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Summary
This thesis will explore whether, and if so how, airlines make use of a combination of multimodal choices, storytelling and persuasion in the efforts to persuade passengers to watch safety videos. This research is highly relevant in academia as well as in business, as it exemplifies how different disciplines and the theories associated with them can be combined in an interdisciplinary frame which can be used in business. The thesis is based on analyses two safety video examples; one from Delta Airlines and one from Turkish Airlines.

The problem statement focuses on the significance of looking at how airlines create videos that are entertaining enough to catch the passengers’ attention. The analyses are of how, in safety videos, the airlines draw on complex multimodal choices, as well as storytelling strategies in order to persuade their passengers to watch and pay attention. The links between the two safety videos are that they share overall communicative purpose (safety) and humour, as the latter is applied as a strategic ‘weapon’ for attention-catching. For further understanding, the two airlines will be compared after the individual analyses.

The thesis includes a theory chapter which presents the field in which the problem is located. Theory involved is on multimodality, storytelling and persuasion and include theorists such as Halliday (1978), Kress and van Leeuwen (2006), Iedema (2001), van Leeuwen (2011), Fairclough (1992), Bhatia (2010), Fog et al. (2010) and Gass and Seiter (2011). Thus the theoretical framework is interdisciplinary. The scientific theory on which the thesis is based is that of social constructionism. This perception is relevant for the investigation in this thesis, as both social semiotics and social constructionism assume, for instance, that knowledge is constructed through social interactions.

The method chapter describes how the interdisciplinary frame is built, which theories are interlinked and what this connection means for the analysis. Then an elaboration is given of how each theory is used for the analyses of the videos; including tables with specific investigation questions. The videos are analysed in terms of multimodal concepts of representational,
orientational and organizational meaning, storytelling structure and persuasion technique in relation to humour.

In terms of findings it became obvious through the analyses that both safety videos contain an interesting mix of multimodality, storytelling and persuasion strategies. The two airlines make use of the interdisciplinary frame e.g. in the video and story structure, in addition to the choice of characters. However, it was discovered that the last mentioned is a point where the two videos differ. Another resemblance was found in the interdiscursive use of storytelling. Delta Airlines had implemented an 80’s theme through which the message was communicated in a humorous manner, while Turkish Airlines approached it differently and had invited football players to help communicating the safety rules. In other words, Delta Airlines had a structure where interdiscursive storytelling was merged with intertextual communication. Whereas, Turkish Airlines’ video had scenes shifting between interdiscursive communication staring the football players, and intertextual communication involving the flight personnel.

On the foundation of the analyses and the comparison, the thesis concludes that it is useful and important to understand how to combine several tools of communication when conveying a message to a broad audience. It is evident that interdisciplinary frameworks are especially constructive when analysing this type of multimodal messages (videos with a broad audience). It is argued that passengers are more likely to watch and pay attention to safety videos when these are created on an interdisciplinary frame including interdiscursivity, storytelling as well as strong humorous appeals.
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1. Introduction:

This first chapter introduces the problem statement for the thesis, as well as accounts for the purpose and aim of the chosen subject. Following that is a mention of theory and method used in the analysis. Moreover, a short description of the empirical data is provided, and the limitations of the project as well as the structure of the thesis are discussed.

1.1. Problem statement, purpose and aim

Today air travel is a multimillion dollar industry covering all corners of the world. It is used for business, pleasure, for necessity and fun. However, there is one topic which is on most people’s minds when entering an airplane – namely safety. Safety on board an airplane is rather complex and the procedures vary between the types of aircrafts. Hence paying attention to the in-flight safety video is important for the passengers, in order to know how to behave in the event of an emergency. Therefore, it is significant to look at how airlines create videos that are entertaining enough to catch the passengers’ attention. I intent to analyse the following: In safety videos the airlines draw on complex multimodal choices, as well as storytelling strategies in order to persuade their passengers to watch and pay attention. In order to investigate the above, I have chosen to analyse two safety videos where the link between them is the message and humour, as the latter is applied as a strategic ‘weapon’.

The questions I want answered in order to verify the hypothesis are;

1. How are multimodal choices combined with storytelling strategy, in the airlines’ efforts to persuade passengers to watch the videos?

2. Which differences are there between the airlines’ safety videos?

1.2. Empirical data, Theory and Method

In order to answer these questions I want to analyse two different safety videos from two different airlines: From Delta Airlines Delta’s 80’s In-Flight Safety Video and from Turkish Airlines Turkish Airlines New Safety Video (English). Though very different in presentation, the videos share the important message of how to behave on board the plane, and in the event of an emergency. Another shared feature is the strategic use of humour. As tools for analysing these safety videos, I will initiate a multimodal analysis based on the notion of social semiotics with Iedema’s (2001) concepts for film analysis, van Leeuwen’s (2007) notions of legitimation as well as Bhatia’s (2010) and
Fairclough’s (1992) thoughts of intertextuality and interdiscursivity. The multimodal analysis is connected to an analysis of storytelling strategy and finally I elaborate on how these elements effect persuasion of the viewers. I have chosen to approach the problem from the view of a social constructionist, as the connection is strong between the social constructionist view and the notion of social semiotics. The analysis is based on a table containing screen shot examples, oral examples as well as a multimodal analysis and a storytelling analysis. The analysis chapter is written with the basic analysis, in the tables (Appendices 4-5), as a foundation.

1.3. Limitations and general structure

The focus in the thesis will be on finding answers to the questions I posed, in order to verify the hypothesis formulated in the beginning of this introduction. The in-depth multimodal analysis of the two videos will keep focus directly on the elements from the hypothesis; multimodal choices in relation to social semiotics and tele-filmic analysis, storytelling strategies and persuasion specifically centred on humour. This also means that the analysis will be concentrated on the most relevant features of these two videos. Consequently, the multimodal and storytelling analyses are based on chosen representative scene shots, not the full length videos. These are the scenes and shots displaying features that represent the airlines’ use of multimodal choices and storytelling structure.

The analysis is mainly visual because I work from the perception that these videos predominantly invite the eye that sees – not so much the part of the brain that processes written text.

Although based on the scene analysis, the persuasion analysis is made on the overall impression of the videos, as persuasion lies not only in one scene, but in the attempt as a whole. Attributable to the limited number of characters and the time perspective, any culture or branding aspects will not be considered in the analysis. As it can be very culture dependant, please note that humour is here identified and considered by me, from my personal view. With these comments on limitations, I continue by elaborating on the structure of the thesis.

Structure wise the thesis will be presented in six chapters. First is an introduction with problem and purpose statement. Second comes relevant background information on the airlines. This will help create a basic understanding of the origins of the videos. Third chapter is on theory relevant for the analysis of how multimodal choices are combined with storytelling leading to persuasion Chapter four covers chosen methodology. It accounts for which parts of the theory that
is appropriate to use in this specific analysis, and how it is going to be used. In addition, an account is given for the interdisciplinary theory frame which I have created. The fifth is the actual analysis of the two videos finishing with a comparative analysis. The last chapter serves a conclusion on the thesis, forming a general answer to my hypothesis “In safety videos the airlines draw on storytelling strategies, as well as complex multimodal choices in order to persuade their passengers to watch and pay attention to the safety videos” and the questions asked in relation.

2. Background information

2.1. Delta Airlines
Operations began in 1924, however the passenger flights under the current name of Delta Airlines began in 1929. Since then the company has expanded to servicing around 165 million passengers per year. Delta won the “2014 Airline of the Year” award by Air Transport World magazine, and in connection, their current slogan is “keep climbing”. One of their main focus areas is corporate social responsibility which relates to the airline’s core values; honesty, integrity and respect.

2.2. Turkish Airlines
The Turkish aviation story begins in 1933. A steady development follows, and Turkish Airlines gets its current name in 1955. The airline’s mission is “[t]o become the preferred leading European air carrier with a global network of coverage thanks to its strict compliance with flight safety, reliability, product line, service quality and competitiveness, whilst maintaining its identity as the flag carrier of the Republic of Turkey in the civil air transportation industry.” (Turkish Airlines). The mission is supported by strong visions, as well as core values

3. Theory
The theory chapter aims to firstly create a frame for the approach of the thesis, in terms of explaining the scientific framework on which it is based. The scientific approach explains from which angle the thesis topic is seen and which presupposed view, on the world and the reader, the writer has. Secondly, the theory chapter gives a description of the different theories on which the multimodal analysis is based.
3.1. Theory of science: Burr on social constructionism

For this thesis the scientific approach chosen is that of social constructionism. According to Burr, a social constructionist agrees with “[...] one or more of the following key assumption.” (2001: 2). Firstly, a social constructionist will always have a critical perspective on knowledge that would normally be taken for granted. Secondly, she or he recognises that all knowledge is corresponding to the historical and cultural context from which it stems. Thirdly, knowledge is constructed through a social, interactive process, thus it can never be objective, or created by an individual. The fourth assumption is that as the understanding of the world is socially dependant, the actions that follow the understanding are as well (Burr 2001).

The social constructionist’s approach is appropriate for this thesis since it forms a link with many of the theories on multimodality and social semiotics, as well as persuasion, which are also culturally and contextually defined.

3.2. Theoretical framework

In order to ensure a good overview of the theories that create the basis for the multimodal analysis, the theoretical framework for this thesis is divided into two main areas; Social semiotics and storytelling and persuasion in multimodal text.

3.2.1. Social semiotics

Semiotics stems from an ancient Greek word, which at that time defined the studies of signs in the form of symptoms. Where traditional semiotics is the art of sign analysis, social semiotics is a broadened notion which has focus on the fact that the meaning of a sign is affected by the ‘social’ context which it relates to.

Halliday (1978, 1985) was the first social semiotician to consider a framework for analysing language as a system. Halliday (1978, 1985) maintained that “Grammar goes beyond formal rules of correctness. It is a means of representing patterns of experience. [...] It enables human beings to build a mental picture of reality, to make sense of their experience of what goes on around them and inside.” (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006: 2). In other words, language is not restricted by the coded meaning of the words, but is influenced by “experience” and social context.

Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) extended Halliday’s (1978, 1985) social semiotic frame to include visual analysis, and thus made semiotics multimodal. Similar to Halliday, Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) identify the three metafunctions; ideational, interpersonal and textual. Iedema
(2001) has taken point of departure in Halliday’s (1978) metafunctions as well as Kress and van Leeuwen’s (2006) idea of social semiotics. He bases his tele-filmic analysis on the notion of social semiotics, which “acknowledges that the analyst’s own reading position is likely to guide her or his interpretations [...]” (Iedema 2001: 186). Social semiotics focuses on texts rather than signs (traditional semiotics), and name ‘real’ time situations such as phone calls, presentations and films etc. re-presentations. Jewitt and Oyama work with Kress and van Leeuwen’s social semiotic frame and conclude that the framework for visual analysis can be used successfully, as it is deduced that “[...] the method is effective in bringing out hidden meanings.” (Jewitt and Oyama 2001: 154).

3.2.1.1. Kress and van Leeuwen on visual analysis

The traditional notion on semiotics, with focus on signs and codes, is considered by Jewitt and Oyama, in order to explain how social semiotics works in relation to the traditional. Social semiotics is defined as “[...] a tool for use in critical research.” (2001: 136). In connection, Jewitt and Oyama emphasise that it is important that “[...] others use whatever resources of interpretation and intertextual connection they can lay their hands on to create their own new interpretations and interconnections.” (2001: 134). The importance of viewpoint is underlined by explaining that a horizontal angle shows the viewer’s involvement, whereas the vertical angle shows a symbolic power. However, the authors also stress that “[...] symbolic relations are not real relations [...]” (2001: 135) meaning that the symbolism, which often lies in an image made from a vertical angle, can be used to trick the eye of the viewer. In their considerations on expanding semiotic resources Jewitt and Oyama (2001) draw on Halliday’s metafunctions as well as Kress and van Leeuwen’s concept of representational, interactive and compositional representation.

Representational meaning is conveyed by the participants in the image (human or object). Within the representational meaning there can be a narrative or a conceptual structure present. Narrative means that vector lines connect two or more participants illustrating that these are involved with each other, in some way. “The concept of narrative visual analysis [...] can help ‘interrogate’ a visual text, help to frame questions...” (Jewitt and Oyama 2001: 143). Conceptual structures are images lacking vector lines. Different conceptual structures are classification structures, where participants are placed so they belong to same ‘class’, and symbolic structures give the participants (carrier) meaning by giving them items (attributes) which bring symbolic meaning.
*Interactive* meaning is the particular relation created between the viewer and the picture-frame-world. Such relations can be created by *contact* where there is a sense of direct eye contact with the viewer. This may also be called a ‘demand’ picture, as the viewers will feel the direct eye contact demanding something from them. The relation between image and viewer may also be in the sense of *distance*. Here it is, for instance, considered whether the image brings the viewers in or keeps them at a distance. Close-ups often indicate intimate relations; medium shots indicate social relations and full figure shots often create a sense of impersonal relation. *Distance* relates to the notion of view point which I explained earlier.

*Compositional* meaning includes three parts; information value, framing and salience and modality (Jewitt and Oyama 2001: 147). “Information values are realized by the placement of elements of a composition.” (2001: 147). Hence, the placement, of an element in an image, is vital for the intended understanding of information. The information value basically depends on whether the item is placed to the left or the right. In *compositional* meaning the framing gives the viewer an idea of whether the elements in the image are connected or separated. In other words, the framing shows the connection or disconnection between the identities of the elements. When looking at salience, it is important to see which elements are most visible (often very/most important). An element can be made salient by means of size or colour. This makes the elements “eye-catching” (Jewitt and Oyama 2001: 150). Modality is defined as the reality-value. How real is the image? Modality also has two sides; naturalistic modality and scientific modality. The naturalistic modality is defined as follows “the greater the congruence between what you see of an object in an image and what you see of it in reality [...] the higher the modality of that image.” (Jewitt and Oyama 2001: 151). Thus, the more alike the image is to the real version, the more modality it contains. The scientific modality, in contrast, is not dependant on what elements look like in an image, but on “how things are in general” (2001: 151). Here there is no congruence between ‘real life’ and image.

### 3.2.1.2. van Leeuwen on Legitimation

Theo van Leeuwen creates a framework for legitimation which is constructed for social practices in public communication. He singles out four types of legitimation; *Authorization*, *Moral evaluation*, *Rationalization* and *Mythopoesis* (2007: 92). “They can be used to legitimize, but also to de-legitimize, to critique.” (2007: 92). He refers to the fact that the four legitimation types can appear single or combined. Legitimation is characterised as answer to the “why” questions. These answers are shaped by the four types of legitimation. *Authorization* includes personal, expert, role model,
impersonal authority and authority of tradition. Rather than depending on an authority, *Moral evaluation* is based on basic moral values and includes evaluation, abstraction and analogies. Van Leeuwen highlights the fact that certain adjectives “[...] trigger a moral concept [...]” (2007: 97). *Rationalization* consists of two kinds; instrumental and theoretical rationalization. *Mythopoesis* is where storytelling connects with legitimation. This includes moral tales, which consist of good examples, and cautionary tales including bad examples and warnings. *Multimodal legitimation* is when legitimation is expressed visually/musically, when legitimation is e.g. represented/played or acted on film.

Finally, referring to an analysis by Gunther Kress which shows that legitimation sometimes exist in situations/texts where many discourses are combined, van Leeuwen states that a link is created between social practices and value discourses when discourse e.g. medical, Christian, populist etc. (2007: 108) are named legitimation discourses.

3.2.1.3. Film analysis – Iedema

Halliday’s metafunctions and Kress and Van Leeuwen’s ideas of social semiotics have inspired Iedema (2001) to take social semiotics to another level. Iedema (2001) goes beyond language and enters the field of analysing moving images. More specifically, he focuses his attention on tele-filmic texts. Hence focus here is on re-presentation. Iedema (2001) takes analysis to a new stage as he considers several semiotic modes apart from language. He divides a filmic text into six parts: frame, shot, scene, sequence, generic stage and work as whole. Additional to the six parts subject to analysis, Iedema argues that the three metafunctions (ideational, interpersonal and textual) can be used as tools for analysis of all meaning-making texts (2001: 191), however he has renamed them to suit his tele-filmic analysis; *representational, orientational* and *organizational* (191).

The *representational* metafunction “[...] talk[s] about what meanings represent visually, verbally, musically or sound-wise.” (Iedema 2001: 191). In other words, we ask questions about “what is the subject of the shot?” In relation to the *orientation*, focus is on the position of the characters. Which meanings are created by their physical positions? The third metafunction, *organization*, “[...] concerns how meanings are sequenced and integrated into dynamic text.” (2001: 192). Consequently, Halliday’s metafunctions have been altered into a tool which can be used for analysing moving images.
3.2.2. Intertextuality and interdiscursivity – Fairclough and Bhatia

Intertextuality can be defined as the idea that texts inherit features from previous texts of same genre. It creates something “typical” of a genre, as is the relation between texts of same genre. Interdiscursivity is when there is a cross-over phenomenon, meaning that different genres are mixed: Traits from one genre merge with traits from another genre. Fairclough describes intertextuality as a concept that “…points to the productivity of texts, to how texts can transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions…” (Fairclough 1992: 270). He claims that texts can be simple or complex depending on the intertextual relations they are constructed from. In connection, Bhatia states that “interrelationships between and across texts, focusing primarily on text-internal properties, are viewed as intertextual...” and “…interactions across and between genres, resulting primarily from text-external factors, are seen as interdiscursive...” (2010: 32-33).

In terms of interdiscursivity, it is Bhatia’s (2010) opinion that professional communication should be analysed on four levels; text, genre, professional practice and professional culture. “Interdiscursivity [...] refers to more innovative attempts to create various forms of hybrid and relatively novel constructs by appropriating or exploiting established conventions or resources associated with other genres and practices.” (Bhatia 2010: 35). Hence, interdiscursivity is finding a ‘new way’ of using what is already there. However, in order to get a full understanding of this new form, it is necessary to have an understanding of the genres and context that have been ‘mixed’. Bhatia underlines that “It is often based on shared generic or contextual characteristics...and some understanding of these shared features is a necessary condition to an adequate understanding...” (2010: 36).

3.2.3. Storytelling – Fog et al.

Storytelling is extremely valuable in effective communication, as a good story can reinforce an argument. A good story catches people’s attention and makes them listen. Hence storytelling persuades people, without them noticing it, to watch/listen, simply because their ears and eyes are caught by the story. Fog et al. refer to important people such as Martin Luther King and Gandhi as “…they could tell a spellbinding story that made a difference and gave meaning to people’s lives.” (2010: 19). Fog et al. continue by exemplifying that storytelling has four elements; “message, conflict, characters and plot” (2010: 33). In a story, the message is given ‘life’ and is communicated in a way which ensures a better understanding. There has to be a conflict or problem of some kind; big or small, yet necessary. “The story comes to life during the transition that takes place from the
onset of change until the conflict has been resolved.”(2010: 35). Character structure is often built with one main character and several supporting. Emphasis is put on the importance of ‘direct’ contact between the characters and the viewers. “In order to get personally involved with a story, we...must be able to identify with the characters.”(Fog et al. 2010: 41) The plot is important for the “flow of the story” (2010: 44), as it ensures that the viewer/listener’s attention is not lost. Thus storytelling can be defined as follows; there is an underlying message, which is communicated via characters that have a conflict, which is then solved. Fog et al. say that “as storytellers, we get our message across through conflict and its resolution.” (2010: 36).

3.2.4. Persuasion- Gass and Seiter

Persuasion, as a general term, is very broad. Taking point of departure in many different theories on persuasion, Gass and Seiter (2011) argue that there are basically two different kinds of persuasion: pure and borderline. Pure persuasion is persuasion which all will agree is persuasion. There is for instance no doubt that a commercial contains an effort to persuade, however a borderline case could be a bodily reflex such as a burp. It is argued that some may be ‘persuaded’ to keep a distance to a person who burps. Consequently, it can be said that pure persuasion is intentional, whereas borderline persuasion is unintentional.

Whichever kind of persuasion we talk about, the receiver can deal with the persuasion attempt in two ways. For this, Gass and Seiter discuss the “elaboration likelihood model of persuasion (ELM)” (2011: 34). The ELM works with two routes of processing the persuasive message: a central route and a peripheral route. People who take the central route tend to be “...thinking about the content of a message, reflecting on the ideas and information contained in it...” (2011: 34) whereas others taking the peripheral route will focus more “[...] on cues that aren’t directly related to the substance of a message.” (2011: 34). A peripheral cue could, for instance, be a humour appeal.

An important element in persuasion, discussed by Gass and Seiter, is humour. There are many different forms of humour and it is widely used in persuasion today. “The first way in which humor assists persuasion is by capturing attention.” (2011: 277). Humour can also act as a distracter, as the listener concentrates on the joke rather than the message. Taking a number of studies into account, Gass and Seiter claim that “...humor indirectly facilitates persuasion...by increasing liking for the persuader...” (2011: 278). In other words, the sender is often perceived
more credible and likeable if the message is conveyed by means of humour; however humorous
appeals are only indirectly strengthening to persuasion.

4. Method
The methodology-chapter starts by explaining, in short, the interdisciplinary frame that I created for
this thesis. The interdisciplinary frame is followed by a description and substantiation of how the
multimodal, storytelling and persuasion theories will be applied in the analysis, in order to answer
my hypothesis and two questions. Last, the strengths and weaknesses for this methodological
approach are discussed.

4.1. The interdisciplinary frame
In order to find answers to my hypothesis and questions I have created a frame in which several
different theories are incorporated. At the same time as I have incorporated several theories, I have
also left those out that will not be helpful in discovering the answers I am searching for. I have
chosen to combine Iedema’s metafunctions (2001) with storytelling strategy by Fog et al. (2010)
and Gass and Seiter’s (2011) thoughts on persuasion. In connection with the metafunctions, the
concepts of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, as well as legitimation, are discussed too.

My reason for creating this interdisciplinary frame is that the different theories are linked as
the multimodal analysis and the storytelling analysis look at many similar points; however interest
is raised by the fact that they are analysed from two different angles; one from social semiotics and
the other from storytelling.

Iedema’s (2001) representational metafunction is focused on what the subject is and how it
is represented in the scene. This links to the storytelling structure, where the ‘message’ and the
‘conflict’ of the scene are considered. The orientational metafunction and the ‘characters’ element
of storytelling connect, as both look at the viewers’ relations to the characters. The storytelling
‘plot’ is, like the organizational metafunction about the dynamics of the overall text. The difference
between the two angles of analysis is that the multimodal analysis includes more elements, such as
sound and music. In addition, there is a connection between interdiscursivity and storytelling. In
fact, I believe that often interdiscursive practice is what makes a story interesting, as the mix of
discourses catch the attention of the reader/viewer.
4.2. Multimodal analysis

Multimodality provides a possibility to construct a comprehensive report of the semiotic modes, the meaning-making systems and the interrelations. The multimodal approach will also make a common terminology available which covers the meaning-making resources that I intend to analyse. The results from the multimodal analysis will enable me to recognise the social reality that the airlines build and combine this with the notions on storytelling and persuasion strategy.

Iedema’s (2001) method for analysis (Appendix 1) will constitute the framework for the multimodal analysis. Iedema’s structure is multi-layered and highly relevant as it is based on Halliday’s concepts as well as Kress and van Leeuwen’s further development of these. Simultaneously, Iedema’s (2001) framework involves several modes which make it appropriate for analysis of telefilmic texts. The representational metafunction concentrates on which meanings are represented visually, verbally, musically or sound-wise. In order to analyse this metafunction I ask questions such as “what is the subject which the shots portray...?” (Iedema 2001: 191). When looking at the orientational metafunction focus is on the characters and their relations to the viewers. These relations are considered both in terms of visuals as well as music-wise (Iedema 2001: 192). A question could be “Do we see people in close up or long shot?” (2001: 192). The third metafunction concerning organization is reflecting on how “...meanings are sequenced and integrated into dynamic text.” (2001: 192). In other words, organization focuses on the dynamics and flow which constitutes the text and creates multimodality.

Appendix 1: Iedema’s metafunctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We analyze what meanings represent visually, verbally, musically or sound-wise</td>
<td>We analyze how meanings position characters and readers-viewers</td>
<td>We analyze how meanings are sequenced and integrated into dynamic texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the subject which the shots portray?</td>
<td>- Do we see people in close up or long shot?</td>
<td>- How are meanings linked together?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is, he, she or they is/are doing?</td>
<td>- Does the camera use a high angle, a low angle, a side-on or oblique angle?</td>
<td>- In what order are the meanings linked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kind of music track is used?</td>
<td>- Does the camera move with the subject and in that way constructs dynamism, urgency and immediacy?</td>
<td>- In what kind of rhythmic units?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kinds of associations are suggested through it?</td>
<td>- Does the camera keep its distance and stand steady?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kinds of sound appear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kinds of associations are suggested through it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kind of verbal and/or speech track are employed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the verbal or speech track about?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Carmen D. Maier
Intertextuality and interdiscursivity are considered through the ideas of Bhatia and Fairclough. In terms of intertextuality attention is on whether there are any traits present that are typical of a certain genre, whereas the focal point of interdiscursivity lies in analysing whether there is a mix of genres, or perhaps a genre typical of one thing, has been used in a new situation.

Theo van Leeuwen’s (2007) thoughts on the concept of legitimation (Appendix 3) is used to analyse which types of legitimation the airlines apply in order to make their claims legitimate, in the safety videos. Van Leeuwen (2007) focuses on five different types where authorization, moral evaluation, rationalization and Mythopoesis are textual in their base form. Nevertheless, these have a more ‘active’ form as well as they can all transpire in relation to the fifth type. The fifth type of legitimation is multimodal and occurs when legitimation is “...expressed visually, or even musically.” (2007: 107). Hence, authorization, moral evaluation, rationalization and Mythopoesis can all be expressed visually or musically in addition to textually, and thereby appear as multimodal.

### Appendix 3: Theo van Leeuwen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legitimation</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Moral evaluation</th>
<th>Rationalization</th>
<th>Mythopoesis</th>
<th>Multimodal Legitimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal, expert, role model, impersonal or traditional authorization</td>
<td>Moral values</td>
<td>Certain adjectives “trigger” moral concepts; e.g. healthy, normal, natural, useful</td>
<td>Instrumental; When one action depends on another</td>
<td>Storytelling: Tales with good or bad experiences</td>
<td>Legitimation acted through film, music etc. The legitimation is visual not only textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretical; when the action only depends on “the way things are” (van Leeuwen 103)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3. Storytelling analysis

In order to add further detail and make the multimodal tele-filmic analysis more comprehensible, I continue by using storytelling theory. Storytelling is an ancient art which has always been used, intentionally and unintentionally, to persuade the listeners. As stated earlier, a good story can strengthen an argument, as it makes it easier for the listener to relate to the situation. On the basis of Fog et al.’s (2010) idea of a storytelling structure, I have formulated questions for each element of a story structure (Appendix 2). The following questions are examples of those that will constitute the
storytelling analysis: What is the message? What is the problem or conflict? Which characters are in play and how do they relate to the viewer? And finally, how does the scene contribute to the overall plot?

Appendix 2: Fog et al.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storytelling story-structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What is the message? | What is the conflict or potential conflict? | Who are the characters?  
- Main/supporting  
Which role do they play?  
Is there direct contact between the characters and the viewer? | How does the scene/shot/situation contribute to the plot?  
Which role does it play? |

4.4. Persuasion

The persuasion analysis takes point of departure in Gass and Seiter’s (2011) considerations on persuasion. The analysis is made on a general level, as it considers the chosen safety video scenes as a whole. I intend to look at whether the safety videos are pure or borderline persuasion attempts, at which route the viewer is expected to take in relation to the Elaboration Likelihood Model, as well as how humour is implemented in the videos and which effects it may have.

4.5. Strengths and weaknesses

A strong element of this methodology is that the story structure analysis can be held together with the multimodal analysis to create a strong, detailed overview for comparison between the safety videos. In terms of weaknesses there are certain limitations to the analysis. One specific limitation is that culture aspects are left out, and that can interfere with the analysis of humour, wherefore I have chosen to call humour “humour” and consider it as a general concept, leaving out the fact that it is highly culture dependant. This can be a weakness, as it limits the analysis vastly. However as the audience of a safety video is so broad, I have presumed that the airlines have made an effort to
accommodate most people, for instance by using humour fit for a broad audience (in my opinion humour which is not e.g. sexist, morbid and otherwise at risk of being offensive).

5. Analysis

This chapter brings forward the analysis of the two safety videos; in terms of multimodality, storytelling and persuasive strategies. Large parts of the analysis are written on the basis of appendices 4 and 5. These are tables with representative scene shots and important points for each. The first section of the analysis chapter will consist of two video analyses with each three parts, first an analysis from the multimodal perspective with an account of any intertextual and interdiscursive presence as well as legitimation, second an analysis seen from the angle of storytelling. In the third part, a sum up is created by drawing in the results from the multimodal and storytelling analyses and commenting on their relation to the overall persuasion attempt. The second section of the analysis chapter will be a comparative analysis of the safety videos, focusing on any similarities and differences there may be.

5.1. Delta Airlines

The safety video from Delta Airlines has the purpose of informing passengers of how to behave on board the airplane, and in the event of an emergency. However, the information is here communicated in an entertaining manner, namely by implementing a theme. The theme is inspired by the 80’s which is evident in the clothes and hair styles, as well as passenger behaviour and background music.

_Representation:_ The video begins with a rather traditional welcoming by a speaking stewardess. She presents the overall communicative purpose which is “safety”. The safety ‘rules’ are told, one by one, by the stewardess, and demonstrated and put into practice by the passengers. All the rules and demonstrations are carried out accordingly and humour is implemented through the 80’s theme mentioned above. The passengers wear time-typical, colourful clothes, big fluffy hair styles and behave in a very stereotypical 80’s manner. The film finishes with, unquestionably, the most important people on board – the pilot and co-pilot. The pilots are thanking for the viewers’ attention and wishing everyone a pleasant flight. The pilots are in the cockpit, at work, in their uniforms, thus the viewer is taken out of the 80’s context and left in a more professional manner.

Seen from the storytelling perspective the message links with the representational metafunction, seeing that focus is on the overall communicative purpose as well as the small
messages, in each scene, which support the overall communicative purpose. Fog et al. emphasise the importance of only having one message per story. “A story with more than one central message runs the risk of becoming messy and unclear.” (2010: 35). Delta has kept to one central message, but ‘spiced it up’ by adding a theme to the actual expression of the message. The conflict is obviously the issue of safety, and each scene has a small conflict of its own, which links with the specific small message. For instance, if you are not willing to assist in the event of an emergency (shot 5, appendix 4), you cannot sit at the exit (conflict), hence you can ‘worm’ out of it and get a different seat (small message). The characters throughout the video are the flight personnel and the passengers. Here, a link is made to the representational metafunction in terms of the portrayed subjects, and the orientational metafunction in terms of the level of interaction between characters and the viewer.

Orientation: This metafunction focuses on camera and character position as well as viewing angle. Delta’s safety video is mainly filmed in medium shots, and with a steady camera distance. I believe that the medium shots here represent that all the messages are equally important, as they all concern people’s safety. No message is more in focus than another. Yet, there are a couple of incidents where the camera moves in order to show a detail.

The angle is mainly frontal; however some scenes have examples of side-on or oblique angles. These occur when there is a sideways movement, e.g. when the man puts his carry-on item in the overhead compartment (shot 2, appendix 4). As stated before, the scenes shift between the flight personnel and the passengers. Direct eye-contact is made between the character and the viewer when the personnel are acting. When the passengers are acting, it is as if eye-contact is between the passenger and the flight personnel. This fact creates a feel of power distance between the cabin crew and the rest. The rest being the passengers as well as the viewer, as we all refer to the personnel for guidance. Hence, the passengers and the viewer are at the same level, looking at the flight personnel. Another fact in this is that the stewardess is placed isolated when she speaks directly to the viewer. She is not interacting with the passengers while speaking. This is again a sign of power distance.

Organization: “[...] organisation concerns how meanings are sequenced and integrated into dynamic text.” (Iedema 2001: 192). The overall structure of this safety video is very simple; beginning, middle, end. However, the scenes continuously shift back and forth between the stewardess and other personnel, and the passengers, ensuring also that the viewer understands the relations. The beginning features a verbal presentation with a beat as a signifier. Some very small
hints of the 80’s context are visible. Moving on, the beat is accompanied by a melody, signifying a ‘move’ in the context. The beat with melody is the same throughout the video, creating continuity. Iedema argues that “[...] temporal continuity is often achieved by maintaining sound continuity across visual cuts.” (2001: 188). This means that even though the video consists of scenes, continuity is ensured by means of the background music.

Humorous verbal-visual links are made, for example the girls with big hair (shot 3, appendix 4) where a link is made between their ‘bulky’ hair styles and the term ‘bulkhead areas’ on board the plane. Another funny example is the scene where the two men swap seats, because the first does not want to assist in case of an emergency (shot 5, appendix 4). Visually: the first man ‘worms’ out of the situation by literally ‘worming’ down the aisle, and the other man taking his place ‘moonwalks’. Both are dance moves which can be associated with the 80’s, at the same time as they create a link to the textual element in the scene. Throughout the video, visual and verbal meanings are linked, creating a dynamic flow. From the storytelling point of view, the plot is brought together with the organizational metafunction as these two features are focused around the structure of the video and the flow of the scenes/events. The simple structure is supported by the attention catchers along the way, which ensures progression and natural flow.

Intertextuality and interdiscursivity: Both intertextual and interdiscursive elements are found in the Delta airlines video. “Interrelationships between and across texts, focusing primarily on text-internal properties, are viewed as intertextual in nature...” (Bhatia 2010: 32). Thus, the overall communicative purpose is communicated in a highly intertextual manner, and accordingly is the visual beginning and ending where focus is on the personnel only. The intertextuality is seen in the way that the communication is very context typical. Looking at interdiscursivity; “...interactions across and between genres, resulting primarily from text-external factors, are seen as interdiscursive in nature.”(Bhatia 2010: 33). In this video, interdiscursivity is brought in by means of the 80’s theme, as there is nothing traditional or genre-typical about the 80’s look of the passengers, or the chosen background music which accompanies the visuals.

Legitimation: Legitimation can be employed both textually and visually. In this video, legitimation is mainly visual (multimodal). As van Leeuwen states it, multimodal legitimation is when legitimation is, as mentioned before, “...expressed visually...” (2007: 107). Authorization is here evident in the flight personnel, as they represent ‘experts’ and ‘authorities’ on the area.
Additionally, the passengers function as role-models as they demonstrate how to comply with the rules on board. The visual-verbal link in shot 3 (appendix 4) has a notion of multimodal instrumental rationalization, since the girls realise that in order to ensure clear aisles, they have to swap places. Instrumental rationalization is, according to van Leeuwen, when one action or state depends on another. In other words, the girls swap places (action) in order to ensure clear aisles on board the plane (state). I will also argue that we see an example of Mythopoesis when the stewardess speaks of the importance of keeping the seatbelt on, in case of an encounter with turbulence. The mention of turbulence functions here as a kind of warning. As Mythopoesis, for instance, can be cautionary tales “conveying what will happen if you do not conform to the norms...” (van Leeuwen 2007: 106), Thus, I argue that e.g. a ‘warning’ of turbulence can be a type of cautionary tale.

In the seventh shot (appendix 4) the American state is mentioned, as the stewardess points out that the rules are not just the airline’s, but it is “federal regulations”. This is using authorization at a high level, in order to ensure compliance. In the eighth shot the immediate topic is smoking. Consequently, moral evaluation comes into play, as it is implied that smoking is not only illegal on board, it is also harmful to other passengers; especially children. The girl has a lifted index finger signalling that moral values are at stake.

Persuasion: When the multimodal choices are seen in connection with the storytelling structure, it is evident that Delta Airlines has made a strong persuasion attempt. A safety video is a pure case of persuasion, as it is a video which all passengers are presented with and the video contains a specific message. The video contains ‘experts’ in the shape of the flight personnel, and strong humorous appeals in terms of the 80’s theme and the funny situations (verbal-visual link) the passengers are in, as they try to comply to the safety rules. Gass and Seiter argue that humour in persuasion works mainly by “capturing attention” (2011: 277), a factor which Delta Airlines has categorically made use of here.

Where humour may facilitate a general “liking” of the sender, it can be argued that Delta Airlines also ensure that the company is perceived as credible, due to the positioning of the flight personnel and the direct eye-contact. Another factor in ensuring credibility is the use of legitimation. Thus the many examples of authorization as well as role-models and rationalization are solid credibility builders. Hence, it is not all fun.
5.2. Turkish Airlines

Turkish Airlines’ safety video has the overall communicative purpose of informing passengers of appropriate behaviour on board an airplane, and in an emergency. This information is here communicated in an entertaining video, where humour is a strong strategic tool for ensuring attention. Humour is applied by means of footballers (interdiscursivity) and in the general structure of the video.

_Representation:_ Under this metafunction “[...] we talk about what meanings represent visually, verbally, musically or sound-wise.” (Iedema 2001: 191) and this is clearly an airline safety video. The welcoming is performed by a speaker accompanied by a pleasant looking, smiling stewardess and a logo representing the airline. After the initial presentation, the scene shifts to present six football players, who will ‘help’ in the video. Following, the rules of flying are presented through a series of good and bad examples. The football players are how storytelling is implemented. There are many football associations implemented into the scenes; for instance the ‘honk’ sound which can be associated with the whistle used in football when a player is doing something wrong. In the video the ‘honk’ is used exactly for a wrong action. Another football element is the red card which is also given for bad behaviour (shot 6, appendix 5). The ‘honk’ and the red card are both connecting to the idea of a storytelling conflict, as here important issues such as safety and strict rules are at risk when the players misbehave. In shot 9 (appendix 5) the speaker tells the rule ‘brace for impact’ and another link to football is made, as the players instinctively line up as a ‘wall’ against a penalty kick.

The video finishes with the football players thanking for the attention, on behalf of the airline. This is the only time the characters speak themselves. Perhaps their allowance to speak is due to the fact that they have now learned how to behave and therefore they can be given some responsibility. Music-wise, a beat and a melody signal an easy start. As the scenes move on, the melody is broken by the cheers and ‘honks’. Thus the music has a mix of calm melody for a calm environment on board the airplane and the loud ‘honk’ and cheers for associations to football.

_Orientation:_ When concentrating on the metafunction of orientation we look at camera distance, angle, movement as well as character/viewer relation in terms of eye-contact. The start of this video is filmed in a medium to close shot where focus shifts from the logo in the background to the stewardess in the foreground. The angle is slightly oblique, which creates a sense of connection between the logo and the stewardess. This connection signals that she represents the airline. Through the video the camera distance moves between long-shot and medium to close; medium to
close shots for the scenes that are ‘most important’, hence the one presenting the rules and exemplifying the ‘right’ way to behave. Longer camera distance is, for the most part, used in the scenes involving the football players. This is due to the scenes’ humorous elements and the fact that these scenes are not meant to be in focus, but merely attention catchers. Iedema argues that when characters are placed distant, it “[...] may discourage us from identifying with them [...]” (2001:192). Hence, we refrain from behaving badly like the football players.

There are many different angles used in the video which help signal meanings. Mixed angles, for instance in shot 2 (appendix 5), create dynamism as the guys play together and are active. Likewise, in shot 3 (appendix 5), the camera moves towards the passenger as she is in action, and ends with focus directly on the overhead bin. This movement creates urgency. Other camera movements create a sense of immediacy and help clarify situations (e.g. shot 4-5, appendix 5). Direct eye-contact is used in the welcoming by the stewardess and in scenes with the football players, as they thereby create a direct contact with the viewer and thus hold the attention. Looking at this from the storytelling theory, the many camera movements and angles for filming are all part of telling the story and sending the right signals and messages throughout. The stewardess and the passengers are expected in an airline safety video, however the football players ‘play’ a different role here, as they are not usually there. Turkish airlines have hired them to play conflict-makers, as they show bad, nevertheless entertaining, examples through the video.

**Organization:** The video has a beginning, middle and an end, hence a very basic overall structure. However, the middle has its own structure, as the scenes shift between examples of right and wrong behaviour. “Such sequencings have to do with how meanings are linked together, in what order and in what kinds of rhythmic units.” (Iedema 2001: 192). The scene structure, in this safety video, creates a rhythm which ensures that attention is kept, because new things happen every time and the viewer is left curious to see what comes next. This also generates a strong link between the scenes. Furthermore, the verbal-visual connection secures correct understanding and anchors the message. The humorous use of different discourses results in each scene contributing to a flow which catches the attention of the viewer.

**Intertextuality and interdiscursivity:** Turkish Airlines has created a safety video which is built on a mixture of intertextuality and interdiscursivity. The beginning of the video, as well as approximately every second scene, are made intertextual, as they are traditional and typical of the context of airline safety videos. This means that those scenes are based on intertextual principles
where, as Fairclough says it, “[a]ll utterances are populated, and indeed constituted, by snatches of others’ utterances [...]” (1992: 270). The rest of the scenes and the ending are, on the other hand, interdiscursive. The interdiscursivity is seen in the way the sports, more specifically the football, discourse is mixed into the discourse of airline safety. As mentioned earlier, the video is built of scenes that shift between being intertextual and interdiscursive. In addition to being interdiscursive, the same scenes are meant to be humorous in order to catch viewer attention. At the end the football players are representing the airline and one of the players is even given a pilot hat. Thus this scene is extraordinarily interdiscursive.

Legitimation: Legitimation occurs both visually and textually in Turkish airlines’ video. In terms of the visual, multimodal legitimation, first and foremost, it can be argued that the whole video is built on the notion of Mythopoesis, as the structure consists of a mix of the so-called moral and cautionary tales. These tales are shown through the football players’ bad behaviour for instance in shot 4 where they do not handle baggage as the rules request, or shot 6 where one player is given the red card for speaking on the phone (Appendix 5). Other places where multimodal legitimation is evident are in the intertextual scenes where the passengers act as role-models in their rule-compliance. Further, authorization is used through the speaker, the stewardess and in fact also in the last scene, where the football players are given the responsibility of representing the airline. In terms of textual legitimation evidence is in shot 6 (appendix 5) when the player is speaking on the phone, and his co-players give him the red card, the speaker says “it is not the place or the time” (shot 6, appendix 5). This sentence carries a theoretical rationalization legitimation as it is simply “[...]’the way things are’ [...]” (van Leeuwen 2007: 103).

Persuasion: Looking at Turkish Airlines’ use of multimodality and connecting this to the storytelling structure, it is safe to say that Turkish Airlines has made a video which is highly persuasive. The video has ‘authorities’ in terms of the stewardess and the recorded speaker, and strong humorous scenes with the football players and their bad behaviour (verbal-visual link). The video is entertaining and funny and it is clear that Turkish Airlines has taken advantage of humour, using again Gass and Seiter’s argument that humour in persuasion helps “capturing attention” (2011: 277). In addition, the direct eye-contact between the characters and the viewer, and the use of legitimation, works to obtain credibility.
5.3. Comparison

When comparing the two videos from Delta Airlines and Turkish Airlines respectively, there are many points where they share elements; however, there are also many differences. The similarities between the two are; the overall communicative purpose of safety, the fact that airline personnel and passengers are characters in the videos, that both videos start with a beat and a melody follows, the mix of intertextual and interdiscursive practices as well as the airlines’ use of multimodal legitimation, storytelling and persuasion.

The similarities in relation to persuasion lie in the fact that a safety video is generally a pure case of persuasion, as it is a video which all passengers are presented with and the video contains a specific message which we are all aware of is persuasive. Both videos make use of related humour, which is “[h]umor that is integrated into a message [...]” (Gass and Seiter 2011:278). In relation to the Elaboration Likelihood Model you could reason that central processing is the most appropriate when the topic is safety, however the use of humour suggests that viewers tend to process peripherally (Gass and Seiter 2011:277). From own experience, I also believe that most passengers, who are not nervous flyers, process the information rather lightly (peripheral).

A difference between the two videos is the filming. Delta’s video has very few camera movements as most of the video is filmed from a medium distance, whereas the Turkish Airlines’ video has many camera movements which help communicate the message more strongly. Also, Turkish Airlines has invited a whole set of extra characters into the video – characters that we would not normally see in a safety video (interdiscursive practice). These extra characters result in another difference, as the interdiscursivity they bring sets the tone for the structure of the video. In other words, Delta Airlines has mixed discourses in almost every scene throughout the video; Turkish Airlines shifts between the safety discourse and the football discourse and only mixes them fully at the end.
6. Conclusion

Having established that air travel has become increasingly important to people, and today is a multimillion dollar industry, centre of attention paused on the continuously important topic of safety. On board airplanes, all safety procedures have been collected and are communicated to passengers through a video. Consequently, this thesis initiated an investigation into the question of how two airlines combine multimodal choices with storytelling strategy when attempting to persuade passengers to pay attention to safety videos on board. Two safety videos were chosen to serve as examples; one video from Delta Airlines and another from Turkish Airlines. The two videos were analysed and compared on the levels of multimodality, seen from the perspective of Iedema’s metafunctions as well as intertextuality, interdiscursivity and legitimation, storytelling structure and its connection to multimodal choices, and lastly on the level of persuasion.

The analysis of Delta Airlines’ safety video confirmed that the airline does combine multimodality with storytelling concepts in order to create an entertaining video which persuades passengers to watch. Delta’s video has used airline personnel and passengers to communicate the central message of safety by means of intertextual scenes in the beginning and end, and otherwise interdiscursive scenes with an 80’s theme. The theme is a great attention catcher as it integrates
humour into the message. In the specific safety video analysed in this thesis, a link is created to Delta’s mission as well as core values such as innovation, customer satisfaction as well as productivity (Delta).

The Turkish Airlines safety video analysis also confirmed my hypothesis that airlines draw on complex multimodal choices as well as storytelling strategies in order to persuade their passengers. In this video it became evident that intertextuality and interdiscursivity again functioned well in combination with storytelling, when attempting to catch viewer attention. Turkish Airlines has used airline personnel, passengers and added an extra dimension by inviting football players to demonstrate behaviour in the video. The scenes vary between being context typical (intertextual in appearance) and interdiscursive in appearance. The intertextual communication is when the stewardess and/or passengers are acting (scenes on/inside the plane), and the interdiscursive practice is evident when the football players are acting. Hence, a humorous mix of situations is created.

The two videos are alike at the foundation, as both are made with the overall communicative purpose of safety on board and they apply humorous elements to get attention. Both are based on an interdisciplinary theoretical frame which implements multimodality, storytelling and persuasion. Yet, however alike the overall frames are, the videos are very different in their actual combination of multimodal choices and storytelling in persuasion.

In conclusion, the study in this thesis shows how important it is to combine several tools of communication when conveying a message to a broad audience. As demonstrated here, interdisciplinary frameworks are especially constructive when analysing this type of multimodal messages. Based on the analyses, I argue that passengers are more likely to watch and pay attention to Delta Airlines’ and Turkish Airlines’ safety videos due to the successful use of an interdisciplinary frame including interdiscursivity and storytelling, and the strong humorous appeals and many attention catchers. As Bhatia says “[...] interdiscursivity is central to our understanding of the complexities of professional genres which are typically used in professional, disciplinary, institutional as well as workplace contexts. “(2010:33).

Total amount of characters excl. blanks: 49911
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Appendix 1: Iedema's metafunctions

**WHAT KINDS OF PATTERNS PREVAIL?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We analyze what meanings represent visually, verbally, musically or sound-wise</td>
<td>We analyze how meanings position characters and readers-viewers</td>
<td>We analyze how meanings are sequenced and integrated into dynamic texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the subject which the shots portray?</td>
<td>- Do we see people in close up or long shot?</td>
<td>- How are meanings linked together?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What it, he, she or they is/are doing?</td>
<td>- Does the camera use a high angle, a low angle, a side-on or oblique angle?</td>
<td>- In what order are the meanings linked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kind of music track is used?</td>
<td>- Does the camera move with the subject and in that way constructs dynamism, urgency and immediacy?</td>
<td>- In what kind of rhythmic units?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kinds of associations are suggested through it?</td>
<td>- Does the camera keep its distance and stand steady?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kinds of sound appear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kinds of associations are suggested through it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What kind of verbal and/or speech track are employed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the verbal or speech track about?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Carmen D. Maier
### Appendix 2: Fog et al.

## Storytelling

**story-structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Plot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What is the message? | What is the conflict or potential conflict? | Who are the characters?  
- Main/supporting | How does the scene/shot/situation contribute to the plot?  
Which role does it play? |
| | | Which role do they play? | |
| | | Is there direct contact between the characters and the viewer? | |
| | | | |
Appendix 3: **Theo van Leeuwen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Moral evaluation</th>
<th>Rationalization</th>
<th>Mythopoesis</th>
<th>Multimodal Legitimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal, expert, role model, impersonal or traditional authorization</td>
<td>Moral values</td>
<td>Instrumental; When one action depends on another</td>
<td>Storytelling: Tales with good or bad experiences</td>
<td>Legitimation acted through film, music etc. The legitimation is visual not only textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certain adjectives “trigger” moral concepts; e.g. healthy, normal, natural, useful</td>
<td>Theoretical; when the action only depends on “the way things are” (van Leeuwen 103)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Delta Airlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot/time</th>
<th>Visual example</th>
<th>Oral example</th>
<th>Multimodal analysis</th>
<th>Storytelling analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Shot 1 0:05/5:21 | ![Visual Example](image1) | “Our first priority on every flight is safety” | **Representation:** a happy welcoming with topic. Background music: starting beat. Stewardess speaking.  
**Orientation:** Medium-shot. Distance kept  
**Organization:** Clear beginning - presentation  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** A typical safety video start (intertextuality)  
**Legitimation:** Authorization in terms of multimodal legitimation | **Message:** Welcome + introduction of topic  
**Conflict:** safety  
**Characters:** Stewardess. Direct eye-contact.  
**Plot:** Beginning → more info coming. |
| Shot 2 0:15/5:21 | ![Visual Example](image2) | “Be sure all carry-on items are securely stowed in an overhead bin” | **Representation:** Man puts carry-on item in the overhead bin. Background music: beat accompanied by melody – 80’s style.  
**Orientation:** Medium-shot. Distance kept. Side-on or oblique angle.  
**Organization:** the verbal message is demonstrated. Camera swaps between stewardess and passengers  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** 80’s look (interdiscursivity) message = intertextual  
**Legitimation:** Role-model | **Message:** first ‘rule’ of safety  
**Conflict:** carry-on item has to be stowed  
**Characters:** Passenger. Focus on action, rather than person.  
**Plot:** demonstration of ‘rule’ – expect more. The camera activity creates flow. |
| Shot 3 0:25/5:21 | ![Visual Example](image3) | “And ensure all aisles, exits and bulkhead-areas are clear” | **Representation:** Passengers with big hair. Association with verbal “bulkhead”. Background music: beat accompanied by melody – 80’s style  
**Orientation:** Medium-shot.  
**Organization:** Passengers ensure fulfilling the ‘rule’ with action  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** interdiscursivity  
**Legitimation:** Multimodal: rationalization | **Message:** another ‘rule’ + underlying message → look around you to solve conflict  
**Conflict:** big hair in the aisle  
**Characters:** female passengers  
**Plot:** Passengers swap places to solve ‘conflict’. Flow. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot 4</th>
<th>0:47/5:21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Representation:** A ‘large’ electronic device (verbal link). Switches off to comply. Beat with melody.  
**Orientation:** medium-shot camera distance + full character.  
**Organization:** rule compliance → moving on to next  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** personalisation/humanisation of teddy bear = Interdiscursive.  
**Legitimation:** multimodal authorization; role-model  
**Message:** switch off electronic devices  
**Conflict:** even if it is someone important- ‘yourself’  
**Characters:** The teddy. No direct eye-contact  
**Plot:** holds attention |
| “Larger electronic devices like laptops should be turned off and stowed until we’re airborne” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot 5</th>
<th>1:33/5:21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Representation:** One person ‘worms’ out of ‘assisting’ another ‘moonwalks’ in. A stewardess stands by.  
**Organization:** displays possibilities, if you do not want to comply.  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** Dance/disco moves = interdiscursivity  
**Legitimation:** authorization + Instrumental rationalization  
**Message:** you can ‘worm’ out if you want.  
**Conflict:** not willing to assist – switching places  
**Characters:** stewardess (authority), passengers who sit + passengers who dance/worm  
**Plot:** ensures viewer attention due to unexpected actions |
| “Are you willing and able to assist with the operation of the exit if necessary?” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot 6</th>
<th>1:51/5:21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Representation:** scene shifts to stewardess. 80’s association = star.  
**Orientation:** medium-shot. Steady camera. Isolated position.  
**Organization:** no direct verbal-visual link. Star-shift links to 80’s theme.  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** interdiscursivity  
**Legitimation:** authority. A sense of Mythopoesis: mention of turbulence.  
**Message:** verbal: sum up of seatbelt-rule.  
**Conflict:** A recommendation  
**Characters:** Stewardess. Direct eye-contact with viewer.  
**Plot:** flow |
| “Please remain seated with your seatbelt securely fastened any time the seatbelt sign is on” |
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| Shot 7 2:14/5:21 | “For everyone’s safety, federal regulations require all passengers to comply with the...information signs located throughout the cabin...” | **Representation:** Signs shown. A warning is given – this is a federal regulation.  
**Orientation:** the camera distance is kept. Scene is cut to show all the signs spoken of.  
**Organization:** warning to ‘scare’  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:**  
**Legitimation:** Multimodal; instrumental rationalization + authorization (power holder) | **Message:** This is not ‘just’ our rule- it is federal  
**Conflict:** safety  
**Characters:** visually; the stewardess. Textually; the state  
**Plot:** Catches attention! |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Shot 8 2:24/5:21 | “Smoking is not allowed on any Delta flight” | **Representation:** A child (girl) with lifted index finger. Associates “no” to smoking.  
**Orientation:** medium-shot  
**Organization:** verbal-visual link.  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** child showing ‘no smoking’ = link to harmfulness  
interdiscursive (cancer adds + plane info)  
**Legitimation:** multimodal legitimation; moral; harmful to children (and other passengers). The lifted finger is a sign triggering moral values | **Message:** smoking is not allowed – it is a “no no”  
**Conflict:** some people may smoke and want to on board  
**Characters:** the girl – moral trigger  
**Plot:** viewer attention |
| Shot 9 3:04/5:21 | “Please take a moment to find the exits closest to you and remember they might be behind you” | **Representation:** topic: find the nearest exit. One passenger is trying to see. Verbal-visual link (80’s +humour)  
**Orientation:** Medium- close up. Only faces.  
**Organization:** verbal-visual-acting link  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** 80’s  
**Legitimation:** | **Message:** it is important to find nearest exit  
**Conflict:** the ‘high haired’ people is blocking the view  
**Characters:** passengers  
**Plot:** flow |
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| Shot 10 4:48/5:21 | “and all carry-on items are properly stowed” | **Representation:** man is fixing his tape. Tape = 80’s. Verbal-visual link. He is in time pressure to ‘stow’ his ‘carry-on item’- tempo rise  
**Orientation:** medium shot. Camera moving from low to high – first tape-problem then face.  
**Organization:** link; verbal-visual  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:**  
**Legitimation:** | **Message:** take off is close- stow items. Be fast  
**Conflict:** passenger has time pressure, due to tape problems  
**Characters:** passenger  
**Plot:** flow towards end |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Shot 11 5:14/5:21 | “On behalf of everyone at Delta Airlines we wanna thank you for paying attention. Please relax and enjoy your flight” | **Representation:** The pilot and co-pilot are ‘rounding off’ by thanking.  
**Orientation:** medium shot with direct eye-contact with pilot + side-on angle on co-pilot (signifies level of importance)  
**Organization:** verbal-visual link. Out of 80’s context.  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:**  
**Legitimation:** Authorization; pilot + co have authority to speak on ‘behalf of’ the airline. They are *experts* | **Message:** thanking for passengers’ attention + wish for good flight  
**Conflict:** attention  
**Characters:** pilot + co-pilot. Eye-contact ensuring attention  
**Plot:** the end. Professional. |
### Appendix 5: Turkish Airlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot/time</th>
<th>Visual example</th>
<th>Oral example</th>
<th>Multimodal analysis</th>
<th>Storytelling analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shot 1 0:07/5:26</td>
<td>“Ladies and gentlemen. Welcome on board...”</td>
<td><strong>Representation:</strong> stewardess. Welcoming. Background; beat + melody. Voice recorded. <strong>Orientation:</strong> camera focus shifts from the airline logo in the background to the stewardess. Slight oblique angle. Post presentation- camera moves. <strong>Organization:</strong> verbal-visual link; first focus on logo, then on matter. Immediacy. <strong>Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:</strong> intertextuality <strong>Legitimation:</strong> multimodal; authorization</td>
<td><strong>Message:</strong> welcome + topic: safety <strong>Conflict:</strong> safety <strong>Characters:</strong> logo+ stewardess. Direct eye-contact. <strong>Plot:</strong> Beginning. Initial attention catcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot 2 0:14/5:26</td>
<td>“The superstars of Manchester United”</td>
<td><strong>Representation:</strong> presentation of six footballers dribbling. Melody broken by cheers- connection to footballers <strong>Orientation:</strong> long shot. Mix of angles. Dynamism. Later in scene- camera moves in to close-up. Immediacy. <strong>Organization:</strong> strong verbal-visual link in presentation. <strong>Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:</strong> interdiscursivity – sports/football discourse <strong>Legitimation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Message:</strong> more people are involved <strong>Conflict:</strong> <strong>Characters:</strong> popular footballers <strong>Plot:</strong> Further attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot 3 0:37/5:26</td>
<td>“You must place your baggage in the overhead bins...”</td>
<td><strong>Representation:</strong> first safety rule. Passenger stows bag. Association: being on an airplane. <strong>Orientation:</strong> Medium-shot. Camera moves towards person + focus on overhead bin. Urgency. <strong>Organization:</strong> verbal-visual link. Importance. <strong>Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:</strong> intertextual <strong>Legitimation:</strong> multimodal role-model</td>
<td><strong>Message:</strong> where to put your bags and how to do it <strong>Conflict:</strong> a rule <strong>Characters:</strong> female passenger <strong>Plot:</strong> flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Intertextuality/Interdiscursivity</th>
<th>Legitimation</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Plot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shot 4</td>
<td>0:45</td>
<td>“Just don’t get overexcited”</td>
<td>footballers handling their bags – wrong. Sound; melody broken by cheers and a ‘honk’ to signal “wrong” behaviour.</td>
<td>long shot. Camera moving in to clarify + humour.</td>
<td>link with previous scene. Rhythm: do/don’t</td>
<td>multimodal mythopoiesis</td>
<td>how you should NOT do it.</td>
<td>wrong behaviour.</td>
<td>Footballers</td>
<td>flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot 5</td>
<td>0:53</td>
<td>“Please make sure your mobile phones and devices with mobile phone capabilities have been set to flight mode...”</td>
<td>A mobile phone. Demonstration of how to set correctly. Background melody.</td>
<td>close-up. Urgency + immediacy.</td>
<td>verbal-visual link</td>
<td>intertextual (context typical)</td>
<td>what to do with your phone and other devices.</td>
<td>has to be on flight mode</td>
<td>the phone + fingers</td>
<td>link with next scene – how to/not to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot 6</td>
<td>1:05</td>
<td>“it’s not the place or the time”</td>
<td>the footballers give him the red card. Indicate very wrong behaviour. “Honk” sound for further indication.</td>
<td>long shot moving in. Further focus on the wrong action = shows regret.</td>
<td>verbal-visual link</td>
<td>interdiscursivity. Bring football rules into airline rules.</td>
<td>speaking on mobile phones is not allowed</td>
<td>he uses the phone</td>
<td>one footballer with bad behaviour. Two correcting him.</td>
<td>links back to last scene of how to do it correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Shot 7 2:27/5:26 | “Attend to yourself first, before helping a child” | **Representation:** passenger with mask on helps child.  
**Orientation:** medium shot. Camera distance kept. Melody.  
**Organization:** Intertextuality/interdiscursivity: Legitimation: Multimodal; theoretical rationalization | **Message:** help yourself before others; otherwise you may be unable to help.  
**Conflict:** oxygen masks  
**Characters:** passenger with child  
**Plot:** flow |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Shot 8 2:35/5:26 | “Do you really think this will help?” | **Representation:** footballer helps other with mask, before attending to himself. Melody broken by “honk” - attention  
**Orientation:** long shot.  
**Organization:** first behaviour – then question. Again link to previous scene. Intertextuality/interdiscursivity: Legitimation: | **Message:** oxygen masks should be used correctly  
**Conflict:** he is doing it wrong  
**Characters:** two footballers  
**Plot:** viewer attention + humour |
**Orientation:** Medium shot – to get most important part of action.  
**Organization:** verbal-visual-acting link Intertextuality/interdiscursivity: intertextual Legitimation: | **Message:** important to know how to sit when landing.  
**Conflict:** emergency  
**Characters:** passenger  
**Plot:** flow |
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| Shot 10 3:12/5:26 | “now come on guys, this is serious” | **Representation:** footballers hear ‘brace for impact’ and react instinctively. Football associations; wall for penalty kick. Verbal; humorous reprimand.  
**Orientation:** long shot.  
**Organization:** link; verbal-visual  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** sports vs. airplane discourse  
**Legitimation:** | **Message:** behave yourselves  
**Conflict:** footballers behave wrong  
**Characters:** footballers  
**Plot:** funny scene |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Shot 11 5:05/5:26 | “That’s all. Have a nice flight. Thank you for listening. We are Turkish airlines. We are globally yours” | **Representation:** The footballers are ‘rounding off’ by thanking + Turkish Airlines’ motto.  
**Orientation:** long shot with direct eye-contact. Camera moves in as each person speaks their part. Immediacy.  
**Organization:** verbal-visual link. Representatives- ‘we are...’  
**Intertextuality/interdiscursivity:** interdiscursivity; footballers’ captain = pilot.  
**Legitimation:** Authorization; pilot/captain given authority to speak on ‘behalf of’ the airline. They are role-models representing Turkish Airlines. | **Message:** thanking for passengers’ attention + wish for good flight  
**Conflict:**  
**Characters:** footballers + captain/pilot. Eye-contact ensuring attention  
**Plot:** the end. Interdiscursive- funny. |
### Appendix 6: Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Delta Airlines</th>
<th>Turkish Airlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall communicative purpose; safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters; airline personnel and passengers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat + melody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of intertextuality and interdiscursive practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use many types of legitimation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Delta Airlines</th>
<th>Turkish Airlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very few camera movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only beat + melody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The beginning and the end are communicated intertextually, as both are context typical in appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The middle of the video is interdiscursive, as the discourse of safety and the 80’s theme are completely merged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimation exploited through the visuals/textual in the scenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Mythopoesis