付晓丽 付天军 ◎著

A Study of Persuasive Functions of
Interactional Metadiscourse in
Advertising Discourse

广告语篇互动元话语
说服功能研究

广告语篇互动元话语
说服功能研究

A Study of Persuasive Functions
of Interactional Metadiscourse
in Advertising Discourse

付晓丽　付天军　著

内容提要

本书以广告语篇为例,进一步从理论上对互动元话语的说服功能进行阐释。本书主要分为理论和应用两部分。理论部分将互动元话语的说服功能视为一种语言修辞现象,借鉴社会心理学、传播学、营销学等相关理论,对互动元话语在广告语篇中的说服功能进行梳理和总结,并在此基础上提出一个全新的互动元话语说服模式;应用部分则以这个互动元话语说服模式为分析框架,选择四个类别的广告语篇:产品广告、服务广告、机构广告和公益广告,对这些语篇中的互动元话语的说服功能进行考察。

Acknowledgments

前　言

　　本书是第一作者博士学位论文《基于语类的互动元话语研究》的延伸研究。元话语研究是近 20 年来国内外学界研究的一个热点。互动元话语是元话语的一个次范畴,它主要关涉那些反映作者与读者进行互动的语言资源。近年来,互动元话语的研究得到了学界的广泛重视。目前,已有证据表明,互动元话语的使用是作者提升文本说服力的一种有效手法。本书以广告语篇为例,进一步从理论上对互动元话语的说服功能进行阐释。本书主要分为理论和应用两部分。理论部分将互动元话语的说服功能视为一种语言修辞现象,借鉴社会心理学、传播学、营销学等相关理论,对互动元话语在广告语篇中的说服功能进行梳理和总结,并在此基础上提出一个全新的互动元话语说服模式;应用部分则以这个互动元话语说服模式为分析框架,选择四个类别的广告语篇:产品广告、服务广告、机构广告和公益广告,对这些语篇中的互动元话语的说服功能进行考察。

　　本书共分为九章。

　　第一章是绪论,对论题及相关背景(包括研究背景、研究动机、研究方法等)进行阐述。本章重点介绍互动元话语的起源、学界对互动元话语的研究现状、本书的研究范式及创新点。此外,本章还特别对一些概念(如广告语篇、说服等)在本书的使用情况进行了界定和说明。

　　第二章至第四章是全书的理论基础。第二章重点论述了广告的定义、广告的分类、广告语篇的种类、广告策略及广告诉求等内容。第三章对互动元话语进行了综述,总结了元话语及互动元话语在篇

章中的使用情况。特别值得一提的是,作者在本章尝试提出了一个新的元话语定义。第四章对互动元话语在广告语篇中的说服诉求进行了阐释,并在此基础上提出了互动元话语在广告语篇中的整合模式,即元话语说服模式。

第五章至第八章属于应用研究。第五章重点对产品类广告进行了考察,包括耐用品和非耐用品等类别。第六章对服务类广告语篇进行了考察,包括金融服务、日常生活服务等内容。第七章对机构广告语篇进行探索,主要考察了大学和企业这两类机构的广告语篇。第八章则对公益广告语篇中的互动元话语资源进行了深入分析。

第九章是结论,总结了本书的主要观点,指出了本书的不足,并对未来研究方向提出了设想。

我们认为,本书作为跨学科研究的一个尝试,在努力探寻互动元话语本质特征方面做出了有益的探索。书中内容有一定的创新性,既反映了元话语研究领域前沿的国内外研究成果,又体现了作者把社会研究与人文研究合二为一的独特新视野。本书内容适合有一定学术基础的语言学、心理学、传播学、管理学等诸多相关领域的专业人员阅读。

Contents

Part I Introduction

Part II Theoretical Foundations

Part III   Interactional Metadiscourse Resources

in Advertising Texts

Part I

Introduction

Chapter 1   Introduction

The research topic of the book is the appeal of persuasion of interactional metadiscourse in advertising, which is a relatively new topic. Although advertising is not a new area for exploration, the investigations of the persuasive functions of interactional metadiscourse in advertising discourse seem novel. In the book we attempt to treat interactional metadiscourse resources as rhetorical devices, and approach them in advertising discourse from a socio-psychological perspective. Before we embark on this task, it is imperative to state the logic of the study first. In other words, we are to address several important issues so that readers could gain a better understanding of the motivation and organization of this book.

1.1   Introducing the Field

1.1.1   What Is Interactional Metadiscourse?

First, we are to answer the question: why do we study interactional metadiscourse? To answer this question is not easy because readers must be acquainted with prior knowledge about what metadiscourse is and what interactional metadiscourse is. Admittedly, the two questions are too big to be addressed here due to limited space in introduction section, and the detailed account about this aspect will be presented in Chapter Two. Here we just offer a rather quick answer to give the readers a rough picture of metadiscourse study.

In brief, metadiscourse is a cover term of "discourse about discourse", which is used to organize the text and convey the writer's stance and the reader's engagement in the text (e. g.,

Vande Kopple, 1985; Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen, 1993; Xu, 2006). Over the past twenty years, researches on metadiscourse have gained increasing attention among many scholars. Interactional metadiscourse, as a subcategory and an important branch of metadiscourse, was first recognized and developed by Hyland (2005) in his seminal book *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Interactional metadiscourse mainly deals with "the ways writers conduct interaction by intruding and commenting on their message. The writer's goal here is to make his or her views explicit and to involve readers by allowing them to respond to the unfolding text" (Hyland, 2005, p. 49). Interactional metadiscourse so far has been proved to possess a significant force in adding the text's persuasiveness. In other words, the writer typically uses interactional metadiscourse to enhance the persuasive effect of the text. Previous studies (e. g., Hyland, 2005, 2010) have shown that interactional metadiscourse occurs more commonly in articles of social sciences than in research articles of "pure sciences", which reveals that interactional metadiscourse is more persuasive in nature because the "soft-knowledge fields are typically more interpretive and less abstract than the 'hard' sciences and their forms of argument rely more on a dialogic engagement and more explicit recognition of alternative voices" (Hyland, 2005, p. 145).

1. 1. 2 Why Advertising Discourse?

Second, we are faced with the question: why do we study advertising discourse? Apparently, there seems to be a self-evident answer to this question as advertising is undoubtedly a well-established area of research which has enjoyed scholars' attention for many decades. However, the question is not that self-evident as Cook (2001, p. 1ff) notices that many scholars ignore ads and do not

pay much attention to their textuality. Indeed, there is much work that should be done to further our understanding of advertising discourse as a genre as Bhatia (2005, p. 214) observes that "advertising is one of the most dynamic and versatile genres of public discourse today, in that it can boast of some of the most varied and innovative uses of lexico-grammatical and discoursal forms and rhetorical strategies."

As we all know, many ads, especially the commercial ads, cost a lot of money and the copy writer's energy. In other words, ads are products of human intelligence to persuade the audience and impose positive influence on the audience. Even those public service ads that are not profit-driven are good reflections and illustrations of the society's value system. Conveying significant social intent, ads are designed and transmitted in a particular way that attracts our attention.

In fact, ads are worthy of our attention because of the high frequency of occurrences in people's daily life as estimated by Brierley (1995, p. 1) nearly twenty years ago that "by the age of 18, for instance, the average American teenager will have seen over 350, 000 advertisements". On the other hand, it is the peculiarities of language in use in ads that have attracted many scholars' attention. Notably, Simpson (2001, p. 605) views advertising as "prevalent form of social praxis" and argues "that social process—advertising discourse—is as pervasive as it is institutionally powerful." Cook (2001, p. 237) concludes at the end of his book that "the very quantity of advertising in our society, the skill and effort which goes into its creation, the complexity of its discourse, and its impact on its receivers, are enough to make it interesting. Advertising can focus and redefine ideas about language, discourse, art and society, and in this respect its study is well worthwhile." Therefore, to explore the

persuasiveness of interactional metadiscourse in ads may be a sound choice, which will enable us to gain some useful insights on the role interactional metadiscourse resources play in such a typical persuasive discourse as ads.

1.2 The Motivation of the Study

There have been various attempts over the past decades in investigating metadiscourse use in a variety of contexts. However, the previous researches on metadiscourse have long been confined to academic discourse with few texts of other genres being researched. Hyland's (2005) interpersonal model of metadiscourse, marking a new stage of metadiscourse studies, offers us a new perspective to revisit metadiscourse use. In the wake of the introduction of Hyland's interpersonal model of metadiscourse, there have been many efforts made by scholars all over the world in and beyond the field of Applied Linguistics who follow Hyland's arguments and are fans of the methodology he established in the past years to examine the use of metadiscourse in diverse social contexts. Fu's (2010) dissertation entitled *A Genre-based Study of Interactional Metadiscourse* is one of the recent attempts in this field, which has yielded many interesting findings.

Despite the fact that much has been revealed regarding the occurrences of interactional metadiscourse in different genres, little progress has ever been made in the past to address the question "why do the interactional metadiscourse resources have impact on the receivers of message?". In fact, there are many questions left to be addressed, and much of the work should be done to provide reasonable explanations in this aspect. In other words, although we have gained some knowledge about how interactional metadiscourse resources are employed in particular texts and answered the questions such as the distributions and