



Agata Križan

## The persuasive mechanism of monoglossic propositions in advertisements

### 1 Introduction

As a genre, advertising is generally characterized by its persuasive and communicative rhetoric, i.e. it uses language and strategies effectively as a means of “structured” and “paid nonpersonal communication” to influence or persuade the potential consumer to buy the product (Wells et al., 2000, 6; Arens et al., 2008, 7). Persuasive rhetoric has its origins in Aristotle’s rhetorical theory; according to Barnes (1984), advertisements utilize three modes of persuasion: *ethos* (the appeal to one’s character), *pathos* (the appeal to emotion) and *logos* (the appeal to reason). As illustrated in the paper, it is the evaluative nature of appraisals in seemingly factual monoglossic propositions that helps realise those appeals, in particular pathos. Perloff (2010) and Jefkins and Yadin (2000, 13-15) define advertising persuasion in terms of changing and influencing the consumer’s attitudes or behaviour. This is principally achieved through the social values, norms and attitudes that they mirror and shape (White, 2000; Vestergaard, Schroder, 1985). The social activity of advertisements, as of most genre types, is managed particularly through interpersonal meanings<sup>1</sup>, which closely pertain to the persuasive rhetoric, since their realization reflects the participants’ (advertiser vs advertisee) interaction, their mutual influence, the construction and fulfilment of social roles, the adoption of attitudinal positions, and the establishment of relationships (White, 2000).

One of the linguistic tools that realizes the interpersonal function is the appraisal, defined as “one of three major discourse-semantic resources for construing interpersonal meaning” (Martin, White, 2005). In the appraisal model, all utterances (verbal and print) are considered “dialogic”, i.e. they refer to, respond to, affirm or stay neutral toward value judgements: they also anticipate the possible responses of an actual and imagined reader, and so on (Martin, White, 2005, 92). Such a view is based on Bakhtin (1981, 281), who states that all utterances exist “... against backdrop of other concrete utterances on the same theme, a background made up of contradictory opinions,

---

1 In systemic functional linguistics, each text/clause expresses ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings simultaneously, each one realised with particular lexico-grammatical resources chosen from the language system (Halliday, 1994).





points of view and value judgements... pregnant with responses and objections". Bare assertions are therefore not seen as simply neutral or factual, but as "undialogised" or "monoglossic" (ibid. 427).

In the appraisal system, the lexical and grammatical locutions that signal authorial value positions are captured in the category of engagement, with a division made between the heteroglossic and monoglossic propositions. The use of engagement elements defines a proposition as heteroglossic, whereas the absence of such elements defines it as monoglossic.

While the intersubjective<sup>2</sup> and thus the interactive nature of monoglossic propositions may be diminished through non-authorial intervention, the paper illustrates that the intersubjective value of monoglossic propositions in advertisements is in fact heightened by the use of appraisal language, which may help instil a particular ideology<sup>3</sup> in society, hence acting persuasively. As Thompson (2004, 76) rightly states, appraisal choices are seen as to "reflect and reinforce the ideological values of the culture".

## 2 Monoglossic and heteroglossic propositions

As mentioned above, the division between monogloss and heterogloss depends on whether the author<sup>4</sup> signals (or not) their position and presence through engagement elements (e.g. *not, despite, of course, the fact is, perhaps, according to*) (Martin, White, 2005, 94-98). While heteroglossic propositions are always angled at some other point of view in a text by using engagement elements, (White, 1998), monoglossic assertions are usually expressed categorically, often sounding descriptive and objective, hence intersubjectively neutral, i.e. knowledge and information are presented as commonly accepted and acknowledged, with no need to argue for them (e.g. monoglossic: The data were collected over a period of six months; heteroglossic: *Although* the data were collected over a period of six months, they do *not* provide enough evidence).

Monoglossic propositions in advertising have not yet been researched systematically in terms of their evaluative, hence persuasive potential, and a similar situation exists in other genre texts, where monoglossic propositions are not the main and only

---

2 The expressions *intersubjective* and *interpersonal* are used interchangeably in the paper to denote "relations constructed in and through the interactions between individuals and may thus be considered as an *interactional phenomenon*" (Rommetveit, 1976 in Stevanović, Koski, 2018, 42). In other words, both expressions are used to convey relations or involvement in relations between persons. In advertising, the relations meant are those between advertisers (manufacturers) and advisees (potential consumers).

3 In the literature there are many similar definitions of ideology. According to van Dijk (2006, 116), "ideologies... are primarily some kind of 'ideas', that is, *belief systems*", which "...are *socially shared* by the members of a collectivity of social actors". By the same token, ideology is recognized "as a system of ideas, beliefs, ideals and principles that guide the social, cultural, political and economic functioning of a society" (Harvey, 2012-2019).

4 In this paper, the terms 'author' and 'writer' are used interchangeably to denote the person/s who created the advertising text.





focus of research but are studied with other categories of the appraisal system, with an increased focus on heteroglossic propositions. This may not be surprising, as it is heteroglossic propositions which are considered to be more rhetorically engaging, i.e. more interactive and interpersonal through authorial intervention (Hood, Forey, 2005, 296), and this is particularly true of academic discourse (e.g. Chatterjee, 2008; Fryer, 2015; Vega Garrido, 2017; Sheldon, 2018). Apart from academic discourse, engagement has also been explored in political discourse (e.g. White, Sano, 2006; Kozubíková Šandová, 2015; Plemenitaš, Krajnc, 2019), social media (e.g. Trevisan, 2018), educational discourse (e.g. Chang, 2019), argumentative discourse (e.g. Miller et al., 2014), and media texts (White, 1998; Ertyas 2011). For example, by comparing the dialogic positioning of the British and Japanese prime ministers, White and Sano (2006, 209) made a distinction between monoglossed informational/experiential propositions and monoglossed evaluative ones. Moreover, monoglossic and heteroglossic propositions have been also studied in the visual mode of texts or as part of multimodal texts (e.g. Economou, 2009; Le, 2012).

A detailed analysis of monoglossic propositions in argumentative essays carried out by Lee (2017) shows that successful writing utilizes the ‘presuppose’ monogloss to a greater extent than other types of monogloss. Furthermore, Beangstrom and Adendorff’s (2013) analysis of monoglossic/heteroglossic propositions in real estate advertisements points out a lack of heteroglossic propositions, leaving no space for arguments from (potential) buyers.

### 3 Appraisal system

The appraisal system is “... concerned with evaluation: the kinds of attitudes that are negotiated in a text, the strength of the feelings involved and the ways which values are sourced and readers aligned” (Martin, Rose, 2003, 22). It distinguishes between three main categories, namely, attitude, graduation and engagement. Regarding attitude, writers adopt subjective positions as *affect* (language conveying feelings), *judgement* (language evaluating human behaviour) and/or *appreciation* (language evaluating things) (ibid. 43-53). Regarding graduation, writers intensify or downgrade a given attitude as force (e.g. *very easy*) or focus (e.g. *true friend*) (ibid. 137), while with engagement writers manage and negotiate intersubjective positions. As three attitudinal sub-categories, affect is concerned with language that conveys feelings of un/happiness (e.g. *cheerful*), dis/satisfaction (e.g. *impressed*), dis/inclination (e.g. *fearful*), or in/security (e.g. *anxious*), judgement with language that deals with values of normality (how special one is, e.g. *charmed*), capacity (how capable one is, e.g. *expert*), tenacity (how dependable one is, e.g. *flexible*), veracity (honesty, e.g. *frank*), and propriety (ethics, e.g. *modest*), and appreciation with language that deals with values of reaction (appeal





to emotions, e.g. *amazing*), composition (proportionality and detail, e.g. *balanced*) and valuation (social significance, e.g. *worthwhile*).

Attitudes can have a positive or negative valence, and can be expressed explicitly<sup>5</sup> or implicitly<sup>6</sup>. While explicit attitudes are encoded primarily in attitudinal lexis, expressions of implicit attitudes use no such lexis and are frequently co(n)textually bound. Thus, in the proposition *They are kind and caring*, the positive attitudes of judgement are lexically encoded explicitly in *kind* and *caring*, both grammatically realized as attributes in the relational clause. In the proposition *The company built a new house for the family who lost everything in a fire*, the positive attitude of judgement targeting the company is implicitly expressed on the basis of a culturally bound context in which those who help people in need are evaluated as caring and kind.

The identification of attitudes in advertising texts<sup>7</sup> is often context dependent due to the use of creative language (e.g. metaphors, word puns, ellipsis) and their brevity, which requires an attitudinal “double-coding”<sup>8</sup> and often results in a multiplicity of attitudes within the same proposition or around the same lexical instance (see Križan, 2016a, Križan, 2016b).

## 4 Methodology of analysis

For the analysis, 200 advertisements were first selected randomly from various British magazines primarily addressing a female readership (99 from *Marie Claire*, 22 from *Red*, 13 from *She*, 14 from *New Woman*, 16 from *Grazia*, 23 from *Eve*, 3 from *Vanity Fair*, and 10 from *Real*). Of these advertisements, 42 advertise health products, 104 beauty products, and 54 products for the home. Due to the nature of typically female product advertising (e.g. beauty products), it was anticipated not only that appraisals would feature extensively, but also that they would help create and transmit certain values, norms and stereotypes, such as, for example, beauty and youth ideals to which women are expected to conform. In order to establish the impact of magazine choice on the results in this study, a systematic analysis of the appraisals in advertisements from magazines addressing a primarily male readership is needed.

The analysis focuses only on the textual section of an advertisement, encompassing the headline, slogan (if given and if written close to the main body of text) as well as the main body of the text. All of these sections have been put into the form of a connected text following the natural order of reading the text from left to right and

---

5 The expressions *direct*, *inscribe* and *overt* are also used interchangeably in literature as well as in the paper.

6 The expressions *indirect*, *evoke* and *covert* are also used interchangeably in literature as well as in the paper.

7 In the paper, the expression ‘advertising text’ refers to all written material in a print advertisement.

8 Coding one instance as two or more (same or different) appraisal categories (Martin, White, 2005, 67).





top to bottom, starting with the headline. The length of advertising text varies from 45 to 200 words per advertisement, making a corpus of approximately 15,500 words. The advertising texts were parsed into sentences<sup>9</sup> and coded as monoglossic or heteroglossic propositions based on the inclusion/exclusion of engagement elements (Martin, White, 2005). The average frequency of occurrence for monoglossic and heteroglossic propositions was then calculated manually by using the arithmetic means formula<sup>10</sup>. In this paper, the results of the average frequency of occurrence of monoglossic propositions are provided, as well as the selected monoglossic propositions to exemplify their types and present their evaluative potential as an intersubjective, hence persuasive, value within the appraisal system (ibid.).

In the analysis, the following marking system is used: **inscribed attitudes** (bold); *graders* (italics); and ***inscribed attitudes+graded*** (bold+italics).

## 5 Results of analysis

Table 1 presents the frequency of the occurrence of monoglossic and heteroglossic propositions in the sample advertisements<sup>11</sup>.

Table1: The ratio of monoglossic and heteroglossic propositions in 200 advertisements

Number of propositions (n = 1119)	
Monoglossic propositions	429 (39%)
Heteroglossic propositions	690 (61%)

Table 1 shows the prevalence of heteroglossic propositions over monoglossic propositions in advertising texts, which indicates that the authorial persona is actively engaged with dialogic alternatives by opposing, rejecting, contradicting or acknowledging them. Even though the authors frequently overtly signal their presence in propositions through the use of engagement elements, the number of monoglossic propositions indicates that much of the content is presented by a single-voice, allowing for no further dialogic negotiation, which may be perceived as a less intersubjective activity. However, as the analysis reveals, monoglossic propositions are largely permeated with explicit and implicit attitudes, hence strengthening their interpersonal activity despite their non-dialogic ‘passivity’, and with this the attempt to influence. The results of the chi-square test ( $\chi^2$ ) for the monoglossic and heteroglossic

9 Slogans and headlines that appeared as phrases were considered as individual sentences.

10 
$$M = \frac{\sum X}{n}$$

11 The data were collected within the framework of my unpublished PhD thesis *The Language of British Advertisements: Social and Cultural Aspects of the Appraisal Model* (2015).





propositions show that there is a significant difference between the expected and observed propositions ( $\chi^2 = 60.86$ ;  $fe = 559.5$ ;  $p = 0.001$  (10.83);  $df = 1$ ;  $p \leq \chi^2$ ). With this, the null hypothesis that the frequency of occurrence of monoglossic and heteroglossic propositions is equal is rejected.

Furthermore, the analysis shows that the array of monoglossic propositions in advertisements encompasses what I term:

- a) non-attitudinal commands,
- b) attitudinal commands,
- c) attitude-inscribed statements,
- d) graduation-triggered attitudinal statements.

### 5.1 Non-attitudinal commands

Monoglossic propositions in advertisements are typically expressed with a command, grammatically realized by an imperative, which “neither references nor allows for the possibility of alternative actions” (Martin, White, 2005, 111). These commands do not express any attitudes, as exemplified in (1).

- (1) Imagine. (*Marie Claire*, April, 2008)

### 5.2 Attitudinal commands

This type of monoglossic proposition includes commands which are also realized linguistically with an imperative as non-attitudinal commands, but express attitudes explicitly or/and implicitly. Commands expressing one attitude occur rarely, as shown in the seemingly attitudinally neutral command in (2), where the manufacturer’s suggestion of a joint solution to the problem (to break the problematic circle of sleeplessness) may evoke an attitude of positive judgment: a capability targeting both the manufacturer and the potential consumer. This in turn thus motivates the potential consumer not just to continue reading the advertisement, but also to act.

- (2) Let’s break the circle. (*She*, January, 2005)

The majority of such commands, however, express more than one attitude explicitly and/or implicitly, depending on the context, co-text and grading elements, as shown in examples (3-12).

- (3) ...**simply** massage **nature’s famous stress-buster** onto the back of your neck, temples and earlobes. (*New Woman*, October, 2004)
- (4) Lick the lid of life. (*Marie Claire*, July, 2007)





- (5) *Just* think of it as a **bridge back** to a **normal** sleeping pattern. (*She*, January, 2005)
- (6) *Just* look for the **green banner**. (*Marie Claire*, August, 2005)
- (7) Find out how **dry** your skin is using the moisture test strips featured at the bottom of the page. (*Red*, November, 2006)

In (3), the command expresses only explicit positive appreciation: reaction (*simply*) and valuation (*nature's, famous, stress-buster*). In (4), all of the attitudes are implicit positive appreciation: valuation (*lid of life*), which metaphorically refers to the product's quality of being healthy, and reaction (*lick the lid of life*), where the *licking* coupled with the *lid of life* signifies the product's delicious taste.

In most cases, however, commands express both explicit and implicit attitudes, as in (5) and (6). In (5), the grader *just* evokes a positive attitude of appreciation: reaction emphasizing the value of simplicity, and the metaphorical *bridge back to*<sup>12</sup> inscribes a positive attitude of appreciation: valuation as a synonym for solution. Similarly, in (6) there is a positive attitude of appreciation: reaction foregrounding the value of simplicity is evoked via the grader *just*, and the metaphorical *green banner* inscribes a positive attitude of appreciation: valuation as a symbol for environmental awareness.

Besides a negative attitude (appreciation: composition) inscribed lexically in *dry* in (7), targeting the potential consumer's skin, the advertiser's role as a friend helping the potential consumer by making the testing strips available to them additionally evokes a positive attitude of judgement: propriety targeting the advertiser. Moreover, by categorically referring to the level of skin dryness, hence not questioning the existence of the potential consumer's dry skin, the advertiser's familiarity with the potential consumer's problem evokes a positive attitude of judgement: capability targeting the manufacturer. The potential consumer's lack of awareness of the problem (having dry skin) further evokes a negative attitude of judgement: capability.

- (8) Try the *nation's favourite*. (*Marie Claire*, July, 2008)
- (9) *Every night*, remove your make-up with an **expert**. (*Marie Claire*, July, 2007)
- (10) Choose from a *black/chrome* or the **revolutionary new satin** steel finish that is **resistant** to finger marking. (*Red*, November, 2006)
- (11) Look up to 5 years **younger in a flash**. (*Eve*, February, 2005)
- (12) *Look and feel fabulous* this summer with the **stunning new** Bronzing & Illuminating collection from [...]<sup>13</sup>. (*Marie Claire*, January, 2007)

12 When reformulating the phrase *bridge back to normal* into, for example, *establishes/d normal sleeping pattern*, the inscribed attitude can easily be identified in *normal*.

13 Brand names and names of products are omitted to avoid recognition.





Commands in (8-12) inscribe positive attitudes lexically in *favourite* (likeability = affect:), *expert* (appreciation), *revolutionary*, *new*, *satın* and *resistant* (appreciation), *younger* and *in a flash* (appreciation), *fabulous* (appreciation/affect), *stunning* and *new* (appreciation) targeting mainly the product in terms of its characteristics, beneficial performance and effect.

Besides inscribing attitudes, these commands also evoke them. In (8), the inscribed attitude which is paired with the quantifier (*nation*) invites the potential consumer to try the widely-consumed product, hence evoking positive appreciation: valuation. In (9), the quantifier *every night* evokes positive appreciation: valuation towards a make-up cleansing routine, hence prescribing regular cleansing as a society norm. In the same command, the value of expertise is emphasized via the inscription (*expert*). In (10), the positive judgement: propriety is evoked on the basis of the advertiser's caring attempt to meet the potential consumer's individual needs (the possibility of choosing). In (11), the implication of insufficient youthfulness in the potential consumer via comparison evokes negative appreciation: reaction, whereby youth is introduced as an important value. In (12), the intensifying grader as a repetition of commands (*look and feel*) and qualities (*stunning new*) triggers positive appreciation: valuation targeting the product's efficiency and benefits.

Some commands evoke an attitude solely with the use of graduation, as in (13), where the quantifying grader *4 to 6 weeks* evokes positive appreciation: valuation targeting the product, hence emphasizing the value of the rapid results to which modern society aspires.

(13) See results in *4 to 6 weeks*. (*Marie Claire*, April, 2008)

### 5.3 Attitude-inscribed statements

As illustrated above, even though commands, as monoglossic propositions, occur frequently, the prevailing attitudinal monoglossic propositions are statements. Examples (14-16) show only inscribed attitudes, which are all positive appreciation, targeting the news and the product, grammatically realized as epithets (*good*, *beautiful*) and an attribute in a relational elliptical clause (*new*).

(14) That's the **good** news. (*Marie Claire*, April, 2007)

(15) It's a **beautiful** thing.<sup>14</sup> (*Marie Claire*, July, 2007)

---

14 Such monoglossic propositions are classified as 'asserts' in Lee's (2006) tripartite system of monoglossic propositions encompassing presupposition, fact and assert. For the purposes of this research, the division into monoglossic and heteroglossic propositions is sufficient, as the analysis focuses on the kinds of monoglossic propositions in terms of their evaluative properties as part of advertising persuasive agenda.







(16) **New.**<sup>15</sup> (*Marie Claire*, August, 2005)

Within the advertising context and based on the meaning of the idiom<sup>16</sup> (*cheap*<sup>17</sup> already inscribes an attitude of appreciation) in (17), the seemingly factual statement may evoke negative veracity, targeting other manufacturers' misleading promises about their products, whereas the manufacturers of the advertised product act to help.

(17) Talk is **cheap**. (*She*, January, 2005)

#### 5.4 Graduation-triggered attitudinal statements

The analysis shows that statements may use graduation not only to grade inscribed attitudes but also to evoke attitudes. All the examples below (18-23) inscribe at least one attitude, already intensified through infusion (*mad*, *unique*, *leading*) or/and comparison (*the best*). Additionally, other forms of grading with inscribed attitudes, such as the isolated comparison *as...as* in (21), the amount quantifier *all* in (22), and repetition in (23) can be found. In (20), the intensified positive appreciation *unique* targets the product through the matchless quality of its ingredient, thus also evoking negative appreciation of valuation targeting competing products. In (21), the simplicity of the solution to the problem (getting relief) inscribes positive appreciation: valuation targeting the product's performance, and the simplicity of the action inscribes positive appreciation: reaction targeting the act itself. In (22), the quantifier *all* not only upgrades the already intensified attitude of appreciation: valuation targeting supermarkets and pharmacies (*leading*), but also evokes positive valuation targeting the product's exclusivity by being sold only in the best locations, hence emphasizing exclusivity as an important value. In (23), the listing of three benefits in the same clause upgrades positive appreciation targeting the product, hence intensifying the value of the product's efficiency.

(18) A sane snack in a **mad** world. (*Marie Claire*, July, 2007)

(19) Attack is the **best** form of defence. (*Red*, November, 2006)

(20) The **unique** ingredient. (*She*, January, 2005)

(21) It's **as simple as** [...]. (*New Woman*, October, 2004)

(22) ... is available in **all leading** supermarkets and pharmacies. (*Marie Claire*, July, 2007)

(23) **Easy, quick** and **effective**. (*Marie Claire*, July, 2007)

15 In advertisements, due to the creative language, it frequently occurs that a monoglossic elliptical proposition consists of only one word, which is often evaluative.

16 *Talk is cheap* means that it is easier to talk about something than actually do it, which makes it difficult to believe that person.

17 Although clearly evaluative, the status of *cheap* varies depending on the context (e.g. a *cheap* product may inscribe a positive attitude).





As already mentioned, graduation does not occur only with inscriptions but may also evoke attitudes. In (24), the specificity<sup>18</sup> grader *allergy* specifies the kind of testing carried out by the manufacturer, hence evoking positive tenacity/propriety targeting them with regard to their cautious approach towards the potential consumer's safety. This also simultaneously implies a caring attitude on the part of the manufacturer. In (25), the quantifier of amount *all* helps evoke the negative judgement of veracity targeting competing manufacturers in terms of their misleading approach. In (26), the intensifier realized as a comparison *less than* evokes positive appreciation: valuation targeting the product's characteristic of using less fat, which is healthier, negative appreciation: valuation targeting the fat itself as a potentially unhealthy ingredient, as well as negative appreciation: valuation targeting competing products on the basis of their less healthy fat content.

(24) *Allergy* Tested. (*Marie Claire*, July, 2007)

(25) They're *all* retouched! (*Marie Claire*, July, 2007)

(26) *Less than 10%* fat. (*Marie Claire*, July, 2007)

As well as the use of one grader, statements also use multiple graders with the attitude-evoking potential. For example, although in (27) no direct attitudes are expressed, the quantifying graders *day 1*, *instantly*, *reduced* and *up to 36%* evoke positive appreciation: reaction and valuation targeting the product in terms of its rapid effect and wide range of benefits (length, depth and a number of reduced lines and wrinkles). Additionally, the reduction of lines and wrinkles evokes negative appreciation: valuation towards these two concepts, introducing them as undesirable in society and thus emphasizing the value of a youthful appearance. Moreover, wrinkle and line reduction evokes positive appreciation: composition targeting the skin structure as a result of the product's use. By the same token, in (28) the quantifier *7* and the intensifier realized as the comparison *different* evoke positive appreciation: valuation targeting the product in terms of its versatile capabilities, as well as positive judgement: capability targeting the manufacturer in terms of their innovative approach.

(27) *Day 1 Instantly, the length, depth and number of lines and wrinkles look reduced up to 36%*. (*Marie Claire*, August, 2005)

(28) Oven includes *7 different* functions. (*Red*, November, 2006)

---

18 According to Hood's (2004) extension of graduation in the appraisal model, specificity is one of the graders to grade the attitudes in focus on the basis of what is more or less specific. Since allergy testing can be reformulated into, for example, testing specifically for an allergy, allergy could be identified as a specificity grader.





As illustrated above, the multiplicity of attitudes evoked solely through graders is not a rare occurrence in monoglossic advertising statements. However, a more frequent attitude-evoking feature is the use of graders paired with attitudinal inscriptions, such as in (29), where the specificity graders *scientific* (also attitudinally inscribed) and the product's name, as well as the infused intensification in *rigorous* paired with the positive attitudinal inscriptions *checks* and *balances* (repetition) evoke positive judgement of capability, tenacity and propriety targeting the manufacturer in terms of their professional and cautious approach, and concern for the potential consumer's safety.

By the same token, in (30) and (31) inscriptions of positive appreciation: valuation encoded lexically in *enriched*, *key*, and *technology* target the product in terms of its beneficial performance and characteristics. Furthermore, in the same monoglossic statements, graders of repetition via the listing of the two valuable substances *Biotin* and *Vitamin C* evoke positive appreciation of valuation targeting the product in terms of its health-enhancing characteristics, while the specificity grader *Lacreation* evokes positive judgement of capability targeting the manufacturer in terms of their innovative approach based on the special technology with which the product is made. Additionally, the quantifying grader of extent *throughout the day*, the quantifying grader of amount *vitamins*, and the listing of the product's beneficial performance characteristics (*retains*, *stays in*) evoke three attitudes of positive appreciation: valuation targeting the product in terms of its effectiveness, lasting efficiency and healthy, vitamin rich content.

- (29) ... use a **scientific** manufacturing process with *rigorous checks* and **balances**. (*Marie Claire*, October, 2004)
- (30) ... **enriched** with **key** vitamins including *Biotin* and *Vitamin C* ... (*Real*, May, 2005)
- (31) They are made with **LACREON technology** containing an ingredient that *retains* moisture and *stays in* the lens *throughout the day*. (*Marie Claire*, August, 2005)

## 6 Conclusion

The paper illustrates that monoglossic propositions in advertising texts, despite their often neutral non-engaging expression, are nevertheless frequently interpersonally (and hence interactively) charged by using appraisal language, which creates evaluative meanings explicitly or implicitly through and around the advertised product/service). On the basis of the interplay of certain appraisal categories, context and co-text, with the (in)visible values, norms and beliefs that they carry and transmit to potential consumers, these attitudes may be recognized as important contributors to the persuasive rhetoric of advertisements. The analysis of appraisals in monoglossic





propositions with the application of Martin and White's appraisal model (2005) shows that advertisements express monoglossic propositions as non-attitudinal commands, attitudinal commands, attitude-inscribed statements, and graduation-triggered attitudinal statements. Moreover, as shown in the results, context and graders are indispensable to the identification of attitudes in monoglossic propositions, often producing a cluster of attitudes, which makes even at first glance attitudinally empty monoglossic propositions evaluative, hence interactive and socially-dynamic. To sum up, the analysis of appraisals in monoglossic propositions shows that monoglossic propositions in advertisements do, nevertheless, play a persuasive role through appraisal language despite their attempt to present the content objectively and informatively.

## References

- Arens, W. F. et al., *Contemporary Advertising*, Boston 2008.
- Bakhtin, M. M., *The Dialogical Imagination*, Austin 1981.
- Barnes, J. (ed.). *The Complete Works of Aristotle. The Revised Oxford Translation*, Princeton 1984.
- Beangstrom, T., Adendorff, R., An APPRAISAL analysis of the language of real estate advertisements, *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 31, 3, 2013, pp. 325-347.
- Chang, V. M. P., *Analysis of Stance in Two Interactive Mathematics Lessons*, [http://sigmaa.maa.org/rume/crume2008/Proceedings/Mesa%20LONG\(28\).PDF](http://sigmaa.maa.org/rume/crume2008/Proceedings/Mesa%20LONG(28).PDF) (Accessed 15 Jul. 2019).
- Chatterjee, M., *Textual engagement of a different kind? Bridging Discourse*: ASFLA 2007, Online Proceedings, Australia: Australian Systemic Functional Linguistics Association, 2008, pp.1-15.
- Economou, D., *Photos in the News: Appraisal Analysis of Visual Semiosis and Verbal-visual Intersemiosis*, Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Sydney 2009.
- Ertayas, P. C., *An Appraisal Analysis of Gossip news Texts written by Perez Hilton*, Masters Thesis, Faculty of Letters and Fine Arts of Sebelas Maret University 2011.
- Fryer, D. L., Exploring the dialogism of academic discourse: Heteroglossic Engagement in medical research articles, in: *English Corpus Linguistics: Variation in Time, Space and Genre* (eds. Andersen, G. and K. Bech), Amsterdam and New York 2015, pp.183-207.
- Halliday, M.A.K., *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London 1994.
- Harvey, L. *Social Research Glossary*, Quality Research International, 2012-2019. <https://www.qualityresearchinternational.com/socialresearch/csr.htm> (Accessed 20 Aug. 2019).
- Hood, S., Forey, G., Introducing a conference paper: Getting interpersonal with your audience, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4, 2005, pp. 291-306.
- Hood, S., *Appraising Research: Taking Stance in Academic Writing*, Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Sydney 2004.
- Jefkins, F. W., Yadin, D. *Advertising* (4th edition), Harlow 2000.
- Kozubikova Šandová, J., Intersubjective positioning in political and economic interviews, *Discourse and Interaction*, 2015, pp. 65-81.
- Križan, A., The language of appraisal in British advertisements: the construal of attitudinal judgement, *Elope* 13, 2, 2016a, pp.199-220.





- Križan, A., The social aspect of the discourse-semantic appraisal model in British advertisements: The category of attitude, *Jezikoslovlje* 17, 3, 2016b, pp. 643-665.
- Le, E., Gateways to the News: Headlines on Le Monde's Home Page and Front Page, *Discourse, Context & Media*, 2012, pp. 32-44.
- Lee, S. H., *The use of interpersonal resources in argumentative/persuasive essays by East-Asian ESL and Australian tertiary students*, Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Sydney 2006.
- Lee, S. H., Use of implicit intertextuality by undergraduate students: Focusing on Monogloss in argumentative essays, *Linguistics and the Human Sciences* 13, 1, 2017, pp. 150-178.
- Martin, J. R., Rose, D., *Working with Discourse: meaning beyond the clause*, London 2003.
- Martin, J. R., White, P. R. R., *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*, New York 2005.
- Miller, R. T. et al., Valued voices: Students' use of Engagement in argumentative history writing, *Linguistics and Education* 28, 2014, pp. 107-120.
- Perloff, R. M., *The dynamics of persuasion: communication and attitudes in the 21st century* (4th edition), New York and London 2010.
- Plemenitaš, K., Krajnc, Ž., Framed: A Study of Media Discourse, in: *Od jezika k filozofiji in nazaj: Festschrift ob 75-letnici Dunje Jutronić* (eds. Borstner, B., Onič, T. and S. Zupan), Maribor, 2019, pp. 13-30.
- Sheldon, E., Dialogic spaces of knowledge construction in research article conclusion sections written by English L1, English L2 and Spanish L1 writers, *Iberica* 35, 2018, pp. 13-40.
- Stevanović, M., Koski, S. E., Intersubjectivity and the domains of social interaction: proposal of a cross-sectional approach, *Psychology of Language and Communication* 22, 1, 2018, pp. 39-70.
- Thibault, P. J., Mood and Eco-Social Dynamics, in: *On Subject and Theme: A Discourse Functional Perspective* (eds. Hasan, R. and P. Fries), The Hague 1997, pp. 51-90.
- Thompson, G., *Introducing functional grammar* (2nd edition), London 2004.
- Trevisan, P., Tweeting 'engagement' Strategies of identity construction and 'alignment-disalignment' in Donald Trump's use of social media, *Lingue e Linguaggi* 28, 2018, pp.337-353.
- van Dijk, T.A., Ideology and Discourse Analysis, *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11, 2, 2006, pp. 115-140.
- Vega Garrido, M. E., *Characterizing level iv students' use of engagement resources in academic writing in English: an exploratory study from a systemic functional perspective*, Master's Thesis, Universidad del Norte 2017, <http://manglar.uninorte.edu.co/bitstream/handle/10584/8125/132793.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> (Accessed 19 Apr. 2019).
- Wells, D. et al., *Advertising: Principles & Practice*, New Jersey 2000.
- Vestergaard, T., Schroder, K., *The Language of Advertising*, Oxford 1985.
- White, P. R. R., Sano, M., Dialogistic positions and anticipated audiences - a framework for stylistic comparisons, in: *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast* (eds. Aijmer, K. and A. Simon-Vandenberg), Amsterdam 2006, pp. 189 - 214.
- White, P. R. R., *Telling Media Talks: The News Story as Rhetoric*, Unpub. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Sydney 1998.
- White, R., *Advertising*, London 2000.





## Sources

- Marie Claire* (October, 2004, p.407; August, 2005, pp.14, 37, 281; January, 2007, p.115; April, 2007, p.85; July, 2007, pp. 283, 262, 25, 183, 155, 275, 190, 183, 155; April, 2008, p.15)  
*She* (January, 2005, pp.56, 120, 43)  
*New Woman* (October, 2004, pp.199, 216)  
*Red* (November, 2006, pp.275, 201, 301, 201)  
*Eve* (June, 2004, p.41)  
*Real* (May, 2005, p.6)

Agata Križan

### **The persuasive mechanism of monoglossic propositions in advertisements**

**Keywords:** advertisements, monoglossic propositions, appraisal, persuasion, interpersonal

Bakhtin (1981, 427) does not regard bare assertions as simply neutral or factual, but as “undialogised” or “monoglossic”, and as such still not “free from subjective presencing of the speaker” (Thibault, 1997, 53). Based on such a view, in appraisal theory, monoglossic and heteroglossic propositions are defined as two discursive interpersonal choices for signalling the absence or presence of other voices within the category of engagement (Martin, White, 2005). Even though monoglossic propositions in advertisements apparently diminish their interpersonal and subjective value through undialogised positioning due to the absence of engagement elements, this value is nevertheless commonly increased by the highly evaluative nature of advertisements, which is often permeated by ideology. The paper identifies types of monoglossic propositions and investigates their evaluative charge in advertisements, which may contribute significantly to the overall persuasive rhetoric of advertisements, within the appraisal system (Martin, White, 2005).

Agata Križan

### **Prepričevalni mehanizem enoglasnih izjav v reklamnih oglasih**

**Ključne besede:** reklamni oglasi, enoglasne izjave, jezik vrednotenja, prepričevanje, medosebno

Bakhtin (1981, 427) golih trditev nima za preprosto nevtralne ali dejstvene, pač pa za »nedialogizirane« ali »enoglasne« in kot takšne še vedno neosvobodene subjektivne prisotnosti govorca (Thibault, 1997, 53). Na podlagi tega so v teoriji jezika vrednotenja enoglasne in mnogoglasne





izjave opredeljene kot dve diskurzni medosebni izbiri, ki pokažeta odsotnost ali prisotnost drugih glasov znotraj kategorije vključenosti (Martin, White, 2005). Čeprav enoglasne izjave v reklamnih oglasih očitno zmanjšajo svojo medosebno in subjektivno vrednost skozi nedialogiziran položaj zaradi odsotnosti elementov vključenosti, je ta vrednost kljub temu pogosto povečana zaradi visoke ocenjevalne narave reklamnih oglasov, ki je pogosto prežeta z ideologijo. Članek prepozna vrste enoglasnih izjav in razišče njihov ocenjevalni naboj v reklamnih oglasih, ki lahko znatno prispeva k vsesplošni prepričevalni retoriki reklamnih oglasov znotraj sistema vrednotenja (Martin, White, 2005).

## O avtorici

**Agata Križan** je zaposlena kot lektorica angleškega jezika na Filozofski fakulteti Univerze v Mariboru. Leta 2004 je magistrirala na področju poučevanja angleškega jezika na Univerzi v Birminghamu (VB) ter leta 2017 doktorirala iz angleškega jezika na Filozofski fakulteti Univerze v Mariboru. Na področju angleškega jezika se strokovno ukvarja z jezikom vrednotenja, jezikom v oglaševanju, diskurzno analizo in kritičnim branjem. S teh področij je objavila več znanstvenih in strokovnih člankov ter poglavij v monografijah.

## About the author

**Agata Križan** is employed as an English language lecturer at the Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor. In 2004 she received her master's degree in English language teaching from the University of Birmingham (UK) and in 2017 her doctorate in English from the Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor. She specializes in the language of evaluation, language in advertising, discourse analysis and critical reading. In these fields she has published several scientific and professional articles, as well as chapters in monographs.

