ABSTRACT

Manner posters, which are used for the purpose of improving people’s manners in public spaces, attempt to be effective without being impositional. How do they meet the challenge? Manner posters can be considered to perform speech acts with written words and visual devices. The current work investigates the generating mechanism of their perlocutionary effects such as persuasion. It provides a case study of Japanese train manner posters by Tokyo Metro in 2008-2010. The analysis is conducted within the framework of mental spaces theory. It was found that the manner posters express the message in an indirect, complex, and humorous manner by a combination of verbal and non-verbal means. Also, humor plays a part in preserving both positive and negative politeness. Devices like these trigger certain cognitive activities on the addressees’ part, through which they will grasp the complete message, acknowledge the point of good manners in a concrete way, and be motivated to put good manners into practice. Instead of making a top-down request, manner posters tend to adopt a communicative approach in order to be effective.
1. Introduction

Manner posters, which are used for the purpose of improving people’s manners in public spaces, attempt to be effective without being impositional. This challenge is shared by requests in face-to-face communication. Suppose that we see an old lady standing in a train and a younger lady using one seat for herself and another for her bag. How can we talk to the younger lady to improve the situation? Just making a polite request may not work. An attempt to change people’s behavior can easily be face-threatening (Brown and Levinson, 1987), just offending the addressee. How do manner posters meet the challenge?

Empirically, manner posters have certain cognitive effects on their addressees (e.g. passengers in the train). We all know that manner posters carry a message from certain individuals or institutions (e.g. the train company; passengers who suffer from the bad manners of others). In this light, we could consider that manner posters perform speech acts with written words and visual aids, even though the ‘speaker’ is physically absent on site. Manner posters have both illocutionary force and perlocutionary effects in Austin’s (1975) sense. The former is based on the speaker’s intention, and the latter on the consequence. The intended perlocutionary effects include persuasion, and the unintended ones include offending. It is the perlocutionary effects, rather than the illocutionary force, that matters here concerning manner posters. How are they obtained?

The current work gives a case study of Japanese train manner posters by Tokyo Metro (a subway company in Tokyo) used in 2008-2010. Two basic formats are investigated using sample posters. They are mata yarou (‘We suggest you do that again’) and X-de yarou (‘We suggest you do that at X’, where X is a specific place). An analysis is conducted to the mechanism in which passengers get the message appropriately and are motivated to put it into practice. The focus of analysis is put on the cognitive effects triggered on the addressees’ part, often unconsciously, rather than the conscious, cooperative process of communication between the posters and their addressees.

The framework of analysis is the mental spaces theory, which is a helpful device for analyzing the structure of human cognitive activities in the current case, the process of the addressees’ understanding and appreciating the message.

2. Preliminaries

2.1 Mental spaces theory

Mental spaces theory (Fauconnier 1994, 1997, Turner & Fauconnier 1995) is a useful device for the analysis of human thought and linguistic activities and has a wide range of applications (e.g. Hiraga 1999, Veale 1999). The key notion of blending applies to conceptual integration, and complex cognitive process involves multiple applications of blending.

To take an example, Fauconnier analyzes counterfactuals like the following.

(1) If I were you, I wouldn’t mess with me.

(Fauconnier 1997, 14)

The question here is why the final word should be me, not a reflexive myself, despite that it is c-commanded by the subject I.

Fauconnier explains the phenomenon in terms of blending of two mental spaces. One space (Input 1) is the real-world space, where the speaker talks to the
addressee, and the other (Input 2) is a hypothetical, counterfactual space where the speaker is in the addressee’s position. In the blended space, there are TWO elements (say \(x\) and \(y\)), each of which partially inherits the speaker’s dispositions. Element \(x\) inherits the speaker’s essential properties from Input 1, whereas \(y\) inherits his position and strengths (which belong to the addressee in the real world) from Input 2. The sentence says that \(y\) wouldn’t mess with \(x\). Given the discrepancy between the two references, there is no wonder that personal pronoun me, not reflexive myself, is the right form.

The mental spaces theory works fine for the analysis of cases like this, which involve hypothetical situations of various kinds.

2.2 Theory of politeness

Brown and Levinson (1987) propose a theory of politeness introducing the notions of positive/negative face and positive/negative politeness.

Positive face represents an individual’s desire to be accepted and liked by others. Positive politeness concerns maintaining the positive face of others and is expressed by, for example, emphasizing one’s solidarity with the addressee and claiming ‘common ground’ with the addressee (Brown & Levinson 1987: 101-29). Negative face refers to an individual’s need not to be imposed on by others. Negative politeness concerns maintaining the negative face of others and is expressed by emphasizing one’s defense to the addressee.

Face is considered to be a universal notion in any human society and conversational participants will ideally try to preserve both their own face and their interlocutor’s face in a verbal interaction. (Huang 2007: 116).

3. Mata yarou
(‘We suggest you do that again’)

3.1 Basic information

The first format under investigation is Mata yarou used in 2010. A sample poster is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. A sample poster in the format of Mata yarou](image)

Mata means ‘again’. Yarou expresses an invitation or encouragement to do something. It can also mean the speaker’s will to do the thing in question. Thus, mata yarou is translated into ‘We suggest you do that again’, or ‘I will do this again’. The simpler English translation shown in the poster, ‘Please do it again’, sounds like a more direct request.

The core element of the message — the requested act, which is the reference of ‘that/this’ in my translation — is left unspecified in the sentence but is given in the illustration. Thus, verbal and non-verbal devices work together to present the whole message. It is expected that the prominent verbal part ‘またやろう’ (mata yarou) first catches the addressees’ eye, triggering a question ‘What should I do again?’, and then they move down to the illustration in search
for the answer. This two-level presentation of the message creates a Q&A effect, contributing to the addressees’ active participation. They then figure out the answer to the question, the requested act, for themselves. The details are given below.

The intended two major perlocutionary effects are: 1) the addressees’ understanding and appreciation of the message, and 2) their orientation toward the requested act. The generating mechanism of these are analyzed below.

### 3.2 The effect of yarou

The requested act is indicated in an indirect manner with a pair of illustrations. The illustrations in a contrast indicate a ‘Before-After’ change. It is this change that is in focus. A single illustration would end up with presenting a rule or a criticism, whereas the pair generates the notion of ‘change’ and would work effectively. Blends explain how the message is substantiated, having a dynamic notion of change as its key element.

The illustrations presented in a contrast also clarify and highlight the problems or benefits of each situation. Presented in a contrast, good manners look more preferable and bad manners look worse. The contrast will be sharpened as the addressee goes back and forth between the two.

This cognitive process is represented in Figure 2, in terms of the blending of two mental spaces.

*Figure 2. The cognitive process of understanding the message*

‘Input space 1’ and ‘Input space 2’ correspond to the ‘Before’ and ‘After’ version of the illustration. The two input spaces have a similar structure, with the passengers and their act. The suffixes of the entities are used according to the space they belong to (i.e. ‘1’ for Input space 1). The two spaces have the same set of passengers, as expressed by the identity function $I$ connecting them. Manners of the passengers are illustrated in a comparative way, as expressed by the analogical function $A$ connecting them.

The core part of the message (i.e. the requested act which the addressees are encouraged to take) is the change, and is only available by integrating the two illustrations. This process is analyzed in terms of blending. The two input spaces create a new space, where some features are inherited from the inputs and others are new. Passengers $a$ is inherited from both input spaces, whereas manners $b$ and $c$ from Input 1 and Input 2, respectively. What’s new in the blended space is the change from $b$ to $c$, a dynamic notion. Furthermore, the details of $b$ and $c$ (equivalently, of $b_1$ and $c_2$) are clarified by virtue of their contrast in the same space.

Given that the essential part of the message should be understood by everyone, it is expected that there is a certain common process of understanding to be shared by different people, while allowing for some variations as to the details. The analysis given here in terms of the blending of mental spaces explains how elements such as structural similarities between the illustrations and their layout strategy lead to the addressees’ correct understanding of the message.

As mentioned earlier, there is another scenario for the use of mata yarou. It is that someone has just done the requested act, having a positive feeling, and says to her/himself ‘I will do this again!’ Those who see the poster (i.e. the addressees) are invited to overlap themselves with the main character in the poster. Here too, a simulation is triggered. The words mata yarou do not sound like a request but is
felt like the addressees’ own words. This is found to be an effective way of guiding the addressees to the requested act without threatening their negative face.

3.3 The effect of mata

Figure 3 illustrates the cognitive process triggered by the effect of mata (‘again’). This involves two steps of blending.

Now, how is mata used felicitously? It presupposes an earlier event of the same sort, but there is no guarantee. It is analyzed that the presupposition causes a simulation effect and reinforces the good manner in reality. It is a blend of a hypothetical change-to-good-manners space, which itself is the above-mentioned blend, and the current situation space.

First, mata linguistically presupposes a past occurrence of the event of the same sort. To take an example, ‘John came again’ can be uttered felicitously only when John has come before. The current message thus triggers a presupposition of a past event and invites the addressees to further practice. However, obviously there is no guarantee for such a fact. For many addressees, the reality may be quite the opposite. Then why can mata be used felicitously?

The felicity is attributed to accommodation (Stalnaker, 1973, 1974, Huang 2007), the phenomenon that the addressee repairs necessary presuppositions assuming that the utterance is felicitous. To accommodate the presupposition, mata will introduce a hypothetical world in which the action is taken. The addressees may reflect on their past act, if there was one. But the presence or absence of such an event does not matter in the current case. In any case, mata has a simulation effect of bringing such an act closer to reality.

In mental spaces terms, this simulation effect can be attributed to the blending of two spaces, as illustrated by the painted-out arrows; Input 1 is the poster space and Input 2 is the real world space in the train. In Blend 1, the change in the manners is inherited from Input 1, whereas the passenger is inherited from Input 2, to be the addressee. Thus, in this blended space, the addressee a takes the requested act (b₁ → c₁). This amounts to simulation.

The second blending applies to the above-mentioned Blend 1 and Input 2, as indicated by the striped arrows. This step concerns an encouragement of bringing the simulated situation into reality, the foreground effect of mata. Blend 2 has the same structure as Blend 1, with the same passenger (i.e. the addressee) and act (b₁ → c₁) and concerns the multiplication of the act by the same person.

Yarou indicates an invitation or encouragement, rather than a request or an order. This leads to the speaker’s expressing solidarity, generating positive politeness. A more direct form of request such as kore-o yat-te kudasai (‘Please do this’) does not have such an effect.

4. X-de yarou
(‘We suggest you do that at X’)

4.1 Basic information

The next format to analyze is X-de yarou used in 2008-09, where X is a place outside the train or station. Three sample posters in this format are shown in Figure 4.
The message is \{Ie-de / Soto-de / Umi-de\} yarou (‘We suggest you do that {at home/ outside/ in the sea}’). It asserts that the act in focus would fit some other place (i.e. at home). The suggested places are contrasted with the current place (i.e. in the train/station). Mapping the acts onto these places is a nontrivial idea and generates humor.

There are two major elements which contribute to the effective work of the message.

4.2 Invited inferences

First, it should be noted that there is no expression of prohibition or request on the surface. In fact, the message says nothing about whether the act is appropriate or not. However, we get the conversational implicature (Grice 1975) that doing the act in focus is inappropriate in the train or station. What comes into play is invited inferences (Geis & Zwicky 1971). To give a simple example:

(2) a. If you go shopping for me, I will give you a tip.
   b. If only you go shopping for me, I will give you a tip.
   c. If you don’t go shopping for me, I will not give you a tip.

Sentence (2a) does not logically entail (2b) or (2c). That is, (2a) does not say anything about what will be the case otherwise. However, considering the motivation for uttering (2a), we intuitively get the implicatures (2b) and (2c).

The same logic applies to the current case.

(3) a. We suggest you do that at home.
   
b. We suggest you don’t do that here in the train/station.

Sentence (3a) conversationally generates an implicature (3b). By mentioning an alternative place, a negative stance for the act done in the current place is implicated.

Figure 5 illustrates an analysis of the process of invited inference.

As before, the model consists of two input spaces and a blended space. What’s new here is that the interpretation process goes the other way: It starts with a blended space, which represents the situation shown in the poster, and will be decomposed into Input 1 and Input 2.

The three spaces have the same structure, with a person \(a\) and his act \(b\).

To take an example of Ie-de yarou, it introduces Input 2 as a hypothetical situation at home. On the other hand, by virtue of invited inference, it introduces Input 1 as a hypothetical (ideal) situation in the train. The persons in Input 1 and Input 2 (\(a_i\) and \(a_s\), respectively) are inherited to the one in the blend (\(a_s\)). Also, the act in Input 2 (\(b_s\)) is inherited to its counterpart in the blend (\(b_j\)), whereas the act in Input 1 (\(b_i\)) is not, to be noted. In fact, \(b_i\) may be a null element.

The idea is that the problem with the illustrated situation is not attributed to the act \(b\) itself but to the wrong combination of the place and the act \(b\). Input 1 and Input 2 both represent normal, desirable
situations, yet the blended space has a problem because it inappropriately inherits the act from Input 2. The expression thus mentions an appropriate place for the act, instead of the inappropriateness of the act in the blend. Thus, *yarou*, an expression with positive politeness can be maintained (‘We suggest you do that’).

4.3 The role of humor

The switch from the train to an alternative place (e.g. home) is a nontrivial idea, and creates a sense of humor. It is most evident in Figure 4-c, where the act is depicted with an exaggeration for triggering an analogy to the man’s swimming or diving. Here, the main focus seems to create humor.

Unexpectedness and humor attract the addressee to the message. The addressee will enjoy imagining the act in the new context. In Figure 5, it is decomposition into a hypothetical space, Input 2. The inappropriateness of the act, or its deviance from the norm, is reduced to a mismatch between the act and the place, and an alternative place is given as a solution. This changes a potential criticism to a presentation with humor.

This contributes to both positive and negative politeness. The message does not sound like a top-down request, but invites the addressee to an observation and understanding of the situation, creating positive politeness with solidarity and negative politeness without imposing. Once the addressee accepts the alternative place, s/he will be motivated to change his/her act. The goal is to remove the act in focus from the current context in the train. The expression used here works well to that end.

If we consider that the poster performs speech acts, such results are regarded as perlocutionary effects. Besides such immediate effects, it may also have long-term perlocutionary effects (Noriick, 1993) such as more essential and stable improvement of the passenger’s manners. Persuasion is a typical example of perlocutionary effect of speech acts, and goes beyond the speaker’s control. It requires the addressee’s change in the idea and act. Nontrivial ideas and humor as we observe them here are helpful for attracting the addressee and, consequently, making the message not imposing but effective.

There are various studies on how humor works in human interaction. However, further investigations into the role of humor is beyond the scope of the current paper.

5. Conclusion

The manner posters investigated here express the message in an indirect, complex, and humorous manner by a combination of verbal and non-verbal means. The strategies include Q&A style presentation, use of a contrast, creative analogy, and exaggeration. Such devices trigger certain cognitive activities on the addressee’s part through which s/he would fully understand the message, acknowledge the point of good manners in a concrete way, and are motivated for putting good manners into practice.

The major mechanism in which the addressee obtains such effects—the perlocutionary effects in a wider sense—was analyzed in the mental spaces framework. It is shown that blending plays a key role in people’s generating a complete message by integrating given information. It was also found that humor plays a part in preserving both positive and negative politeness.

Manner posters meet the challenge of being effective without being imposing, by triggering an active process of interpretation on the addressee’s part, while attracting them using humor.
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Endnote

1. Part of the content of an earlier version of this paper appeared in my poster presentation at the Conference on Language, Discourse and Communication (CLDC2012), Taipei, Taiwan, May 4-6, 2012.

2. Back numbers of manner posters used to be seen on Tokyo Metro HP, which the author referred to earlier in 2012 for the sample posters analyzed in the current paper. However, now the collection only covers more recent posters (2011-2012). For the reader’s information, URLs of some personal homepages are given where those sample posters can be seen.

Websites (Last accessed on 9/12/2012)

- Personal HP ‘Blog of science and advertisement’ (Kagaku-to koukoku-no burogu)
  http://sciencecopywriter.blogspot.jp/
  Specifically,
- Personal HP ‘Thought Gallery’ (Shikuo kairou)
- Personal HP ‘Birth of Blues’
  http://birthofblues.livedoor.biz/archives/50700578.html (for Le-de yarou, 2008.7 and Umi-de yarou, 2008.8)
- Tokyo Metro HP (for 2011-2012 manner posters)
  http://www.metrocf.or.jp/manners/manner-poster.html 2011-2012