



---

**Universidad de Valladolid**

FACULTAD de FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS

DEPARTAMENTO de FILOLOGÍA INGLESA

Grado en Estudios Ingleses

TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

“We’re Better Off Out”: A Multimodal Critical Discourse  
Analysis of One of UKip’s Videos during the Brexit  
Campaign

Gloria Isabel González Caballero

Tutor: Laura Filardo Llamas

2016 - 2017



## **ABSTRACT**

Since Brexit is quite a recent event, few studies have been published so far and none have focused on either of the videos part of UKip's Brexit campaign. This dissertation is focused on uncovering the ways in which UKip's ideas are portrayed in one of their Brexit campaign videos entitled "We're Better Off Out." An introduction to multimodal critical discourse analysis is provided as well as a brief summary of this campaign. The methodology used primarily draws upon Machin and Mayr's (2012) comprehensive toolkit as regards multimodal analysis to examine this video both textually and visually.

Keywords: Brexit, UKip, Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis, Conceptual Metaphor.

## **RESUMEN**

Puesto que el Brexit es un acontecimiento bastante reciente, se han publicado pocos estudios hasta el momento y ninguno de ellos se ha centrado en los vídeos de la campaña del Brexit de UKip. Este trabajo de fin de grado se centra en poner de manifiesto las maneras en que las ideas de este partido se reflejan en uno de sus vídeos de campaña llamado "We're Better Off Out." A su vez, este trabajo comprende una introducción al análisis del discurso crítico multimodal, así como un breve resumen de la campaña del Brexit. La metodología empleada se basa principalmente en el conjunto de herramientas proporcionadas por Machin y Mayr (2012) en lo que respecta al análisis multimodal para analizar este vídeo tanto visual como textualmente.

Palabras clave: Brexit, UKip, Análisis Crítico del Discurso Multimodal, Metáfora Conceptual.



## Index

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction .....  | 6  |
| 2. Political context.....  | 7  |
| 3. Methodology .....   | 9  |
| 4. Analysis and interpretation .....                                 | 11 |
| 4.1. Textual cues.....   | 11 |
| 4.1.1. Lexical choices .....   | 11 |
| 4.1.2. Deixis: indexing participants, time and space.....            | 12 |
| 4.1.3. The role of social actors .....                               | 15 |
| 4.1.4. Transitivity .....  | 16 |
| 4.1.5. Factuality, deonticity and epistemicity .....                 | 18 |
| 4.1.6. Structural oppositions .....                                  | 20 |
| 4.2. Visual cues .....   | 21 |
| 4.2.1. Characterisation of settings.....                             | 23 |
| 4.2.2. Distance .....  | 24 |
| 4.2.3. Angle.....  | 26 |
| 4.2.4. “Don’t be chicken”: Characters’ metaphorical characterisation | 27 |
| 4.2.5. Speakers’ attitude: gaze and pose .....                       | 28 |
| 4.2.6. Visual modality.....  | 29 |
| 5. Conclusion.....   | 32 |

## 1. Introduction

Brexit is quite recent so there are relatively few studies on the matter. One of those studies is Musolff's article (2017), which discusses the use of conceptual metaphors<sup>1</sup> in the environment of the Brexit campaign from both sides: Remain and Leave. There is also little academic literature about the political party UKip.<sup>2</sup> Although there are some books about it, the authors are members of the party itself, such as Daniel (2006) and Gardner (2006). These two authors narrate the rise of the party from their perspective from within it. Being Brexit a major historical event, it is likely that we will start seeing many more studies arise after the UK leaves the EU. These could, for instance, deal with the political and linguistic strategies present during the campaign for Brexit. This dissertation can be considered as part of those first studies, as it focuses on one instance of UKip's campaign political discourse: the YouTube video entitled "We're Better Off Out."

The reason behind this particular choice is the fact that it could perfectly exemplify an instance of political discourse being conveyed through the use of both image and language. Political discourse can be defined in general terms as the use of language within the field of politics or society as a political construct. As Chilton (2008: 30) states, "there is a fundamental connection between the language faculty and the social, in fact political, nature of human beings." This relationship can be studied by approaching it from a political discourse analysis perspective in order to reveal how language is used in these contexts. "We're Better Off Out" is an example of political discourse because language is used within the field of politics by a political party with a specific aim: to convince UK citizens to vote for Brexit.

---

<sup>1</sup> Conceptual metaphors are figurative comparisons where an idea is understood with reference to another. An example can be found in the following conceptual metaphor: COUNTRIES/STATES ARE CONTAINERS (Lakoff 1993).

<sup>2</sup> As stated by Daniel (2006: 16) "the 'UK' in the name should not be rendered as 'United Kingdom' [...] We were to be known as the UK Independence Party, the U-K-I-P or U-Kip."

The video can be analysed adopting a multimodal approach because there is a combination of image and language. Visual and linguistic devices have been used, whether consciously or not, to contribute to the spread of UKip's ideology. However, these devices might not be that evident to the audience. The purpose of this dissertation is to reveal the visual and textual strategies that might have been employed in the making of this video, to uncover the hidden ideology that could and that has been transmitted through it and the relation between these strategies and what they help convey.

This dissertation has been divided and organised into five sections, the first of which is this introduction. In the second section, a summary of the Brexit political context together with a description of the background and content of the analysed video have been provided. In the third section, the nature of critical discourse analysis and the multimodal methodological approach are briefly introduced as well as the analysis process that has been followed. The fourth section is devoted to the multimodal analysis of the video, which has been divided into two subsections: textual cues and visual cues. In the fifth section, the obtained conclusions together with a concise summary of the conducted analysis have been exposed.

## **2. Political context**

'Brexit' became the term that designates the United Kingdom leaving the European Union. This word is the result of combining 'Britain' with 'Exit'. As Moseley (2016) claimed, the honour of coining the word 'Brexit' was awarded to a certain man called Peter Wilding, who wrote about the word back in 2012, four years before the actual EU referendum was held. This EU referendum took place on Thursday 23 June 2016, and it was intended as an event where British citizens would decide whether they would like to remain in the EU or leave it.

As the referendum date was approaching, polling presented the Leave side and the Remain side as evenly matched. The only party that campaigned for leaving the EU in this EU referendum was UKip, and according to the final results published on the BBC website, UKip won with a 51.9% for Leave against a 48.1% for Remain. The result made Prime Minister David Cameron resign from the UK parliament as he admitted that

the UK needed a new leader that would agree with the Brexit result. His resignation was followed by many others such as Boris Johnson's, who was the face of the Leave side during the Brexit campaign, or Nigel Farage, who was UKIP's leader. This wave of resignations of such prominent faces during the campaign left the UK in a state of confusion.

In order to win the Brexit campaign, UKIP made use of many resources, not only oral political speeches and written manifestos, but also a series of powerful images and videos such as "We're Better Off Out" that transmitted their values. Visual and musical alternative means of producing political discourse have been used before as can be seen in the famous Will.i.am's music video 'Yes, We Can', analysed using a multimodal critical discourse approach by Filardo-Llamas (2015). We can extract from her in-depth analysis that this music video was a powerful tool during Barack Obama's presidential candidature, as it contributed to convince American people to vote for him. However, there is a difference in between "Yes, We Can" and "We're Better Off Out": the former was not produced by a political figure but an artist, whereas the latter was officially part of UKIP's Brexit political campaign.

"We're Better Off Out" was taken from 'UKIP Official Channel' on YouTube, which was uploaded on 20 June 2016. Its aim was to persuade UK citizens to vote to leave the EU during the Brexit campaign. As for the internal context, the setting where the storyline develops is a crowded large dark dirt-covered warehouse full of red, grey and black chickens. This place is apparently located in the middle of the countryside. The main characters are three: a red chicken, a white hen, and a farmer. There is also a secondary character which is a black chicken. In the story, there are two sides: Those who want to remain inside the warehouse and those who want to leave. As we will see below, this metaphorically mirrors the contestants in the EU referendum campaign. On the one hand, the Remain side is mainly represented by the farmer, who tries to make the chickens stay inside all throughout the video, and the black chicken, who warns the red chicken and the white hen of the dangers that await them outside the warehouse. On the other hand, the Leave side is represented by the red chicken and the white hen, who discuss the possibility of leaving.



### **3. Methodology**

According to Wodak (2007: 186), critical discourse analysis (CDA) presents “common interests in demystifying ideologies and power through systematic investigation of semiotic data, be they written, spoken or visual.” The CDA approach is interdisciplinary as societies cannot and should not be studied from a single perspective (Wodak 2007). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse that views language as a form of social practice and provides a perspective from which we can focus on social problems such as social change or racism. There are multiple discursive genres which are studied in CDA, from advertisements, newspapers, political speeches or manifestos to other political campaign tools such as the video that is analysed in this dissertation.

Multimodal CDA could be considered as a branch of CDA that developed in the late 1980s and 1990s. The multimodal approach owes its origin mainly to Kress and van Leeuwen’s book (1996). These two linguists were among the first to claim that meaning is not only contained in words, but also in other semiotic modes, e.g. the visual, the textual or the musical. To understand what the term multimodal CDA is we should examine what the ‘multimodal’ means. The word ‘multimodal’ refers to the different modes through which meaning could be conveyed, not only oral or written speech, but also images, music or other.

This dissertation’s multimodal CDA analysis is primarily based upon the methodological approach included in Machin and Mayr’s book (2012), whose aim is to display a set of tools that are usually employed in CDA and also show how they can be applied to media texts. In short, their book provides the necessary tools and methods to examine the production of meaning through the use of image and text. Although there are other semiotic modes such as music, the meaning potentials of “We’re Better Off Out” have been considered to be conveyed mainly through the use of a sequence of images.

First, the YouTube video was downloaded from its source, 'UKIP Official Channel', in order to secure a copy and to be able to reproduce it offline if needed. Second, the video was transcribed bearing in mind the textual and the visual elements present. Finally, the textual and the visual cues were analysed following Machin and Mayr's (2012) multimodal toolkit. This toolkit contains a lot of strategies and items that can be analysed textually and visually in discourses, though only the ones that finally produced relevant data for the analysis of UKip's video were employed.

In order to show a more comprehensible and accessible view of the analysis, this has been divided into two sections. The first section has been devoted to the study of the textual cues, based on speech and textual material. The textual elements within UKip's video have been considered to be the YouTube video description together with the speech and the signs within the video and the characters' speech. I have first analysed the lexical choices present in the YouTube video description area because it is the first thing that the audience may see and because it is also part of UKip's political discourse. Second, person, time and space deixis have been identified in the textual part of the video in order to show the characters' construction and time and spatial construction through their indexicalisation within the video. Third, the role of social actors has been taken into account. This role has been described using two strategies: individualisation versus collectivisation and anonymisation (Krees and van Leeuwen 1996). Fourth, Halliday's (2004) transitivity model has been applied to identify the verb processes present in the video, which have been classified (see Table 1 in the appendix) including four types: material, mental, relational and existential. Fifth, factuality, deonticity and epistemicity have been identified (see Table 2 in the appendix). Finally, structural oppositions have been examined due to their contribution to the ideological squaring (van Dijk 1998), which consists on emphasising 'our' good things, emphasising 'their' bad things, de-emphasising 'our' bad things and de-emphasising 'their' good things.

The second section is strongly focused on the visual cues and constitutes the main reason why the methodological approach adopted in this dissertation has a multimodal character. First, the characterisation of the settings present in the video has been analysed to establish how the UK and the EU are portrayed. Second, I have analysed distance distinguishing and identifying three types of shots: long, medium and close (Kress and van Leeuwen 1996). Third, I have examined the angle from which the video has been created. Fourth, the characters' metaphorical characterisation has been described to understand how the two sides of the story, the Leave side and the Remain side, are built. Fifth, the speakers' attitude has been considered as regards the gaze and pose of the characters in order to study the relationships among them and with the audience. Finally, I have included an analysis of the video regarding Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) list of visual markers of modality: degrees of the articulation of detail, degrees of articulation of background, degrees of depth articulation, degrees of articulation of light and shadow, degrees of articulation of tone, degrees of colour modulation and degrees of colour saturation. Each of them will be explained below.

#### **4. Analysis and interpretation**

##### **4.1. Textual cues**

###### **4.1.1. Lexical choices**

A light-hearted video from UKIP on why we should all Vote to Leave this Thursday, June 23.  
Don't be chicken, we're better off out!

UKIP Official Channel . "We're Better Off Out", *YouTube*, 2016.

The lexical choices in the video description above can also be analysed because it was written by 'UKIP Official Channel' itself and can be therefore considered part of their political discourse. Qualifying this political discourse video as "light-hearted" could be a way to lift some weight off the content of the video and to avoid criticism. However, we, the audience, should not be convinced of the 'light-heartedness' of the video. We should not forget that "We're Better Off Out" is a political discourse campaign video that addresses adults, and that it can potentially have a powerful effect. In fact, 'UKIP Official Channel' also uses the deontic modal 'should' right after using the adjective "light-hearted" to describe the video, which is used to instruct the audience to vote to leave the EU. The combination of the idiomatic expression "don't be chicken"

with the party's slogan "Vote to Leave" turns the video into the embodiment of the party's ideas regarding Brexit. In other words, the implicit message behind this could be 'if you do not vote to leave, you are chicken.'

'UKIP Official Channel' probably used the adjective "light-hearted" because the video could be classified as a cartoon. Cartoons have traditionally addressed children. However, in the last 20 years, there has been a major change as regards the type of viewers that watch cartoons. We have seen the rise of many cartoons whose target audience is not children, but young adults and adults.<sup>3</sup> Although they only refer to children, Nathanson and Cantor (2000) claim that there has been a change in the perspective from which violence is seen in cartoons, and that this change promotes the involvement with the oppressed in the storyline: the purpose is no longer to laugh at the oppressed, but to sympathise and get involved. This change in perspective could also be extrapolated to "We're Better Off Out," in which we are being led to sympathise with the oppressed, who are the chicken in the warehouse. The video pictures the chickens as the good side in contrast with the farmer, as we will see further in the analysis. This is one of the ways in which the video promotes our involvement with the oppressed to acquire the audience's Leave vote.

#### **4.1.2. Deixis: indexing participants, time and space**

When it comes to deixis, we can find three types: person, time and space deixis. Within person deixis, there are instances of the pronouns 'we', 'us', 'you', 'your', 'they', and 'I'. In terms of participants and according to person deixis, we can see there is an us and them division (van Dijk 1998) that plays an important role in the creation of the relationship between the chickens and the farmer, as we will see below.

Since the storyline present in the video is the depiction of a confrontation, we could have expected from the start that we would have the us and them division (van Dijk 1998). In UKip's video, we have the personal pronouns 'we' and 'us'. The former is uttered in two cases. The first case is when the red chicken uses the pronoun 'we' to refer to the chickens and himself as part of the same team. The second case is in UKip's slogan referring to the UK citizens, "we're better off out." The first person plural

---

<sup>3</sup> The earliest instance could be said to be *The Simpsons* (1989), followed by *Family Guy* (1999), until these last years with, for instance, *Rick and Morty* (2013) and *Bojack Horseman* (2014).

pronoun 'we' used in UKip's slogan is always inclusive, which means it includes the speaker and the audience. The object pronoun 'us' is only uttered once by the red chicken to include the rest of chickens and himself in the warehouse (see example 1 below). In this case, we, the audience, are metaphorically involved as well as the rest of chickens in the warehouse because the use of this inclusive 'we' addresses us directly.

(1) RED CHICKEN: There's nothing to stop us leaving, is there?

The second person pronoun 'you', which is sometimes singular, plural or sometimes could be both, is employed to refer to different entities depending on the character who utters it. For instance, the red chicken and the white hen use it to refer to one another as they speak (1); this use of 'you' is always singular. The farmer uses 'you' to address the crowd of chickens as a group (2), making this use plural. The black chicken uses it to refer to both the red chicken and the white hen when these two are considering leaving the warehouse (4), in which case the use of 'you' can be singular or plural since it could refer to one or both characters. The possessive pronoun 'your' is only uttered once and is present in the black chicken's intervention to address the red chicken and the white hen again (3). Thus, the second person pronouns 'you' and 'your' are used by the black chicken to refer only to the red chicken and the white hen.

(2) WHITE CHICKEN: Nope, nothing at all! You go first.

(3) FARMER: Attention, you are safer and stronger inside.

(4) BLACK CHICKEN: You go out there, they won't let you back in and it'll get wet and cold and dark and you won't get your dose of fish meal.

Person deixis helps us to establish the participant construction of the audience. On the one hand, the singular use of the second person pronoun 'you' makes the audience involved as individuals. On the other hand, the plural use of 'you' makes the audience involved as a collective rather than as individuals. The singular use of 'you' is only employed by the two characters that integrate the Leave side, i.e. the red chicken and the white hen, whereas the plural use of 'you' is employed by the two characters of the Remain side, i.e. the farmer and the black chicken. This fact has some implications in the construction of the dichotomy of these two sides: The Leave side promotes the audience involvement as individuals whereas the Remain side promotes the audience

involvement as a collective. Addressing the audience as individuals may be considered to be more effective to convince them to vote for Brexit than addressing them as a group. It is each individual who has to make a decision for the EU referendum, not a group.

Regarding time deixis, it is mostly reflected in the use of the present tense throughout the whole video. There is a different instance of time deixis other than the present tense, which is used right at the end when the message “Vote to Leave this Thursday” appears on screen. In this sentence, we see time deixis reflected on the noun phrase “this Thursday,” referring to Thursday 23 June 2016, i.e. the day of the EU referendum. All in all, time deixis is used in the video to anchor the storyline in the present, the time when the Brexit campaign was taking place. As a consequence, we, the audience, are likely to see the story from a ‘witness’ perspective and get involved into what is happening because it is happening in the present, at the same time we are seeing the events in the video. The recurrent use of the present tense also helps to make the message stronger because it emphasises the present moment; there is no more certain of a reality than that of the present.

Within space deixis, there are many instances of the verbs ‘come’ and ‘go’, which depict proximity and distance to the deictic centre respectively, being the deictic centre the warehouse. The verb ‘leave’ also appears several times as it is a major word in the Brexit campaign, and it also depicts distance from the deictic centre mentioned before. The warehouse is a metaphorical conceptualisation of the EU. Expressions such as “inside” and “out there” establish the dichotomy that is going to be developed in the video. Space deixis plays an important role in the video for the creation of the mental construction of the two sides: Leave and Remain, outside and inside. Chilton (2004: 56) states that “space indexicals relate to political or geopolitical space,” so in the context of the EU referendum, we would assume the two spaces created in the video, the exterior and the interior of the warehouse, are a metaphorical conceptualisation of a UK outside the EU, and a UK inside the EU respectively.

### 4.1.3. The role of social actors

Social actors, or participants, can be identified with a series of strategies. In this video, two strategies have proved to be of special relevance in order to characterise social actors: individualisation versus collectivisation, anonymisation (Kress and van Leeuwen 1996). I have considered the study of social actors in this video as a mix of textual and visual aspects, so both textual and visual strategies have played an important role to determine these social actors.

There is a clear instance of collectivisation when the farmer says “safer and stronger chickens,” (5) where he is providing the chickens with a ‘sense of togetherness’ referring to them in general as a group. Collectivisation also takes place in a visual way by portraying the chickens as a group separate from the farmer. Individualisation happens visually by portraying the farmer in a closed room and always individually in contrast with the chickens, who are usually showed as a group. However, there is an exception to this: there is visual individualisation in the chickens’ group when the red chicken, the white hen and the black chicken speak separately within a close or medium shot. This visual individualisation acts as an emphasiser to highlight who is talking by making use of light and closer shots. The textual and visual collectivisation of the participants or social actors in the video into two groups emphasises the two sides of the confrontation. In this confrontation, we have the chickens constituted as a group, and the farmer as an individual. This metaphorically indicates a political confrontation between the UK and the EU respectively during the Brexit referendum.

(5) FARMER: Come back, safer and stronger chickens!

Anonymisation has been found in the pronoun ‘they’, especially when the black chicken makes his point (4). In the video, there is only the farmer and the chickens, so the referent of the personal pronoun ‘they’ would not be clear unless one inserts the video in its political context – the Brexit campaign. We could therefore say that the pronoun ‘they’ in the black chicken’s utterance refers to the people in the EU government, which would stand as the only direct reference to another world within the video.

#### 4.1.4. Transitivity

Transitivity has been analysed in relation to Halliday's transitivity model to identify verb processes (2004), from which certain types have been especially selected according to their relevance and prominence in the textual part of the video. These are material, relational, mental, and existential verb processes. They have been selected for the analysis in order to show the roles the characters play in the video. Material verb processes constitute the largest amount (23 instances), followed by relational (10 instances), mental (6 instances) and existential (3 instances) verb processes (see Table 1 in the appendix for concrete examples). There were hardly any instances of behavioural or verbal verb processes probably because there is a lack of psychological and physical behaviour and also a lack of reported speech in the video given that it is supposed to look as a spontaneous dialogue.

Material verb processes are described by Machin and Mayr (2012: 106) as "processes of doing." As it has been said before, they are the most frequent ones and they are mainly used by the red chicken and the white hen as agents in the sentences. These two characters appear as active characters who take action (6) whereas the members of the metaphorical Remain side, the farmer and the black chicken, appear as passive (7). In example 6, we can see the use of the material verb process "sing" whose agent is "I", which refers to the character who utters it, the red chicken. In example 7, the farmer does not use material verb processes but relational ones, the verb 'to be' in this case. It is interesting for the aim of the video to show the members of the metaphorical Remain side less active than the Leave side to establish a contrast between them and exaggerate their differences in an additional way. In political campaigns, appearing to be more active than the other parties is a positive contribution to your image in the campaign.

(6) RED CHICKEN: You know what? I don't care! I'll sing in the rain!

(7) FARMER: Attention, this is a European regulated free range chicken farm, thank you.



Relational verb processes are said to “encode meanings about states of being, where things are stated to exist in relation to other things” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 110). The reason why this is the second type as regards to frequency is that the verb ‘to be’ is widely used throughout (8 instances of the verb ‘to be’ out of 10 relational verb processes). Relational verb processes appear in all the characters’ utterances. They are generally employed so as to establish facts and describe the situation. This is the case of the farmer, for example, who qualifies the warehouse (3) and establishes facts (7). This type of verb process also appears in the red chicken and the white hen’s interventions with the same intention. Although the verb ‘to be’ is the one which predominates, there is also an instance of another relational verb process in one of the white hen’s utterances (8) with the verb ‘to look’, and another one in the black chicken’s unique intervention (4) with the verb ‘to get’. The abundance of the verb ‘to be’ promotes the sense of certainty in the characters’ utterances, portraying each of them as confident participants.

(8) WHITE HEN: Whoop! Shame! It looks so nice out there in the sunshine...

Mental verb processes are described by Machin and Mayr (2012:107) as “processes of sensing”. They also claim that these can be split into three classes: cognition (verbs of thinking, knowing or understanding), affection (verbs of liking, disliking or fearing) and perception (verbs of seeing, hearing or perceiving). Mental verb processes also appear, as the characters sometimes mention their perceptions or their opinion. Such is the case of the red chicken saying, “I don’t care” (6) towards the end of the video, when he expresses that going out of the warehouse is worth trying. In “We’re Better Off Out,” the type that predominates is perception mental verb processes (4 instances out of 6) because the characters tend to describe the exterior of the warehouse as they perceive it visually through the warehouse’s gap of light through which they can see the field outside. In example 9, we can see the use of the verb ‘to look’ to indicate what is outside the warehouse. These perceptions are based on visual data and they are always uttered by the red chicken and the white hen. Therefore, we could say that this type of verb process helps in the characterisation of the Leave side as objective at the same time the members express their own opinions. This could help in the involvement of the audience with this side.

(9) RED CHICKEN: Hey, look! Corn! There’s corn out there, the birds are eating it!

Existential verb processes (3 instances) are the last in frequency order. They only appear in the red chicken and white hen's interventions to describe what exists outside the warehouse. In example 9, the 'there is' construction is an instance of this situation described before. The red chicken says this right after viewers are shown the exterior of the warehouse, where there is a trough full of corn. The 'there is' construction is recurrent and constitutes all of the instances of existential verb processes. This verb process also helps in the aforementioned characterisation of the Leave side as objective since the four instances also rely on visual data that can be verified by watching the images we are shown.

#### **4.1.5. Factuality, deonticity and epistemicity**

Factuality is conveyed through the use of the verb 'to be' (10 instances), all of which express the state of facts. The characters seem to be always pretty sure of their perceptions and opinions, as can be seen in one of the sentences uttered by the red chicken (see example 10) with the use of the verb 'to be'. The predominance of the verb 'to be' is important as it helps us understand the characteristics of many interventions.

When we use this verb in political discourse, we are showing ourselves as confident individuals, and it is this sense of confidence which helps to build different levels of authority in the video. The farmer, for instance, is portrayed first as an authoritative figure that gradually loses his authority because of the chickens' vindicating their power through a rebellion near the end. His three interventions are characterised by the use of short direct sentences which contain two instances of the verb 'to be' (examples 7 and 3) and in the last intervention (example 5), a deontic imperative. As can be seen in these interventions, the first and the second include uses of the verb 'to be' to confidently express the state of facts whereas the third one includes an instance of deontic modality, which is reflected on the use of the imperative. The first two times, the farmer only establishes facts to convince the red chicken and the white hen indirectly. However, the third and last time he speaks, he seems to attempt to recover his decaying authority by using a deontic imperative, which denotes a high degree of obligation. This change in the way he talks looks particularly interesting as it reflects the evolution of his status within the story, from being authoritative to having no authority.

(10) RED CHICKEN: I'm not scared! Let's take a look!

Textual modality can be divided into epistemic and deontic modality. Epistemic modality denotes “how certain you are something will happen” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 187). Epistemic instances of textual modality can also show possibility and ability. On the other hand, deontic modality is “about how we compel and instruct others” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 187). Deontic instances of textual modality are used to show different degrees of obligation. In the video, deontic modality prevails against epistemic modality, with 7 deontic instances against 4 epistemic instances respectively (see Table 2 in the appendix for concrete examples).

The number of deontic instances is significant enough to have an effect on the video. Deontic modality is expressed mostly through the use of the imperative (6 imperatives out of 7 total deontic instances). This shows us that the degree of obligation is quite high. Five of these imperatives are used by the characters to instruct each other. They are mainly employed by the red chicken and the white hen to compel one another to do something, as in one of the white hen's utterances shown below (example 11). The other imperative, “don't be,” and the remaining instance of deontic modality, “should,” appear in the YouTube video description area (see lexical choices section for the description). The modal verb “should” is used to instruct the viewers to vote for leaving the EU. This time, the use of this modal verb denotes a high degree of obligation, appearing as an advice that could be taken as an implicit order. The remaining imperative is “don't be” as in “don't be chicken.” In this case, we have a deontic use with a high degree of obligation combined with the word ‘chicken’, a combination that has a double-entendre humorous effect. As we will see below, the word ‘chicken’ has a different meaning depending on its denotation and connotation.

(11) WHITE HEN: No! Oh no! It's not safe out there! Come back!

Regarding epistemic modality (4 instances), it is mainly represented by the black chicken's utterance (see example 4). The three instances of the future simple present in the black chicken's intervention are used to predict with a high degree of certainty, when he warns the red chicken and the white hen of the dangers that exist outside the warehouse. The remaining instance of 'will' appears in one of the last red chicken's interventions (example 6). In this case, 'will' is not used to predict but rather to express willingness.

#### **4.1.6. Structural oppositions**

Machin and Mayr (2012:40) state that when structural oppositions "are more overtly included in a text, we can talk of ideological squaring," a concept which was first mentioned by van Dijk (1998). In this video, structural oppositions have been found to be prominent and influential towards the creation of the ideological message behind it. One of the first structural oppositions can be found when the farmer affirms through the speakers of the warehouse that the chicken farm we are witnessing is a "free range chicken farm." This is deliberately ironic given that viewers are shown a close dim warehouse crowded with chickens. Therefore, the chickens are not "free," but rather 'captive'; this is our first structural opposition: 'free' vs. 'captive'.

Another structural opposition is present in the message, "safer and stronger chickens", and in the white hen's utterance, "it's not safe out there." Here we can see that the interior of the warehouse contains both the adjectives "safe" and "strong." This would lead us to discern that the exterior of the warehouse contains both the opposite adjectives 'unsafe' and 'weak'. As Machin and Mayr contemplate "often only one of these (structural oppositions) may be mentioned, which can imply differences from qualities of its opposites without being overtly stated" (2012: 39), so by qualifying something with a certain adjective, we are also implying the opposite. The four adjectives mentioned in this paragraph constitute the next two structural oppositions present in the video: 'safe' vs. 'unsafe' and 'strong' vs. 'weak'.

In addition to the former display of the values of the interior and the exterior of the warehouse, we can also find the one present in the black chicken's intervention when he says, "it'll get wet, cold and dark." The interior of the warehouse has now another three adjectives: "wet", "cold" and "dark," which implies the contrary. The interior of this warehouse is supposed to be 'dry', 'warm' and 'light', which is again ironic as the viewers can witness the reality of the chickens in the video, which is quite the opposite. Now, we would have another three structural oppositions: 'wet' vs. 'dry', 'cold' vs. 'warm', and 'dark' vs. 'light'.





In connection with the structural opposition analysed before, we could say there is a first 'challenging' of these qualifications referring to both the interior and the exterior of the warehouse when the white chicken says, "it looks so nice out there in the sunshine" (see example 8). She suggests that the exterior does not seem 'dark' but 'light', letting us know that the black chicken is wrong when he describes the exterior as "dark" (example 4). There is a second 'challenging' of all the negative qualifications that have been assigned to the exterior of the warehouse ('unsafe', 'weak', 'wet', 'cold', 'dark') when the red chicken says, "I'm free!" once he is outside (example 12). This contributes again to the idea that the interior makes chickens 'captive', and the first structural opposition ('free' vs. 'captive'). This structural opposition actually reflects the political position of UKip as regards the situation of the UK within the EU, and its slogan, "we're better off out." According to UKip's slogan, a UK outside the EU would embody the positive characteristics established before with each of the structural oppositions, whereas a UK inside the EU would embody all the negative qualities discussed above.

(12) RED CHICKEN: Look! It's not raining! I'm free! Come on!

#### **4.2. Visual cues**

Before going into the visual analysis, a summary of the activity and visual schema (Filardo-Llamas 2016: 159-175) has been provided below in Table 3 to provide the reader with a concise view of the development of the storyline within UKip's Brexit campaign video.

**Table 3. Activity and Visual schema for UKip’s “We’re Better Off Out.”**

| Activity schema  | Visual schema   |
|--|---|
| <p>Chickens are oppressed by an EU farmer</p> <p style="text-align: center;"></p>                             | <p>Short shot of grey brick wall with a sign that reads: EU SAFER/STRONGER CHICKENS.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Slow zoom-out of a crowded large dark dirt-covered warehouse full of static red, grey, and black chickens</p> <p style="text-align: center;"></p>   |
| <p>Some chickens try to leave the warehouse while the EU farmer tries to prevent it</p>  | <p>Mixture of medium and close lighter shots of chickens wishing to leave + medium and close darker shots of EU farmer</p>  |
| <p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p>Chickens finally exit the warehouse and are free from oppression</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p>Long shot, colourful view of chickens dancing together on green field.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Slogan slowly appears: “We’re Better Off Out.”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Zoom-out on the happy crowd of dancing chickens on the green field + display of the message ‘Vote to Leave this Thursday’</p> |

#### 4.2.1. Characterisation of settings

Machin and Mayr (2012: 52) argue that settings should also be analysed because they are used “to communicate general ideas, to connote discourses and their values, identities and actions.” In the case of UKip’s video, we can discern that a rural agrarian UK is represented through the use of the two conceptual metaphors: UK CITIZENS ARE CHICKENS and THE EU GOVERNMENT IS A FARMER.

The association of ‘gloomy’ and ‘closed’ with the warehouse portrays it as a kind of ‘jail’. ‘Light’ and ‘open’ are visually associated with the countryside as the incarnation of freedom. We can find a first conceptual metaphor hidden in this visual message: COUNTRIES/STATES ARE CONTAINERS (Lakoff: 1993). We could also draw two mappings from this metaphor if we consider the interior and the exterior of the warehouse: FREEDOM IS OPEN and OPPRESSION IS CLOSE. Another two conceptual metaphors could be drawn from the characteristics of the interior and the exterior: GOOD IS LIGHT and BAD IS DARK (Lakoff: 2010). These metaphors have been quite important to convey the political discourse of UKip during the Brexit campaign, characterising ‘leaving’ the EU as good and ‘remaining’ as bad. The outside of the warehouse, a UK outside the EU, has been visually pictured as ‘light’ whereas the inside of the warehouse, a UK inside the EU, has been visually pictured as ‘dark’. Therefore, we can see another two mappings: LEAVING IS GOOD, REMAINING IS BAD.

Light is also key in characterising settings. According to Machin and Mayr (2012: 52), high key lighting suggests optimism whereas low key lighting suggests pessimism. In the video, high key lighting is used to illustrate the heavenly field and also to highlight the red chicken and the white hen, whereas low key lighting is used with the rest of chickens and the farmer. This will be explained in depth in the section dedicated to visual modality.

#### 4.2.2. Distance

Distance refers to not only the visual distance among characters within the video, but also the distance between characters and audience. Distance can be divided into close, medium, or long shots (Machin and Mayr 2012: 97). If we pay attention to this element in the visual display of the video, we will realise there is a clear distinction in the use of the three sizes of frames.

Long shots are only used at the beginning and at the end of the video to show a generalised view (Kress and van Leeuwen 1996) of the chickens in the warehouse, first depicted as ‘enclosed’ and ‘oppressed’ and later portrayed as ‘free’ and ‘independent’. It could be argued that the first long shot of the oppressed chickens is the prelude of the confrontation that is going to occur, setting the reasons<sup>4</sup> why we are going to witness an imminent rebellion. The long shots used towards the end of the video show the viewers the result of this confrontation: a happy view of many chickens dancing together on the green field outside the warehouse, free from all oppression and finally in charge of their own fate.

Medium and close shots are mainly used to focus the viewers’ attention on the two sides of the confrontation established at the very beginning of the video: the chickens in the warehouse on one side, and the farmer on the other. It is worth mentioning that neither of these two sides appears with the other at any time; they are always shown as separate entities with nothing in common. Medium shots allow us to perceive the characters as if they were people we know, like neighbours (Kress and van Leeuwen 1996: 132) because when we interact with people face to face, we normally have their upper body part in our field of vision. This helps again in the process of making the audience involved with the characters in this video. Close shots are distinctively used to convey confrontation. The clearest example is the case of the farmer’s mouth close-up, when he speaks to the chickens in the warehouse in order to make them stay within and stop the incipient rebellion. The confrontation effect is here achieved by showing a close-up of the angry lower part of the face of the farmer.

---

<sup>4</sup> In this long shot, viewers are shown a crowded large dark dirt-covered warehouse full of red, grey, and black chickens. As the zoom-out stops, we see a small gap through which light enters the warehouse.



Considering distance within the video and among the different characters that appear, viewers would probably realise there is an evident long distance between the chickens in the warehouse and the farmer. I have labelled this the ‘first detachment’ since this is the first way in which we establish two sides in the story. However, a ‘second detachment’ could be considered within the side of the chickens. This detachment would enable us to affirm that a little after the beginning of the video, we start to have not only two, but three different groups of participants: the rebelling red chicken and white hen, the rest of the chickens, and the farmer. This ‘second detachment’ is reached through the visual isolation of the red chicken and white hen from the rest of the crowd, when they start considering leaving the warehouse. This is accomplished through the use of several markers of visual modality: degrees of articulation of light and shadow, which help in the red chicken and white hen’s isolation, and degrees of articulation of detail, which also help in distinguishing these two main characters from the rest. These visual markers of modality will be discussed in detail below.

There is one last detachment which I have called the ‘third detachment’. This detachment is achieved through the unique black chicken’s intervention. This third detachment occurs through the use of a slow zoom-in of the black chicken to show a medium shot as he speaks. This is done to make clear he is the one who is speaking from among the crowd of chickens and set the focus on him instead of the rest of the chickens around him. With this detaching strategy, four groups of participants are visually created: the red chicken and the white hen, the farmer, the black chicken and the rest of the chickens in the warehouse.

### 4.2.3. Angle

Images within the video are always centred, they never change perspective, and they are prominently combined with close and medium shots. This type of angle is called ‘side-on view’ and it is combined with closeness in the case of UKip’s video. As Machin and Mayr (2012: 98) claim, “the side-on view is a more detached, although combined with closeness, it can, depending on the circumstances, index togetherness.”

We could be tempted to say that the generally centred type of view chosen for the video could be a sign of objectivity as we do not look at the characters from below or above. This type of view is merely another way, together with close and medium shots, to promote the involvement of the audience in the situation at hand. The two types of shots and the centred view offer viewers a close social situation in which they can be free to participate. The conversation between the red chicken and the white hen is a clear example of this idea, since the audience is shown a series of close and medium shots of these characters as they express hope, disappointment, or fear. This is likely to have been done so as to boost empathy in the viewers as they cannot be detached from what is happening in the storyline. We, the audience, are no longer simple alien watchers, but empathically active subjects who are forced to join the oppressed side – in this case, the chickens – by experiencing their feelings and reactions from a short distance and a centred perspective.

In this empathically potential scenario, we as analysts should have a close look at the ways in which the population of the UK is included or excluded from the EU. The representation of the UK within UKip’s campaign video should also be our focus because it is one of the ways in which UKip’s ideology is transmitted. These two issues will be developed below.

#### 4.2.4. “Don’t be chicken”: Characters’ metaphorical characterisation

We, the audience, do not see the UK citizens represented as such in the video, but rather through the use of the figure of the chicken. However, we should question why have the creators of the video decided to use this figure to represent the UK’s population. To address this issue, we should firstly find the denotations and secondly, the connotations of the word ‘chicken’. This is going to allow us to be able to explain the choices in the creation of the characters present in the video.

A ‘chicken’ is defined as “a domestic fowl kept for its eggs or meat, especially a young one” (Oxford Dictionaries 2017). UK citizens are therefore depicted as a domestic animal of significant importance due to the resources it provides. The ‘exploiting agent’ in this type of context would be the figure of the farmer, who is a personification of the abstract entity of the EU. This first denotational analysis would allow us to confirm the use of the conceptual metaphor UK CITIZENS IN THE EU ARE CHICKENS and, as a result, THE EU GOVERNMENT IS A FARMER. These conceptual metaphors play an important role in the characterisation of both the British people and the EU respectively. We can extract several mappings.<sup>5</sup> The first is ‘chickens are subject to farmers’ so ‘UK citizens in the EU are subject to the EU’. The connotation of the word ‘chicken’ is “a coward” (Oxford Dictionaries 2017), so we would also find the mapping ‘UK citizens in the EU are cowards’. The reason for the choice of the figure of the chicken is that the creators of the video probably used this figure to represent a British citizen so as to provoke the audience and call upon their participation. Viewers would likely be challenged by the implicit mapping, ‘UK citizens in the EU are cowards’, regarding their cowardice and would be prompted to vote as active citizens.

---

<sup>5</sup> A mapping is a set of correspondences that exist between the source domain and the target domain of the conceptual metaphor (Kövecses 2002). For example, if we take the conceptual metaphor UK CITIZENS ARE CHICKENS, we could deduce the mapping ‘UK citizens in the EU are cowards’. In this instance, the source domain is ‘chickens’ and the target domain is ‘UK citizens in the EU’.

If we return to the characterisation of the EU within the video, we have previously seen that it is personified by the figure of the farmer. A ‘farmer’ is a “person who owns or manages a farm” (Oxford Dictionaries 2017). As a consequence of this, and together with the intervention of the black chicken, who portrays the farmer as someone to be afraid of, the following mapping could be established: ‘the EU government is the UK’s owner/oppressor’. Viewers are thus being implicitly shown UKip’s political message during the Brexit campaign: “We’re better off out” (the EU) because they take advantage of our resources and use us to their benefit. We could also affirm that the politics of fear are employed in “We’re Better Off Out” as the video could be said to be trying to make us realise we are under the oppression and control of other people (the EU) who are taking what is ours.

As a result of all the mappings established above, we could identify some intertextual references to the British writer George Orwell, specifically his famous allegorical novel *Animal Farm* (1945), where the farm animals rebel against their abusive farmers. Therefore, we can see that there are strong claims behind the metaphorical relationship between the chickens and the farmer.

#### **4.2.5. Speakers’ attitude: gaze and pose**

If we examine gaze within the video, we can see that, for the most part, characters tend to look at each other in the eyes, but they sometimes address the audience by looking directly at the camera – usually when there is an emphasis on a point being made. An instance of this can be found in one of the red chicken’s interventions (see example 10) as he looks directly at the audience. There is a decrease from one to zero in the frequency of chickens’ upwards gazes, which means there is an evolution. At the beginning, there is one instance in which the chickens gaze upwards. This occurs when the farmer speaks using a microphone from his cabin (example 7). His words come through the speakers of the warehouse, which are placed higher than the chickens. This situation is relevant to determine who starts having more authority in the story. The farmer is the entity placed higher in the images of the video to highlight his prevalence over the chickens in the warehouse. That is the reason why these animals have to look upwards when they listen to him speaking. From this we could extract two mappings: POWER IS UP, SUBSERVIENCE IS DOWN. These come from the well-documented GOOD IS

UP and BAD IS DOWN conceptual metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Being under the government of the farmer, the metaphorical personification of the EU, is thus portrayed as negative. It is a situation the chickens have to overcome by leaving the warehouse, which acts as the European space.

By examining pose, we can see what characters suggest with their body language such as the initial look of the chickens in the warehouse, who are pictured as a whole robotic as-if hypnotised crowd. There is a contrast in between this initial look of the chickens and their final look. When they exit the warehouse towards the end of the video, the situation is quite different: they seem more active, lifting their arms in the air and jumping around the country field. Although they are always represented as a unit from the beginning to the end, the chickens experiment a noticeable change during the video. They shift their emotional state completely from one extreme to the other as a result of their decision to exit the warehouse. We could also extract another conceptual metaphor from this observation: *ACTIVITY IS GOOD, PASSIVITY IS BAD*. This contributes again to the goal of the video as UKip's political discourse: to encourage UK citizens to take action and vote for Brexit.

#### **4.2.6. Visual modality**

Markers of visual modality are also considered to be important by Machin and Mayr (2012) as they follow Kress and van Leeuwen's (1996) list of modality markers for visual communication. They affirm modality is as present in speech as it is in images, where certain visual elements can shed light on different aspects of the message of the video. Visual modality is said to be conveyed through the degrees of articulation of several elements such as detail, background, depth, light and shadow, tone, colour modulation or colour saturation.

Degrees of articulation of detail can go "from the simplest line drawing to the sharpest and most finely grained photograph" (Machin and Mayr 2012: 202). There is an apparent low degree of articulation of detail overall, especially when the chickens appear. However, there are instances of a higher degree of articulation of detail such as when we are shown a close-up of the farmer's mouth. The purpose behind this deliberate display of a grim mouth possibly resides on depicting the farmer as the bad

side of the storyline by emphasising his grotesque looks. On the contrary, we have a low degree of articulation of detail when it comes to the portrayal of the chickens, which could be said to provoke a sense of uniformity and thus a sense of group and togetherness. The red chicken and the white hen seem to have been characterised in a more detailed way as they do not share the same features as the rest of the chickens in the warehouse. This contributes to the ‘second detachment’ that was stated earlier in the analysis, where the red chicken and the white chicken were shown as isolated from the rest of the crowd.

Degrees of articulation of the background can range “from a blank background (...) to maximally sharp and detailed backgrounds” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 203). The outside and inside of the warehouse seem to have the same degree of articulation. Yet, there is a major difference in between these two places: We should not forget that the inside of the warehouse is populated by a large crowd of chickens that blend forming a unit, whereas the outside of the warehouse has a wider range of elements present, creating a feeling of a better array of opportunities.

Degree of depth articulation can range “from the absence of any depth to maximally deep perspective” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 203). We can see there is very little depth; our knowledge is limited to the time of the day outside the warehouse – daytime. We cannot know what day it is except for the fact that it might be a spring or summer day due to the sunny weather outside. This last detail makes sense because the Brexit referendum took place on 26 June 2016. Besides, the idea of summer and spring is generally related to the idea of prosperity and happiness, so this also influences the characterisation of the exterior of the warehouse as an ideal destination.

Degrees of articulation of light and shadow can range “from zero articulation to the maximum number of degrees of depth of shade” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 204). This element can be particularly relevant as it serves as a major isolation factor in the ‘second detachment’, where the focus is set on the red chicken and the white hen, who are in the light of the sun, whereas the rest of the crowd stays in the shadows. Here, we find a prominent conceptual metaphor that is quite significant in this video, KNOWING IS SEEING (Sweetser: 1990). On the one hand, it could be ascertained that the red chicken and the white hen that stay in the light are ‘illuminated’ by their revolutionary ideas of

leaving the warehouse. They are empowered by the process of thinking of their situation and the consequent logical solution to it: “We’re better off out.” On the other hand, the rest of the chickens, who stay in the shadows, are in the position of ignorance about their situation; they are not conscious of what is being done to them.

Closely related to this, we also have degrees of articulation of tone, which can range “from two shades of tonal gradation, black and white (...), to maximum tonal gradation” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 205). The extremes of light and dark tones in the video shows us the extremist sides of what was designated early in this analysis as a confrontation, where we have the rebelling side composed by all the chickens, who finally exit the warehouse to enter the bright sunny field, and the farmer, who tries to prevent this. The degrees of articulation of tone are another major factor that plays an important role in the conceptual metaphor KNOWING IS SEEING. Machin and Mayr (2012: 205) claim that extremes of light and dark tones normally imply “extremes of emotion, truth or obscurity.” Furthermore, they go further and comment that “in Western cultures, brightness has metaphorical associations of transparency and truth as opposed to darkness which has associations of concealment, lack of clarity and the unknown” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 205). This statement contributes to the dichotomy established before: the red chicken and the white hen represent ‘truth’ and ‘transparency’, since they are in a bright sunny area of the warehouse, whereas the rest of the chickens and are concealed from this ‘truth’ and stay in the darkness. The farmer is also in a state of ‘concealment’. However, contrary to the other chickens, he does not come out from the darkness at any point in the video, so we can say that there is an evolution towards ‘knowledge’ in the other chickens that is not present in the farmer. If you leave the EU, the warehouse, you will find truth and knowledge. This constitutes one of the major ideas of UKip, which portrays being inside the EU as negative and counterproductive, as can be seen in the video.

Degrees of colour modulation can range “from flat, unmodulated colour to the representation of all the fine nuances of a given colour” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 205). The images in the video can be characterised as flat and unmodulated, which according to them suggests “simplicity and certainty” (2012: 205). This is likely to promote a wider sense of ‘absolute truth’ in the message behind UKip’s campaign video. Related

to colour modulation, we have degrees of colour saturation, which can range “from black and white to maximally saturated colours” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 205). In the video, we find saturated colours such as the bright white colour of the white hen or the brown and red colours of the red hen, which “suggest emotional intensity” (Machin and Mayr 2012: 205). Emotional intensity is very much required in political speeches and discourse in general to build an “affective, argumentative and also entertaining appeal” (Musolff 2017: 15) so that recipients can build an opinion. As a consequence, the high degree of colour saturation is something that can be expected in UKip’s video since it is part of their political discourse and it has a cartoony nature, where colours can be more easily exaggerated.

## **5. Conclusion**

As Filardo-Llamas (2015) claims, combining multimodal tools with a linguistic analysis can be quite useful to unveil the ways in which ideology is built in political discourse. If we take into account not only the textual parts of discourse but also the visual ones, applying the tools that Machin and Mayr (2012) offer, we can open new possibilities of interpretation.

In “We’re Better Off Out,” images are extremely helpful to complement the textual linguistic analysis. For example, this has been seen in the metaphorical characterisation present in the video, within the visual cues section. The way in which UK citizens are represented could not have been found if not for a visual analysis. We have discovered the implicit meanings in the metaphorical representation of these citizens as chickens. UK citizens within the EU, the chickens inside the warehouse, have been portrayed as domestic, submissive, and cowardly. UK citizens outside the EU, the chickens outside the warehouse, are shown as free and in charge of their own destiny.

Considering the implicit description of the Leave side and the Remain side of the Brexit campaign, both textual and visual elements have been useful. Strategies such as visual and textual collectivisation, established mainly with long shots and the use of person deixis respectively, have contributed to making the Leave/Remain dichotomy visible. The us and them division analysis has also been important to uncover who is seen as the enemy, the farmer, in the story and who are the characters we, the audience, should be inclined to empathise with, the chickens. This has been therefore identified as



a confrontation between the two sides, where the audience is invited to participate by taking the side of the chickens, the UK, and thus vote Brexit.

The Leave side and the Remain side have also been portrayed through the use of other strategies. The former has been characterised as 'active' due to the prominent use of material verb processes in contrast with the low frequency of these in the Remain side's utterances. The Leave side has also been showed as confident and certain of its ideas, as it has been seen in the analysis of factuality, represented by the prominent use of the verb 'to be'. Utterances with the verb 'to be' were recurrent in the red chicken and the white hen's interventions. Through the establishing of structural oppositions, positive qualities ('free', 'safe', 'strong', 'dry', 'warm' and 'light') were assigned to a UK inside the EU, the chickens inside the warehouse, in contrast with a UK outside the EU, the chickens outside the warehouse ('captive', 'unsafe', 'weak', 'wet', 'cold' and 'dark'). However, a challenging of the negative qualities of the exterior of the warehouse was unveiled, reversing these qualities to the benefit of the Leave side. The characters representing the Leave side make evident through their visual perceptions that these are not true so that the audience can see that they are being lied to by the Remain side.

It has been interesting to discover the evolution of the story through its segmentation into three 'detachments': The first indicated two sides, the chickens and the farmer, the second, three sides composed by the red chicken and white hen, the rest of the chickens and the farmer, and the third, when the black chicken intervenes, constituting four groups, the former three plus the black chicken. Nevertheless, all the chickens transform into one rebelling group in the end, the Leave side, by coming out of the warehouse and becoming a unit, disarranging these 'detachments'.

After having done this multimodal discourse analysis, it has been confirmed that it is a valid approach since it has helped shedding light on the implicit UKip's ideology and the strategies employed, whether consciously or not, within the video. This dissertation's analysis has also proven, as Filardo-Llamas and Boyd (2017: 323) also do, that political CDA should not ignore the gaining power of social online platforms and spaces, such as YouTube, where political discourse is also being conveyed these days. Through this analysis, we have seen how an apparently "light-hearted" cartoon can contain a lot of explicit and implicit values referring to the ideology of a political party.

## Works cited

- “Chicken.” *Oxford Dictionaries / English*, 2017,  
<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/chicken>. Accessed 13 June 2017.
- Chilton, Paul. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Daniel, Mark. *Cranks And Gadflies: The Story Of UKIP*. London: Timewell Press, 2005.
- “Farmer.” *Oxford Dictionaries / English*, 2017,  
<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/farmer>. Accessed 13 June 2017.
- Filardo-Llamas, Laura and Michael Boyd. “Critical Discourse Analysis & Politics,” in John Richardson and John Flowerdew (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Routledge, 2017: 312-327.
- Filardo-Llamas, Laura. “Re-contextualizing Political Discourse: An analysis of shifting spaces in songs used as a political tool.” *Critical Discourse Studies* 12.3, 2015: 279-296.
- Filardo-Llamas, Laura. “When the Fairy Tale Is Over: An Analysis of Songs and Institutional Discourse against Domestic Violence in Spain” in Lyndon C. S Way and Simon McKerrell, *Music As Multimodal Discourse: semiotics, power and protest*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.
- Gardner, Peter. *Hard Pounding: The Story of the UK Independence Party: an Inside Story of the Rise of the UK Independence Party*. June Press, 2006.
- Halliday, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., London: Hodder Education, 2004.
- Halliday, M. A. K. *Language As Social Semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold, 1978.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. “Cognitive-linguistic comments on metaphor identification.” *Language and Literature* 11.1, 2002.

- Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen. *Reading Images: the grammar of visual design*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago press, 1980.
- Lakoff, George. *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think*. University of Chicago Press, 2010
- Lakoff, George. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor" in *Metaphor and Thought*. UC Berkeley: Ortony, Andrew ed., 1993.
- Machin, David, and Andrea Mayr. *How To Do Critical Discourse Analysis: a multimodal introduction*. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2012.
- Moseley, Tom. "The Rise Of The Word Brexit - BBC News." *BBC News*, 25 December 2016. <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-37896977>. Accessed 13 May 2017.
- Musolff, Andreas. "Truths, lies and figurative scenarios." Pre-publication version, to appear in *Journal of Language and Politics*, 2017.
- Nathanson, Amy I., and Joanne Cantor. "Reducing The Aggression-Promoting Effect Of Violent Cartoons By Increasing Children's Fictional Involvement With The Victim: A Study Of Active Mediation." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 44.1, 2000: 125-142.
- Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. New York: Knopf, 1993.
- Sweetser, Eve. *From Etymology To Pragmatics*. Peking: Peking University Press, 2002.
- UKIP Official Channel. "We're Better Off Out." *YouTube*, 20 June 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ulkh10sSmVE&t=2s>. Accessed 13 May 2017.
- Van Dijk, Teun Adrianus. "Ideology And Discourse Analysis." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11.2, 2006: 115-140.

Van Dijk, Teun Adrianus. *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage Publications, 1998.

Weiss, Gilbert, and Ruth Wodak, eds. *Critical discourse analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

## Appendix

**Table 1. Instances of the most prominent types of verb processes.**

| Type                      | N° of instances | Instances  | Function   |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Material verb processes   | 23              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Thank</b> you.</li> <li>- There's nothing <b>to stop</b> us leaving.</li> <li>- There's nothing to stop us <b>leaving</b>.</li> <li>- Turn clockwise to deter from <b>leaving</b>.</li> <li>- Turn clockwise to <b>deter</b> from leaving.</li> <li>- <b>Turn</b> clockwise to deter from leaving.</li> <li>- You <b>go</b> first.</li> <li>- You <b>go out</b> there.</li> <li>- They <b>won't let</b> you <b>back</b> in.</li> <li>- You <b>won't get</b> your dose of fish meal.</li> <li>- The birds <b>are eating</b> it!</li> <li>- I'll <b>sing</b> in the rain.</li> <li>- <b>Come back!</b> (x2)</li> <li>- <b>Come on!</b></li> <li>- I'm <b>coming</b> with you.</li> <li>- I'm <b>coming</b> too.</li> <li>- <b>Vote</b> to leave. (x3)</li> <li>- Vote to <b>leave</b>. (x3)</li> </ul> | <p>To establish a contrast between the <i>active</i> metaphorical <i>Leave</i> side and the <i>passive</i> <i>Remain</i> side members.</p> |
| Relational verb processes | 10              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This <b>is</b> a European regulated free range</li> </ul>   | <p>To establish facts and describe.</p>  |

|                            |            |   |   |   |
|----------------------------|------------|---|---|---|
|                            |            |   | chicken farm.<br>- You <b>are</b> safer and stronger inside.<br>- I' <b>m not</b> scared.<br>- I' <b>m</b> free!<br>- It <b>looks</b> so nice out there in the sunshine.<br>- It' <b>ll get</b> wet and cold and dark.<br>- It' <b>s not</b> safe out there!<br>- We' <b>re</b> better off out.<br>(x2)<br>- <b>Don't be</b> chicken. |   |
| Mental verb processes      | Cognition  | 1 | - You <b>know</b> what?   | To express processes of knowing.                            |
|                            | Affection  | 1 | - I <b>don't care!</b>  | To express opinion.   |
|                            | Perception | 4 | - Let's <b>take a look!</b><br>- <b>See</b> Guide for Authorised Playlist.<br>- <b>Look!</b> (x2)   | To show visual perception of the exterior of the warehouse. |
| Existential verb processes |            | 3 | - <b>There's</b> nothing to stop us leaving.<br>- <b>Is there?</b><br>- <b>There's</b> corn out there.  | To describe what exists outside the warehouse.              |

**Table 2. Instances of factuality, deonticity and epistemicity.**

|              | N° of instances | Instances  | Function                            |
|--------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Factuality   | 10              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This <b>is</b> a European regulated free range chicken farm.</li> <li>- <b>Is</b> there?</li> <li>- There's nothing to stop us leaving.</li> <li>- There's corn out there.</li> <li>- You <b>are</b> safer and stronger inside.</li> <li>- I'm not scared!</li> <li>- I'm free!</li> <li>- It's <b>not</b> safe out there!</li> <li>- We're better off out. (x2)</li> </ul> | To express the state of facts.      |
| Deonticity   | 7               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Look!</b> (x2)</li> <li>- <b>Come back!</b> (x2)</li> <li>- <b>Come on!</b></li> <li>- We <b>should</b> all vote to leave this Thursday, June 23.</li> <li>- <b>Don't be</b> chicken.</li> </ul>   | To instruct.                        |
| Epistemicity | 4               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They <b>won't</b> let you back in.</li> <li>- You <b>won't</b> get your dose of fish meal.</li> <li>- It'll get wet and cold and dark.</li> <li>- I'll sing in the rain!</li> </ul>   | To predict and express willingness. |