

# "Surf on 4-inch stilettos": Multimodal Metaphor and Metonymy in Mobile Phone Advertising

Samantha Ford, BA  
MA by Research PG 17/18  
University of Birmingham, United Kingdom

- Email: [samanthaford473@gmail.com](mailto:samanthaford473@gmail.com)
- Mobile: 07901 622 122
- Website: [samantha-ford.weebly.com](http://samantha-ford.weebly.com)
- Twitter: @samanthaford473
- LinkedIn: samanthaford473

## **Keywords:**

*Metaphor Metonymy Multimodality Digital Marketing Concreteness*

The popularity of mobile phones has given rise to digital and mobile marketing. Multimodal metaphor and metonymy are frequently used in advertising (Forceville, 2008, 2009; Hidalgo & Kraljevic, 2011; Pérez-Sobrino, 2016). We analysed a corpus of 60 advertisements from 16 telecommunication brands using a modified protocol (Pérez-Sobrino, 2016, 2017) including complex figurative operations: metaphonymy, metonymic chains, and metaphoric complexes (Goossens, 1990; Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez & José-Pérez Hernandez, 2011). We compared 31 mobile network advertisements to 29 mobile manufacturer advertisements because these product categories differ in concreteness. Mobiles involve physical interaction, while networks are intangible and are frequently conceptualised via metaphor (Maglio & Matlock, 1988; Matlock et al., 2014). We predicted a higher frequency of metaphor and metonymy for networks compared to devices.

We found 43 advertisements (72%) included some form of figurative operation, including mobile devices and SIM cards as metonymy and container metaphors. A total of 27 ads (45%) featured complex figurative operations. There was no frequency difference in metaphor, metonymy, nor figurative complexity between mobile phones and networks (all  $p$ 's > 0.05), disconfirming our concreteness-based hypothesis. We suggest that mobile networks may be so familiar to users that their conceptualisation does not need additional figurative operations (cf Matlock et al., 2014). Alternatively, the constraints of mobile phone and network discourse may create similarity in mobile advertising, regardless of conceptual differences between mobile manufacturers and networks. We realised the need for a revised protocol and propose further research into mobile and digital marketing discourse.

## **References**

Forceville, C. (2008) Metaphor in Pictures and Multimodal Representations. In: Gibbs, R. (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Forceville, C. (2009) Metonymy in visual and audiovisual discourse. In: Ventola, E. & Guijarro, A. (eds.) *The World Told and the World Shown*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goossens, L. (1990) Metaphonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics*. 1 (3), pp. 323-340.
- Hidalgo Downing, L. & Kraljevic Mujic, B. (2011) Multimodal metonymy and metaphor as complex discourse resources for creativity in ICT advertising discourse. In: González García, F; Peña, S.; & Pérez-Hernández, L. (eds.) *Metaphor and Metonymy Revisited Beyond the Contemporary Theory of Metaphor*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp.157-181.
- Maglio, P. & Matlock, T. (1998) Metaphors we surf the web by. *Proceedings of Workshop on Personalized and Social Navigation in Information Space*. Stockholm, Sweden: Swedish Institute of Computer Science. pp. 1-9.
- Matlock, T.; Castro, S.; Fleming, M.; Gann, T.; & Maglio, P. (2014) Spatial Metaphors of Web Use. *Spatial Cognition & Computation*. 14 (4), pp. 306-320.
- Pérez-Sobrino, P. (2016) Multimodal metaphor and metonymy in advertising: A corpus-based account. *Metaphor & Symbol*. 31 (2), pp. 73-90.
- Pérez-Sobrino, P. (2017) *Multimodal Metaphor and Metonymy in Advertising*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, F. & Perez Hernandez, L. (2011) The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor: Myths, Developments and Challenges. *Metaphor and Symbol*. 26 (3), pp. 161-185.