

İki Film Sahnesinden Çok Modlu Söylem Çözümlemesi: Kullanılan Dilde Güç ve Kimlik İlişkisi

Deniz ELÇİN¹

¹Siirt Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, delcin@siirt.edu.tr 0000-0002-1905-3845

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, Al Pacino'nun *Scent of a Woman* (1992) filminde canlandırdığı Lt. Colonel Frank Slade karakteri ile Robert De Niro'nun *The Intern* (2015) filminde canlandırdığı Ben Whittaker karakterinin yer aldığı iki film sahnesini incelemiştir. Fairclough'un üç boyutlu modeli, multimodal davranış örüntüleriyle bütünleştirilerek sahneler analiz edilmiştir. İnceleme sonucunda, seçilen örüntülerin hem sözlü hem de sözsüz iletişimde güç, kimlik ve otorite göstergeleri taşıdığı belirlenmiştir. Jestler, ses tonu, intonasyon, ritim gibi multimodal özellikler ile kamera açıları gibi sinematografik tercihler de kişisel ifadelerin anlam yaratma süreçlerindeki çok boyutlu yapısını ortaya koymak amacıyla değerlendirilmiştir. Bulgular, Frank Slade'in öfke, doğrudan ahlaki söylemler ve iddialı beden dili aracılığıyla otoriteye ve kurumsal güce meydan okuduğunu; buna karşılık Ben Whittaker'ın sakin, nazik ve ölçülü tavırlarıyla bir güç üstünlüğü kurduğunu ve bu tavrın yaşına ve yaşam deneyimine ilişkin ipuçları taşıdığını göstermiştir. Zıt stillerine rağmen her iki karakter de etkileşime başlangıçta daha düşük bir konumdan girip, seçtikleri dilsel ve multimodal stratejiler yoluyla sahnenin sonunda güçlü figürlere dönüşmektedir. Diyalogların analizi, gücün yalnızca resmi statüden kaynaklanmadığını, bireyin yaşam deneyimlerine ve etkileşimsel performansına sıkı sıkıya bağlı olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Sonuç olarak, multimodal CDA yaklaşımı; dil, bedensel davranış ve görsel ipuçlarının nasıl birlikte anlam inşa ettiğine, dinleyici algısını şekillendirdiğine ve kimliğin çok katmanlı özelliklerini ilettiğine dair önemli göstergeler sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çoklu mod eleştirel söylem çözümlemesi, güç ve kimlik, film söylemi, kurumsal hiyerarşi

MAKALE BİLGİ

Makale Tarihiçesi:

Alındı: 07.12.2025

Düzeltilmiş hali alındı: 22.12.2025

Kabul edildi: 27.12.2025

Çevrimiçi yayımlandı: 30.12.2025

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

A Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis From Two Movie Scenes: Power and Identity in Language

Deniz ELÇİN¹

¹Siirt Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, delcin@siirt.edu.tr, 0000-0002-1905-3845

ABSTRACT

This study examined two movie scenes in which Al Pacino played as Lt. Colonel Frank Slade in the Scent of woman (1992), and Robert De Niro in The Intern (2015) as Ben Whittaker. Using Fairclough's three dimensional model integrated with multimodal behaviours of patterns, the movie scenes were analyzed. It was concluded that the chosen patterns showed signs of power, identity and authority in both verbal or nonverbal communication. Multimodal traits like gestures, tone of voice, intonation, rythms and some cinematic choices like camera framing were also included into the analysis to look at the multifaceted structure of personal expressions to convey related meanings. Findings revealed that Frank Slade confronted authority and institutional power by means of fury and direct moral messages on the other hand, Ben won the power struggle with his calm and gentle manners which gave clues about his life experience and age related stereotype behaviors. Despite their contrasting styles, both characters reshape the interaction from lower status at the beginning to a highly powerful figures at the end by using differing multimodal strategies along with their chosen linguistic uses. The analysis of the dialogues showed that power could go beyond official and formal status and is deeply rooted in somebody's life experiences. To sum up, multimodal CDA could give cues about how language, embodied behavior, and visual cues together function to construct meaning, to influence the perceptions of listeners and convey a diverse bulk of identity qualities.

Keywords: Multi-modal CDA, power and identity, film discourse, institutional hierarchy

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article History:

Receipt: 07.12.2025

Corrected version received: 22.12.2025

Accepted: 27.12.2025

Published online: 30.12.2025

Article Type: Research Article

Extended Summary

This study investigates how power, identity, and authority are constructed through multimodal communication in two iconic film scenes featuring Al Pacino as Lt. Colonel Frank Slade in *Scent of a Woman* (1992) and Robert De Niro as Ben Whittaker in *The Intern* (2015). Although the characters come from different cinematic worlds—a military veteran confronting an elite disciplinary committee and a seventy-year-old retiree interviewing for an internship in a modern tech company—both scenes provide rich discursive data for examining how verbal and nonverbal communication operate together to negotiate social hierarchy, ideological positioning, and interpersonal meaning. Drawing on Fairclough’s three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) model and key principles of Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA), the study shows how linguistic forms, paralinguistic signals, embodied gestures, spatial arrangements, and cinematic framing co-construct communicative power in institutional settings.

The analysis begins from the premise that language is not merely a vehicle for transferring information but a socially embedded practice that produces, maintains, and challenges power relations (Fairclough, 1993, 2015; Wodak & Meyer, 2015). In both film scenes, communication extends beyond speech: gestures, voice tone, pacing, rhythm, posture, gaze, proxemics, and camera angles all serve as integral meaning-making resources. This multimodal orientation is grounded in the works of Kress and van Leeuwen (2001, 2006), Norris (2004, 2011), Jewitt (2008, 2009), and others who argue that contemporary communication—especially in visually saturated media—is inherently multimodal. Thus, the study examines not only what the characters say but *how* they say it, *how* their bodies behave, *how* the environment frames them, and *how* institutional actors respond.

Methodologically, the study adopts a qualitative, interpretive design. Selected scenes were transcribed verbatim and annotated for multimodal features including gesture types, gaze shifts, prosodic contours, body orientation, voice quality, and camera framing. These data were analyzed through Fairclough’s three stages—description (textual features), interpretation (interactional and relational meanings), and explanation (wider social ideologies). This was supplemented by multimodal frameworks focusing on embodied action (Norris, 2004; Mondada, 2016), visual grammar (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2020), and cinematic semiotics (Bateman, 2014). The aim was not to critique the films as artworks but to use their constructed dialogues as authentic-like representations of real-world institutional communication, power negotiations, and identity performance.

In the case of Ben Whittaker, the analysis shows that his power emerges not from institutional authority—he is, in fact, the lowest-ranking figure in the interview setting—but from emotional intelligence, experience, calmness, and interpersonal composure. His lexical choices—“I want to be needed,” “I still have music in me,” “I’m eager to learn”—construct an identity of warmth, humility, and confidence without arrogance. His self-deprecating humor (“I had to call my grandson to find out what a USB connector was”) reframes age not as a deficit but as an opportunity for adaptability and continual learning. Paralinguistically, his soft tone, even pacing, gentle smile, and steady gaze communicate authenticity and reliability. Visually, eye-level camera angles and centered framing emphasize sincerity and moral equality despite the institutional imbalance.

Ben’s interactional approach constitutes what scholars call soft resistance: rather than confronting ageist ideology head-on, he destabilizes it by performing competence, emotional balance, and reflective maturity. His stillness and restrained gestures align with Norris’s (2011) argument that minimal embodied movement can index high status, self-control, and authority. As the interviews progress, power subtly shifts: although the interviewers represent institutional authority, their hesitations, awkward questions, nervous laughter, and visible discomfort reveal insecurity. Ben thus reconstructs the hierarchy by embodying a type of power that derives not from position but from lived experience, character, and emotional stability.

In contrast, Lt. Colonel Frank Slade’s power emerges through direct confrontation, moral rhetoric, and embodied force. His explosive declarations—“This is such a crock of shit!” “You’re executing his soul!”—and metaphors such as “an amputated spirit” transform the disciplinary hearing into a moral battlefield. His linguistic style is accusatory, declarative, and emotionally saturated. Paralinguistically, he uses a loud, dynamic voice, sudden changes in pitch, emphatic stresses, and physical gestures such as pointing, leaning forward, rising abruptly from his seat, and sweeping his arms. These cues construct a persona of righteous indignation, military assertiveness, and unwavering loyalty.

Cinematically, low-angle shots elevate Slade above committee members, visually enhancing his authority despite his lack of institutional role. Close-ups emphasize vulnerability and sincerity during key moral assertions. The students' approving reactions signal collective alignment, gradually converting Slade's individual protest into a broader ideological critique of elitism and institutional hypocrisy.

Slade's discourse directly attacks class privilege, administrative power, and the moral emptiness of a system that protects wealthy wrongdoers while punishing an innocent student. In Fairclough's terms, he recontextualizes the event: instead of a procedural inquiry, it becomes a confrontation between integrity and corruption. Drawing on van Dijk's (2017) discussion of elite discourse, Slade exposes how institutional language can manipulate power and suppress marginalized voices. Although he is a blind, retired outsider with no official standing, his multimodal force overturns the hierarchy, culminating in the committee's reluctant reversal and the student's vindication.

Comparatively, Ben and Slade adopt opposite multimodal strategies—subtle emotional intelligence versus explosive moral confrontation—but both achieve the same discursive outcome: each transforms a position of institutional weakness into one of symbolic and interpersonal power. Ben embodies calm authority rooted in age, experience, and relational competence; Slade embodies urgent moral resistance shaped by military background, ethical outrage, and embodied intensity. Their communicative approaches reflect differing ideological struggles: Ben challenges youth-centrism and ageism in neoliberal workplaces, while Slade confronts elitism, injustice, and the coercive mechanisms of disciplinary institutions.

The findings strongly support the argument that power extends beyond official roles and is deeply rooted in identity, life experience, embodied performance, and the strategic use of multimodal cues. Both characters demonstrate that language combined with gesture, voice, posture, and spatial organization can reshape social perceptions, influence institutional outcomes, and signal personal integrity.

Pedagogically, the study offers important implications for English Language Teaching (ELT). Many ELT undergraduates prioritize grammatical accuracy over pragmatic, discursive, and multimodal competence. These film scenes illustrate that effective communication requires much more than correct structures: it involves positioning oneself relationally, managing emotions, using voice and gesture strategically, and understanding how meaning is co-constructed through multiple modes. Integrating multimodal CDA into teacher education can develop students' critical language awareness, enabling them to analyze not only what is said but *how* it is said and *why* it functions effectively. Such insights can help future teachers design richer classroom communication, build rapport, manage interactions more skillfully, and foster inclusive, low-anxiety learning environments.

All in all, this study shows that multimodal CDA provides a powerful lens for understanding how speakers use linguistic and embodied resources to construct authority, negotiate identity, and challenge institutional power. Through the contrasting cases of Ben Whittaker and Frank Slade, it demonstrates that power is not inherent in institutional roles but emerges dynamically through discourse, multimodal performance, and social ideology. The analysis reinforces the value of multimodal literacy in language education and highlights the transformative potential of discourse for shaping social realities.

1. Introduction

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) looks through the used language of whose properties include both a vehicle to convey a message and a social practice which constructs identities in the dialogues, negotiations of power relations and shapes ideological meanings as well as institutional hierarchies and stereotypes in the society's meanings (Fairclough, 1992, 2015; van Dijk, 1997; Wodak & Meyer, 2015). Multi-modal discourse analysis shows meanings which are co-produced by means of multifaceted tools like gestures, gaze, and posture, tone of voice, rhythm and spatial orientation along with the spoken language. These emerge as an embodied multi-modal socially constructed practices. This study adopted a comparative multimodal CDA to look into two movie scenes playing Al Pacino as Mr. Slade in *Scent of Woman* and Robert De Niro as Mr. Whittaker in the *Intern* movies. The scenes included Mr. Slade's representation of a parental responsibility for a poor student in a disciplinary committee meeting who is about to be expelled from the school if he does not reveal the identities of his friends, three of whom committed a crime to the headmaster's car in the school garden. On the other hand, Ben Whittaker who is a retired widower aged 70 and is applying to an internship program of an online clothing company and who indeed worked for 40 years in that same building as a high rank officer for another company who printed phone-books. The parts of disciplinary committee meeting and Ben's interviews to apply for internship program was cut by related programs, transcribed and analyzed according to multi-modal CDA format (See Appendix 1 and Appendix 2). Within this cinematic interaction, there can be communicative strategies, inter or intra-personal negotiations and identity constructs which reflect real life interactional motifs (Bednarek, 2018). These movie scenes provide a rich set of discursive data to look at how speakers, two very well-known and successful Oscar winner actors in this case, combine verbal and non verbal communication tools to convey an intended message. They meanwhile reflect by means of those tools, their identities, status, their occupational traits, authority, protect their moral integrity as well as resist institutional power or hierarchy and show emotional intelligence all of which are reflected upon by means of language.

The significance of this study is that it is important to show ELT undergraduates the real meaning of what language is as most of the teacher candidates often prioritize grammatical accuracy and translation from one language to the other but underscore wider and deeper understanding of the power of sentences, words, gestures, body language, tone of voice while conveying a message. As future ELT teachers and educators, language professionals and advanced English learners, ELT students need to see the sub-components of chosen words or sentences which consist of thoughts, values, emotions and an external world of interactions which are combined by a bridge, called language (Kramsch, 2009). By means of consciously chosen communicative tools along side voice, gestures, postures and lexical words, people might be able to shape how they could be perceived by others, how effectively they could defend themselves in an emergent social context, professional, formal or institutional environments. The two film scenes analyzed here showed important characteristic features of two experienced old man; on one side, Slade's confrontational rhetoric and embodied intensity and Ben's calm, emotionally intellectual self expression. They both revealed us here that effective communication does not directly come from linguistic forms but from the integration and relationship among multifaceted behaviors along with language to convey the intended message.

This study tried to answer the following research questions:

- How do the two characters construct power and identity by means of verbal language in their formal institutional social environments?
- How can multi-modal components (gesture, gaze, tone of voice, body language, camera framing) shape the conveying of authority, resistance and self expression in the scenes?

- In what ways the analysis of two movie characters in two scenes of movies could contribute to deeper understanding of what language means to convey main messages in dynamically emerging contexts?

1.1. Literature review

Communication, power and identities are mostly shaped by discursive behaviors, multi-modality and media based meaning making, which were all the main focus of various studies by related scholars. With the advent of digital technologies, cinematic narrations and AI mediated tools; discourse analysis has moved from simply linguistic structures to include multi-modal structures like gestures, camera movements, spatial designs and intended interactions. The founders of Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1997, 2006, 2017; Wodak & Meyer, 2015) and multi-modal discourse analysis (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001; Jewitt, 2008; Norris, 2011; Scollon & Scollon, 2004) have laid the foundations for analyzing how intended meanings are conveyed through differing modes emerging according to the social contexts or environments. Recent research focus is on films, digital storytelling, blogs, wikis and social media platforms as key sites to show identity relations and ideological reproductions (Hafner, 2015; Kessler, 2009; Sun, 2010). On the other hand, there are also discourse studies of media texts to show the rich and effective potential of analyzing movie scenes to give away power, hierarchy and social norms according to emergent communicative needs (Machin & Mayr, 2012; Bateman, 2014; Baldry & Thibault, 2006; Jewitt, 2009; Fiske, 1990). These studies all show that CDA, MDA and media discourse play a role to build a theoretical framework to look through deeply film based communication scenarios and its implications for language learning, critical thinking and social identities.

1.2. What Is Discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)?

Discourse means socially organized ways of thinking, acting, and representation of the internal and external world including a deeper insight into constructs far beyond individual sentences or chosen words and spoken exchanges (Gee, 2014). It is mostly ideological, embedding claims about normality, legitimacy, formality, social status, identity and authority within an emergent context (Foucault, 1980). Discourse practices not only convey, encode or decode meaning but also shape the people's social relations and identities within their emergent immediate contexts (Richardson, 2017) Through repeated actions, discourse constructs shared meanings while showing power structures in social environments like schools, governmental offices, media and working environments. Critical Discourse Analysis on the other hand, looks into deeply how such power relations and identities are enacted, legitimized and resisted through the chosen words, sentences and nonverbal behaviours. Fairclough's (1992) three dimensional model, text, discourse and social context gives us a brief understanding of systematic view to connect both micro level structures like vocabulary, grammar, cohesion and so on and macro level components like ideology, stereotypes, class distinctions, institutional authority and power relations. Wodak and Meyer (2015) claim that language can never be neutral on its own. It gives speakers and listeners the opportunity to express their power and identity relations in small dialogues. van Dijk (1997, 2017) extended the scope of model and added some social cognitions, beliefs, attitudes, stereotypes and identities which all mediate how discourse is produced and conceived. To sum up, discourse becomes a tool to reflect social inequalities and a tool to challenge those inequalities. In educational settings, CDA could give a chance to enhance learners' critical language awareness and critical Outlook on small dialogues as to how interactions between people could be shaped by politics, identity, intentions and symbolic power (Janks, 2009).

1.3. Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA)

Multimodal critical discourse analysis focus on verbal language but communication is mostly multimodal. Kress and van Leeuwen (2001) expressed that meaning shows itself by means of an interplay between diverse relationships of modes like gestures, postures, body language, spatial arrangement, camera movements, intonation, eyes, gazing, visual design, tone of voice all of which are subcomponents of nonverbal communication and Bezemer and Jewitt (2010) added that meaning could be conveyed by means of an interplay between gestures, body language, voice and posture not by only language itself. Social interaction, identity formation and power negotiations are later added by scholars such as Jewitt (2008), Norris (2011), and Scollon and Scollon (2004) to multimodal analysis scheme.

MDA consists of some subcomponents; gestures which show embodied arguments, tone of voice and intonation patterns conveying stances and emotions, some indexes to show hierarchy and intimacy, camera angles to construct and influence viewer comprehension and understanding and finally posture signals of resistance, anxiety, anger, confidence, submission or moods. Movies are rich in communication tools for MDA analysis as they include observable, repeatable and carefully organized cues to look into deeper understanding for dynamic interplay between characters (Bateman, 2014). There have been very detailed and carefully organized multi modal analysis of movies, some of which included filmic texts using systemic functional multimodality (Baldry and Thibault, 2006), the interaction between visual semiotics and ideology (Machin and Mayr, 2012), the co-construction of mathematical, visual and linguistic modes via software support systems to transcribe and analyze various resources to see the interplay between differing subcomponents (O'Halloran, 2011). In multimodal interactions, co-speech gestures play role to transfer a meaning by means of multi components to make the interaction better understood (McNeill, 2008). Benson (2016) in a very significant book declared that YouTube was not just a music or video channel but a big and rich source of differing identity negotiations among the users and a source of multi modal discourses shaped by interaction, language, images and so on and finally digital narrations and identity constructions in movies (Page, 2015). These frameworks collectively show that meaning cannot be understood solely from language; multimodal resources significantly determine interpretation.

1.4. Power and Identity in Language

Identity and power relations seem to be an inevitable part of language used (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). Speakers repeatedly reveal their identities showing authority, vulnerability, expertise, anxieties, and calmness and so on by means of lexical choices, metaphors, politeness, sincerity, stances and interactional choices. Power in discursive practices consist of control of turn taking, speech acts like commands, evaluations or interruptions, institutional voice and occupational behaviors (soldier, teacher, administrator and so on), authoritative tools (claiming knowledge and moral positioning) and affective controls like managing emotions, offering validation or threat, warning, anxiety. Identities on the other hand, are conveyed by means of self disclosures, narrative positioning, alignment or resistance to institutional power or norms and emotional performances or reactions. There have been several studies how identities are shaped by means of communication strategies in movie interactions by means of media discourse analysis (Fiske, 1990; Thornborrow & Fitzgerald, 2004; Richardson, 2017; Bednarek & Caple, 2012; Toolan, 2014). This study similarly looked into two movies to see how Slade (from *Scent of a Woman*) and Ben (from *The Intern*) showed their power by differing modalities while one confronting injustice with emotional intensity and the other character showing a calm competence by means of his emotional intelligence. Both actors showed us that identity could be fluid, performative and negotiated through discursive elements.

1.5. How Language Shapes Societies and Stereotype Beliefs

Language is a tool to sustain social hierarchies and stereotypes by repeatedly embedding them into discourse (Lakoff, 2000; Lippi-Green, 2012). Societies through differing tools adopt some beliefs about age, class, gender and authority by means of repeated discourse practices in media tools, educational settings, workplaces and everyday interactions. These normalized and accepted patterns ultimately shape expectations among people about who is credible, competent, reliable, acceptable, respectable or authoritative. Stereotypes somehow emerge as a concurrent exposure to modes in various tools such as spoken, written, visual, cinematic and digital media. Films and online narratives could play a vital role or have an impact in reproducing and challenging the ideologies (van Dijk, 1993; Wodak, 2015; Barker & Jane, 2016; Couldry, 2012). Kramsch (2009) further suggest that language is playing a mediating role between individual's inner values and external social norms which makes discursive behaviours as a powersite for resistance. The two movies subject to this study could demonstrate institutional expectations, showing how linguistic and multimodal resources can challenge dominant power structures. Moreover metaphors and political discourse or ideologies could also create persuasive and stereotype beliefs about people (Charteris-Black, 2018).

There has been a bulk of multimodal studies of movie scenes in literature. The pioneer ones could be as follows;

Norris (2004) developed a very detailed framework for multi modal analysis to examine how meaning can be conveyed by means of the interaction of multiple modes of gestures, gaze, pauses, postures, spacing and talk. Norris highlighted the action oriented nature of multimodality that is how individuals coordinate embodied actions by moments to construct identity, involvement and stances. Some moments of an interaction may show denser semiotic weight through dense layering of modes. Her framework is of great importance to look deeper into real times conduct in film scenes where nonverbal communicative elements could play a big role to convey messages. Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) looked into this kind of analysis from a different perspective claiming that reading images could include some clues of visual grammar in which the images operate systematically like language itself following a similar routes of composition, framing, salience and perspectives. Their framework added camera angles, gaze direction, posture, sitting style, spatial arrangements to communicate ideological meanings. They claim that every mode in an interaction is socially shaped and culturally meaningful. Their work is valuable as it shows us cinematographic choices like shot size, lights and framing could affect the understanding of the intended messages. Jewitt (2009) added to multimodal analysis by means of integrating it into educational and social contexts saying that learning is almost always multimodal as meaning is constantly produced by means of combinations of language, image, gesture, tools and material objects. She suggested that multimodal issues must be central to literary and communication studies by means of digital and visual cultures. There seems to be a need to analyze language used deeper along with embodied cues, material environments and technological mediations. Mondada (2016) provided a detailed framework for embodied interaction by means of video recordings, emphasizing fine grained integration of gesture, body orientation, object manipulation and spatial navigation. Spoken language is deeply embedded into ecology of body and environment. Some nonverbal tools like gaze shifts, hand movements, step movements and postures can be some means to foster better understanding of messages conveyed. Mondada's model helps researchers understand how actors in films use their body movements with speech patterns to display emotion, assert power, or negotiate interpersonal alignment. Goodwin (2000) also showed us that human interaction is organized by means of gestures, gaze and talk. His work showed that some nonverbal actions such as pointing, holding an object, gazing or leaning forward, hesitations or pauses constitute communication purposes. He further claimed that human activities reveal how speakers build shared understanding without even pre planning of the actions to understand each other. Bateman (2014) also created a framework to analyze multimodal communication in films by means of linguistic, visual and cinematic semiotics. In films, he claimed that the messages are not directly given by means of dialogues but also by editing, shot sequencing, lighting, colors, framing and sound design. His model helped scholars to examine the impact of cinematic elements coordination with spoken language to shape character identities and audience interpretations. These cinematic tools are consciously chosen to convey a message in more effective ways. Machin & Mayr (2012) also created a similar to that of Bateman's saying that ideology is encoded both in language and in design, visuals and embodied conduct. Their work focused on chosen colors, lighting, typography or facial expressions to show power, authority, vulnerability or hierarchy in interactions. This approach included institutional settings like private school hearings or corporate interviews in which multimodal cues could support or show inequalities in discourses. Bezemer and Jewitt (2010) tried to look at how professionals use multiple semiotic modes simultaneously—writing, gesture, diagrams, tools, gaze—to perform duties and negotiate their power and identity relations. According to them, multimodal communication is a must to see how expertise or authority is shown in real world contexts. Their findings support that institutional contexts rely on some communication tools of space, gaze and voice. There have also been similar studies uniting differing communication tools and multimodal clues to convey a message in the movies like Stivers and Sidnell (2016) showing conversational turn taking is dependent on some modes of gaze, breath intake, gestures and body movements which altogether could shape who holds the floor, who may interrupt, how authority is shaped by what or by whom. Flewitt (2011) looked into how children used multimodal resources and concluded that embodied modes could mean resistance, vulnerability or confidence which could be a parallel to our actors in these two movie scenes one person enacting an identity as a moral defender of a defenceless poor student and other a wise and experienced elder in a working environment full of young people. These works are in align with broader multimodal and media semiotics research (Baldry & Thibault, 2006; Jewitt, 2008; Scollon & Scollon, 2004; Bateman, 2014; Machin & Mayr, 2012; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001), as well as with critical media studies addressing ideology and representation (Fiske, 1990; Richardson, 2017; Bednarek &

Caple, 2012; Barker & Jane, 2016; Couldry, 2012). Together, they confirm that meaning can never be purely linguistic and that multimodal cues significantly shape power, identity, and interpretation.

This literature review summarizes the theoretical works and frameworks as for CDA, MDA and media discourse studies to show a comprehensive data set for analyzing film scenes and their educational implications. CDA shows us tools to integrate linguistic clues with social power and ideologies (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1997, 2006, 2017; Wodak & Meyer, 2015; Janks, 2009), while MDA frameworks highlight how differing modes such as gesture, gaze, spatial design, intonation, and cinematic techniques shape meaning beyond words (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001, 2006; Jewitt, 2008, 2009; Norris, 2004, 2011; Scollon & Scollon, 2004; Bateman, 2014). Studies in media discourse and multimodal communication (Machin & Mayr, 2012; Baldry & Thibault, 2006; Fiske, 1990; Barker & Jane, 2016; Richardson, 2017; Couldry, 2012) further demonstrate that films could operate as a tool to show ideological and representational systems in which identity and power are performed. The integration of these perspectives allows a deeper understanding of how language is used to shape one's identity and power relations in a dialogue and how it could be significant to help EFL learners to see the proper use of language along with nonverbal equipments to convey a message more meaningfully and effectively.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

The design of this study is qualitative, interpretive research design adopting Critical discourse analysis and multimodal discourse analysis. CDA refers to looking into how linguistic preferences work together to construct, maintain or perform institutional power relations (Fairclough, 1992, 2015; van Dijk, 2017). MDA on the other hand, adds to CDA analysis in that it adopts embodied and visual modalities like gestures, gaze, body language all of which are a part of nonverbal communication (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006; Jewitt, 2008; Norris, 2004). By integration of this analytical outlook, this study aims at looking into deeper understanding of two dialogues between characters in two films playing Al Pacino in *The Scent of Woman* and Robert De Niro in *The Intern*. In the movies, one character is a representative of a poor student's parents in a disciplinary committee which will decide to dismiss the boy at the end. In the second movie Ben a retired widower who worked for a phone book company for 40 years and a very experienced high rank manager is applying to an internship program of a cloth sale company. His main aim here is to fill a gap in his life as he feels he is doing the same things every day and he still feels like working very efficiently. The movie extracts are about his CV video and interviews with the young people to be accepted to the company. The transcriptions of the movie clips can be seen in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. This blended approach is about a detailed interpretation of how spoken language can be intensified, reshaped or contradicted by body and visual clues.

2.2. Data Sources

The analysis focused on two short scenes taken from two famous films. The first scene is about Lt. Colonel Frank Slade in the *Scent of Woman* movie attending to a disciplinary committee meeting on behalf of a poor student's family to support him against administrative sanctions and claims. This scene shows the hierarchical relationship between people in institutions and the scene about a power and identity shift between the defendant and the headmaster from the beginning to the end. The second data set is about Ben Whittaker's CV video and his three interviews with three young high rank officers of an online clothes sale company. These interviews show the generation gap between people, the power and identity shift between younger and older generations and can even give clues about experienced or inexperienced workers. Both sets of data were chosen as they consist of identity construction, power relations or multimodal meaning making which makes such an analysis significant to show the real function of language to ELT students and EFL learners.

2.3. Data Preparation

Transcription

All verbal dialogues from the movie scenes were transcribed using verbatim method. By this way, it was suggested that the lexical choices were preserved accurately. The transcription process included

marking pauses, hesitations, emphatic stress, shifts in voice, interruptions and important prosodic changes, which was put forward by Mondada (2016). The emergent themes might be about how language is spoken and how small body clues contribute to deeper meanings.

Multimodal Annotation

After the transcription period, the scenes were classified for multimodal traits which are central to the interaction between the characters. The traits included hand and arm movements, pointing, stress, and tone, postural orientations like leaning back or forward as well as some eye contact patterns. Some facial expressions such as smiling, frowning, tightening of the jaws or directed loudness and emphasis. Some physical features like the distance between people, their posture in a place, camera framing, angle, zoom and cuts were also noted to look into cinematic techniques which contribute to meaning making in a conversation.

Analytical Framework

The analysis followed Fairclough's (1992) three dimensional model followed by Multimodal interaction analysis (Norris, 2011) and visual grammar Grammar (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). At the beginning, the textual level, description part, the lexical choices, modality, turn taking tools, emotional and evaluative terms and some metaphors repetition and stance markers were examined to look into surface meaning of the texts. Narrative frameworks sometimes need to be used when doing discourse analysis as it serves as a cognitive template in which people produce and comprehend negotiations and interactions with other people (Toolan, 2014). The second dimension in the model includes interpretation of chosen words, sentences as to show the relations between speakers, identity and power relations, institutional practices, which shape the production and comprehension of meaning and how communicative events are reshaped. The final stage for the analysis, explanation part includes the social practice of the dialogues which is like a summary of events, identities, power relations between the characters in their social contexts. The final social contexts might include aging, authority, forms of resistance, reflection of social identities. Integrating these frames, the researcher tried to reach a multilayered interpretation of linguistic, embodied and ideological dimensions in the conversations.

The coding process was in three stages, the first one including the extraction of linguistic items and coded for assertiveness, politeness, formality or informality, hedging versus certainty and the use of evaluative terms. The second stage involved multi modality where meaning was constructed by gestures, gaze patterns, body language, and tone of voice and camera angles. These codes were integrated to look into how language is used to convey the intended meanings by means of literal choices and nonverbal communicative tools. The third part was about a comparative analysis of two characters that showed clues to construct power and identity during the conversations. This kind of comparison allowed seeing the confrontational or non confrontational patterns with multimodal strategies.

Trustworthiness and Validity

To ensure the credibility of the analysis, multiple strategies were adopted. Triangulation of the data was supported by examining linguistic, gestures and visual clues to prevent overreliance over one side of meaning making process. Each movie clip was repeatedly viewed to find the multimodal details and ensure consistency to interpret the data. Reflexive memoing was done through transparency as analytical outcomes and evolving codes were documented till the end. And as a last stage, CDA and MDA analysis were integrated to look into the matter deeper in that they combine linguistic choices with visual and bodily clues.

Pedagogical Orientation

This study is significant in that especially ELT students who are future teacher candidates were observed in internship programs mostly adopting grammar translation method and exam based teaching styles but to show them the real function of language by means of discourse analysis, the functions of nonverbal communication tools and the deeper meanings of real life conversations may help them change their teaching styles in the future. These film excerpts in spite of their seemingly artificial conversations played by actors encourage learners to see how language interacts with gestures, voice patterns and spatial arrangements in real communication. Enabling EFL learners to look at the language used with deeper lenses could also contribute to their critical thinking and autonomy as a learner. Understanding

the discursive clues used during the conversations even may contribute to fewer misunderstandings between people as sometimes the listener can misinterpret the intended message and the conversation may end up with a irreversible damaged relationship among people in view of that misunderstanding.

3. Findings

This section provides an analysis of two iconic movie scenes one from *The Intern* movie palying Robert De Niro as Ben Whittaker and Alpacino in *The Scent of Woman* as Lt. Colonel Frank Slade. Analyzed according to Fairclough's three dimensional model, description, interpretation and explanation and some multi modal perspectives by Norris (2004) and Kress and van Leeuwen (2006), the emergent codes and themes were classified to see the power, identity and ideologies of characters. By means of the integration of linguistic choices with multimodal cues, the analysis demonstrated how each character used differing communication tools to negotiate or resist institutional authority in which Ben showed more emotional intelligence and gentle rapport building which might have resulted from his working as a high rank manager in a company and Slade showing more moral rhetoric and forceful embodied performance which could reflect his soldier career throughout his life. Together these outlooks show us that there is a possible relation between multimodal discourses to shape the societies' social hierarchies and redefining the interactional patterns in institutional levels.

This full analysis presents two separate multimodal CDA tables—one for Ben Whittaker and another for Lt. Col. Frank Slade—each followed by three detailed analytical subsections:

1. Description (What the multimodal features are)
2. Interpretation (What they mean in context)
3. Explanation (How social ideologies and power relations shape the scene)

All interpretations are grounded with direct extracts from the transcripts of the scenes.

After these individual analyses, a comparison table and an extended comparative explanation paragraph are provided.

Table 1- *Ben Whittaker (The Intern, Robert De Niro)*

Subtheme	Description (with transcript extracts)	Interpretation	Explanation (social/ideological meaning)
1. Textual Choices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I love the idea of having a place I can go every day.” • “I want to be needed.” • “Eager to learn.” • “I still have music in me.” • Humorous humility: “I had to call my grandson to find out what a USB connector was.” 	Ben’s lexical style constructs him as warm, gentle, reflective, and emotionally open. His self-deprecating humor softens age-based stereotypes and frames him as adaptable.	His discourse resists ageism by framing age as a resource, not a deficit. He aligns himself with values (purpose, connection, loyalty) that the startup environment lacks.
2. Paralinguistics / Body Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calm, steady tone during: “I still have music in me.” • Gentle laugh after the tech joke • Minimal hand movement • Soft, frequent smiles • Open posture; slight nods while saying “Eager to learn.” 	Calmness and warmth serve as Ben’s primary mode of authority. His voice and gestures communicate emotional stability and confidence, not insecurity.	Emotional intelligence becomes a counter-ideological performance: in a youth-driven workplace that values speed and innovation, he asserts maturity, patience, and self-regulation as alternative leadership traits.
3. Visual & Spatial Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center framing in his application video • Eye-level camera angle during interview • Warm lighting • Interviewers behind a 	Visual neutrality positions Ben as morally equal to the interviewers despite institutional hierarchy. His centered framing in the self-video enhances sincerity.	Proxemically, Ben appears structurally subordinate, yet his stillness and warm gaze invert the hierarchy. His multimodal presence subtly critiques the ageist

Subtheme	Description (with transcript extracts)	Interpretation	Explanation (social/ideological meaning)
	desk (symbolic barrier); Ben seated lower		assumptions embedded in startup corporate culture.

**Transcript source included in attached document Annex 1*

Ben's ;

- Description

Ben's chosen sentences include very sincere but a self confident and experienced retired applicant like:

I love the idea of having a place I can go every day” “I want to be needed.

I read once, musicians don't retire. They stop when there's no more music in them. Well, I still have music in me, absolutely positive about that.”.

These extracts show his willingness to go on working and be worthy of being hired and also show some clues about his lonely life and bored with doing the same things again and again. These conversational patterns show us relational, emotional and communal values in the societies. Ben's body language is mostly gentle with consciously chosen movements, a relaxed posture and calm and sincere eye contact. His tone in most of the speech is soft, reflective and supported visually by warm lighting and centered framing in the scenes all of which creates intimate scenes in the eyes of the viewers. The complete multi modal posture shows us a portrait of a man who is deeply self aware, emotionally intelligent, experienced and grounded.

- Interpretation

The multimodal traits here show us authenticity, modesty and apparent confidence. His self confessing humor; —“*I had to call my grandson to find out what a USB connector was*”— was not chosen to express his digital illiteracy because of his age but instead strengthens his credibility by showing adaptability, thirst for learning about new innovation although he struggles a lot to conceive and even his self discipline as a serious and lifelong learning employee. His calm manners are in contrast to interviewers' nervous laughter, rising intonation and some conscious chosen sentences to express their concern about his age;

“Wow, what was your major? Do you remember? (interviewer 1), Okay, and they made...? (interviewer2) ,Where do you see yourself in 10 years? (interviewer 3”

These three questions do not function as to ask for something. They consistently have some concerns about the age of the interviewee and even might show use the interviewer unwillingness to hire Ben as an intern. They might also show us the inferiority complex of three young people in front of a highly experienced calm self confident 70 year old candidate. Although Ben was institutionally low in rank as an interviewee for a job, he has the power through out the conversations with his calmness, self confident answers and serious tone of voice and eye contact. Indeed he even makes the others feel wondering why they are asking those questions as he is almost %100 percent sure to be hired as an experienced worker.

- Explanation

Ben's discourse in these scenes challenges the neoliberal youth centered ideologies and a big generation gap between young and old generation. Even the clothing choices, Ben wearing a very neat and smart suit, the young wearing casual clothes every time shows us some clues about this kind of generation gap. Aging and the surprised manners of interviewers emerge when especially the third youngster stated;

“Wait... did not realize you were 70...” however, Ben's reaction to such a remark was not some kind anger but a warm and ironic smile to express the awkwardness of the sentence and repositioned his wisdom rather than limiting his status. His values attached to that age group include loyalty, connection and stability in a corporate environment in rapid turnover and youthful branding. Ben somehow shows a soft resistance without confronting institutional power directly but redefining the meaning of his

competence and leadership by means of multimodal calmness and experience with his serious tone and sincere manners.

Table 2: Lt. Col. Frank Slade (*Scent of a Woman*, Al Pacino)

Subtheme	Description (with transcript extracts)	Interpretation	Explanation (social/ideological meaning)
1. Textual Choices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explosive declarations: <i>"This is such a crock of shit!"</i> Metaphorical indictment: <i>"There is no prosthetic for an amputated spirit."</i> Accusatory reframing: <i>"You're building a rat ship here."</i> Moral elevation: <i>"You're executing his soul!"</i> 	Slade uses moralized, emotionally loaded language to redefine the hearing as a moral crisis rather than a procedural inquiry. His metaphors elevate Charlie's silence into an ethical stand.	His discourse challenges elitist ideology and exposes the disciplinary hearing as a coercive, class-driven mechanism. He positions himself as guardian of integrity and truth against institutional corruption.
2. Paralinguistics / Body Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raised voice: <i>"Out of order? I'll show you out of order!"</i> Forward lean, sudden standing, finger-pointing Tight jaw during <i>"I'd take a flamethrower to this place!"</i> Widened eyes for emphasis 	Slade performs power through volume, aggression, and embodied dominance. His gestures create threat, intensity, and urgency.	These multimodal signals subvert institutional authority. A blind, non-staff guest becomes the center of power, reversing hierarchy through embodied resistance.
3. Visual & Spatial Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-angle shots during monologue Long close-ups during emotional lines: <i>"You hold this boy's future in your hands."</i> Students' approving reactions Slade standing while all others sit 	Camera work frames Slade as a towering moral figure. Standing among seated elites visually symbolizes his takeover of authority.	The institution's authority collapses symbolically: the Headmaster's prestige is replaced by Slade's moral authority, legitimized by collective student approval.

*Transcript source included in attached document in Annex 2.

Slade's Analysis;

- Description

Slade's linguistic choices show us confrontational and metaphorical manners in lines like;

"This is such a crock of shit!" and *"You're executing his soul!"*. These lines are a direct manner to challenge the institutional power of the headmaster and the disciplinary committee who are about to dismiss a boy who is the only innocent one in a claimed crime to the headmaster's car. His body language though he is a blind man suddenly erupts into kinetic energy, standing abruptly, interrupting the headmaster who had several identities, a headmaster, a teacher, a judge in this meeting and pointing fingers to show a threatening manner and sweeping his arms. His voice and tone goes higher in lines *"Out of order? I'll show you out of order!"*. These lines gives us clues about his previous job as a soldier and provide some stereotype behaviours of soldiers at that time. *"But not a snitch!"* This line is also showing us the general outlook of Slade as a soldier who claims that the boy is a foot soldier who is worthy of being saved and given a chance to gon his life. Cinematic clues also give us dominance of Slade for instance low angle shots elevate him above the institutional committee to Show his power and greatness as a retired colonel and long close ups Show his emotional authority.

- Interpretation

Slade's discourse in the conversation indeed controls the whole power throughout the scene. Instead of the boy's revealing the identities of vandals, who are his classmates at the expense of his being expelled from the school and say farewell to his future forever, Slade shows everybody a moral narrative of his life about integrity, courage and institutional hypocrisy to challenge the power of disciplinary committee. His aggressive paralinguistic manners suppress the power of headmaster and deconstruct the power of committee who had to unwillingly accept to declare the boy's innocence and charge the real

wrongdoers. Slade's metaphor "*amputated spirit*"—is used to evoke the wartime suffering and a moral message to support the boy and emphasize the school's injustice with national ethical failures. He even said that;

"No, I am just warming up. I don't know who went to this place.

William Howard Taft, William Jennings Bryan, William Tell, whoever. Their spirit is dead, if they ever had one. It's gone. You're buildin' a rat ship here, a vessel for seagoins' snitches. And if you think you're preparin' these minnows for manhood, you better think again, because I say you are killin' the very spirit this institution proclaims it instills."

These extracts are a direct insult and criticism to the hypocrisy of the school's administration as he claims the committee are not behaving according to the norms they claim they are following. His body language here shows signs of moral warfare to confront and challenge elitist and hypocrisy driven manners.

- Explanation

Slade unlike Ben is a counter hegemonic character here who challenges class privilege, elitism, imperialism and money corrupted elitist education system. There is a boy who is supposed to reveal his friends' identities to secure his future and the others though they committed the crime were exempted from any accusation of their wrong doing because of their fathers' pockets. By telling stories about war heroes and national leaders, he tried to show broader American cultural discourses and stereotypes that were instilled by bravery and sacrifice. His multimodal cues shows us signs of individual challenges to institutional oppression which might have resulted from his soldier identity and which ended up with the young boy's becoming a hero in the eyes of the whole saloon except for the disciplinary committee members and the real criminals. Slade showed us that institutional power could be established through the lenses of moral authenticity by resisting with a proper and effective language.

Table 3: *BEN vs. SLADE*

Dimension	Ben Whittaker	Frank Slade
Textual Style	Warm, humble, reflective: " <i>I want to be needed.</i> "	Explosive, accusatory, moralizing: " <i>You're executing his soul!</i> "
Resistance Strategy	Soft resistance; emotional intelligence; humor	Direct confrontation; moral outrage; aggressive exposure of hypocrisy
Main Identity Performed	Wise elder, mentor, emotionally stable	Warrior of integrity, truth-teller, moral defender
Paralinguistic Style	Calm, soft, steady pacing	Loud, rising intensity, vocal crescendos
Gestural Style	Minimal, open posture	Large, forceful gestures
Relationship to Institution	Negotiates stigma; undermines ageism	Attacks institutional elitism and injustice
Outcome	Subverts age stereotypes; becomes respected	Saves Charlie; reorders moral hierarchy
Ideology Challenged	Youth-centrism, ageism	Class privilege, elitist disciplinary culture

- Detailed Comparative Explanation

Ben and Slade as we can see from the analysis and Table 3, show differing multi modal patterns to achieve discursive outcomes. Ben is generally gently, calm but sound very confident and experienced to confront youth centric assumptions and prejudices. His warm tone accomplishes credibility over challenging manners of the young interviewers. On the other hand, Slade's furious manners and direct accusations were to support the boy against institutional hypocrisy which was about to destroy the boy's future forever if he did not want to reveal his friends' identities. Slade's embodied aggression, rising tone of voice and moral messages were some kind of ethical resistance to institutional power to protect the boy, which can also be resembled to a soldier's trying to protect his country at the expense of his life. Both characters at the beginning start with a low power, an old man trying to be hired as an intern and a blind retired soldier with no formal and official authority at the meeting. By means of multimodal

discursive manners, they both adopted and achieved a reverse hierarchical power in the meetings. Ben becomes an emotionally intelligent main figure at the three interviews and Slade becomes a rightful fury who both showed some kind of resistance to institutional power, one with his emotional intelligence and calm self confidence and the other with explosive and furious moral confrontation.

4. Discussion

The general findings of these two dialogues taken from the movie scenes show us power, identity and resistance clues through multimodal manners instead of a pure choice of linguistic patterns. This finding is in line with multiple semiotic norms that co construct meanings in real life situations (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006; Jewitt, 2009). Both characters in our analysis show a lower rank status at the beginning of their talks but later turned out to be very strong characters who took power of the speech by means of chosen linguistic uses and body and facial expressions. They strategically mobilized linguistic, paralinguistic, embodied and visual clues to diverse the institutional and ideological power. This supports Fairclough's (1992) claim that discourse is a constant struggle of power and identity relation in an emergent social context. Furthermore Norris (2004) view that embodied actions play a significant role to make meaning in emergent contexts was also supported by the findings in this study.

Ben Whittaker's success in power by means of emotional intelligence and soft resistance can be seen from his soft authority despite his old age, 70. His self narratives like "*I want to be needed*", "*I still have music in me*" is in line with Goleman's (1995) *emotionally intelligence presentation of self which confronts interactional threat and rapport building*. His warm tone, slow manners and gentle but ironic smiles could be similar to immediacy behaviours to those of Burgoon et al (2021) which are used to increase interpersonal trust and decrease the level of power distance. Ben's multimodal calmness can be seen in Norris' (2011) conclusions that stillness and controlled gestures reveals high status composure and self confidence even when individuals hold low institutional status. On the other hand, Ben's confession with the line —"*I had to call my grandson to find out what a USB connector was*"—with a humorous tone, shows us some cues about self disclosure strategy which can suppress the negative stereotypes (Holmes, 2015), particularly in connection with aging problems and also an indication of his lifelong learner identity and a serious employee who is still willing to improve himself at even at that age. Several studies on workplace aging show that older adults generally encounter age related prejudices by expressions of adaptability and feeling of vitality (Krekula & Vickerstaff, 2017), which is reflected by Ben's still eagerness to learn and worthy of being of use for sometime in his life span. Camera framing also contributed to Ben's authority in the interviews. Eye level shooting, warm lighting and centered positioning of Ben plays a big role to shape Ben's identification and moral integrity in the eyes of the viewers which is in align with Bateman's (2014) visual grammar. Ben's discourse **reshapes** the interview conversations transforming everything on behalf of Ben showing some implicit clues as to neoliberal workplaces and their ideologies which overpower young generations and their technological advantages over old ages (Fairclough's, 2015).

Colonel Frank Slade's acquiring power by means of institutional resistance and moral outrage shows us a diverse repertoire of Slade's communicative tools focusing on heavily confrontational rhetorics, embodied intensity and moral messages. His insulting fury —"*This is such a crock of shit!*" and "*You're executing his soul!*"—shows us Wodak's (2015) discourses of confrontation do deconstruct institutional authority and expose his diverse or constastive ideological outlook to the claims of that school. His metaphor "an amputated spirit" was used intentionally to persuade the viewers of the committee meeting as a figurative language to give a moral message (Charteris-Black, 2018). This metaphor indeed succeed in the audience feeling empathy towards the boy's situation at the end with a loud clapping and cheering, which meant that communal power might win even if the committee was going to decide the dismissal of the boy from the school. Multimodal clues about Slade's posture, tone of voice, his soldier like manners and vocal ups and downs show us body movements to empower somebody with dominance, moral certainty and heightened involvement in a situation (McNeill, 2008; Calbris, 2011). His sudden standing up and giving direct answers is what van Leeuwen (2008) concluded as some terms are used visually to sign power claims, which was the case for Slade here. Low angle camera shooting reinforced the moral elevation in the eyes of the audience in the saloons by empowering Slade a visually superior figure against the headmaster and the committee members which is in line with the findings of Machin and Mayr's (2012) showing the clues about cinematographic elements to construct ideological authority.

Moreover, Slade's reframing his identity from a low rank retired blind old man to a highly selfconfident moral soldier playing as a parent to a needy boy is compatible with Fairclough's (1992) recontextualization term in which there is a constant ideological contest to win the power. Slade's attack and insults to elitism and moral corruption reflect van Dijk's (2017) norms that powerful discourse often emerge by means of institutionalized patterns and resistance to such patterns cause moral and linguistic confrontations to emerge. Slade in our case here serves as a counter heroic figure to show moral critiques suppressing power of institutional or societal structures Giroux (2020). Despite both characters' having differing communicative tools, they share a common achievement of power by means of multimodal performances. This supports Foucault's (1980) claim that power is relational and enacted in social contexts and marginal speakers can reposition their powers by means of strategic manners (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). Ben's calm authority gain aligns with affiliative facework (Brown & Levinson, 1987) on the other hand Slade's resistance to authority is about a challenging facework (Ting-Toomey, 2005). They both showed us the shift of social actor positioning by altering moral and interactional standing against institutional powers (Scollon, 2001). Multimodal behaviours, Ben's calmness and gentle manners can show us power outcomes depending on the context and workplaces by means of semiotic strategies (Goodwin, 2000; Stivers & Sidnell, 2016). In both scenes, not only the actors themselves but also some cinematic choices or actions were also effective to give certain messages about the characters like camera framing, proxemics and editing to give rise to their symbolic power, giving us clues about visual grammar (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). The multi modal manners show us resources to allow the characters challenge authority and build new powerful figures by means of integrity, morality, experience, empathy, ageism in Ben's case and elitist critic of school's authority by Slade. Thornborrow and Fitzgerald (2004) concluded that institutional discourse was generally associated with roles, power contradictions and chosen negotiated identities, which could be another social function of discursive behaviours of a person in their emergent contexts. Fairclough (2015) express that neoliberal ideologies shape workplace discourses, public institutions and linguistic norms all of which have an impact on stereotypes created for common people. Kramsch (2009) emphasized the role of language to shape identity, ideology, symbolic power and life experiences. She adds that discourse can be bridge between someone's inner World with the social World around. Bloome et al.'s (2005) work can be given as an example as to why and how critical discourse analysis should be integrated into classroom settings to show the learners the interplay between identity and power relations in social lives of people. Janks (2009) provided a comprehensive theory that literacy and discourse reproduce social inequalities which consist of class discriminations, age, power and institutional rank systems. The findings also support van Dijk's (2017) elitist power struggles which is more dominant especially in workplaces where institutions shape, legitimize or maintain control by means of used language, which is a case for our both characters here, Ben and Slade.

5. Implications for ELT Pedagogy and some limitations

The findings of this study hold significant pedagogical value for ELT undergraduates and teacher candidates, who often learn English through a predominantly linguistic lens that emphasizes grammar, vocabulary, and accuracy while overlooking the multimodal and social dimensions of communication. By means of showing the proper and effective use of language to shift power from one person to the other in a movie scene dialogue, it was confirmed that language cannot be seen as a simple tool of communication but a more complex and sophisticated tool to be playing a big role in somebody's daily life. It is a very important bridge rather than an organization of grammatical rules and chosen words along with nonverbal communication tools and gestures, body language, tone of voice to give an effective message to the listeners. Another significant finding of the study was that strategic communication is important to gain power in a conversation in which Slade protected a boy who was about to be expelled from the school. Effective communication styles vary according to emergent contexts. The integration of linguistic choices with multimodality might provide language learners and future teacher candidates the multifaceted structure of language used in social settings. Moreover, such functional strength of language might also contribute to critical language awareness for learners. These analyses might also show learners how to practice effective presentation skills, job interview simulations, story telling or role plays all of which can be seen as daily life practices to be confronted by individuals on one day or another. Finally, for teacher candidates, equipping them with a deeper and better understanding of what language is, they can in the future design or organize more inclusive,

learning environments by means of adjusting their own tones, postures and linguistic choices to shape classroom management while creating an anxiety and stress free environments for their possible future students. Overall, the pedagogical implications of this study highlight the importance of multimodal literacy, identity awareness, and critical discourse skills in ELT education, encouraging learners and teacher candidates to view language not only as a tool of expression but as a powerful medium for social action, ethical communication, and personal empowerment.

There are also some limitations of this study as only two movies were analyzed to show power and identity relations by means of multimodal behaviours. Some outcomes or scenes might seem artificial as they are played by professionals and might sound unfamiliar or unreal. It might be suggested that more long term and real life situations in workplaces are analyzed to see the real atmospheres of resistance to institutional powers in workplaces. Moreover, it might be more useful to add some more real job interviews which could show us the real stressed atmospheres for job applicants trying to be hired by somebody's power on the other side.

6. Conclusion

This study tried to look into multimodal patterns in two movie scenes, Frank Slade in *The Scent Of Woman* and Ben Whittaker in *The Intern* to see how two characters won power by means of their strategic behaviours and choices. The findings of the study showed us that in spite of two opposite characters, one very calm and self confident and the other furious and aggressive, they gave us a lot of clues as of their identities, jobs, life experiences, age, self confidence, self expressions to encounter and confront institutional power instilled into them in the conversations. Slade's showing military assertiveness; vocal changes and gestures showed us a moral man with high integrity to challenge authority and won power at the end saved a student's life. On the other hand, Ben's experience shaped calmness, gentle manners, emotional intelligence and controlled body language along with his clothing style gave us clues of reflective power of identity who overpowered all of the three interviewers at the end. He behaved as if he was the boss there and he was interviewing the others to be recruited. These results are also significant for teacher candidates of ELT departments as in a country where mostly teaching styles are exam driven, showing them the real powerful function of language may help them shape their teaching methods and styles accordingly. Showing them discursive patterns in real life situations might even help them to become better presenters in the classrooms and also they will know that their future teaching environments will include a very diverse and rich discursive patterns from both colleagues and students. The integration of discursive elements with multimodal choices might also contribute to critical thinking, identity awareness and communicative competence all of which can prevent possible misunderstandings between a speaker and listener. By means of such outlook into deeper meanings conveyed by several communicative tools, educators and teachers can foster richer classroom interactions and prepare their learners for real life situations. Classrooms are places for diverse identities, social and cultural backgrounds in which there can be prejudices and stereotype beliefs and teacher candidates could be aware of such powerful misunderstanding tools and behave accordingly. Integrating such outlooks into ELT curricula might ultimately add to improve reflective, empowered, and critically informed language users who are well equipped to use English not just for communication—but for meaningful participation in society and by understanding true nature of language, these future teachers might design their teaching environments with stress and anxiety free atmospheres with an awareness how diverse their classroom setting might be.

Reference List

- Baldry, A. & Thibault, P. J. (2006). *Multimodal transcription and text analysis: A multimodal toolkit and coursebook*. University of Toronto Press. Barker,
- Barker, C., & Jane, E. A. (2016). *Cultural studies: Theory and practice*. Sage.
- Bateman, J. (2014). *Text and image: A critical introduction to the visual/verbal divide*. Routledge.
- Bednarek, M., & Caple, H. (2012). *News discourse*. Bloomsbury.

- Bednarek, M. (2018). *Language and television series: A linguistic approach to TV dialogue*. Cambridge University Press.
- Benson, P. (2016). *The discourse of YouTube: Multimodal text in a global context*. Routledge.
- Bezemer, J., & Jewitt, C. (2010). Multimodal analysis: Key issues. In E. Margolis & L. Pauwels (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of visual research methods* (pp. 396–413). Sage.
- Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective*. Routledge.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.
- Burgoon, J. K. Manusov, V. & Guerrero, L. K. (2021). *Nonverbal communication*. Routledge.
- Calbris, G. (2011). *Elements of meaning in gesture*. John Benjamins.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Couldry, N. (2012). *Media, society, world: Social theory and digital media practice*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & society*, 4(2), 133-168.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Fiske, J. (1990). *Introduction to communication studies*. Routledge.
- Flewitt, R. (2011). Bringing ethnography to a multimodal investigation of early literacy. *Qualitative Research*, 11(3), 293–310.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. Pantheon.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (2020). *On critical pedagogy*. Bloomsbury.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. Bantam.
- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment in human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1489–1522.
- Holmes, J. (2015). Discourse in the workplace. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 880-901.
- Janks, H. (2009). *Literacy and power*. Routledge..
- Jewitt, C. (Ed.). (2008). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis*. Routledge.
- Jewitt, C. (2009). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Kessler, G. (2009). Student-initiated attention to form in wiki-based collaborative writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 13(1), 79–95.
- Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject*. Oxford University Press.

- Krekula, C. & Vickerstaff, S. (2017). Theoretical and conceptual issues in the extending working lives agenda. In *Gender, ageing and extended working life* (pp. 27-52). Policy Press.
- Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold.
- Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2020). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Routledge.
- Lakoff, R. (2000). *The language war*. University of California Press.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States*. Routledge.
- Mayr, A. & Machin, D. (2012). How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction. *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis*, 1-240.
- McNeill, D. (2008). *Gesture and thought*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mondada, L. (2016). Challenges of multimodality: Language and the body in social interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 20(3), 336–366.
- Norris, S. (2004). *Analyzing multimodal interaction*. Routledge.
- Norris, S. (2011). *Identity in (inter)action: Introducing multimodal (inter)action analysis*. De Gruyter.
- O'Halloran, K. L. (2011). Multimodal discourse analysis. *The Bloomsbury handbook of discourse analysis*, pp.249-282.
- O'Halloran, K. L. Tan, S. Smith, B. A., & Podlasov, A. (2011). Multimodal analysis within an interactive software environment. *Visual Communication*, 10(1), 103–129.
- Page, R. (2015). The narrative dimensions of social media storytelling: Options for linearity and tellership. *The handbook of narrative analysis*, 329-347.
- Richardson, J. E. (2017). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Scollon, R. (2001). *Mediated discourse: The nexus of practice*. Routledge.
- Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. W. (2004). *Nexus analysis: Discourse and the emerging internet*. Routledge.
- Stivers, T. & Sidnell, J. (2016). Multimodal participation in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(1), 1–7.
- Sun, Y. C. (2010). Extensive writing in foreign-language classrooms: A blogging approach. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 47(3), 327–339.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). The matrix of face: An updated face-negotiation theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 71–92). Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). The study of discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–34). Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2017). *Discourse and power*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (2015). Critical discourse analysis, discourse-historical approach. *The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction*, 3, 1-14.

Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Methods of critical discourse studies*. Sage.

Makale Bilgi Formu

Yazarın Katkıları	Makale tek yazarlıdır.
Çıkar Çatışması Bildirimi	Yazar tarafından potansiyel çıkar çatışması bildirilmemiştir.
Destek/Destekleyen Kuruluşlar	Bu araştırma için herhangi bir kamu kuruluşundan, özel veya kar amacı gütmeyen sektörlerden hibe alınmamıştır.
Etik Onay ve Katılımcı Rızası	“A Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis From two Movie Scenes: Power and Identity in Language” başlıklı çalışma etik kurul onayı gerektirmemektedir. Yazım sürecinde bilimsel, etik ve alıntı kurallarına uyulduğu, toplanan veriler üzerinde herhangi bir tahrifat yapılmadığı yazar tarafından beyan edilmiştir.

APPENDIX I-BEN'S INTERVIEW VIDEO

So here I am, applying to be one of your interns because the more I think about this idea, the more tremendous I think it is. I love the idea of having a place I can go every day. I want the connection, the excitement. I want to be challenged, and I guess I might even want to be needed. The tech stuff might take a bit to figure out. I had to call my 9-year-old grandson just to find out what a USB connector was. But I'll get there. Eager to learn. Also, I want you to know I've been a company man all my life. I'm loyal, I'm trustworthy, and I'm good in a crisis. And I love that you're right here in Brooklyn. I've lived here all my life, and lately I feel I may not be hip enough to live in Brooklyn, so this could help with that, too. I read once, musicians don't retire. They stop when there's no more music in them. Well, I still have music in me, absolutely positive about that.

INTERVIEWS

Interviewer 1: There's gonna be a couple of Interviews today, Ben.
We want to make sure that we both find the right fit. Business as usual is not really our motto, so we hope you have some fun here. This is the first time we're hiring senior interns, so some of our intern questions may not exactly fit your profile, but we're gonna go for it anyway, okay?
BEN: Fire away.
Interviewer 1: Okay, good. Where'd you go to school?
BEN: I went to Northwestern.
Interviewer 1: Hey, my brother went to Northwestern.
BEN: Probably not at the same time.
Interviewer 1: Probably not. He graduated in 2009.
BEN:.....
Interviewer 1: Wow, what was your major? Do you remember?
INTERVIEWER 2: And after Northwestern you went on to...?
BEN: I went to work for Dex one.
INTERVIEWER 2: Okay, and they made...?
BEN: Phonebooks.
I was in charge of overseeing the printing of the physical phonebook. I did that for over 20 years, and before that, I was their V.P. of sales and advertising.
INTERVIEWER 2: So, do they still make phonebooks?
I mean, doesn't everyone just Google numbers?
BEN: I believe they do, but before Google that was how you got a number.
INTERVIEWER 2: Oh, no, no. Yeah, I... I get it.
INTERVIEWER 3: So 40 years at the phonebook company?
That is amazing, seriously.
Okay, Benjamin.
Now, I'm gonna ask you one of our more telling questions for all of our interns, so I want you to, like, this is the one to really think about, okay?
And...
and take your time.
Where do you see yourself in 10 years?
BEN: When I'm 80?
INTERVIEWER 3: Yeah, sure.
Yeah, whatever.
Um...
Wait.
Did not realize you were 70.
That's, uh... that question just doesn't work for you, does it?
Should we just scratch that one and just move on?
BEN: - It's your call, Justin.
INTERVIEWER 3: - Okay, that one's gone.
You look great, by the way. So great.
And you're clearly more than qualified for this job.
You're actually, like, way over qualified, and we were so impressed.
You had great interviews, great video.
You nailed it, Ben. Congrats.
You're an intern.

APPENDIX II- MOVIE CONVERSATIONS FROM “*THE SCENT OF WOMEN*”

HEADMASTER: I called an open meeting of this institution this morning because the incident that occurred this Tuesday last describes an issue that concerns all of us. Not an isolated case of vandalism. What happened is a symptom of the sickness of a society. A sickness which runs counter to the principles this school was founded on. A school among whose graduates two have sat behind the desk in the Oval Office, in the White House. Baird men have run State Departments and investment houses, founded department stores and coached football teams. Our alumni receive their bulletins in ashrams in India and in palaces in Jordan. We are, in fact, known around the world as the cradle of this country's leadership. A beacon in the...

CHARLIE: (TO AL PACINO) What are you doing here?

AL PACINO: Got room for me up there, Charlie?

HEADMASTER (STARING WITH ANGER AND WONDER TO CHARLIE AND AL PACINO, KEEPING HIS SPEECH) But today we are bleeding from disrespect.

AL PACINO: Yeah, I guess so. Blatant disrespect. Give us a hand.

HEADMASTER A disrespect for our values, and a disrespect for our standards. A disrespect for the Baird tradition. And, as the custodians of that tradition, we are here today to protect each other from those who threaten it.

(TURNING TO CHARLIE, WITH A CONFUSED FACE) Who is this, Mr. Simms?

AL PACINO: This is Mr. Frank Slade, Lieutenant Colonel, United States Army, retired. I'm here in place of Charlie's parents.

HEADMASTER: Excuse me?

AL PACINO: In loco parentis. They could not make the trip from Oregon today.

HEADMASTER: And what is your relationship to Mr. Simms?

AL PACINO: Is this a courtroom?

HEADMASTER: Closest thing we could manage to it.

AL PACINO: Then if we're taking oaths, there's a few people I'd like to swear in. There are no oaths at Baird. We are all on our honor.

AL PACINO: Larry and Franny Simms are very dear, close friends of mine.

They've asked me to appear here on Charlie's behalf.

HEADMASTER: Okay? (WITH A SUSPICIOUS VOICE) Happy to have you with us, Colonel.

(turning to a boy with a man sitting on the opposite table) Mr. Willis.

The man: Which Mr. Willis?

HEADMASTER: George, Junior, sir.

The man: Yes.

HEADMASTER: You were in a position last Tuesday night to see who committed this act of vandalism. Who was it?

George: Well, I have an idea who it was.

HEADMASTER: No, not an idea, Mr. Willis. Did you see or did you not see?

George: Well...(with a shy and suspicious face) I didn't have my contacts in.

The man: Come on.

George: I was in the library. I'd taken my glasses off, and I was gonna put my contacts back in. Then I helped Simms close up and the next thing I know, we're outside, and I hear this sound and I didn't have any time to put my contacts in.

HEADMASTER: Whom, with your limited vision, did you see?

George: (The man whispering to his ear) (With a fierce reaction to whatever the man whispered) Like I say, it was blurry. I can't see without my contacts.

HEADMASTER: What did you see, Mr. Willis? (With a sharp and threatening voice)

George:(laughing and smirking) What? You mean definitively?

HEADMASTER: Stop fencing with me, Mr. Willis! Tell me what you saw!

George: Now, don't hold me to this, but no contacts, it's dark... And everything, I mean...

HEADMASTER: (With a more sharp and threatening voice) Mr. Willis!

George: Maybe... Harry Havemeyer, Trent Potter and Jimmy Jameson. Maybe? Ballpark, best guess.

HEADMASTER: Could you provide us with some detail?

George: Why don't you ask Charlie? I really think he was closer.

HEADMASTER:(turning to Charlie with a mixture of proud and suspicious face)Mr Simms..

Charlie: (Clearing his throat ihmmm) Yes.

HEADMASTER: You don't wear contact lenses, do you?

Charlie: No, sir.

HEADMASTER: With your untrammled sight, whom did you see?

Charlie: Well, I saw something, but I couldn't say who.

HEADMASTER: All right. What was the something you saw?

Charlie: I couldn't say.

HEADMASTER: You couldn't or wouldn't say? (with a disappointed and threatening voice)

Charlie: Well, I just... I just couldn't say.

HEADMASTER: Couldn't, wouldn't, shouldn't.

Charlie:

HEADMASTER: You're exhausting my patience and making a mockery of these proceedings. I will give you one last chance. The consequences of your response will be dire. By dire, I mean your future will be jeopardized permanently. Now for the last time, what did you see last Tuesday night outside my office?

Charlie: I saw somebody.

HEADMASTER: "I saw somebody." Good. Did you see their size and shape?

Charlie: Yeah.

HEADMASTER: And they were the size and shape of whom?

Charlie: They were the size and shape..... of most any Baird student, sir.

HEADMASTER: I am left with no real witness. Mr. Willis' testimony is not only vague, it is unsubstantiated. The substance I was looking for, Mr. Simms, was to come from you.(disappointed and furious)

Charlie: I'm sorry.

HEADMASTER: I'm sorry, too, Mr. Simms, because you know what I'm going to do inasmuch as I can't punish Mr. Havemeyer Mr. Potter or Mr. Jameson? And I won't punish Mr. Willis.

He's the only party to this incident who is still worthy of calling himself a Baird man. I'm going to recommend to the disciplinary committee that you be expelled. Mr. Simms, you are a cover-up artist and you are a liar.

AL PACINO: But not a snitch!

HEADMASTER: Excuse me?

AL PACINO: No, I don't think I will.

HEADMASTER: Mr. Slade.

AL PACINO: This is such a crock of shit!

HEADMASTER: Please watch your language, Mr. Slade. You are in the Baird school, not a barracks.(turning to Charlie) Mr. Simms, I will give you one final opportunity to speak up.

AL PACINO: **CLIMAX SCENE OF THE SPEECH**

Mr. Simms doesn't want it. He doesn't need to be labeled "still worthy of being a Baird man." What the hell is that? What is your motto here? "Boys, inform on your classmates, save your hide, "anything short of that, we're gonna burn you at the stake?" Well, gentlemen, when the shit hits the fan, some guys run, and some guys stay. Here's Charlie, facin' the fire, and there's George, hidin' in big daddy's pocket. And what are you doin'? You're gonna reward George and destroy Charlie.

HEADMASTER: Are you finished, Mr. Slade?
AL PACINO: No, I am just warming up. I don't know who went to this place.
William Howard Taft, William Jennings Bryan, William Tell, whoever. Their spirit is dead, if they ever had one. It's gone. You're buildin' a rat ship here, a vessel for seagoin' snitches. And if you think you're preparin' these minnows for manhood, you better think again, because I say you are killin' the very spirit this institution proclaims it instills. What a sham.
What kind of a show are you guys puttin' on here today?
The only class in this act is sittin' next to me.
And I'm here to tell you this boy's soul is intact.
It's non-negotiable. You know how I know?
Someone here, and I won't say who, offered to buy it.
Only Charlie here wasn't sellin'.
HEADMASTER:(with his hammer trying to finalize the conversation by knocking like a judge)
Sir, you're out of order.
AL PACINO: I'd show you out of order. (standing up from his chair)
You don't know what out of order is, Mr. Trask. I'd show you, but I'm too old, I'm too tired, I'm too fuckin' blind. If I were the man I was five years ago, I'd take a flamethrower to this place!
Out of order? Who the hell you think you're talkin' to? I've been around, you know? There was a time I could see. And I have seen. Boys like these, younger than these, their arms torn out, their legs ripped off. But there is nothin' like the sight of an amputated spirit.
There is no prosthetic for that. You think you're merely sendin' this splendid foot soldier back home to Oregon with his tail between his legs, but I say you are executin' his soul!
And why?
Because he's not a Baird man. Baird men. You hurt this boy, you're gonna be Baird bums, the lot of you.
And, Harry, Jimmy, Trent, wherever you are out there, f..... you, too!
HEADMASTER: Stand down, Mr. Slade!
AL PACINO: I'm not finished. As I came in here, I heard those words, "cradle of leadership."
Well, "when the bough breaks, the cradle will fall," and it has fallen here. It has fallen. Makers of men, creators of leaders. Be careful what kind of leaders you're producin' here.
I don't know if Charlie's silence here today is right or wrong. I'm not a judge or jury. But I can tell you this, he won't sell anybody out to buy his future!
And that, my friends, is called integrity. That's called courage.
Now that's the stuff leaders should be made of.
Now I have come to the crossroads in my life.
I always knew what the right path was.
Without exception, I knew, but I never took it.
You know why?
It was too damn hard.
Now here's Charlie. He's come to the crossroads.
He has chosen a path. It's the right path.
It's a path made of principle that leads to character.
Let him continue on his journey.
You hold this boy's future in your hands, committee.
It's a valuable future, believe me. Don't destroy it. Protect it. Embrace it. It's gonna make you proud one day, I promise you.(sitting down silently)
(Clapping and cheering from the salloon)
How's that for cornball?
(The headmaster trying to silence the salloon with his judge hammer)
Nothing can shut them up, sir.
HEADMASTER: (After the stop of applause) The disciplinary committee will take this matter under advisement in closed session.

AL PACINO: What are they doin', Charlie?
Charlie: I think they're going to come to a decision now.
AL PACINO : Very well.
HEADMASTER: Apparently, that meeting will be unnecessary. Mrs. Hunsaker.
MRS.Hunsaker: (getting to the stage to explain the final decision of the committee): The joint student-faculty disciplinary committee needs no further sessions. They have come to a decision.
Messrs. Havemeyer, Potter and Jameson are placed on probation for suspicion of ungentlemanly conduct. It is further recommended that Mr. George Willis, Jr. Receive neither recognition nor commendation for his cooperation. Mr. Charles Simms is excused from any further response to this incident.
Al pacino: Hoo-ah!
(Cheers and applouse from the salloon full of students, very disappointed and embarrassed faces of lecturers)
Last step. I can always count on you, Charlie.(holding Charlie's arm as they were going out of the building.
A women: running and approaching them) Colonel! I'm Christine Downes, Colonel Slade. I teach political science. I wanted to tell you how much I appreciate you speaking your mind.
Al pacino: Why, thank you. Are you married? Went to an artillery school at Fort Sill with a Mickey Downes. Thought he might've snagged you.
Women: No, I'm afraid not.
Charlie: Colonel Slade was on Lyndon Johnson's staff, Miss Downes.
Women: Were you? Fascinating.
Al pacino: We should get together, talk politics sometime. Fleurs de Rocaille.
Women: yes
Al pacino: "Flowers from a brook."
Women: That's right.
Al pacino: Well, Miss Downes, I'll know where to find you. Charlie. Bye, Miss Downes. You don't have to tell me, Charlie. auburn hair, beautiful brown eyes. Yabba-dabba-doo.