advertisement may have a great influence on the readers, yet, it is usually the text that makes the readers identify a product or service, remember it and purchase and use it. They are

now extensively used in many aspects of life like politics, business, or even in education.

Nowadays, it is quite common for any educational institutions like colleges or universities to use slogans as a motto. For example, the slogan of Surabaya Institute of Technology (ITS) is *CAK ITS CAK!* (www.its.go.id). *CAK* is an abbreviation which refers to *Cerdas* (smart), *Amanah* (accountable), and *Kreatif* (creative). Seeing its form, this slogan is unique because there is a creativity in the word sound and repetition. The meaning of this slogan is even more interesting. The words in the slogan imply that the institution always try to educate the students to be smart, reliable, creative people. Furthermore, the word *Cak* is used to greet Surabaya people. So, this slogan also carries a cultural value. This kind of slogan can draw people's attention and therefore it somehow can mobilize people to come to study in that university. For that reason, language in slogans is carefully designed and thoughtfully planned. It also consists of implicit presuppositions that need to be explored further.

The writer was interested in exploring more about presupposition used in slogans because she indicates that somehow there is a relationship between linguistic presupposition and critical thinking. The use of presupposition can help establish a good communication as it can draw recipients' (readers or listeners) critical reading radar in a predetermined, particular direction, which means that. Then, in relation to this study, the understanding toward an advertisement, say a slogan, can help the readers or the hearers be more selective in choosing or

using something advertised, in this case, which university to choose.

Pragmatic transfer has been much discussed under the notion of Interlanguage Pragmatics. It has a lot to do with language acquisition as asserted by Franch (1998:7) that pragmatic transfer can provide the information on how the languages known to speakers (students) influence each other in their acquisition and/or use by considering the relationship between language and culture.

In addition to the above reasons, presupposition is part of pragmatics which gives great contribution to language teaching. Pragmatics helps students to use words and sentences in both meaningful and structural setting. Furthermore, Demirezen (1991:3) asserts that pragmatics along with Applied Linguistics work in language teaching area supplying and suggesting the ways of practical usage in the classroom: so it is both a guide and a safeguard to language teaching since it helps in reforming and improving classroom practices of language teachers. Then, Kelder (1996:3) states that presupposition can be a helpful tool for students when they learn reading comprehension as it enables the students as the readers to consider the existence of objects, propositions, even cultural properties in a text. Therefore, presupposition becomes an important component of the overall message of the text.

2. CONCEPTS OF PRESUPPOSITIONS

Presuppositions are variously defined but in general constitute assumptions underlying a statement or utterance. For example: when someone said that “*Johnny’s wife is sick*”. There is an assumption which is believed as the background information of the statement that *Johnny has a wife*. A speaker utters something based on his assumption of what the hearer is likely to ‘know’ (Paltridge, 2006:60). Presupposition is not stated by the speaker (writer) explicitly in the utterance but the speaker believes that the hearer (reader) has the same assumption with him. Then, Givon (1989: 146) states that presupposition refers to terms of assumption the speaker (writer) makes about what the hearer (reader) is likely to accept without challenge. It means that the hearer (reader) takes it for granted. It has been known or accepted by the hearer or reader as the basic information of the utterance (even if he/she is not really aware of it).

There are two approaches for analyzing presupposition in utterances: semantically –deals with the truth value and pragmatically- context dependent (deals with shared non-controversial knowledge). Stalnaker (1999:452) states that there are two ways of treating presuppositions: from a semantic point of view, presupposition is a relation between a sentence and a proposition; from a pragmatic point of view, presupposition is a relation between a speaker and a proposition. Fromkin (1993:160) states that the presupposition of an utterance is fact whose truth

is required in order that the utterance become appropriate. For example: (1) *Have you stopped playing football?* This sentence is inappropriate if the addressee has never played football. The producer is said to presuppose, or assume the truth of the fact that the addressee used to play football.

The semantic presupposition has less explanation in certain aspect. It only focuses on the truth value so that a sentence will make sense or be correctly interpreted. Truth value itself is defined as a parameter describing the proposition of a sentence. It is the value that is returned by a measurement of the agreement between the semantic content of a sentence and the way things are /reality (Young, 2011: 3). That is, a sentence has a truth value true exactly when the semantic content expressed by the sentence agrees with the way thing actually are. For example, the expression “*All bachelors are unmarried men*” has truth value true; we would argue that the meaning of the concept bachelor implies that anyone who is a bachelor must, by definition, be unmarried and a man. That is, we would appeal to the conventions which define the meaning of the relevant words. Thus, a semantic presupposition is the condition on the meaningfulness of a sentence or utterance. The writer identifies the characteristics of semantic presupposition i.e. (a) presuppositions are conditions that must be fulfilled, so that an utterance can assign the truth value and; (b) presuppositions remain constant under negation. According to Cann (1993:6), a sentence is said to presuppose another if its truth and that of its negation both imply that the presupposed sentence is also true. It means that the

presupposition survives even the sentence or utterance denied by its negation. Then, Cummings (2005:33) states that presuppositions that are properly semantic based on the truth value; it is no contradiction results from the negation of the presupposition. For example: (2) *David's brother is a poor man* (p). It presupposes that *David has a brother*(q). The sentence is inappropriate if the person (David) has no brother. Moreover, we can use the negation as the proposition that denies the utterance to get the presupposition. The constancy under negation has been described as a 'linguistic test' of the presence of a presupposition. Consider the negation of *David's brother is not a poor man* (not p). The proposition (not p) would have the same presupposition as (p) i.e. *Davis has a brother*. (p) \gg (q) and (not p) \gg q . We use the symbol \gg to mean presupposes, (p) as the symbol of utterance, and (q) as the proposition of the presupposition (see also Yule 1996: 26). The concept of presupposition is often treated as the relationship between two propositions. According to Robins (1984:367), propositions may be regarded as something different from sentences, but they must be expressed in sentences. Here a proposition is said to presuppose an utterance if both of the utterance and its negation entail the presupposed utterance. However, even as semantic analyses of presupposition were being developed, it was becoming evident that not all presupposition phenomena could be readily accounted for, in terms of the truth values of sentences or the semantic structures of lexical items. Semantic presupposition only focuses a semantic relation

between sentences or propositions, which is independent or beliefs of speaker or writer and hearer or reader, background knowledge or other contextual factors (Sandt, 1988: 13). That is why, in understanding language meaning in communication, semantic analysis cannot capture all the things meant.

Then, linguists used pragmatic approach to analyze presupposition in understanding the utterance based on the context i.e. to focus on the speaker's assumption or the implied meaning that has already been known by the participants. Pragmatic presupposition is able to explain the background information of the reason of why the hearer or reader understands what the speaker or writer intends to express in the communication. Pragmatic presupposition is much more interesting to try and find out why people say something than whether what they say is true or false.

In pragmatic approach, presupposition is defined as the background knowledge that is not stated in an utterance, it is common to the speaker (writer) and the hearer (reader). So they do not need to elaborate some information to make the hearer (reader) understand what the speaker intends. Grundy (2000:119) states that the presupposition is about the existing knowledge common to the speaker (writer) and hearer (reader) that the speaker (writer) does not therefore need to assert. This presupposed knowledge is then taken together with the presuppositions asserted in the utterance and the addressee's knowledge of the world as the basis on which an utterance conveys. It means that to understand the utterance conveyed, the addressee and the producer must have shared background

knowledge or information. For example when someone says, (3) “*I worry about my daughter.*” The speaker does not need to say that she/he has a daughter. We use another proposition as the presupposition. That is the speaker has a daughter. On the other hand, pragmatic presupposition is that what the speaker (writer) assume or beliefs about something that is also known by the hearer (reader) as the background information of the utterance. We need to analyze the pragmatic presupposition (context dependent) in order to get what really communicated by the producer (speaker or writer) to the addressee (hearer or reader).

2.1 Pragmatic Presupposition

Pragmatic presupposition is shared by non-controversial knowledge common to the producer and the addressee. Pragmatic presupposition as defined here is a relation between a sentence and the speaker’s or writer’s beliefs about what has already been known or accepted by the hearer in order that the assertion of the sentence become appropriate in the context. Grundy (2000:129) states that another way of looking at presuppositions (besides semantic presuppositions, which concerns with the truth value or the negation) is to think of them as ways of expressing shared or non-controversial knowledge. That is pragmatic presupposition. It is safe to claim that pragmatic presupposition has been located in a wider communicative setting covering such notions as participants, context, belief, appropriateness and mutual knowledge (Sergerdahl, 1996:190).

In analyzing the pragmatic presupposition, Adisutrisno (2008:78) states, pragmatic presuppositions pertain to the various kinds of knowledge of the world that are assumed to preexist when an utterance is made. They are determined by the context. These various kinds of knowledge are assumed to be understood by both producer (the speaker or the writer) and the addressee (the hearer or the reader). For example, the utterance: (4) “*A three-year-old boy named Bartholomew was found at the bus stop.*” In addition to the semantic presupposition that “A three-year-old boy was lost”, the above sentence has pragmatic presuppositions (context dependent) that the parents are quite probably Christians, that they must be very anxious and depressed, that they will try anyway to find the whereabouts of the boy and they earnestly want to get their child back. Then, Caffi cited in Mey (1994:2003), pragmatic presuppositions are not only concerned with knowledge or whether something is true or false, but they are also concerned with the expectations, desires, interests, claims, and attitudes towards the world. In other words, Pragmatic presuppositions are context dependent regardless whether the utterance is true or false.

There are two ways in analyzing pragmatic presupposition that is shared by non-controversial knowledge in pragmatic condition (Grundy, 2000:136): (1) firstly, by analyzing the potential presupposition (possible presupposition-literal knowledge); and (2) secondly, by analyzing the context (actual presupposition- concerned with the background belief of speaker or writer to become the hearer or the reader).

2.2 Potential Presupposition

Yule (1996:27) states that in the analysis of how background belief of speaker (writer) become the hearer (reader) assumptions are typically expressed, presupposition has been associated with the use of a large number of words, phrases, and structures. The linguistic forms here are considered as indicators of potential presupposition, which can only become actual presupposition in context between the participants (the second analysis). Then, Hatim and Mason (1990:10) state that the meaning of potential is possible, we feed our own beliefs, knowledge, and attitudes and so on into our processing of the meaning of the utterance. So, the potential presupposition means that the possible presupposition of an utterance. It is an assumption typically associated with the use of linguistic form.

The potential presupposition may be taken from the sentence presupposition that is the linguistic or semantic presupposition if it is also the speaker's or writer's presupposition based on their belief about the common ground of the utterance; it is still based on the context. The semantic presupposition identified by linguists' constitutes source of pragmatic presupposition. In analyzing the speaker's assumption, there are some expressions or constructions which can act as the sources of presuppositions. This kind of expressions or constructions is called presupposition triggers. For example: (5) *Mary saw the man with blue eyes*>>*there exists a man with blue eyes*; the potential presupposition of this sentence is triggered by part of this

sentences 'with blue eyes'. However, it may not be the presupposition of the whole sentence.

There are six types of potential presupposition (Yule, 1996:27-31) namely existential presupposition, factive presupposition, lexical presupposition, structural presupposition, non-factive presupposition; and counter-factual presupposition. Each will be described as follows:

1) Existential Presupposition

The existential presupposition is not only assumed to be present in possessive construction for example, (6) *your car* >> *you have a car*, but more generally in any definite noun phrase. In the previous example; *Mary saw the man with the blue eyes*, the existential presupposition is found in the utterance that has entity name – the man. The speaker assumes that the hearer has already known which man that is intended by the speaker. Other examples: the woman, the girl, the coach and the football players. There is a mutual knowledge between speaker and the hearer. The hearer has already known or been prepared to accept as non-controversial that there exist a woman, a girl, a coach, and football players. The hearer has already known which woman/girl/coach/football players that are intended by the speaker.

2) Factive Presupposition

There are particular verbs in the utterance that indicate facts. For example: regret, know, glad, realize, recover, and aware. The presuppositions resulted are called factive presuppositions.

3) Lexical Presupposition

In lexical presupposition, the use of one form with its asserted meaning is conventionally interpreted with the presupposition that another (non-asserted) meaning is understood. In utterance of someone that worked as a shopkeeper, (13) *My boss managed to sell the bookstore before it crashed*, when the shopkeeper said that the boss 'managed', there is a presupposition that the boss 'tried' to do something. Other examples, involving the lexical items like stop, forget, and again.

4) Structural Presupposition

In this case, certain sentence structures have been analyzed as conventionally and regularly presupposing that part of the structure has already been assumed to be true. We can find this phenomenon in question construction.

5) Non- Factive Presupposition

Something assumed not to be true is the type of non-factive presupposition. Some verbs like dream or imagine is used with non-factive presupposition. For example: *I dreamed that I met Celine Dion.* >> *I do not meet Celine Dion.*

6) Counter- Factual Presupposition

Sometimes the presupposition of an utterance is the opposite of what is true, or contrary to the fact. For example: *If you were my sister, I would tell you my secret* presupposes that you are not my sister. The presupposition of *I have a secret for you* is the type of factive presupposition.

7) Actual Presupposition

An actual presupposition is a potentially presupposition for which all the contextual information is known (Horton, 1987: 47). In the pragmatic presupposition, it is the belief about the context that must attribute to the participants' common ground. Context is characterized in terms of producer's belief about the common ground. One way to understand the contextual meaning, we shall consider the expression shared or non-controversial knowledge between the participants.

There is some information that has already been known by both (the speaker and hearer or the writer and reader) even though that it is not explicitly stated. This is called presupposition information. According to Givon (1989: 135-136), the sources of presupposed information are the shared generic context, the shared situational context, and the shared discourse context. Wang and Cui (2010:12) provide a contextual framework for analyzing presupposition in those three major subdivisions of context by referring to Givon's theory of presupposed information. Each is described as follows:

1) Shared Generic Context

Shared generic context refers to the universal information or the knowledge of the knowledge of the world. It focused on the shared world and cultures, and refers to something universal to a great degree and remains the same across different cultures. It comprises on the one hand knowledge and beliefs concerning the real world, and on the other hand people's ways and capacities to make sense of the world. For illustration, people from different cultures have the same knowledge about day and night, except

for those who live in the polar regions who may know only “day season” (or polar day in the technical term) and “night season”(or polar night in the technical term).

2) Shared Situational Context

Situational context is the nonlinguistic environment in which the utterance or statement happens. It is the context that allows us to interpret the utterance seamlessly, even unknowingly. Situational context includes the producer, addressee, and any third parties present, along with their beliefs and their beliefs about what the others believe (Fromkin, 1993: 162). In other words it refers to the immediate communicative situation. It covers what can be known about the speech situation, social-personal relations between participants, including their respective conditions such as status, power, obligations, needs and expectations, and goals of communication.

3) Shared Discourse Context

According to Brown and Yule (2003:47), discourse analysis necessarily takes a pragmatic approach to the study of language in use, which is in using terms such as references, presupposition, implicature, and inference. The discourse analysis is describing what the producer and addressee are doing. According to Renkema (2004: 65), in analyzing the discourse (spoken or written), the term addressee can be used to denote both readers and listeners, and the term producer is used to denote both speakers and writers. McCarthy (1991:5) states that discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the context.

In the study of language, it is alongside the emergence of pragmatics, which is the study of meaning in context.

Pragmatic presupposition can be analyzed from its discourse context as the presupposition information; the discourse context can change the potential presupposition as the preassumption of the utterance if the information as the common ground in the discourse does not license it (Givon, 1989). From the discourse, more information can be obtained that what is explicitly stated. A special type of implicit information (not the whole implicit meaning) is called presupposition, meaning to assume beforehand. When some proposition of the immediate discourse context directly adds presuppositions, the set of presupposition must be believed by the participants.

Hickey (1998:116) mentions that presuppositions can also be triggered by discourse elements other than the actual language used. There is more information about what really happened in the utterances by analyzing the discourse. The information about what really happened in the utterances as the shared knowledge of the participants will be stated as a proportion. A proportion of the information will be considered as the presupposition of the utterances. On the other hand, this presupposed knowledge is then taken together with the propositions asserted as a new incoming utterance. From the perspective of discourse pragmatics, it will be used to share certain information of the assumption that is not explicitly stated.

4) Slogans

A slogan is a memorable motto or phrase used in a political, commercial, religious and other contexts as a repetitive expression of an idea or purpose. The word slogan is derived from *slogorn* which was an Anglicisation of the Scottish Gaelic *sluagh-ghairm* (*sluagh* "army", "host" + *gairm* "cry") (Wikipedia: 2011). A slogan is a form of verbal logo. In a print ad, it usually appears just beneath or beside the brand name or logo. Slogan is important in advertising as it has the power to attract people's attention since they are short, striking, and easy to remember. Thus, we can say that a slogan is kind of language phenomenon as it differs from most of other forms of writing because it is designed to be remembered and repeated word for word to impress a brand and its message on the consumer.

According to Kirkpatrick (1964:486) a slogan needs to be a memorable message with few words. Thus, ideally, the slogan should be short clear, and easy to remember, for example: *Generation Next* from Pepsi. Kam (2007: 1) also asserts that being concise and precise is crucial for an effective slogan for branding. Slogans must be concise in order to be effective. Slogans, taking up a whole sentence to convey your brand are less effective than a slogan with just 3 words. The less words, the easier it is to be remembered. Since a human memory is limited, the slogans are supposed to as short as possible for an optimal recall rate.

Slogans must be precise as well in order to be effective. Those few words used in the slogan must convey exactly what to achieve. Slogans that leave the readers guessing or confused will

give them a much harder time understanding the brand being promoted.

Therefore, we cannot treat slogans as merely simple rhetorical performance as they have such a power in their appeal strategy. There is something behind simple and brief words. It is the presupposed meaning that can attract people's attention known as presuppositions. They also enable slogans to be recognized instantly and understood by people. Thus, the slogans are worth analyzing.

5) Pragmatic Transfer

The term pragmatic transfer has been referred to some various notions. It may refer to sociolinguistic transfer or discourse transfer. However, the writer used the term pragmatic transfer as it is understood by Kasper (1992) who considers that it refers to the influence of speakers' previous pragmatic knowledge of one language and culture on their comprehension and production of the pragmatics of another language.

Pragmatic knowledge itself is to be understood as referring to "a particular component of language users' general communicative knowledge of how verbal acts are understood and performed in accordance with a speaker's intention under contextual and discursal constraints" (Kasper, 1992:214).

Kasper (1992) identifies two types of pragmatic transfer: Pragmalinguistic transfer and Sociopragmatic transfer. A pragmalinguistic transfer is the influence of the learner's knowledge about the illocutionary force or politeness value assigned to particular linguistic form-functions in native language, which, when

mapped by learners into the perception and production of a similar situation in target language, sounds different to native speakers. In Kasper's words, it is — the process whereby the illocutionary force or politeness value assigned to a particular linguistic material in NL influences learners' perception and production of form-function mappings in target language

A sociopragmatic transfer is a process "operative when the social perceptions underlying language users' interpretation and performance of linguistic action in target language are influenced by their assessment of subjectively equivalent native language contexts." (Kasper, 1992:209). Accordingly, it can be inferred from Kasper's dichotomous division of pragmatic transfer that negative pragmatic transfer also has two corresponding types. The first type is negative pragmalinguistic pragmatic transfer, and the other, negative sociopragmatic transfer.

Interference or negative transfer and facilitative or positive transfer are the most obvious types of different manifestations of pragmatic transfer which have been identified in many studies. The influence of one language on another may bring different results for examples (as asserted by Franch, 1998: 10) excessive use (or abuse) of one form or function; and under – use (or avoidance) of forms and/or functions. Second or third languages can also influence the mother tongue. However, the abuse or avoidance can be positive or negative.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the findings, the writer figured out that out of six types of potential presuppositions, there were only three types of presuppositions found namely existential presupposition, factive presupposition, and lexical presupposition in which existential presupposition became the most dominant type found.

It was evident that there are three types of potential presuppositions of the Indonesian universities. The discussion on each type of potential presupposition is supported by the discussion on the actual presupposition.

1) Existential Presupposition

The existential presupposition is found in the utterance that has entity name or in any definite noun phrase. It is also assumed to be present in possessive construction.

The following is the example of existential presupposition in the slogans of Indonesian universities.

"Innovation for the glory and truth" means 'Innovation is needed to reach the glory and to find the truth.'

This type of potential presupposition is categorized as existential presupposition. The readers are assumed to understand that the glory and the truth are there because of the innovation. The following is the discussion on the actual presupposition.

a) Shared Generic Context: The three concepts proposed by this slogan are *innovation, glory, and truth*, in which the three terms bring a positive sense to the readers. *Innovation* is related to positive changes done to get a better outcome or result. It is a new way for

the improvement. *Glory* means the source of fame and success while *truth* in common sense has something to do with what is believed to be wrong or right. >>*Innovation is the action while glory and truth are the goals.*

b) Shared Situational Context: *Innovation* is commonly linked to some context e.g. business, economics, technology, and organization. In those contexts, *innovation* means advancements. Innovating does not mean inventing a new thing, but it is more to the process done for the improvement. In other words, it is like handling the same thing as others also have but in a different way. In this context, *innovation* is perhaps closely related to the management system of the university, the research, and the teaching and learning process. *Innovation* is related to a betterment. Betterment means advancement, and surely advancement means leading. Leading is winning, and winning leads to *glory*. Next, the readers are expected to understand that *truth* is something that may not be disregarded in doing the innovation for the glory as the *truth* here means the standard, originality, and good values that should always be kept in the journey of reaching the glory.>>*The glory should be reached through a truth-based innovation.*

c) Shared Discourse Context: The mission of this university is to be leading and innovating to reach the glory through science and technology, and hard work for a thorough professional academic quality as well as a strong commitment for the society and the nation through education, reasearch, and

devotion. Therefore, the readers are assumed to understand that this university believes that innovation is the key to reach the glory. It means that this university supports its students to do the innovation to reach their goals, and at the end to be leading for the glory without neglecting the truth. >>*This university is for the students who accept changes for betterment but remain faithful to the truth or good values.*

d) Interpretation of the actual presupposition: From the three contexts above, the readers are presupposed to understand that the *truth* and *innovation* go hand in hand in this university. Changes for betterment are accepted but the *truth* or good values may not be neglected. When the *innovation* is done properly, the *glory* shall come.

3.1 Interpretation

The findings show that existential, factive, lexical, and structural potential presuppositions are implied in the selected slogans analyzed. Since most of the slogans are in the form of noun phrases and the rest are presented in the form of barely simple sentences, non-factive and counterfactual potential presuppositions do not occur in the slogans analyzed as these kinds of presuppositions are usually productive in utterances like questions or conditional sentences.

Next, concerning with the each type of presupposition found in the selected slogans, the writer believes that there are particular implied purposes in the analyzed slogans of state

Indonesian universities. Firstly, the existential presuppositions were implied in most of the slogans of state Indonesian universities. The writer can infer that those universities with this kind of presupposition in their slogans want to show their existence by displaying slogans that truly expresses their identities and strengths. Other universities imply their goals and objectives in their slogans. Expectantly, by doing so, these universities will be able to inspire and encourage their students as well as their academicians. Other universities also imply their principles and values in their slogans. These universities might want their slogans to be the guidelines for their students and academicians in studying, researching, or working.

Compared to existential presupposition, factive presuppositions are rather imposing. The use of particular verbs indicate a strong invitation to prospective students that by joining these universities, they will get what they need. Other examples of factive presuppositions in denote facts as people (readers) are likely to accept facts effortlessly.

Then, the last type of potential presupposition found is lexical presupposition. Lexical presuppositions were derived from particular markers (words) that expectantly non-asserted meaning is understood. It means that by using such words, the readers are expected to grasp the real messages which are not directly stated in the slogans.

The analysis on each potential presupposition is supported by the discussion on its actual presupposition. The potential presuppositions were not rejected by the actual presupposition, meaning that all potential

presuppositions found were accepted by the contexts of actual presupposition. It can be seen from the analyzed sample slogans that the discussion on the actual presupposition is in line with the potential presupposition. However, the writer figured out that potential presupposition provides a rather limited explanation of the slogans, meaning that the assumption derived from the potential presupposition did not really provide a clear idea of the slogan. This is caused by the fact that potential presuppositions are determined by linguistics items only (presupposition triggers). Meanwhile, actual presuppositions give a better ideas on what is actually implied in each slogans as determining the actual presuppositions takes three contexts; from the most general one into the most specific one by referring to linguistic items used as well as the shared world between the writer (the slogan) and the reader (in this case, the writer doing the analyses). In the actual presupposition discussion, the writer did not only analyze the presupposition in a broad, common sense but also in a specific one by referring to the shared discourse context of each slogan. Furthermore, the writer believes that by applying this kind of steps in analyzing texts, readers are likely to be successful in fully grasping pragmatic understanding. When people are good in capturing pragmatic understanding, miscommunications can be avoided.

Then, in terms of pragmatic transfer, the writer did not find any negative pragmatic transfer (neither pragmalinguistically nor sociopragmatically) as she did not find any erroneous or inappropriate term which might sound strange or different in English culture –

related context. However, the writer analyzed that all of the English slogans mentioned above are common formal expressions and even sound too official. It seems that the slogans are used merely as an ‘add-on’. There are some facts in the society about Indonesian university that good promises, great mission and goal which are implied in the slogans are not in line with the quality of the graduates and those universities. As Paramitha (2012:1) noted that the surveys done by OEDC (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) and World Bank in relation to higher education in Indonesia show that Indonesian university graduates commonly do not have adequate working experience. They are also lack of skill and are not discipline. Surely, these things are not the goal of the slogans published by those universities. Those slogans carry positive meaning, values, and hopes for the best quality of the students, lecturers, and the social community of those universities. Therefore, the writer might suggest that if only those universities are more creative in turning their slogans into a more communicating yet persuading one, it will bring a new spirit to the students, lecturers, and the social community of the universities to improve the quality of the universities not only in terms of services but also in the quality of the graduates.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Three conclusions could be drawn. First, there were two kinds of pragmatic presuppositions of the slogans namely potential

presuppositions and actual presuppositions. Out of six types of potential presupposition, there were only three types found. They are existential presuppositions, factive presuppositions, and lexical presuppositions. Existential presuppositions of the slogans indicate the identities and strengths of Indonesian universities, factive presuppositions denote facts which impose a strong invitation to the prospective students of Indonesian universities, and lexical presupposition denotes another non-asserted meaning. Second, actual presuppositions provide clearer ideas of the slogans compared to the potential presuppositions. Third, pragmatic transfer was not found in the slogans .

REFERENCES

- Adisutrisno, W. 2008. *Semantics: An introduction to the basic concepts*. Andi. Yogyakarta.
- Bolter, J. D. 2003. *Critical Theory and the Challenge of New Media*. MIT Press. Cambridge.
- Cann, R. 1993. *Formal semantics: An introduction*. CUP. Cambridge.
- Cummings, L. 2005. *Pragmatics: A multidisciplinary perspective*. Edinburgh University Press, Ltd. Edinburgh.
- Demirezen, M. 1991. *Pragmatics and language teaching*. Online. (Diakses <http://www.literacyonline.org>, tanggal 10 Januari 2011)
- Franch, P. B. 1998. *On Pragmatic Transfer*. *Studies in English Language and Linguistics Journal*, 2, 5-20.
- Fromkin, V., & Rodman, R. 1993. *An introduction to language* (5th). Hartcourt Brace College Publishers. New York, NY.
- Givon, T. 1989. *Mind, Code, and Context: Essays in Pragmatics*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Hillsdale, NJ.
- Grundy, P. 2000. *Doing pragmatics*. Arnold. London.
- Hatim, B., & Ian, M. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. Longman Inc. New York, NY.
- Hickey, L. 1998. *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Multilingual Matters Ltd. Manchester.
- Kasper, G. 1992. *Pragmatic Transfer*. *Second Language Research*. 8:3, 203-231.
- Kelder, R. 1996. *Rethinking Literacy Studies: From the Past to Present*. Online. (Diakses <http://www.literacyonline.org>., tanggal 8 Januari 2011).
- Lam, C. K. Y. 2009. *What is Useful in Advertisements and What Does it Reflect? A Sociolinguistic Study of Hong Kong Culture*. Online. (Diakses http://www0.hku.hk/english/LCOM%20paper/LCOM%20papers%20new,%20rev/2009%20vol2/4_Carrie_Lam.pdf., tanggal 23 September 2011).
- McCarthy, M. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. CUP. Cambridge.
- Mey, J. L. 1993. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Blackwell. Oxford.
- Paltridge, B. 2006. *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Continuum. London.
- Renkema, J. 2004. *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. John Benjamins B.V. Netherlands.
- Robins, R.H. 1984. *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey*. Longman Group Ltd. London.
- Sandt, A. V. D. 1988. *Context and Presupposition*. Croom Helm. London.
- Saeed, J. I. 2003. *Semantics*. Blackwell Publishing. Oxford.
- Segerdahl, P. 1996. *Language Use: A Philosophical Investigation into the Basic Notions of Pragmatics*. Mcmillan Press Ltd. London.
- Stalnaker, R. 1973. *Pragmatic Presuppositions*. New York University Press. New York, NY.
- Stalnaker, R. 1999. *Pragmatic Presupposition*. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 2. Reprinted from *Context and Content* (1974). Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Wang, Q., & Chui, Y. 2010. *Differences in the Transference of Humor and Personification in Advertisement Translation*. *Journal of Language & Translation*, 11, 47-69.
- Young, R. 2011. *What is a truth value?*. Online. (Diakses www.ryanyoung.org/truthvalue.pdf., tanggal 1 April 2011).

Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.