

‘You love the open road...’: Building identities and relationships in car advertising discourse

Christopher Hopkinson

Abstract

This paper addresses the construction of identities and relationships as a manipulative strategy in advertising discourse. Based on a corpus of British and Czech promotional brochures, the study applies an approach grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis, identifying ways in which text-producers attempt to create simulated identities for themselves and their readers. The author addresses the texts’ construction of virtual relationships between the addresser and the addressee in terms of positive and negative ‘face’. The study also discusses the extent to which the corpus reveals contrastive differences in strategies and discourse preferences between the British and Czech texts.

Keywords: advertising discourse, manipulation, mental models, Critical Discourse Analysis, communication strategies

1 Introduction and aims

Studies of advertising and media discourse grounded in the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis frequently focus on the ways in which these discourses create **identities** for their participants (i.e. both the addresser and the addressee) and construct real and/or virtual **relationships** between those participants. The present paper reports on a study of **advertising discourse** from one specific market – the automotive industry.

Advertising discourse is essentially **manipulative**, as its primary communicative intention is to positively influence the addressee’s perception of the products and companies being promoted and thus to achieve commercial gain. Addressers (i.e. the producers of advertising discourse) make use of a range of **communication strategies** in an attempt to

manipulate the addressee's perception; among the most effective are strategies of building identities and relationships.

This study reports on an analysis of a corpus of texts consisting of British and Czech commercial presentations by car manufacturers. The texts were taken from websites and brochures downloadable from the internet.

The analysis represents a continuation of the author's previous research – outlined in Hopkinson – which examined communication strategies used in commercial websites promoting food and drink producers. The **aims** of the present research were formulated in response to some of the tentative conclusions arrived at in the previous study, which are outlined in section 2. The primary aim of the present study was to map **core strategies of building identities and relationships** in a new set of data from a different sector of the economy (in this case, commercial presentations by carmakers). Secondly, the distribution of these strategies throughout the corpus was analyzed and compared with the previous (food and drink industry) data in order to determine whether any **contrastive differences** exist between the British and Czech subcorpora which may reflect cross-cultural differences in discourse preferences.

The present corpus was compiled in January 2010 and totals approximately 130,000 words. The data consists of 100 presentations of 50 cars produced by 13 European and Asian manufacturers. Each presentation of a particular car exists in two versions – one for the British market (on a UK website) and one for the Czech market – so the British and Czech subcorpora are directly comparable. The automotive industry was chosen mainly because of the international nature of the sector, which enables a direct comparison of two different ways of presenting exactly the same product.

While being large enough to yield potentially generalizable results, the corpus is also manageable enough in size to enable manual analysis to be undertaken. The analysis was primarily **qualitative**. However, simple quantifiable indicators of certain discourse tendencies were also taken into account wherever it proved to be practically possible. These **quantitative indicators** cannot capture the full complexity of the analyzed phenomena; nevertheless they represent a rough guide to certain properties of the discourse that are of relevance to the aims of the research.

2 Theoretical framework of the analysis

It has already been mentioned that advertising discourse is essentially **manipulative** in its intentions and strategies. Its ultimate goal is to manipulate the addressee's perception of the product, the producer, and the addressee him/herself.

Manipulative media discourse, and the strategies it uses to achieve its aims, have been studied extensively by researchers working within the paradigm of **Critical Discourse Analysis** – whether as part of research into media discourse in general (e.g. Fowler; Van Dijk, *Racism and the Press*; Fairclough, *Media Discourse*; Reisigl & Wodak), in studies of advertising discourse (e.g. Čmejrková; Cook on advertising in Czech and English respectively), or in studies devoted specifically to manipulation (e.g. two 2006 papers by Van Dijk). The present study applies essentially the same conceptual framework and analytical criteria as the research reported in Hopkinson. It draws on the concepts introduced and developed by the researchers listed above, which in turn are grounded

in a **Hallidayan systemic-functional framework** emphasizing the systemic and social elements of language use (e.g. Halliday).

Van Dijk (*Discourse and Manipulation*) has developed a **cognitive approach** to manipulative discourse based around the notion of **mental models** – that is, the models of the communicated reality and the communicative situation which the discourse activates (or attempts to activate) in the minds of its addressees. In order to manipulate their readers, the producers of advertising texts attempt to 'plant' in the reader's mind mental models both of the **product** (emphasizing its positive qualities) and of the roles and identities of the two main participants in the discourse – the **producer** of the product and/or the text¹, and the **reader**². Producers thus attempt to align the reader's mental models with **target mental models** that are compatible with the producer's interests. In Van Dijk's words: "Given the fundamental role of mental models in speaking and understanding, manipulation may be expected to especially target the formation, activation and uses of mental models [...] If manipulators are aiming for receivers to understand a discourse as *they* see it, it is crucial that the receivers form the mental models the manipulators want them to form [...]" (*Discourse and Manipulation* 367)

From the 1990s onwards, Van Dijk has developed a distinction between two types of mental models. Firstly there are '**semantic models**'. Van Dijk defines a semantic model as "a subjective representation of the events or situation that discourse is *about*." (*Discourse, Context and Cognition* 169) This type of mental model corresponds to Fairclough's category of '**representations**' – the ways in which a discourse conceptualizes and represents the reality it describes (Fairclough, *Media Discourse* 5). Secondly there are '**context models**' (also termed 'pragmatic models' by Van Dijk), which are explained as "subjective definitions of events or situations, but in this case not of the situation we talk *about* but the situation *in which* we now participate when we engage in talk or text. That is, contexts are the participants' mental models of communicative situations." (Van Dijk, *Discourse, Context and Cognition* 170) This type of mental model corresponds to Fairclough's concepts of '**identities**' and '**relationships**' (*Media Discourse* 5). Any discourse of this type will attempt to shape the reader's perception (i.e. the reader's mental models) of his/her own identity, as well as the identity of the producer. Inseparably connected with this notion of identity is that of the (virtual) producer-reader relationship which the discourse attempts to construct.

This study deals with mental models of two main types:

a) Mental models involving the **identity of the producer** – both in terms of the persona adopted by the producer (e.g. an expert or a friendly advisor) and in terms of the producer's (virtual) relationship with the reader – a relationship that may be modelled as being distant or close, formal or familiar. These are Van Dijk's '**context models**' – i.e. mental models of the communicative situation in which the participants are involved – and as such they correspond broadly with Halliday's **interpersonal component** of language.

b) Mental models involving the **identity of the reader** in relation to the product. The discourse frequently positions the reader not merely as the potential consumer of the product, but as the actual owner of the car, constructing a potential identity for the reader based on this (virtual) ownership. In this case, the mental models do not concern the reader's identity as a participant in the communicative situation; instead they construct an identity based on the discourse's representation of the reality described. As such, they

correspond with Van Dijk's '**semantic models**' and primarily involve Halliday's **ideational component** of language.

The manipulation of these two types of mental models belongs among the core communication strategies in advertising discourse, and forms the main subject of the present paper. Previous research on this subject by the present author (focusing on internet presentations from the food and drink industry) found that the Czech commercial websites more often backgrounded the reader in the discourse, creating a more **impersonal tenor**, whereas the British websites more frequently foregrounded the reader, attempting to draw the reader into the discourse and simulate a relationship based on **familiarity and mutuality**. As a potential explanation for this contrastive difference, it was suggested that the observed difference may be due to the **generic instability** of commercial websites, which may be drifting away from a more objective, informational type of discourse towards the generic properties of advertising proper; it was hypothesized that this process may be more advanced in the British discourse community than in the Czech community (Hopkinson 32–33).

The present paper uses essentially the same conceptual framework and analytical criteria as the author's previous research outlined above, but applies them to discourse from a different sector of the economy – the car industry. It aims to expand and build on the previous research in an attempt to reveal similarities and differences between the discourse preferences and manipulative strategies used in presentations from two different discourse communities (the UK and the Czech Republic) and two different sectors of the economy.

The following three sections of this paper (sections 3–5) present the results of the corpus analysis with regard to the two main types of mental models outlined above. The construction of **producer-identities** is examined in section 4, while **reader-identities** form the subject of section 5. However, before moving on to discuss these two core strategies of manipulation, section 3 first deals with the producer's options for the **linguistic encoding** of the three main entities represented in the text (producer, product, reader), touching on the strategic implications of the producer's choices.

3 The linguistic encoding of entities in the discourse

At the heart of advertising discourse are three entities: the producer, the product, and the reader (addressee). A key aspect of the manipulation outlined in the previous section is the text-producer's choice of how each of these three entities should be encoded in the discourse. This involves the decision as to which of the entities should be represented in the text, and how they should be encoded linguistically.

3.1 Encoding the producer and the product

On one 'side' of the communicative situation are two closely related entities – the producer and the product. When constructing a presentation, the text-producer is faced with the option of giving greater prominence to one or the other entity, or giving equal prominence to both.

In some presentations, the producer is entirely or almost entirely backgrounded in favour of the product, which is strongly foregrounded. The producer is thus implicitly

present, though not explicitly encoded in the text. For example, one presentation consists entirely of product descriptions such as

- (1) *A car that combines refined elegance and top-flight performance with impeccable control and unequalled safety [...] (Alfa Romeo GT)*³

The only explicit mention of the producer in the presentation cited above is the brand name attached to the product. In other presentations, the text foregrounds processes but backgrounds agency. The producer is the implicit agent, concealed behind the process. In both English and Czech texts, this is mainly realized via passive structures:

- (2) *Inside, every piece of technology, every new feature, has been examined and the learnings gleaned from a variety of different industries applied to them. The result is a car that's as innovative as it is chic. (Ford Fiesta)*

In strategic terms, this **backgrounding of the producer** may be explained as part of an attempt to focus the reader's attention entirely on the product, without the potential distraction of the producer's presence in the text.

However, other presentations choose to foreground both the product and the producer. The producer is typically encoded in **exclusive 'we'** forms. This can be seen as the default encoding option in the corpus:

- (3) *Vorsprung durch Technik isn't a slogan. It's **our** way of seeing the world. It is the driving force behind **our** history of innovation that continues into the 21st century. Indeed, many technologies that Audi pioneered remain in **our** cars today. (Audi A3)*⁴

Occasionally, **inclusive 'we'** forms are used with the intention of drawing the reader into the discourse and creating a bond between the producer and the reader based on shared membership of an **in-group**. This represents an attempt to manipulate the reader's mental model of the producer's identity, to position the producer as a partner of the reader, with both participants involved in a relationship based on mutuality and sharing. In the following example, the text shifts from exclusive 'we' to the most universal type of inclusive 'we' – that based on membership of the same species:

- (4) *We have continually strived to look at ways of making engines that are cleaner and more efficient. But there's one piece of advanced machinery **we all have** that can help with fuel economy, and that's **our brains**. (Honda Civic Hybrid)*

Alternatively, the in-group membership may be based on shared lifestyle:

- (5) *As **we spend more and more time in our cars**, being comfortable is essential. (Škoda Fabia)*

The use of this inclusive 'we' encoding is entirely marginal in both the English and Czech subcorpora; exclusive 'we' dominates throughout.

The foregrounding or backgrounding of the product and the producer does not always remain stable throughout a single presentation. The text-producer may alternate between product-orientation and producer-orientation to achieve certain strategic goals; this involves not merely the selection of options from a paradigm, but also a **syntagmatic** dimension. A particularly common strategic shift is from product-orientation to producer-orientation at points in the text when potentially emotive issues – such as safety or the environment – are discussed. All three of the following examples are taken from presentations in which the

producer is otherwise entirely backgrounded in favour of the product. However, when an emotive issue is raised, the producer seizes the opportunity to step into the discourse and take centre stage:

- (6a) *And we've thought of your children's safety too and provided a three-point rear seat attachment for Isofix child seats.* (Alfa Romeo 159)
- (6b) *Child safety is as important to us as it is to you.* (Citroën C3)
- (6c) *At Mitsubishi Motors we believe everyone can contribute to a cleaner environment, including us.* (Mitsubishi Colt)

This shift of orientation – suddenly drawing attention to the previously backgrounded producer – represents an attempt to manipulate the reader's mental models of the producer's identity by presenting the company as caring and considerate, thus promoting a positive corporate image.

This syntagmatic strategy of orientation-shifting can not only be used to shift the reader's attention *to* one of the entities in the discourse, but may also divert attention *away from* an entity instead. The following example is taken from a presentation in which the product is otherwise strongly foregrounded throughout. However, when the text turns to the issue of breakdowns, the orientation suddenly shifts away from 'it' (the car) and instead focuses on 'you' (the reader/consumer):

- (7) *Every Škoda is covered by Škoda Roadside Assistance. So **if you break down**, even if **you**'re on holiday or on business in Europe, **you** can use the freephone number to call someone to come and help **you**.* (Škoda Octavia)

In strategic terms, this represents a subtle attempt to divert the reader's attention away from the possibility that the product may be unreliable, by conceptualizing the central entity in the breakdown situation not as the car (i.e. 'if the car breaks down') but as the driver ('if you break down').

In some cases, the discourse co-opts other voices to speak on behalf of the producer. Typically these third parties are the voices of customers (whether authentic or fictitious) who have bought the product and are satisfied with their ownership experience:

- (8a) *"I'm proud of my Colt. It's stylish, distinctive and sporty – full of character!"* (Mitsubishi Colt)
- (8b) *"The interior is beautiful and original, more comfortable than I ever could have imagined."* (Alfa Romeo MiTo)
- (8c) *"It's as if this little Alfa, glued to the road, showed me the way, recovering in situations where I really thought it wasn't possible. Great! Nice one Alfa!"* (Alfa Romeo MiTo)

These co-opted voices tend to be graphically separated from the main text, located on the periphery of the page or screen and featuring different colours and fonts. They also tend to adopt a more informal and expressive tenor than the main text (e.g. via the use of exclamation marks, as in two of the examples above), providing a more emotional evaluation of the product as a counterpoint to the main text's more technical, expert discourse. In strategic terms, the juxtaposition of two different voices – one more technical and one

more emotional – represents an attempt to appeal to the reader on two different levels at the same time.

3.2 Encoding the reader

On the other 'side' of the communicative situation, opposite the producer and the product, is the reader (addressee). The reader is usually encoded in the text either explicitly via second-person forms, or implicitly via speech acts implying the reader's presence in the discourse (challenges, recommendations, rhetorical questions, invitations, and so on). Typically, the reader is positioned either as being the potential owner of the car, or as the owner already:

- (9) *The Accord cockpit has been designed to enhance your driving experience. It's the combination of comfort and ergonomic design that allows you to concentrate on what's important – the road.* (Honda Accord)

This encoding of the reader-as-consumer exemplifies the technique of **synthetic personalization** (e.g. Fairclough, *Language and Power* 52): although the addressee is a mass audience, the producer attempts to create the illusion that each individual reader is being addressed personally. In strategic terms, the foregrounding of the reader/consumer represents an attempt to draw the reader into the discourse by suggesting that he/she has a stake in it – thus creating involvement and holding the reader's interest.

It has been noted above (when discussing examples 6 and 7) that the text's orientation may shift from the product to the producer, or from the product to the reader/consumer, in order to achieve certain strategic goals. This syntagmatic strategy also applies to the text's representation of the reader/consumer. For example, a second-person encoding of the reader/consumer may shift to a third-person encoding when unpleasant or worrying topics are discussed. This is shown in the following example, which is taken from a presentation consisting of a set of texts in which the reader/consumer is otherwise consistently encoded as 'you'. However, when the subject of accidents is broached, the encoding suddenly shifts to the third person:

- (10) *In the event of an accident, the pedals retract to reduce potential injury to **the driver's** feet and ankles. [...] The steering column absorbs the impact of any collision, and collapses away from **the driver** into the dashboard which can substantially reduce the likelihood of injuries.* (Ford Focus)

In strategic terms, this shift represents a subtle attempt not to draw the reader in to the discourse, but rather to do the opposite: to temporarily distance the reader from the worrying scenario described in the text and thus to prevent the reader from associating ownership of the product with personal experience of such scenarios.

The **distribution** of these encoding choices throughout the corpus can be quantified by counting the number of presentations (out of a total of 50 in each language) which feature >2 explicit encodings of the three entities discussed above. This is admittedly quite a crude measure, nevertheless it does provide a rough indication of which encoding strategies are more universal and which are more culture-specific or peripheral.

Table 1 Explicit encodings of entities in the discourse

encoding type	number of presentations featuring >2 occurrences of the particular encoding type	
	British corpus (N = 50)	Czech corpus (N = 50)
explicit encoding of product ('it'-orientation)	50	50
explicit encoding of producer ('we'-orientation)	30	23
explicit encoding of reader/consumer ('you'-orientation)	48	42

Unsurprisingly, all of the presentations featured explicit encoding of the product. The explicit encoding of the reader/consumer in the discourse ('you'-orientation) was also strongly represented, and can be viewed as a core strategy in the corpus examined here. The explicit encoding of the producer ('we'-orientation), though far from being a peripheral phenomenon, is less frequent. The corpus also reveals a slight contrastive difference in discourse preferences between the British presentations and their Czech counterparts; the lower frequency of 'we' and 'you' encodings in the Czech texts suggests that the Czech discourse is somewhat less pseudo-interactive and somewhat more impersonal in its tenor. This tendency is in accordance with a similar tendency revealed in the author's previous research into promotional texts from the food and drink industry. Nevertheless, due to the relatively small size of the sample in the present research, this should be regarded as a tentative conclusion only.

4 Producer-identity and virtual producer-reader relationships

A central process in the manipulation of the reader's mental models is the construction of an identity for the producer – both in terms of the persona adopted by the producer and in terms of the producer's (virtual) relationship with the reader. The subject of manipulation here are Van Dijk's '**context models**' – i.e. the reader's 'pragmatic' mental models of the communicative situation in which the participants are involved. As such, this type of manipulation involves primarily Halliday's **interpersonal component** of language use.

This section first examines the ways in which text-producers project their own identities ('voices') into the discourse, and then moves on to discuss the text's simulation of a relationship between the producer and the reader.

4.1 Constructing a producer 'voice'

The term 'voice' is used here in Fairclough's sense, to refer to the **persona** of the text-producer as projected into the text and forming part of the producer's self-representation. Fairclough (*Media Discourse* 128 ff.) shows how radio presenters adopt a particular voice or persona in order to achieve the strategic goals of their discourse. The persona may be that of an expert, or the presenter may play the role of an 'ordinary bloke' (ibid. 137) in order to position himself closer to his audience. The same principle applies to the producers of commercial presentations. The present author's previous research focusing on

presentations from the food and drink industry found that the default voice of the producer was simply that of the enthusiastic manufacturer, but that other voices were also adopted; the producer may also play the role of a friend, an advisor, a guide, an expert, a host, and so on (Hopkinson 34–37).

The range of producer-voices in the car industry texts examined here is narrower, being essentially limited to **two personas**: a default voice and a more familiar voice posing as a friend or acquaintance of the reader.

The **default voice** exists in isolation, making no reference to the existence of the reader/consumer. As in the texts from the food and drink industry, here too the producer simply plays the role of the enthusiastic and competent manufacturer creating the product:

- (11) *We're working to use less fuel, release less CO2 and waste less energy. It's why we've incorporated a number of more efficient technologies into the Audi A3.*

In order to shape readers' perception of the producer, the texts frequently **personalize or emotionalize** this default producer-voice by presenting it as the holder of opinions or the experiencer of emotions. This may help to soften and humanize what might otherwise be a rather faceless corporate image:

- (12a) *Why reducing CO2 emissions makes us really happy [...] At Honda, we see a challenge, where others see a problem. (Honda Civic Hybrid)*
 (12b) *At Honda we love challenges. It makes us think differently and it produces innovative solutions [...] (Honda Civic)*

The other type of voice adopted by the producer in the corpus texts goes beyond this default role and is more **familiar** in tenor, with the producer posing as an acquaintance or friend of the reader. Unlike the default voice, this more familiar voice does not exist independently; it always acknowledges or implies the presence of the other participant in the discourse – the reader/consumer. The strategic goal of this voice is to 'plant' in the reader's mind the mental model of a reader-producer relationship based on trust, confidence and good will. As part of this strategy, the producer may claim or imply knowledge of the reader's lifestyle:

- (13) *When you arrive home after an enjoyable night out, flash the left stalk and the headlights will stay on for a short while, illuminating the way to your door. (Ford Fiesta)*

The use of this familiar voice may also involve the implication that the producer and the reader share a certain experience. In the following example, it is implied that the situation in question (i.e. not having enough room in your car to fit in everything you want to take) is well known to both participants:

- (14) *Imagine not having to decide what to leave behind. Colt has plenty of space for you and everything you need to take with you. (Mitsubishi Colt)*

These two producer-voices frequently alternate within the text of a single presentation, allowing the producer to project a dual persona – competent and professional, yet at the same time approachable.

4.2 Constructing a virtual producer-reader relationship

The choice of the producer's persona has clear implications for the nature of the virtual producer-reader relationship that is simulated by the discourse. The construction of such relationships is a central communication strategy employed by the producers of commercial texts, who frequently attempt to manipulate the reader's mental models in order to 'plant' the existence of a certain type of relationship in his/her mind. This strategy has two main goals. Firstly it is part of the attempt to engage and hold the reader's attention by suggesting that the reader is genuinely involved in the discourse as a party in a potentially reciprocal relationship with the producer. Secondly, the construction of a positive relationship helps to reinforce the positive image of the producer in the reader's mind, thus making the reader more likely to accept the producer's claims and suggestions.

Two key aspects of this relationship-constructing strategy will be discussed in the following paragraphs: firstly producers' attempts to simulate reciprocal communication between the two participants, and secondly the way in which the discourse positions these two participants in a relationship which is either close or distant, familiar or formal.

4.2.1 Simulating reciprocity

Commercial presentations involve one-way monologic communication from producer to reader, with no direct face-to-face contact. However, as part of their attempt to construct a virtual producer-reader relationship, text-producers employ a range of means to create the illusion of interactive communication between the two participants. This corresponds with Fairclough's observation of a general trend towards **conversationalization** in mass media discourse (*Media Discourse* 9 ff.).

A central means of suggesting that the reader is involved in personal communication with the producer is the use of **pseudo-reciprocal speech acts** performed by the persona of the producer and directed at the reader. These speech acts fall into two main types: questions and invitations.

Rhetorical **questions** frequently play a text-structuring role, functioning as **structural cues** for the presentation of information which poses as the 'answer' to the question. A form typically associated with interactivity (the question) is thus co-opted in order to simulate a dialogic exchange:

- (15) So you've read a little about some of the Fabia's features, but what else do you need to know? Well, it's available in hatchback, estate and the fuel efficient, low CO₂ emitting GreenLine.

This structural feature is often used to frame **problem-solution** patterns; the producer first introduces the problem, then offers a solution:

- (16a) *So having all this space is great, but how are you going to load it all in? How about doors that open almost 90 degrees for easy access? At Honda we understand that answers sometimes come from asking the right questions. (Honda Civic)*
- (16b) *In a hurry? Put your trust in the Carminat TomTom navigation system. (Renault Clio)*

A second function of rhetorical questions is to imply that the producer and the reader share the same views, to **simulate consensus** between the two participants. Often the 'answer' is left unstated, though it is clearly implicit in the discourse:

- (17) *Would you put a part into your Audi that wasn't the same quality as the factory fitted original? You can rest assured that only Audi Genuine Parts will be used on your vehicle. (Audi A3)*

However, the 'answer' may also be stated explicitly, confirming that the producer and the reader are of the same mind:

- (18) *Zdá se Vám povrchní, je-li kladen důraz na zevnějšek? **Nám také.** Proto se pod plně pozinkovanou karoserií nového vozu Polo skrývá skutečný charakter. [Do you think that it's superficial when emphasis is placed on external appearances? **So do we.** That's why real character is hidden under the new Polo's fully galvanized body.] (VW Polo)*

In addition to questions, **invitations** are the other main type of pseudo-reciprocal speech act that is used in an attempt to simulate interaction between the producer and the reader. These usually take the form of imperatives:

- (19a) *Set change in motion. Drive the evolution. There are many roads to the future. Choose yours. (Fiat Punto)*
- (19b) *Feel every movement. Experience full-on performance. Measure quality by attention to detail. Appreciate the bespoke craftsmanship. See precision as a way of life. [...] (Renault Laguna)*

Invitations may also be formulated as questions:

- (20) *So now the introduction's over, why not have a look at the Fabia in a little more detail? (Škoda Fabia)*

The **distribution** of these pseudo-reciprocal speech acts throughout the corpus can be quantified by counting the number of presentations (out of a total of 50 in each language) which feature speech acts of the types outlined above (examples 15–20). Like the data in Table 1, this too is a relatively crude measure, as the concentration of pseudo-reciprocal features in texts varies between presentations, being denser in some and sparser in others.

Nevertheless, even this simple count serves to provide a rough indication of the extent to which the strategy is represented across the entire corpus:

Table 2 Number of presentations featuring pseudo-reciprocal speech acts

British corpus (N = 50)	Czech corpus (N = 50)
37	29

Although the majority of both the British and Czech presentations make at least some use of these rhetorical devices, their lower frequency in the Czech texts suggests that the Czech discourse is somewhat less pseudo-interactive and more impersonal in its tenor. This tendency accords with similar tendencies observed when discussing the data in Table 1. It also tallies with the results of the author's previous research as outlined above.

4.2.2 Closeness or distance in virtual relationships: positive and negative 'face'

The second main aspect of relationship-constructing strategies to be discussed at this point is the way in which the discourse positions the two participants in a relationship which is either close or distant, familiar or formal.

The producer-reader relationship can be conceptualized on the basis of the notion of *face*, which has found wide application in pragmatic approaches to language (e.g. Brown & Levinson, Scollon & Scollon). While some discourse attempts to construct a virtual relationship based on the reader's **positive face** wants (involving mutuality, closeness and sharing), other discourse displays a preference for **negative face** (i.e. emotionally neutral relationships based on non-intrusion into the private space of others); this distinction could also be conceptualized (as by Scollon & Scollon) as **involvement face** and **independence face** respectively. Both types of relationship have certain strategic advantages in commercial presentations such as those examined in this study. A virtual relationship based on negative face respects the reader's privacy and avoids the intrusiveness of positive-face discourse, which could potentially irritate the reader. However, a relationship based on positive face can also offer potential advantages: it can 'plant' in the reader's mind the mental model of a reader-producer relationship based on trust, confidence and good will, which may make the reader more predisposed to accept the producer's claims.

The focus in the following paragraphs is on ways in which producers construct **virtual relationships based on positive face**. (Negative-face discourse, by contrast, is based on the non-use of the techniques and features discussed below.)

Text-producers use a variety of means to simulate relationships based on positive face, mutuality and familiarity. Some of these means have been discussed above: e.g. the **pseudo-reciprocal speech acts** (examples 15–20). In addition, producers may make various claims which imply personal knowledge of and familiarity with the reader's views, experiences, reactions, desires, or personality.

Familiarity (and agreement) with the reader's **views** is implied by the texts cited as examples 17 and 18 above. These examples use rhetorical questions addressed to the reader and prompting an answer that is in accordance with the producer's stated or implied views. Related to this technique are cases when the producer makes general value-statements that

invite agreement from the reader; this is part of an attempt to bring the reader on-side and create consensus between the two participants:

- (21) ***Driving should be a blast. Motoring is there to be enjoyed.***
And in your Mazda MX-5, heart-racing excitement and wind-in-your-hair exhilaration is all but guaranteed.

Producers also construct texts which imply that the two participants share the same **experiences** – as in example 14 above. A frequent linguistic realization of this technique is the use of demonstratives to signal that the experience described is well known to both participants:

- (22) *There's best-in-class visibility at both the front and rear, improving general driving safety and making **those** awkward reverse parks a thing of the past. [...] We've reduced road noise to a minimum, so there's no need to squirm and grit your teeth when faced with **that** pending section of harsh motorway concrete.* (Mazda 3)

The producer may also claim to know and be able to predict the reader's **reactions**:

- (23) *One glance at its impressive lines and the dynamic qualities of the Focus are immediately apparent. Gaze at it for a few seconds longer and you will appreciate the meticulously crafted details and innovative design flourishes.* (Ford Focus)

This technique is frequently realized via the use of ambiguous second-person forms that could be interpreted either as a genuine mode of address aimed at the reader, or as generic 'you' forms:

- (24) *Something strange happens when **you** sit inside the Citroën C5 – **you** feel excited and relaxed, all at once. [...] It's a pleasantly thrilling sensation. Controlled power. **Your** heart wants to pump. **Your** head wants to control. So the Citroën C5 pays equal homage to both.*

The producer may also claim to know the reader's personal **desires**:

- (25) *You've always wanted a roadster. A two-seater. The driving exhilaration that goes with it. And now, you can experience it all with the convenience of a power-folding hardtop. Introducing the Mazda MX-5 Roadster Coupe.*

– or to know the reader's **personality**:

- (26) *On the one hand you relish adventure – you appreciate the joy of an open road and the lure of an empty track. On the other hand you acknowledge the practical side of life – the frequent, sometimes tedious need to transport a number of people and varying amounts of kit from point A to point B as safely as possible.* (Mitsubishi Outlander)

In addition to pseudo-reciprocal speech acts and claims implying personal knowledge of and familiarity with the reader's life, text-producers may reinforce the simulation of a

positive-face relationship by using stylistic features associated with **orality** or informal face-to-face communication:

- (27) *Whereas other cars of this size can feel, **well**, a bit dull, the Mazda6 knows exactly what it means to have a great time.*

Elements of **humour** can also be deployed in an attempt to simulate a relaxed, familiar relationship. These may be based on wordplay, often involving a clash between literal and metaphorical meanings:

- (28a) *But what would these cutting-edge safety measures be without you having an uninterrupted view of the road lying ahead? Our new windscreen wiper system with three wash jets will make sure of that. Covering 20% more of your windscreen and proven to work like clockwork at high speeds and in temperatures below 0°C. **All clear?** Perfect. (Seat Ibiza)*
- (28b) *Nový Golf **sahá po hvězdách a získal jich pět**: V nárazovém testu EuroNCAP dosahuje nejlepší Golf všech dob příkladných výsledků. [The new Golf **reaches for the stars and has won five of them**: in the EuroNCAP crash test the best Golf of all time achieved exemplary results. – i.e. a ‘5-star’ rating in the crash test] (VW Golf)*

Due to the complexity of the concepts of positive and negative face, the **distribution** of positive vs. negative face-based relationships in the corpus cannot be reliably determined using objective and precise quantitative methods. Given the large number of contributory factors, it is not methodologically viable simply to count and statistically analyze selected linguistic indicators that determine, for example, whether a British presentation displays a stronger orientation towards a positive-face relationship than its Czech counterpart presentation. For this reason, any such comparative judgement necessarily involves a degree of subjectivity. Nevertheless, this does not render a contrastive approach entirely invalid; while acknowledging the methodological flaws and limitations outlined above, a subjective but informed judgement is still capable of offering general insights and providing a rough indication of differences in discourse preferences between the British and Czech presentations. Each of the 50 English presentations was therefore compared with its Czech counterpart and a judgement was made in each case as to whether there was a noticeable difference in the level of positivity or negativity of face.

Table 3: British vs. Czech presentations: positivity / negativity of face in the relationship constructed by the discourse
N = 50

British presentation displays more positive face than its counterpart	no noticeable difference in face	Czech presentation displays more positive face than its counterpart
16	31	3

In over half of the presentation pairs, there was no noticeable difference in the relationship constructed by the British and Czech discourse. Where there was a discernable difference in face, it was mainly the British presentations that displayed a more positive face-based relationship. These results are in accordance with the general tendency already

observed in the present paper and in previous research (Hopkinson); namely that the Czech discourse is more impersonal in tenor, whereas the British discourse displays a stronger preference for pseudo-reciprocity and the construction of producer-reader relationships based on simulated mutuality and closeness.

5 The identity of the reader/consumer

Whereas the previous section has examined strategies for constructing identities of the producer (including the producer's role in the virtual relationship between the two participants), this section now turns to discuss the ways in which commercial presentations attempt to manipulate the reader's mental models of his/her own identity, shaping the reader's self-image.

In the commercial presentations examined here, the reader's identity is primarily defined by **association with the product**. For example, the discourse frequently positions the reader not merely as the potential consumer of the product, but as the actual owner of the car:

(29) *Take time to admire your new Polo.*

– and attempts to plant in the reader's mind a mental model of a potential identity based on this virtual ownership. Alternatively, the discourse may characterize (in glowingly positive terms) the type of person who owns a particular car, explicitly or implicitly inviting the reader to join the **in-group** of owners. This technique involves an appeal to the reader's ego: the reader can acquire a desirable potential identity by associating him/herself with the product:

(30) *For those who love undiluted Italian spirit. For those who long to travel for the pleasure of it. For those who are always looking for a great deal. For those who hate compromises. For those who want to do their bit for the environment. For those who fancy something uniquely cool. For those with a weakness for beautiful things... (Fiat Panda)*

As has been noted earlier, these mental models do not concern the reader's identity as a participant in the communicative situation – e.g. as a party in the producer-reader relationship. Instead, they create an identity based on the discourse's representation of the reader/consumer as part of the reality described. As such, they correspond with Van Dijk's '**semantic models**' and primarily involve Halliday's **ideational component** of language.

The construction of the reader/consumer's identity involves two main mechanisms: firstly the metonymic transfer of attributes between the product and the consumer, and secondly the encoding of the product and the consumer in terms of their semantic roles. Each of these mechanisms is now discussed in turn.

5.1 Metonymic transfer of attributes

A key technique for constructing reader/consumer-identity is the metonymic transfer of attributes (in the semantic sense of the term 'attribute'). Metonymy is based on a relationship of contiguity between two entities – in this case the product and the reader/consumer. Frequently in advertising discourse, positive associations or intangible attributes of the product are symbolically transferred to its consumers, or vice versa. The consumer's

identity is thus defined by his/her choice of car, or the car is defined by the type of people who drive it. This strategy is particularly prevalent in automotive industry advertising because cars are frequently presented not merely as practical tools, but as lifestyle accessories which reveal something about their owners' personality.

The identity of the consumer may be expressed simply and **overtly** in the text, as in example 30 above. In some cases, a parallel is drawn between a positive personality trait of the car's owners and a similarly positive attribute of the car (in the following example, their understated style):

- (31) *Do you prefer the labels to be discreetly inside your clothes? Mondeo drivers seldom rely on others for reassurance, they instinctively know when something is right. The elegant, muscular exterior and well-equipped interior are designed with uncompromising quality, but they aren't designed to draw attention for attention's sake.* (Ford Mondeo)

A related technique involves the **personification** of the product, which is described as possessing human qualities that mirror those of its owners:

- (32a) ***Fun and rebellious**, this model is aimed at those who aren't afraid to stand out from the crowd and change the rules.* (Fiat Punto)
(32b) *A **thoughtful** vehicle. Designed for thoughtful people.* (Honda CR-V)

Alternatively, the transfer of attributes may take place more **covertly**, without direct reference to the identity of the consumer. Instead, the car is presented as the embodiment of an abstract concept (such as sophistication or style), and this quality is then implicitly transferred to its owners, setting up a desirable potential identity which the reader can 'buy into'. Again, the technique of **personification** is frequently used in order to reinforce the potential transfer of human-like qualities from the car to its consumers:

- (33a) *A **temperament** already evident in the front-end with its **bold** shield [...] The elegant **personality** of a luxury saloon is reflected in the generous space available to the driver and passengers [...] a refined sporting **spirit** [...]* (Alfa Romeo GT)
(33b) *Viewed from any direction, Lancer is **broad-chested**, low slung and **muscular**. There is nothing superfluous, no design for design's sake, just an extremely purposeful and attractive car that looks **born** for the open road.* (Mitsubishi Lancer)

Whereas example 33a implicitly transfers **personality features** to the consumer of the car, example 33b also focuses on **physical features**. This technique of personification may also involve the construction of a **gender identity** for the product (and by extension, for the reader/consumer). Example 33b clearly appeals to a male target readership with its emphasis on macho qualities. By contrast, the following example (33c) is based on stereotypically feminine attributes. In both 33b and 33c, the personification of the product is subtly underlined by the omission of the definite article. The unmarked form 'the Lancer'

or 'the Clio' becomes 'Lancer' or 'Clio', thus appropriating a form of naming typically associated with animate referents:

- (33c) *Clio arrives, oozing class. A flash of sunlight outlines the elegant silhouette, the purposeful shoulders, those streamlined headlights. Clean contours cut through the air gracefully.* (Renault Clio)

5.2 Encoding of the consumer and the product in terms of semantic roles

Another important mechanism for the construction of reader/consumer-identity is the encoding of the consumer and the product in terms of their semantic roles. Both entities can be conceptualized by the discourse as playing certain semantic roles in relation to each other. Of particular relevance here are the roles of **agent**, **patient** and **instrument**, and the linguistic encoding of these roles and their holders through the system of **transitivity** (in the Hallidayan sense of the term). This assignation of semantic roles is related to the overall perspectivization of the text – i.e. the text-level decision to foreground or background certain ways of encoding the described reality.

The text-producer essentially has a choice between two opposite poles, which may be termed 'strategic perspectivizations': the agent role may be assigned either to the consumer or to the product. If the consumer is encoded as the agent (typically realized as the subject of the sentence), then the underlying 'ideology' (to apply a term from Critical Discourse Analysis) is one in which the consumer has control over the situation described by the text. This strategic choice of encoding can be termed '**consumer-perspectivization**'. At the heart of this choice of encoding is an appeal to the reader/consumer's desire for control. It may subtly reinforce the reader/consumer's positive self-image because the product is represented as enabling the consumer to be more than just a passive recipient; instead, the consumer is an active entity, achieving his/her goals with the help of the product, which is assigned the semantic role of instrument or facilitator:

- (34a) *An audible warning helps you judge the distance between your car and any obstacle behind you.* (Ford Focus)
- (34b) *[a computer system] provides useful suggestions regarding acceleration and gear changes that will allow you to optimise the car's fuel economy and minimise its environmental impact.* (Fiat Punto)

A second type of perspectivization – halfway between the two opposite poles outlined above – assigns the agent role jointly to the consumer and the product. This option is relatively rare in the corpus examined here, and can be seen as a marginal choice. The consumer and the product are represented as **co-agents**:

- (35) *Select the setting that's perfect for you, and Fiesta will keep it that way with its advanced air conditioning.* (Ford Fiesta)

This option may involve a strategy of personification, in which the car is represented as an entity with human emotions:

- (36) *Sat at the wheel, you feel a sense of synergy with your car. You're both ready for a great time. And you look the part, too.* (Mazda MX-5)

At the opposite end of the scale from the consumer-perspectivization is an encoding choice that can be termed ‘**product-perspectivization**’. The car is represented as the agent, while the consumer (if represented at all) plays the patient role:

- (37) [...] *you can trust our premium business saloon to **get you there**, safely and in style.* (VW Passat)

This perspectivization is frequently employed in connection with the product-personification strategies outlined above. For example:

- (38a) *The Alfa Brera wraps driver and passengers alike in a **warm, welcoming embrace**.*
 (38b) *Even when it's stopped, the Citroën C5 doesn't **sleep**. It's constantly **on alert** for dangerous situations, with anti-theft alarm and deadlocks fitted as standard*

The ideology of the car-as-agent encoding is based around the passivity of the consumer; it is the product that dominates the situation described. The consumer is presented as a passive vessel, whose only role is to be surprised or impressed, to be the recipient of impressions, to have his/her senses satisfied:

- (39a) *From any angle, the Citroën C5 saloon inspires awe and desire.*
 (39b) *New Citroën C3 will stir your senses on every trip. 360 degrees of inspiration. You'll sense it the instant you get into a new Citroën C3 [...]*
 (39c) *The precision of its lines takes your breath away [...]* (Renault Megane)

Another typical encoding within this product-perspectivization strategy involves the de-agentization of the driving process; the driver/consumer and the act of driving are frequently backgrounded, hidden behind nominal forms (in the following examples, *drive* or *journey*):

- (40a) ***Every journey is a special experience** in the Passat, thanks to Volkswagen's superb range of economical, high-torque petrol and diesel engines [...]* (VW Passat)
 (40b) *The Citroën C4 is also alive with technology that **delivers a thrilling drive**.*

It is thus not the consumer who controls the car, but the car that provides the consumer with an enjoyable experience. In strategic terms, product-perspectivizations can be seen as part of advertisers' attempts to subliminally break down readers' resistance to manipulation. This choice of encoding subtly attempts to build or reinforce a mental model in which the reader/consumer is willingly subordinated to the product. In such cases, the discourse can be said to symbolically legitimize the roles expressed in the text, including the consumer's submission to the power of the product. A similar strategy was found in the author's previous research analyzing presentations from the food and drink industry. Texts promoting alcoholic drinks or high-fat, high-sugar foods – which may be potentially addictive substances – frequently use product-perspectivization which symbolically legitimates the product's potential control over its consumers (Hopkinson 57–58).

With regard to the strategies for constructing reader identities as discussed in this section, the corpus under investigation reveals no significant **contrastive differences** between the British and Czech presentations. Clearly the chosen strategies differ from product to

product, but the goals and mechanisms of identity-construction appear to be universal, at least in the corpus investigated here.

6 Conclusions

The primary aim of the present study was to **map core strategies of building identities and relationships** in commercial presentations by carmarkers. These strategies belong among the most important techniques of manipulation used in advertising discourse. Through strategies of building identities and relationships, text-producers attempt to align the reader's mental models with target mental models that are compatible with the producer's interests. Three core strategies were analyzed: firstly the encoding of three entities (producer, product and reader) in the text; secondly the construction of an identity (voice) for the producer and the way in which this voice helps to construct a virtual producer-reader relationship; and thirdly the construction of an identity for the reader/consumer.

The second aim of the present study was to analyze the **distribution** of these strategies throughout the corpus in order to determine whether any **contrastive differences** exist between the British and Czech subcorpora which may reflect cross-cultural differences in discourse preferences.

The corpus did indeed reveal a slight contrastive difference in discourse preferences between the British presentations and their Czech counterparts. In terms of the encoding of the three core entities (producer, product, reader) in the text, the lower frequency of 'we' and 'you' encodings (producer-orientation and reader-orientation respectively) in the Czech texts suggests that the Czech discourse, viewed as a whole, is somewhat **less pseudo-interactive** and **more impersonal** in its tenor than the British discourse. This observation is also backed up by the distribution of two more parameters in the present corpus. Firstly, the frequency of **pseudo-reciprocal speech acts** was lower in the Czech texts. Secondly, there was a slight difference in preferences regarding the construction of virtual producer-reader relationships on the basis of either **positive or negative face**: in cases where there was a discernable difference in face between the British and Czech presentations of the same product, it was mainly the British presentations that displayed a more positive face-based relationship.

A similar tendency was observed in the author's previous research into commercial websites from the food and drink industry. In this previous research it was suggested that the observed contrastive difference may be due to the generic instability of commercial websites, which – as the internet becomes an increasingly important medium of commercial communication – may be drifting away from a more objective, informational type of discourse towards the generic properties of advertising proper. It was hypothesized that this process of 'generic drift' may be more advanced in the British discourse community than in the Czech community, which would account for the observed difference in discourse properties (Hopkinson 33). However, the presentations analyzed for the present study represent a different genre than the food and drink industry texts. The car presentations are essentially promotional brochures, and as such they can be considered representatives of a well-established and stable genre. An explanation based on generic 'drifting' does not convincingly apply to the corpus analyzed in the present study. Therefore, it may instead be hypothesized that the observed slight cross-cultural difference in discourse preferences

is more widely present in British and Czech advertising and commercial discourse as a whole.

This tentative hypothesis opens up a potential avenue for future research which would verify its validity using different data sets. Specifically, comparable advertising presentations of the same product aimed at the British and Czech markets could be gathered from other sectors – not only the car industry, but also various other types of internationally marketed consumer goods. From a methodological viewpoint, the toughest challenge will evidently be to develop an objective and reliable way of capturing quantitative data in order to enable a rigorous statistical analysis to be undertaken. It would also be instructive to expand the contrastive element of the research by carrying out a similar analysis on a data set including texts originating in a wider range of cultures; for example the English-language part of the data set could include texts from Britain, the USA, Australia, South Africa and so on. This would enable firmer conclusions to be reached as to possible cross-cultural differences in discourse preferences.

Notes

¹ For the purposes of this analysis, the producer of the product and the producer of the text can be telescoped together into a single analytical entity (on the ‘addresser’ side of the communicative situation) without significant loss of conceptual clarity. The terms ‘producer’ and ‘text-producer’ are thus used interchangeably here.

² Given that the discourse examined in this study is primarily written, the addressee is generally referred to as the ‘reader’.

³ Where possible, illustrative examples are given in English. Czech examples are followed by a working translation in square brackets.

⁴ In all cases, emphasis in the examples (in bold type) is added by the author.

Bibliography

- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Čmejrková, Světlá. *Reklama v češtině. Čeština v reklamě*. Prague: Leda, 2000.
- Cook, Guy. *The Discourse of Advertising*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold, 1995.
- . *Language and Power*. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 2001.
- Fowler, Roger. *Language and the News: Discourse and Ideology*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold, 1978.
- Hopkinson, Christopher. “Communication Strategies in Commercial Media Discourse.” *Communication Strategies in Text and Talk*. Ed. Christopher Hopkinson, Lenka

- Sedlářová, Renáta Tomášková, Sirma Wilamová, and Gabriela Zapletalová. Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita, 2009. 15–76.
- Reisigl, Martin, and Ruth Wodak. *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Scollon, Ronald, and Suzanne Wong Scollon. *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- . "Discourse and Manipulation." *Discourse and Society* 17.2 (2006): 359–383.
- . "Discourse, Context and Cognition." *Discourse Studies* 8.1 (2006): 159–177.

Corpus

The primary sources below are listed by example number. All were accessed in Jan 2010.

- (1) http://www.alfaromeo.co.uk/NEWALFA_UK/download_brochure/GT%20Glossy%20Brochure%20APR%2008.pdf
- (2) <http://www.ford.co.uk/Cars/Fiesta/Technicalhighlights>
- (3) <http://www.audi.co.uk/content/dam/audi/production/PDF/PriceAndSpecGuides/a3-s3.pdf>
- (4) http://www.honda.co.uk/cars/_assets/downloads/civichybrid/CivicHybrid.pdf
- (5) http://www.skoda.co.uk/pdf/brochure_fabia.pdf
- (6a) http://www.alfaromeo.co.uk/NEWALFA_UK/download_brochure/159_&_159_SW_Glossy_Brochure_SEP_09.pdf
- (6b) <http://www.citroen.co.uk/Assets/pdf/new-cars/c3/brochure.pdf>
- (6c) <http://www.mitsubishi-cars.co.uk/colt/colt-brochure.aspx>
- (7) http://www.skoda.co.uk/pdf/brochure_octavia.pdf
- (8a) <http://www.mitsubishi-cars.co.uk/colt/colt-brochure.aspx>
- (8b) http://www.alfaromeo.co.uk/NEWALFA_UK/download_brochure/MiTo_Glossy_Brochure_NOV_08.pdf
- (8c) http://www.alfaromeo.co.uk/NEWALFA_UK/download_brochure/MiTo_Glossy_Brochure_NOV_08.pdf
- (9) http://www.honda.co.uk/cars/_assets/downloads/accordsaloon/Accord_Saloon.pdf
- (10) <http://www.ford.co.uk/Cars/Focus/Safetyandsecurity>
- (11) <http://www.audi.co.uk/content/dam/audi/production/PDF/PriceAndSpecGuides/a3-s3.pdf>
- (12a) http://www.honda.co.uk/cars/_assets/downloads/civichybrid/CivicHybrid.pdf
- (12b) http://www.honda.co.uk/cars/_assets/downloads/civic3door/Civic_TypeS.pdf
- (13) <http://www.ford.co.uk/Cars/Fiesta/Technicalhighlights>
- (14) <http://www.mitsubishi-cars.co.uk/colt/colt-brochure.aspx>
- (15) http://www.skoda.co.uk/pdf/brochure_fabia.pdf
- (16a) http://www.honda.co.uk/cars/_assets/downloads/civic3door/Civic_TypeS.pdf
- (16b) http://www.renault.co.uk/Resources/PDF/Brochures/New_Clio.pdf

- (17) <http://www.audi.co.uk/content/dam/audi/production/PDF/PriceAndSpecGuides/a3-s3.pdf>
- (18) http://www.volkswagen.cz/modely/nove_polo/prednosti/design/
- (19a) <http://www.fiat.co.uk/contactconsole/requestbrochure.aspx?mediaCode=106&hash=showroom/home>
- (19b) http://www.renault.co.uk/Resources/PDF/Brochures/New_Laguna.pdf
- (20) http://www.skoda.co.uk/pdf/brochure_fabia.pdf
- (21) <http://www.mazda.co.uk/showroom/mx-5/>
- (22) <http://www.mazda.co.uk/showroom/mazda3/Unrivalled/>
- (23) <http://www.ford.co.uk/Cars/Focus/Exteriordesign>
- (24) <http://www.citroen.co.uk/Assets/pdf/new-cars/c5-saloon/brochure.pdf>
- (25) http://www.mazda.co.uk/showroom/mx-5/mx-5_roadster/
- (26) <http://www.mitsubishi-cars.co.uk/outlander/brochure.aspx>
- (27) <http://www.mazda.co.uk/showroom/mazda6/overview/>
- (28a) <http://www.seat.co.uk/generator/su/com/newIbiza08/site/highlights/safety/main.html>
- (28b) http://www.volkswagen.cz/modely/novy_golf/
- (29) <http://www.volkswagen.co.uk/assets/common/pdf/brochures/polo-v-brochure.pdf>
- (30) <http://www.fiat.co.uk/contactconsole/requestbrochure.aspx?mediaCode=106&hash=showroom/home>
- (31) <http://www.ford.co.uk/Cars/Mondeo>
- (32a) <http://www.fiat.co.uk/contactconsole/requestbrochure.aspx?mediaCode=106&hash=showroom/home>
- (32b) http://www.honda.co.uk/cars/_assets/downloads/cr-v/CR-V.pdf
- (33a) http://www.alfaromeo.co.uk/NEWALFA_UK/download_brochure/GT%20Glossy%20Brochure%20APR%2008.pdf
- (33b) <http://www.mitsubishi-cars.co.uk/lancer/lancer-brochure.aspx>
- (33c) http://www.renault.co.uk/Resources/PDF/Brochures/New_Clio.pdf
- (34a) <http://www.ford.co.uk/Cars/Focus/Technicalhighlights>
- (34b) <http://www.fiat.co.uk/contactconsole/requestbrochure.aspx?mediaCode=106&hash=showroom/home>
- (35) <http://www.ford.co.uk/Cars/Fiesta/Interiordesign>
- (36) <http://www.mazda.co.uk/showroom/mx-5/>
- (37) <http://www.volkswagen.co.uk/new/passat>
- (38a) http://www.alfaromeo.co.uk/NEWALFA_UK/download_brochure/Bera%20Glossy%20Brochure%20APR%2008.pdf
- (38b) <http://www.citroen.co.uk/Assets/pdf/new-cars/c5-saloon/brochure.pdf>
- (39a) <http://www.citroen.co.uk/Assets/pdf/new-cars/c5-saloon/brochure.pdf>
- (39b) <http://www.citroen.co.uk/Assets/pdf/new-cars/c3/brochure.pdf>
- (39c) http://www.renault.co.uk/Resources/PDF/Brochures/Megane_H_SH.pdf

- (40a) <http://www.volkswagen.co.uk/assets/common/pdf/brochures/passat-brochure.pdf>
- (40b) <http://www.citroen.co.uk/Assets/pdf/new-cars/c4-hatchback/brochure.pdf>

Address:

University of Ostrava

Faculty of Arts

Department of English and American Studies

Reální 5

701 03 Ostrava

Czech Republic

christopher.hopkinson@osu.cz