Nonverbal Domination in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*: A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach

Ayman Khafaga[1&2], Ahmed Mohammed Alotaibi[3], Raneem Bosli[4], & AlShahad Adnan AlDereihim[1]

[1] Department of English, College of Science and Humanities, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

[2] Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Suez Canal University, Egypt

[3] Department of English and Translation, College of Language Sciences, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia

[4] Foreign Languages Department, Arts and Humanities Faculty, Jazan University, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Ayman Khafaga, Department of English Language, College of Science & Humanities at Al-Kharj, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: a.khafaga@psau.edu.sa

Abstract

This study adopts a critical discourse analysis approach to decipher the different nonverbal strategies of domination communicated by the visual and vocalic nonverbal codes in George Orwell's allegorical novella *Animal Farm* (1945). The primary purpose of the paper is to investigate the use of nonverbal practices as mechanisms for manipulative and coercive domination in the selected novel. In so doing, the paper draws on two analytical strands: the first is the critical discourse analysis approach as discussed by Fairclough (1995), van Dijk (2015), Wodak and Meyer (2015), and Weiss and Wodak (2007), and the second is Andersen's (1999) categorization of nonverbal communication strategies. The paper has three main findings: first, four strategies are identified as indicative in the production of domination in *Animal Farm*: the use of violence and gestures at the visual level, and the use of threat and intimidation (manifested in the dogs' growls) and the use of confusion and distraction (represented by the sheep's bleating) at the vocalic level. Second, nonverbal practices in *Animal Farm* are employed manipulatively and/or coercively to shape, reshape, and/or change characters' attitudes and behaviors towards particular attitudinal positions that serve the benefits of those in power. Third, nonverbal practices contribute to the dynamics of power in the discourse of the selected novel and augment the rhetorical influence of discourse interlocutors at the intradiegetic level of communication, particularly in amalgamating the authority of the powerful over the powerless.

Keywords: *Animal Farm*, CDA, domination, nonverbal practices, Orwell, visual nonverbal codes, vocalic nonverbal codes

1. Introduction

Based on the assumption that nonverbal practices produced during an act of communication are very essential in the production and reception of an effective communicative behavior (Kyseliuk et al., 2020; Štěpánková, 2021; Horgan, 2024), this study attempts to decipher the different nonverbal strategies of domination that are communicated by the visual and vocalic nonverbal codes in George Orwell's allegorical novella *Animal Farm* (1945). *Animal Farm* is a potent allegory that examines power and manipulation as means of domination in a dystopian context. It includes a subliminal political account of the 1917 Russian Revolution and the Communist aspiration for a brighter future. Orwell criticizes the misuse of authority and how power and domination blemish a society throughout the discourse of the novel, particularly at the intradiegetic level of communication (i.e., character-to-character level of discourse). Significantly, manipulation and coercion are effective strategies highlighting the intricate relationships between influence and domination in interpersonal relationships. Despite their different approaches, both methods take advantage of power imbalances to accomplish specific objectives, frequently at the price of personal freedom and consent. In the present study, the focus is on the extent to which domination, either attained manipulatively or coercively, is accomplished by several nonverbal practices throughout the discourse of the selected novel.

Nonverbal practices are defined as means of nonverbal communication involved in a communicative act (Streek & Knapp, 1992). These practices encompass both kinesic (mimics and gestures) and phonational (tone, timbre, pace, loudness, and other prosodic qualities) elements, giving the term a broader definition than body language. In nearly all the conversational situations between interlocutors, nonverbal practices, due to their polysemantic nature, convey particular ideas and messages about the attitude of the speaker toward the interlocutor, as well as his/her personality (Poyatos, 1997; Kyseliuk et al., 2020). Nonverbal practices are not only indicators of the attitudinal behaviors of discourse interlocutors (Denaulta, 2024; Khafaga, 2023a), but, in some conversational situations, they also mirror the micro pragmatics in discourse (Cap, 2010; Khafaga, 2022). Nonverbal practices communicate different meanings in discourse that written or spoken language frequently cannot, and they are commonly used as subtle instruments of domination in literature and everyday conversation, with the power to sway and compel recipients (Wharton, 2009; Khafaga, 2023b).

Therefore, the significance of studying nonverbal practices in the interpretation of fictional or non-fictional communication lies in the fact that incorporating the nonverbal practices into the verbal behaviors of discourse interlocutors adds to the pragmatic weight of the analyzed text and contributes to the general interpretative atmosphere of the communicative act. A striking literary illustration of how nonverbal tactics support verbal propaganda to establish domination and solidify power may be found in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. In this novel, Orwell discusses the effectiveness of nonverbal practices in authoritarian institutions in producing, reproducing, and maintaining domination and control. Domination is usually practiced by those in power or who are powerful, either physically or rhetorically, over the powerless for the former to guarantee the implementation of their desires by the latter. In the context of *Animal Farm*, to keep their authority over the other animals, the pigs—Napoleon in particular—master nonverbal practices to dominate the other animals on the farm.

Within politics, nonverbal domination refers to the use of power to control and oppress individuals or groups. Such acts of control and oppression are exercised and maintained through acts of terrorization, dehumanization, intimidation, and violence. Nonverbal domination can be accomplished manipulatively and/or coercively. Manipulation and coercion, therefore, are not only verbally-based and/or physically-based behaviors, but also nonverbal practices have a share in achieving manipulation and coercion. This does not mean that manipulation and coercion are confined to everyday-occurring conversations; however, both processes operate effectively in fictional communication as is the case with real-world interaction. Significantly, fictional discourse offers useful insights into the way real communication is produced and delivered (Jucker, 2021). The study, therefore, uses a fictional type of communication (i.e., Orwell's *Animal Farm*) as the basis of its data in order to provide a linguistic investigation of the way nonverbal practices in face-to-face fictional communication are effective conduits of manipulation and coercion that can be identified in and applied to real discourse between interlocutors. The current study, therefore, offers a better understanding of the nuanced ways in which power operates in totalitarian settings and demonstrates the significance of nonverbal communication in exercising power, achieving domination, and communicating ideologies.

Three research questions are raised in this study. First, what are the nonverbal practices that are employed to achieve manipulative and coercive domination in Orwell's *Animal Farm*? Second, how do nonverbal practices contribute to power dynamics in the discourse of the selected novel? Third, how do nonverbal practices serve to produce and maintain domination in *Animal Farm*? The answer to these questions comprises the principal objective of the study: to investigate the employment of nonverbal practices as mechanisms for manipulative and coercive domination in the selected novel, and it also highlights its significance, as it serves to clarify the extent to which domination can nonverbally be accomplished and how power can rhetorically be exercised without explicit dialogue or narrative exposition.

In what follows, the paper presents the theoretical background and the literature review in Section 2, in which a thorough discussion of nonverbal communication, the notions of power, domination, manipulation, and coercion is offered. This section also provides some previous and related studies that are pertinent to the topic addressed in this paper. Section 3 provides the theoretical framework by discussing the two theoretical strands adopted in this paper, namely critical discourse analysis and Andersen's (1999) categorization of nonverbal communication. Section 4 demonstrates the methodology used in the study, wherein a description of the data, the way data is collected, the rationale of the study, and the analytical procedures adopted in the study are clarified. Section 5 demonstrates the analysis of the selected data and the results. Section 6 offers a general discussion of the findings revealed by the analysis of the selected data. Section 6 is the paper's conclusion, which is entailed by some recommendations for further research.

2. Theoretical Background and Literature

2.1 Nonverbal Communication

According to Richmond et al. (2008), nonverbal communication can be perceived to be any of the many different human behaviors that also can convey messages. They maintain that any nonverbal behavior is also perceived as nonverbal communication if interpreted as a message and communicates a specific meaning to discourse. Burgoon et al. (1996) also define nonverbal communication as a collection of signals often sent over a single channel or medium. For Wiener et al. (1972), nonverbal communication can be broadly defined as any communicative behavior across all modalities not represented in words. Nonverbal communication is thought to include nonverbal behavior as a sub-process (Hess, 2016). It includes various actions, including touch, proxemics, and gaze, as well as vocal, facial, and postural expressions.

Based on the strategy used in the communication process, Druckman et al. (1982) categorize nonverbal practices into four groups: first, visual nonverbal practices, which refer to the nonverbal behaviors pertaining to sight and vision; second, vocalic nonverbal practices, which depend on the prosodic element in the communication process; third, body nonverbal practices, which encompass all behavior produced by the parts of the body; and, fourth, facial nonverbal practices, which comprise the nonverbal behaviors produced by the face. In a similar vein, Burgoon et al. (1996) provide a further classification of nonverbal practices that are entirely based on the manner of production. They divide nonverbal practices into four categories, among which are the nonverbal practices conveyed via visual and auditory codes. Visual and auditory nonverbal practices, according to Burgoon et al. (1996), constitute gestures, body language, physical appearance, and vocalics. While vocalic nonverbal practices refer to any form of nonverbal vocal activity, physical appearance comprises the way interlocutors seem physically during communication.

2.2 Domination and Power

In the context of unequal power relations, the use of power restricts others' possibilities for action and, consequently, their freedom during

the persuasive process (van Dijk, 1997). Within the theoretical framework of critical discourse analysis (CDA), the ability to influence people's thoughts and actions to get them to do what the speaker wants requires specific techniques. That is, speakers can use different tools to influence their audience rather than issuing commands. In this instance, argumentation or other persuasion techniques, rather than an implied threat, are the basis for compliance. In the context of manipulation and coercion, those in positions of power, whether verbally or physically, tend to influence, control, and/or force their targets by restricting their freedom of action and influencing their thoughts.

According to Fairclough (2015), individuals also frequently use coercion or the concealment of power and authority to justify their social behaviors. By employing tactics of manipulation and/or coercion, powerful speakers can restrict the discourse rights of others and often control the conversation. Therefore, the focus of the study of power within the paradigm of dominance is on examining how the powerful affect the weak. According to Partington (2003), who perceives power in this context as the explanation of social institutions where powerful participants can explicitly dominate and coerce the less powerful, this influence can manifest physically as coercion. Alternatively, it can manifest cognitively as manipulation, as stated by van Dijk (1995), who asserts that a large portion of contemporary power is coercive and manipulative, including the explicit issuance of commands, orders, threats, or economic sanctions.

2.3 Manipulation and Coercion

According to Pinto (2004), manipulation is a distinctive form of persuasion and control in which the speaker hides his/her intention. To manipulate their addressees, language users attempt to conceal their real goals in a way that makes it difficult for their recipient to grasp the intended goals beyond the surface linguistic expressions. Harre (1985) argues that when manipulation occurs, the hearer is not conscious of the forces being used against him. The goal of manipulative persuasion, which is typically founded on falsehoods, brainwashing, and factual fabrication, is to create a receiver with a controlled will who lacks the ability to make his own decisions. The ultimate result of this kind of persuasion is total obedience to the persuader's point of view, even if it conflicts with his or her own. According to Pardo (2001), a case of manipulation occurs when B is unaware that A is trying to influence him or her and uses deception to get B to accomplish what A wants. Manipulation, thus, refers to the use of language to influence someone's behavior or decisions, often without their explicit awareness. The intent is usually self-serving and does not prioritize the manipulated person's best interests.

Coercion, on the other hand, is a process in which someone forces another to do something they may not have wanted to do by using excessive pressure, threats, or intimidation. Coercive language tends to be more blatantly hostile or manipulative. Coercion relies on inciting violence, threats, and terror. Both the verbal and physical aspects of power are the foundation of coercion. It also tries to make an argument using fear to induce behavior or boost its potency, and it tends to create a receiver with a controlled will (Pardo, 2001). Mutual comprehension between discourse interlocutors is not the goal of this kind of domination (i.e., coercion); victims know they are being conditioned and controlled against their will rather than acting on their judgment (Sornig, 1989). Coercive domination limits the recipients' freedom and compels them to make a single decision that advances the persuader's goals.

Because coercion and manipulation are inextricably tied to power, they always include some degree of it. Power, coercion, and manipulation are therefore closely related; according to Pardo, this link suggests that political coercion and manipulation are about group values rather than the values of specific people (Pardo, 2001). As a result, they include a certain kind of ideology, as any social group or organization that practices dominance or power over other groups may be linked to an ideology that would serve to justify or cover up that power (Pardo, 2001). Both manipulation and coercion are ways of influencing others' attitudes and behavior in a way that guarantees the implementation of specific actions and/or the adoption of a particular attitude that serves the benefits of the speaker. The ultimate goal of manipulation and coercion, therefore, is to direct others to do actions, change attitudes, shape and/or reshape behavior, and pursue goals that they would not have otherwise. Manipulation and coercion are based on brainwashing and violence, respectively. Both of them can not only be communicated verbally, but they can also be conveyed nonverbally, that is, by nonverbal practices, including the various paralinguistic expressions such as body language, facial expressions, gestures, movement, etc.

2.4 Previous Studies

Tracing the literature that discusses the effectiveness of nonverbal practices in communication, it can be noticed that they have been investigated not only within the context of fictional discourse (e.g., Burrow, 2004; Kim & Klinger, 2019), but also in real- world communications, such as in classroom discourse (e.g., Knapp & Hall, 2002; Lu, 2021), courtroom discourse (e.g., Denaulta et al., 2024; Khafaga, 2023a), political speeches (e.g., Štěpánková 2021), sports (e.g., Furley, 2021), marketing communication (e.g., Lasarov et al., 2023), in medical settings (e.g., Ismail et al. (2024), and in gender studies (e.g., Horgan, 2024), among others. Numerous studies have investigated the extent to which nonverbal practices are used in discourse for persuasive, manipulative, and/or coercive purposes. Some of these studies investigate the nonverbal signals of dominance-submission and power-powerlessness in human relationships (e.g., Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006) and analyze the importance of body language in different political contexts (e.g., Atkinson, 1984), while others concentrate on the employment of gestures in time with pauses, intonation, and other rhetorical strategies that are commonly employed to stop applause (e.g., Bull, 1986). Others examine how the politicians' facial expressions and other verbal and physical practices affect the audience's physiological, cognitive, and emotional responses (e.g., Bucy & Bradley, 2004). Also, some studies offer thorough morphological and semantic explanations of gestures, which, in turn, provide relevant insights into the relationship between gesture and persuasive speech (e.g., Kendon, 2004; Streeck, 2008; Seraku, 2022).

Furthermore, examining how nonverbal practices are used in fictional discourse serves to create a comprehensive artistic image of literary texts, aids in character development, and allows readers to go deeper into the characters' inner lives and sense their emotions. A growing

number of psycholinguistic studies address different facets of this issue. In the work devoted to the writings of de Maupassant, Marmot (1986) turns to the study of nonverbal semiotic signals. The paralinguistic elements of novels by authors such as de Cervantes, Zola, Joyce, and others pique the curiosity of Poyatos (1997) to study the effectiveness of nonverbal communication in literary works. Additionally, Kreidlin (2002) discusses various topics within the scope of nonverbal semiotics in literature and their significance in the interpretation of literary texts. These fields include haptics, olfaction, proxemics, phonemics, phonation, and kinesics. Crucially, it should be remembered that the reader can adequately comprehend the system of values and worldview that underpin the social structure through nonverbal practices resulting from the political, cultural, and social circumstances of the interlocutors. Bjekic et al. (2022) argue that understanding the way nonverbal communications operate in ordinary discourse in general, and in fictional discourse in particular, enables persons to decipher the various meanings conveyed by nonverbal practices and helps them arrive at a comprehensive interpretation of the different conversational situations between interlocutors. Similarly, within the context of fictional discourse, Kyseliuk et al. (2020) investigate the way in which nonverbal practices describing the state of joy pertaining to discourse participants and conclude that joy, as one of the emotional states, is often accompanied by nonverbal communication, particularly gestures.

As for Orwell's *Animal Farm*, the narrative has been investigated from different linguistic perspectives, by using a CDA's approach to discuss the theme of linguistic manipulation in the novel and to decipher the various ways language is strategically utilized to produce domination (Hafez, 1995); exploring the different types of presupposition used in the narrative and the extent to which presupposition serves to arrive at the various pragmatic interpretations of the novel (Risdianto et al., 2019), investigating the ideologies of function words used in the novel, particularly the employment of pronouns and modality, as well as their effectiveness in producing persuasion and/or manipulation at the intradiegetic level of fictional communication (Lu, 2021; Khafaga, 2021), discussing cohesive devices utilized in the narrative to demonstrate the way readers can arrive at the themes of the novel and the way the intention of the author are communicated clearly through specific cohesive devices (Okeme & Olagunju, 2024), and using critical discourse analysis to decode the different strategies of positive-self presentation and negative-other presentation in the discourse of the novel by highlighting the way politicians and those in power use and/or abuse language in persuasive, manipulative, and coercive purposes (Al-Asbahi & Khafaga, 2020).

Although previous literature has tackled a variety of linguistic topics related to *Animal Farm*, particularly in terms of the use of verbal language in producing persuasion, manipulation, and coercion, as well as the role of language in exercising and maintaining power in discourse, either physically or rhetorically, the nonverbal dimension of using language to address the same topics still needs much clarification and further discussions. Significantly, addressing the nonverbal codes of language, particularly at the visual and vocalic levels of discourse production, is anticipated to add further pragmatic meanings to the narrative under investigation and sheds light on the significance of approaching literary texts by going beyond the verbal dimension of using language towards the nonverbal to provide a comprehensive pragmatic interpretation of fictional discourse.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

There are several ways to understand critical discourse analysis (henceforth, CDA). To provide the conceptual foundation for this study, four renowned CDA sources, van Dijk (2015), Fairclough (1995), Weiss and Wodak (2007), and Wodak and Meyer (2015), will be mentioned. According to van Dijk (2015), CDA examines how social power abuse and inequality are performed, reproduced, legitimized, and resisted in social and political settings through speech and writing. He also argues that critical discourse analysts adopt an explicit stance in such a dissident research, seeking to comprehend, reveal, and eventually confront societal inequity. Wodak and Meyer (2015) also focused on CDA's problem-focused approach, although she could not clearly define the concept. Accordingly, she thought that the key ideas of ideology, power, and critique were always at the center of CDA. Following an analysis of CDA's components, Wodak and Meyer (2015) clarify that CDA may be characterized as a core interest in examining obscure and apparent structural linkages of power, control, dominance, and discrimination as they are represented in language. To put it another way, CDA seeks to examine critically how language expresses, establishes, and legitimizes social inequality. Thus, the assumption that language serves as a channel of social power and dominance is supported by the majority of critical discourse analysts. It helps to validate structured power dynamics. Language is also ideological inasmuch as the justifications for power dynamics are not expressed (Weiss & Wodak, 2007).

According to Fairclough, CDA addressed two fundamental ideas: "power" and "ideology" (Fairclough, 2015, p. 3). Therefore, rather than the power inside the discourse, CDA was more concerned with the power behind it. This meant that rather than focusing on how power was manifested in discourse, CDA went further into how those in positions of power created discursive and social systems. Additionally, ideology is one of the two key ideas that CDA focused on. He thought that ideology was the main problem with CDA. Fairclough (2015) likened language to a stake in the conflict between social groupings, or the process of social struggle. For him, CDA was an analysis that integrated discourse critique with an explanation of how discourse functioned and shaped social reality, as well as an understanding of discourse as the basis for action aimed at altering certain facets of the current social reality.

Further, van Dijk (1995) argues that one of CDA's main objectives is the exposition of the underlying structures and ideas that sustain power disparities in society. Through techniques like manufactured consent, critical discourse analysts examine how language is deliberately employed to justify dominance and sway public opinion. CDA aims to reveal what has been concealed or disregarded about the dynamics of power and ideology in communication by concentrating on the discursive tools that support social control and mental management. This entails not only a thorough analysis of the rhetorical devices and grammatical structures of text and talk, but also the

nonverbal practices that serve to bring about the same outcome. For Wodak and Meyer (2015), CDA promotes social transformation and critical engagement with prevailing narratives by drawing attention to the discursive practices that permit the misuse of power. In the end, CDA aims to empower people and organizations by giving them the means to confront unfair power dynamics and promote social justice. Through a more thorough comprehension of discourse in its social context, this comprehensive approach critiques and works for social change.

CDA is interpretative in nature (Wodak & Meyer, 2015; Khafaga, 2017). Interpretation, within the theoretical framework of CDA, entails analyzing texts as social and linguistic processes in order to uncover hidden relationships. According to Fairclough (2013), interpretation is a mutual understanding between the discourse participants and the analyst. While Halliday (2007) stresses the social construction of reality influenced by situational and cultural settings, van Leeuwen (2008) observes that social practices impact interpretative methods, frequently masking implicated actors, and van Dijk (2015) emphasizes the impact of individual ideology and personal experience. In order to identify intertextuality and interdiscursivity, Wodak and Meyer (2015) place a strong emphasis on ideology, power, and history. Interpretation in CDA helps to bridge the gap between text and power relations, and textual components, as well as the interpreter's background, expertise, and social setting, all influence how a text is interpreted (Richardson et al., 2019). Thus, CDA is an interdisciplinary and interpretative method that investigates the complex connections among language, power, and society, with a special emphasis on concerns of inequality and dominance. Through an analysis of spoken and written discourse, CDA looks at how these components support the perpetuation of social hierarchies. CDA is distinguished from classical discourse analysis by its dedication to addressing particular social issues and using a critical lens, highlighting the necessity of explicit critique in order to comprehend the meanings of language usage.

3.2 Andersen's (1999) Categorization of Nonverbal Communication

The second theoretical strand adopted in this study is Andersen's (1999) classification of nonverbal communication. Andersen argues that nonverbal behaviors can be divided into two major types: nonverbal behaviors involving the body and nonverbal behaviors constituting the context of the communicative act. Regarding the nonverbal behaviors pertaining to the body, Andersen (1999) maintains that they can be represented by five nonverbal codes: physical appearance, kinesics, or body movement; oculesics, or eye behavior; proxemics, or interpersonal spatial behavior; and haptics, or physical communication. As for the nonverbal behaviors pertaining to the contextual, they are also manifested in five nonverbal codes: macroenvironments, microenvironments, chronemics, or time-related codes, olfactics, or communication through scent and smell, and vocalics, which constitutes nonverbal elements of the voice. It is obvious that Andersen's categorization of nonverbal behaviors comprises the various sources and channels of nonverbal communication: the visual, the audible, the vocalic, and the physical. Significantly, although there are various sources through which meaning can be communicated, nonverbal behavior often serves to supply information, control interaction, show emotion, permit metacommunication, govern social situations, and create and manage impressions (Eaves & Leathers, 2018). For analytical reasons, this study will focus on only two types of nonverbal practices in the discourse of *Animal Farm*: those communicated by the visual nonverbal code, which include two strategies, the use of violence and gestures, and those conveyed by the vocalic nonverbal code, which also encompass two strategies: dogs' growls and sheep's bleating.

4. Methodology

4.1 Data Collection and Description

The study uses the document analysis method (Bowen, 2009) to collect its data. The document analysis functions to assess both physical and electronic documents in order to decipher their meanings, interpret them, and expand on the information they offer. The data used in the analysis comprises a number of selected extracts from George Orwell's allegorical novella *Animal Farm* (1945). The novel consists of ten chapters, and the selected extracts are confined only to the character-to-character level of communication in the novel. This means that the analytical focus is on the conversational turns between discourse interlocutors at the intradiegetic level of discourse. Two reasons constitute the rationale for selecting this novel in particular. First, the novel is highly political as it presents the events of the Russian Revolution of 1917, which makes it relevant to the study of the theme of domination, given the fact that politics is mainly concerned with notions of power, control, and domination (van Dijk, 2015; Avelino, 2021). Second, the novel abounds in nonverbal practices dexterously utilized to mirror the extent to which domination can be produced and maintained nonverbally.

Orwell's *Animal Farm* is traditionally perceived as a parable about dictatorships in general and the Bolshevik Revolution in particular (Brown, 1984). It reflects the events of the Russian Revolution of 1917. The farm represents Russia, and Mr. Jones and the animals represent the Russian leaders and people of the time (Woodcock, 1984). The novel is a didactic, satirical story that narrates the story of a group of farm animals that revolt against their human farmer in the hopes of establishing a society where the animals might live in equality, freedom, and happiness. The revolt is ultimately betrayed, and the farm ends up in a far worse situation than it was before Napoleon, a pig, takes over as dictator (Welch, 1980). Napoleon's desire for power, control, and domination leads to suffering, as he uses fear and violence to seize and maintain power. According to Sedley (1984), the novel is a powerful metaphor that examines how dictatorship establishes itself and grows. The pigs' use of violence as a means of coercion and manipulation is essential to their consolidation and upkeep of power. In *Animal Farm*, Orwell is entirely concerned with discussing themes of equality, inequality, power, domination, totalitarianism, corruption, and the necessity for revolution and change under an authoritarian regime.

4.2 Research Design and Sampling

This study depends on a qualitative content analysis approach to investigate the employment of nonverbal practices as mechanisms for manipulative and coercive domination in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. Such a qualitative method thoroughly investigates how nonverbal practices in the selected novel are conduits of domination. It also helps to highlight the effectiveness of using nonverbal strategies to enhance the rhetorical effect of discourse interlocutors at the intradiegetic level of discourse, particularly in combining the authority of the powerful over the powerless, and add to the dynamics of power in the narrative. The sampling of the study is entirely purposive, focusing on specific extracts and expressions from the selected novel that are highly indicative in exposing the use of nonverbal practices as strategies of both manipulative and coercive domination in *Animal Farm*.

4.3 Analytical Procedures

The analytical procedures pass through three stages. The first stage is a familiarization of the data, in which a thorough textual analysis, in which a close reading of the whole novel is conducted to highlight the most relevant conversational events that demonstrate an explicit use of nonverbal practices by discourse interlocutors at the character-to-character level of communication. The second analytical stage constitutes a categorization process, wherein the nonverbal practices and their manifestations in the discourse of the novel are classified in terms of their nonverbal code of production (i.e., visual or vocalic) and whether they are employed to achieve manipulative or coercive domination. The third stage encompasses the work of critical discourse analysis. This stage also offers an extensive analysis of how the selected nonverbal practices are discursively used to reinforce and reproduce social power dynamics as well as the way these nonverbal practices are effectively employed to achieve manipulative and coercive domination. It is worth noting that all the italicized words and/or phrases in the selected extracts are made by the researchers for analytical reasons.

5. Analysis and Results

This part presents the analysis and results of the selected data. It demonstrates four nonverbal strategies used to achieve domination in *Animal Farm*. These include the use of violence and gestures at the visual nonverbal code of production and dogs' growl and sheep's bleating at the vocalic nonverbal code of production.

5.1 Visual Strategies of Nonverbal Domination in Animal Farm

At the visual nonverbal level, two strategies are utilized to achieve domination in the discourse of *Animal Farm*: the use of violence, which is realized by the feigned bloody executions arranged by the pigs headed by Napoleon against some animals, and the use of gestures, which is represented by the body language, particularly those produced by Napoleon.

5.1.1 The Use of Violence

Using violence is one of the visual nonverbal strategies of domination in the discourse of *Animal Farm*. This ploy has an enormous effect in producing coercive persuasion in the selected novel. From the outset, the use of violence is foreshadowed as a pivotal mechanism for maintaining domination in *Animal Farm*. Violence is manifested in the bloody confessions of chapter seven. During these confessions, violence is committed by the pigs against the other animals to send fear and terror into their hearts, which, in turn, compels them to accept what the pigs dictate. Consider the following extract:

Extract (1)

> Napoleon stood sternly surveying his audience; *then he uttered a high-pitched whimper*. Immediately the dogs bounded forward, seized four of the pigs by the ear and dragged them, squealing with pain and terror, to Napoleon's feet. The pigs' ears were bleeding, the dogs had tasted blood….Napoleon now called upon them to confess their crimes....without any further prompting they confessed that they had been secretly in touch with Snowball ever since his expulsion, that they had collaborated with him in destroying the windmill, and that they had entered into an agreement with him to hand over Animal farm to Mr. Frederick.…*When they had finished their confession, the dogs promptly tore their throats out, and in a terrible voice Napoleon demanded whether any other animal had anything to confess.* (*Animal Farm* (henceforth *AF*), 1945, p. 42)

As indicated from the above extract, some animals are made to confess of being collaborated with the expelled Snowball against Animal Farm. Napoleon calls together the entire population of the farm, gives his orders to the dogs to torture and then to kill the guilty animals in an attempt to create an atmosphere of terrorism so that no animal can oppose him. It is important to mention here that the whole process of altering the past history of the farm (the seven commandments) begins after these confessions. These bloody confessions show how Napoleon is corrupted by power. These confessions also represent a first step towards violating the seven commandments. It ends with killing a number of animals, which is considered to be a violation of the commandment, "No animal must ever kill any other animal" (*AF*., p. 5). Thus, killing those animals that are forced to confess violates one of the principles of Animalism.

The nonverbal effect of these confessions silences the other animals from protesting, intimidates the rest of the animals into submission, and perpetuates a culture of fear that stifles resistance. Napoleon uses some visual and vocalic effects to influence the animals' attitude. Napoleon's "high-pitched whimper" attempts to show his power to the animals in order to send fear in their hearts. Napoleon also entails his speech with a sentence in which he "demanded whether any other animals had anything to confess." Napoleon does not ask the animals if they want to confess or not. However, his words imply a strongly worded message of threat directed to the animals that anyone

who dares to object to Napoleon's orders or get involved in an act against him will taste the garment of torture and will have the same fate, that is, death.

The series of feigned confessions continues with the aim of terrorizing animals. Some other animals are forced to confess that they had committed a number of crimes against Animal Farm. These crimes are fabricated by the pigs in order to silence any objection and to occupy the animals' minds with nothing but fear of death if they protest:

Extract (2)

> The three hens…came forward and stated that Snowball had appeared to them in a dream and incited them to disobey Napoleon's orders. *They, too, were slaughtered*. Then a goose came forward and confessed to having secreted six ears of corn during the last year's harvest ….Then a sheep confessed to having urinated in the drinking pool urged to do this, so she said, by Snowball…*They were all slain on the spot. And so the table of confessions and executions went on, until there was a pile of corpses lying before Napoleon's feet and the air was heavy with the smell of blood*. (*AF*., pp. 42-43)

The confessions of the hens, the goose, and the sheep also end by murdering them. Crucially, the nonverbal effect of their murder serves to coerce the other animals into a state of silence and submission. Here, the animals' immobility and silence in this scenario, with their wide eyes, shaking limbs, and unwillingness to move, reveal much about the prevailing terror. In Orwell's description "when it was all over, the remaining animals, except for the pigs and dogs, crept away in a body. They were shaken and miserable" (*AF*., 43). Their psychological fear and powerlessness, which words could not adequately express, are reflected in this nonverbal response. The silence is significant because it represents their acquiescence and their incapacity to express disapproval in the face of overwhelming violence. Also, the lack of vocal opposition highlights Napoleon's coercive domination over them.

Furthermore, a rumor spreads of three hens conspiring with Snowball to murder Napoleon. The three hens are compelled to confess to committing such a crime, and they were also slaughtered:

Extract (3)

> In the middle of the summer the animals were alarmed to hear that three hens had come forward and confessed that, inspired by Snowball, they had entered into a plot to murder Napoleon. *They were executed immediately, and fresh precautions for Napoleon's safety, were taken.* (*AF.,* p. 48)

It is clear then that violence has two functions: it tends to vilify Snowball's picture through emphasizing his treachery and to coerce the animals to accept what the pigs do and say without any objection. The animals' inability to protest is due to two reasons: either they lack the right words to express their thoughts, or because of fear, which stands as a hindrance that blocks their mouths. This indicates that those who are powerful, rhetorically or physically, can practice specific types of domination and mind control over those who are powerless. The highest degree of using violence to coerce is demonstrated towards the end of the story when Boxer, who "was universally respected for his steadiness of character and tremendous powers of work" (*AF*., p. 2), was sent to the knacker's. The strongest animal, who is devoted to the principles of Animalism, shares in every success in the farm, since "Nothing could have been achieved without Boxer" (*AF*., p. 31), and holds the two banners of "Napoleon is always right" (*AF*., p. 34) and "I will work harder" (*AF*., p. 37), is sent to be slaughtered at the orders of Napoleon. Significantly, the violence practiced against Boxer also coerces the rest of the animals into submission and compliance. They become disillusioned and start to doubt their exploitation. This dynamic is highlighted by Boxer's tragic destiny. Despite his undying commitment, Boxer is transported to the knacker's under the ruse of obtaining medical care. Orwell's portrayal of Boxer's desperate and failed attempts to flee the wagon eloquently demonstrates the eventual betrayal of the pigs and highlights the role of violence in silencing and dominating even the most committed followers. Table 1 presents some words that carry the associative meaning of violence and their frequencies in *Animal Farm.*

Table 1. Words conveying the connotative meaning of violence and their frequency in *Animal Farm*

The word	Frequency	The word	Frequency
attach	10	suffered	2
kill/ed/ing	10	punished	2
terror	7	horror	2
blood	6	torn	2
confessed	6	shivers	1
destroy	5	threateningly	1
shot	4	suffering	1
violent	4	bloodshed	1
fear/ed	4	slaughter	1
fierce	4	destruction	1
murder/ed	3	tore	1
execution(s)	3	torture	1
slaughtered	2	suicide	1
executed	2	crush	1

Table 1 shows an abundance of frequencies of words that carry the associative meaning of violence, which, in turn, emphasizes the strategic employment of the physical dimension of power to achieve coercive domination in the novel.

5.1.2 Gestures

Another strategy utilized to coerce the animals on the farm is the use of gestures produced by Napoleon that starts immediately after the revolt against Mr. Jones and removing him from the farm and continues throughout the incidents of the novel. Throughout the novel, Napoleon's body language demonstrates his power and skill at manipulation:

Extract (4)

> Then Napoleon stood up to reply. He said *very quietly* that the windmill was *nonsense* and that he advised nobody to vote for it, and *promptly sat down again*; he had spoken for barely thirty seconds, *and seemed almost indifferent as to the effect he produced*. (*AF*. 26)

As indicated from the above extract, Napoleon's behavior of not speaking too much, his physical appearance, his selection of the words to be used in his speech, and his indifferent style of speaking are non/verbal indicators that he is more powerful than the rest of the animals on the farm. This, in turn, manipulates the animals and directs them towards one idea: Napoleon is the only one who can rule and manage.

Further, Napoleon is said to have moved with a slow, heavy dignity in the early years of his ascent to power, which starkly contrasts Snowball's more hurried and enthusiastic motions. He is established as a figure of power and control by his purposeful manner:

Extract (5)

> Napoleon, who *seldom moved out of a walk…. Napoleon paced to and fro in silence, occasionally snuffing at the ground. His tail had grown rigid and twitched sharply from side to side*, a sign in him of intense mental activity. Suddenly he halted as though his mind were made up. (*AF*., pp. 35-36)

Later, Napoleon's gestures become even more intimidating as his authority becomes increasingly oppressive. In the presence of ferocious hounds, Orwell highlights his "calm, commanding eye" (*AF*., 47), how he stood, unmoving, while the others quailed before him, and how he "roared in a voice of thunder" (*AF*., 36). These accounts show how his mere physical presence can evoke dread and compliance, making spoken orders all but useless.

Napoleon also uses nonverbal practices in his encounters with people. In the last scene, as the pigs and humans eat together, the pigs' metamorphosis into human-like beings is expressed by their outward behaviors and looks rather than words.

Extract (6)

> Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and *they were all alike*. No question, now, what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already *it was impossible to say which was which*. (*AF*., p. 71)

The above extract demonstrates the highest degree of the influence of domination over the rest of the animals on the farm. Such an effect comes as a result of the nonverbal behaviors the pigs adopt at the end of the story when they collaborate with the humans, sharing with them their features of playing cards, drinking alcohol, and standing on two legs. According to Orwell, the creatures outside alternate between pigs and humans, but "it was impossible to say which was which." The total betrayal of the animals' initial beliefs is shown by this potent moment of nonverbal imagery. The scene's visual metamorphosis, which highlights the extent of the pigs' degradation, is made the more powerful by the absence of spoken words.

Furthermore, Napoleon produces a nonverbal act to influence the animals' attitude and to direct them to vote against Snowball's plans to build a windmill:

Extract (7)

> Only Napoleon held aloof. He had declared himself against the windmill from the start. One day, however, he arrived unexpectedly to examine the plans. He walked heavily round the shed, looked closely at every detail of the plans and snuffed at them once or twice...*then suddenly he lifted his leg, urinated over the plans, and walked out without uttering a word*. (*AF.,* p. 25)

Napoleon's nonverbal act of urinating over Snowball's plans aims to manipulate the animals into voting against Snowball's plans and communicates their uselessness. Napoleon tries to communicate nonverbally that all plans are nonsense, which, in turn, will influence their attitudes. This nonverbal act is then employed to achieve manipulative domination. Thus, visual nonverbal practices tend to influence the recipients indirectly into adopting particular attitudes that serve the purposes of the speaker.

5.2 Vocalic Strategies of Nonverbal Domination in Animal Farm

At the vocalic nonverbal level, two strategies are employed to achieve domination in the discourse of *Animal Farm*: threat and intimidation, manifested in the dogs' growl; and confusion and distraction, accomplished by the sheep's recurrent bleating in critical moments.

5.2.1 Threat and Intimidation: Dogs' Growl

The dogs' growl, which is always produced in crucial moments, is another tool of coercive domination. Napoleon uses these dogs as a terrorist force that can suppress any objection. The dogs' first appearance comes when Napoleon and Snowball disagree over the idea of building a windmill. When it seems that Snowball will win the controversy, Napoleon orders his dogs to attack Snowball and expel him from the farm. The dogs' growl is a direct threat that sends terror and fear into the animals' hearts because of their ferocity and strength.

Extract (8)

> By the time he had finished speaking, there was no doubt as to which way the vote would go. But just at this moment Napoleon stood up and, casting a peculiar sidelong look at Snowball, uttered a high-pitched whimper of a kind no one had ever heard him utter before. *At this there was a terrible baying sound outside, and nine enormous dogs wearing brass-studded collars came bounding into the barn. They dashed straight for Snowball, who only sprang from his place just in time to escape their snapping jaws.* Too amazed and frightened to speak, all the animals crowded through the door to watch the chase. (*AF*., p. 27)

The dogs' act of attacking Snowball has two functions: to get rid of him forever so that Napoleon can run the farm alone and to create an atmosphere of terror on the farm so that the rest of animals cannot object to Napoleon's orders. This vocalic nonverbal act signifies a direct warning to the rest of the animals that they will have Snowball's same fate if they dare challenge Napoleon's dictatorship. The other animals become fearful and obedient due to Napoleon's trained dogs' vicious attacks. The dogs become tangible representations of force, and their quiet demeanor is sufficient to quell opposition. Because it avoids logical discussion and appeals to instinctive feelings like dread and uncertainty, this type of vocalic nonverbal intimidation is very successful.

The second appearance of the dogs comes after the abolishment of the Sunday morning meetings by Napoleon's orders. Some animals seem to protest against Napoleon's decision, but the dogs are sure to silence them and end their protest before it starts: "Four young porkers in the front row uttered shrill squeals of disapproval…. *But suddenly the dogs sitting round Napoleon let out deep, menacing growls, and the pigs fell silent and sat down again* (*AF.,* p. 28). Here, the dogs' growl attempts to silence the protesters. The dogs force the four porkers to accept Napoleon's decision without objection. The dogs' growl is also an indirect indication that the alternative to obedience will be torture, murder, and expulsion from the farm. This strategy eliminates disagreement without the need for vocal explanation by instilling terror. The other animals are forced into submission by the dogs' quiet threat, which represents dominance.

Another use of the dogs' growl to coerce and silence others occurs near the end of the novel, particularly when the pigs start to walk on two legs. The pigs' act is considered to be a flagrant and shocking violation of the maxim: "four legs good, two legs bad" (*AF*., p. 17). In order to suppress any possible objection against this violation, the dogs are made to produce their fierce growl, while the pigs, led by Napoleon, come out walking on their hind legs:

Extract (9)

> And a moment later, out from the door of the farmhouse came a long file of pigs, all walking on their hind legs…*And finally there was a tremendous baying of dogs and a shrill crowing from the black cockerel,* and out came Napoleon himself…*with his dogs gambolling round him. He carried a whip in his trotter*. (*AF,* p. 67)

The dogs' baying coerces the animals into submission and acceptance of the status quo. Also, the nonverbal effect of Napoleon carrying "a whip in his trotter" increases the feeling of fear and reminds the animals of the cruel and bitter days they led under Jones. The dogs' growl is also used to emphasize Snowball's treachery. The dogs are given orders to utter their fierce baying once Snowball's name is mentioned:

Extract (10)

> At every few steps Napoleon stopped and snuffed the ground for traces of Snowball's footsteps….He has been here! I can smell him distinctly! *And at the word 'Snowball' all the dogs let out blood-curdling growls and showed their side teeth.* (*AF,* pp. 39-40)

The dogs' growls function to associate Snowball with all kinds of evil and attempt to coerce the animals into a belief that Snowball is treacherous and, at the same time, to put an end to any objection. Significantly, the use of the adverb 'distinctly', meaning very definite, to describe the way Napoleon can identify the smell of Snowball delineates Napoleon as the well-informed, experienced, and competent leader who has the ability to know everything taking place on the farm. Also, the combination between the name of Snowball and the dogs' 'blood-curdling growls' that 'showed their side teeth' signifies two things: first, all mischievous acts are attributed to Snowball, and, therefore, any attempts from the animals to collaborate with him will be encountered by violent punishment; and second, coercion is effectively practiced when the nonverbal practices are appropriately accompanied with the verbal language.

Table 2. Total and indicative occurrences of the word 'growl' and its synonyms and derivatives in *Animal Farm*

The word	Total occurrence	No. of occurrence	Indicative	Examples of indicative occurrences in context
growls	3	3		- the dogs sitting round Napoleon let out deep, *menacing growls*, and the pigs fell silent.
				- all the dogs let out *blood-curdling growls*.
				- with his nine huge dogs… uttering *growls that sent shivers down all the animals' spines.*
growling	2	2		- when fierce, *growling dogs roamed everywhere*
				- they were promptly silenced by *a tremendous growling from the dogs*.
growled	2	2		- the three dogs who happened to be with him *growled so threateningly*.
				- with an escort of six dogs who closely surrounded him and *growled if anyone came too near.*
baying	3	3		- suddenly appeared on the men's flank, *baying ferociously*, panic overtook them
				- there was a *tremendous baying* of dogs
				- At this there was *a terrible baying* sound outside.

Table 2 clarifies that the words 'growl', 'growls', 'growling', and 'baying' are strategically used in combination with other expressions to threaten, terrorize, and coerce the rest of the animals in the farm to submit to Napoleon's orders without any objection, and thus end any type of resistance that may arise against him. Thus, expressions such as 'menacing growls', 'blood-curdling growls', 'growls that sent shivers down all the animals' spines', 'tremendous growling', 'growled so threateningly', 'baying ferociously', and 'terrible baying', significantly carry the connotative meaning of threat, terror, and intimidation that serve to achieve coercive domination.

5.2.2 Confusion and Distraction: Sheep's Bleating

A second vocalic strategy used to achieve domination in the discourse of *Animal Farm* is the sheep's bleating. This strategy is frequently utilized to create confusion and interrupt other animals' arguments, particularly Snowball's:

Extract (11)

> Napoleon was better at canvassing support for himself in between times. He was especially successful with the sheep. Of late *the sheep had taken to bleating 'Four legs good, two legs bad' both in and out of season, and they often interrupted the Meeting with* this. It was noticed that they were especially liable to break into 'Four legs good, two legs bad' *at the crucial moments in Snowball's speeches*. (*AF*., p. 24)

As indicated from the above extract, the sheep's bleating aims to prevent Snowball from finishing his argument and to end any potential interaction between Snowball and the other animals before birth. Napoleon's excellent planning of the sheep's bleating becomes evident to support him. The sheep are accustomed to bleating the slogan 'four legs good, two legs bad' in crucial and critical moments of argument in order to cause confusion on the side of the other animals and to limit their right of discourse. Here, the sheep's bleating is strategically used to interrupt other animals' discourse rights in order to generate coercive and manipulative domination. This act of bleating usually occurs during crucial situations, particularly when the pigs break any of the seven commandments and attempt to divert the attention of the other animals. The bleating of the sheep is then used to silence any animal who tries to oppose the pigs' oppression and tyranny.

The use of the same vocalic nonverbal strategy, i.e., the sheep's bleating, continues to be a mark of interruption and distraction targeted to coerce animals into submission to Napoleon. In almost all situations in which there may be any type of objection to or protest against Napoleon's speech, the sheep's bleating is employed to stifle any protestations from the other animals, to give the other animals no chance to object or simply to speak, and to quell any potential criticism of the pigs. This is obviously demonstrated following any transgression of the seven commandments. For example, when Napoleon announced that "the Sunday morning meetings would come to an end" (*AF*., pp. 27-28), young porkers "uttered shrill squeals of disapproval" (*AF*., p. 28), but immediately the sheep burst into a tremendous bleating of "four legs, good, two legs bad, which went on for nearly a quarter of an hour and put an end to any chance of discussion" (*AF*., p. 28). Also, several animals attempt to oppose Napoleon's decision to outlaw the "Beasts of England." The sheep begin their customary interruption to suppress the other animals in order to put an end to their disagreement before it starts. The animals are so terrified that they don't say a word to prevent the pigs from getting even. Despite their fear, some of the animals may have objected, but the sheep interrupted the conversation with their customary bleating of "four legs good, two legs bad," which went on for several minutes and put an end to the discussion" (*AF*., p. 45).

The employment of the sheep's bleating as a vocalic nonverbal strategy of domination reaches its climax at the end of the novel when the slogan 'four legs good, two legs bad', which is always used to create an atmosphere of confusion and distraction, is changed to be 'four legs good, two legs better':

Extract (12)

> But just at that moment, as though at a signal, all the sheep burst out into a tremendous bleating of 'Four legs good, two legs better!' It went on for five minutes without stopping. And by the time the sheep had quieted down, the chance to utter any protest had passed, for the pigs had marched back into the farmhouse. (*AF*., p. 67)

Despite the crucial change of the slogan, the sheep's bleating continues to provide constant support to Napoleon's situation. Therefore, the sheep's bleating, which controls the conversation on inequity, tries to restrict other animals' freedom of speech, prevent them from finishing their speech, and silence any protest or criticism. This act of bleating also tends to coerce the animals into submitting to the pigs' egotistical goals and haughty choices.

Table 3. Total and indicative occurrences of the word 'bleat' and its derivatives in *Animal Farm*

The word	Total occurrence	No. of Indicative occurrence	Examples of indicative occurrences in context
bleating	8	6	- the sheep had taken to bleating "Four legs good, two legs bad" both in and out of season, and *they often interrupted the Meeting with this.*
			- Snowball stood up and, though occasionally *interrupted by bleating from the sheep*.
			- Then the sheep broke out into a t*remendous bleating* of "Four legs good, two legs bad!"
			- at this moment *the sheep set up their usual bleating* of "Four legs good, two legs bad."
			- the sheep were sure to *silence him* with a *tremendous bleating*.
			- all the sheep *burst out into a tremendous bleating* of "Four legs good, two legs better!
bleated	1	0	- the whole farm burst out into Beasts of England in tremendous unison…*the sheep bleated* it

Table 3 shows that the word 'bleating' has a total frequency of 8, among them are 6 occurrences that are indicative in the production of domination in the discourse of *Animal Farm*. The table also clarifies that the contextual environment wherein the word 'bleating' is used plays a vital role in communicating the significance of the sheep's bleating as a vocalic nonverbal strategy that contributes to the pragmatic interpretation of the novel. Table 4 summarizes the results of the study:

Table 4. Nonverbal practices as domination conduits in Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Nonverbal code of production	Nonverbal Strategies	Manifestations	Domination Type	Output
visual	violence	- feigned confessions - slaughter of Boxer	coercive domination	submission, silence, and enforcement to act in one direction that targets the pigs' goals
	gestures	- body language - physical appearance -urinating over Snowball's plans - harsh roar	-coercive and manipulative domination	
vocalic	threat and intimidation	dogs' growls	coercive domination	submission, silence, and enforcement to act in one direction that targets the pigs' goals
	confusion and distraction	sheep's bleating	- coercive domination -manipulative domination	

Table 4 shows that nonverbal domination in *Animal Farm* is communicated by two nonverbal codes: visual and vocalic. In both levels, various nonverbal strategies are strategically used to achieve two types of domination: coercive and manipulative. The ultimate purpose of using such nonverbal strategies is to intimidate the animals into submission to the pigs' desires and to perpetuate a general atmosphere of control and domination over the whole farm.

6. Discussion

The analysis of the selected extracts from Orwell's *Animal Farm* demonstrates that domination cannot only be produced, exercised, and maintained through the linguistic verbal code, but also the nonverbal code contributes significantly to the production of domination in the discourse of the novel under investigation. Nonverbal communication serves as a subtle yet powerful tool in controlling perception and enforcing authority. Nonverbal practices, therefore, are important strategies through which powerful discourse participants can exercise control and domination over the powerless. This correlates with many previous studies, such as Burgoon et al. (2021), Eaves and Leathers (2018), Henley (1995), and LaFrance and Henley (1993), who argue that nonverbal behaviors are effective means of practicing interpersonal domination. Nonverbal practices, therefore, play a significant role in communicating ideologies, effecting attitudes, and shaping behaviors. Table 5 clarifies the different nonverbal strategies that are used to produce domination in the character-to-character level of discourse, either at the visual level of discourse production or the vocalic one.

It is analytically shown that nonverbal domination in Orwell's *Animal Farm* has been communicated by two nonverbal codes: visual and vocalic. At the visual level, nonverbal domination is communicated by two strategies. The first is the use of violence, which manifests itself in the bloody, feigned confessions arranged by Napoleon against a number of animals to coerce the rest of the animals into complete submission to his rule. The second strategy is the employment of gestures, which constitutes the use of body language, physical appearance, and the act of urination. Similarly, at the vocalic level, nonverbal domination is conveyed by two strategies. The first is the use of threat and intimidation, which is realized by the dogs' growl, and the second strategy is the use of confusion and distraction, which

is represented by the sheep's bleating. The use of visual and vocalic nonverbal codes in the production of dominance constitutes two categories of Andersen's (1999) classification of nonverbal codes used in discourse, and it also correlates with Eaves and Leathers's (2018) argument that discourse meanings can be better communicated and managed by nonverbal means. Furthermore, the four nonverbal strategies function to achieve two types of nonverbal domination in the discourse of *Animal Farm*: coercive domination and manipulative domination. The two types of domination discussed in this study emphasize the essential role played by nonverbal language in the production of domination, coercion, and manipulation, notions that represent the core concern of the work of CDA (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2015; Wodak & Meyer, 2015; Weiss & Wodak, 2007). As the analysis clarified, coercive and manipulative domination can be achieved only in an atmosphere of unequal power relations. This also shows the relevance of using and applying CDA's theoretical agenda in the investigation of the theme of nonverbal domination on the one hand and the possibly analytical and theoretical incorporation of CDA into the visual and vocalic nonverbal codes to investigate the theme of domination in literary genres, on the other.

The analysis also shows that the notions of control and domination are closely related and linked to the notion of power, which goes in conformity with Fairclough's (1995) and   van Dijk's (2015) arguments that a successful domination in discourse requires particular possession of power, either physically or rhetorically. Power, therefore, is a prerequisite for a successful act of control and dominance. This power, as is the case for this study, can be practiced physically or rhetorically. Physically, power is manifested in the use of violence to coerce, whereas the rhetorical dimension of power constitutes the strategically rhetorical use of language, verbally and/or nonverbally, to manipulate recipients. It is analytically clarified that Orwell effectively conveys the theme of domination in *Animal Farm* by employing nonverbal practices produced by powerful characters in the novel, specifically Napoleon. Napoleon's physical and rhetorical power highlights the covert control systems that keep the totalitarian government in place. These nonverbal practices encourage readers to go beyond words and examine the ways in which violence, gestures, threat, intimidation, and distraction may affect behavior and transmit meaning, which further accentuates Andersen's (1999) classification of nonverbal communication that the visual and vocalic strategies are significant sources of communicating meanings in discourse. Consequently, Orwell's criticism of dictatorship and exploitation is given a deeper resonance via these careful readings, emphasizing how similar processes are present in both human and animal communities, and it also shows how such a type of criticism can be effectively conveyed at the nonverbal level of communication.

Furthermore, the analysis of the selected data clarifies that nonverbal practices are frequently used in *Animal Farm* to produce manipulative and coercive domination. Both tactics aim to influence behaviors to suit the manipulator's or coercer's goals, and they are both based on power dynamics. The analysis also demonstrates that coercion, on the one hand, is more overt and depends on the use of violence and threat, whereas manipulation is typically psychological and covert. Manipulative domination is mainly concerned with the employment of specific manipulation tactics to mislead someone into doing something that would benefit the manipulator. In contrast to overt force, manipulation frequently conceals the underlying motivations of the manipulator, making it challenging for the victim to identify that they are being persuaded. The analysis further shows that coercive domination operates effectively by using or threatening to use force to make someone do something against his/her will. Coercive domination, thus, is a direct and frequently oppressive kind of power exertion that can take the shape of punitive actions that compel obedience, which indicates that there is always a noticeable power imbalance in this more overt practice. From the imposition of restrictive legislation to the fear of violence, coercion can take the form of physical, emotional, or institutional manifestations. Crucially, the way manipulative and coercive domination interact highlights the versatility of the various dimensions of power as tools for achieving desired outcomes.

In *Animal Farm*, Orwell criticizes how easily people in positions of authority may use nonverbal practices to control others. As contemporary cultures struggle with the growing impact of nonverbal behaviors in politics, this critique is still pertinent today. Understanding nonverbal communication techniques helps people better negotiate the intricate relationship between domination and resistance.

7. Conclusion

This paper presented a critical discourse analysis of nonverbal practices as strategies of domination in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. The analytical focus was on the character-to-character level of fictional communication. The analysis demonstrated that nonverbal practices are not only employed to produce manipulative and coercive domination but also contribute significantly to the representation of characters and help readers understand their deepest sentiments, ideas, and emotions. It was analytically evidenced that the nonverbal practices presented in the discourse of the selected novel have been communicated through two nonverbal codes: visual and vocalic. These two codes have been discursively manifested in four strategies that proved useful in the production of domination in *Animal Farm*: the use of violence and gestures at the visual level and the use of threat and intimidation (manifested in the dogs' growls) and the use of confusion and distraction (represented by the sheep's bleating) at the vocalic level (research question No. 1). The analysis also showed that incorporating nonverbal practices into the verbal means of communication intensifies the pragmatic weight of the analyzed text, reveals various interpersonal relationships between interlocutors, and contributes to the general interpretative atmosphere of the novel. Further, it has been analytically clarified that nonverbal practices used by interlocutors in the discourse of the novel reveal the extent to which nonverbal communication mirrors the different power relations among characters, as well as the extent to which power is a prerequisite for producing, exercising, and maintaining domination in discourse (research question No. 2). The analysis of the selected data also revealed that domination is communicated in two ways: manipulatively and coercively. In both cases, domination is accomplished nonverbally to shape, reshape, and/or change the characters' attitudes and behaviors towards particular attitudinal positions that serve the benefits of those in power (research question No. 3).

Finally, this paper recommends further studies on the effectiveness of nonverbal practices in the production of domination and the exercise of power in discourse settings other than the literary genre. For example, in the context of political discourse, nonverbal practices can be investigated as powerful instruments in political debates. Public impression can be influenced by a confident posture, a solid handshake, or prolonged eye contact that communicates authority and dependability. On the other hand, a slouched posture or avoidance of eye contact might be interpreted as weakness, which damages credibility. When forming opinions, these nonverbal practices frequently have greater influence than spoken words. Also, it is recommended to study the extent to which visual and vocalic nonverbal practices contribute to the production of persuasive discourse, particularly in courtroom and classroom discourse contexts. These studies are anticipated to provide results that are similar to and/or different from the results revealed in this paper.

Authors' contributions

The authors contributed equally to writing, editing, and proofreading the manuscript. They also approved the final version of this manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

Copyrights

References

Al-Asbahi, K. M., & Khafaga, A. (2020). Manipulative strategies of positive/negative presentation in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*: a critical discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, *4*(7), 133-142.

Andersen, P. A. (1999). *Nonverbal communication: Forms and functions*. California: Mayfield.

Atkinson, M. (1984). *Our masters' voices*. *The language and body language of politics*. London: Methuen.

Avelino, F. (2021). Theories of power and social change. Power contestations and their implications for research on social change and innovation. *Journal of Political Power*, *14*(3), 425-448. https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2021.1875307

Bjekic, D., Bojovic, M., & Stojković, M. (2022). Accuracy decoding of nonverbal behavior based on verbal descriptions of nonverbal signs. *Journal of Educational Sciences & Psychology*, *74*(1), 160-175. https://doi.org/10.51865/JESP.2022.1.16

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27-40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Brown, A. (1984). Examining Orwell: Political and literary values in education. In: Norris, K. (Ed.), *Inside the myth. Orwell: Views from the left* (pp. 39-61). London: Lawrence and Wishar.

Bucy, E. P., & Bradley, S. D. (2004). Presidential expressions and viewer emotion: Counter empathic responses to televised leader displays. *Social Science Information*, *43*(1), 59-94. https://doi.org/10.1177/05390184040689

Bull, P. E. (1986). The use of hand gesture in political speeches: Some case studies. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *5*(2), 103-118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X8652002

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, B., & Woodall, W. G. (1996). *Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue* (2nd edn.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Burgoon, J. K., & Dunbar, N. E. (2006). Nonverbal expressions of dominance and power in human relationships. In: V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nonverbal communication* (pp. 279-297). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976152.n15

Burgoon, J. K., Wang, X., Chen, X., Pentland, S. J., & Dunbar, N. E. (2021). Nonverbal behaviors "speak" relational messages of dominance, trust, and composure. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 624177. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.624177

Burrow, J. A. (2004). *Gestures and looks in medieval narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cap, P. (2010). Pragmatics, micropragmatics, macropragmatics. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, *6*(2), 195-228. https://doi.org/10.2478/v10016-010-0011-0

Denaulta, V., Leclerc, C., & Talwar, V. (2024). The use of nonverbal communication when assessing witness credibility: a view from the bench. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, *31*(1), 97-120. https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2023.2175068

Druckman, D., Rozelle, R. M., & Baxter, J. C. (1982). *Nonverbal communication: Survey, theory and research*. California: Sage.

Eaves, M. H. & Leathers, D. (2018). *Successful nonverbal communication: Principles and applications*. New York/London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315542317

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London & New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd edn.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315838250

Furley, P. (2021). The nature and culture of nonverbal behavior in sports: theory, methodology, and a review of the literature. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *16*(1), 448-473. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2021.1894594

Hafez, O. (1995). A critical discourse analysis of linguistic manipulation in *Animal Farm. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Comparative Literature: History in Literature* (pp. 381-403). Cairo: Cairo University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2007). On matter and meaning: The two realms of human experience. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1558/lhs.v1i1.59

Henley, N. M. (1995). Gender politics revisited: What do we know today? In: P. J. Kalbfleisch & M. J. Cody (Eds.), *Gender, power, and communication in human relationships* (pp. 27-61). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hess, U. (2016). Nonverbal communication. In H. S. Friedman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of mental health* (pp. 208-218). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-397045-9.00218-4

Horgan, T. (2024). *The nonverbal communication of our gendered and sexual selves.* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54361-6

Ismail, N., Mageswaran, N., Bujang, S., & Besar M. (2024). Beyond words: Analyzing non-verbal communication techniques in a medical communication skills course via synchronous online platform. *Frontiers in Medicine*, *11*, 1375982. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2024.1375982

Jucker, A. H. (2021). Features of orality in the language of fiction: A corpus-based investigation. *Language and Literature*, *30*(4), 341-360. https://doi.org/10.1177/09639470211047751

Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visible action as utterance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511807572

Khafaga, A. (2017). Discourse interpretation: A deconstructive, reader-oriented approach to critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *6*(2), 134-146. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.2p.138

Khafaga, A. (2021). Exploring ideologies of function words in George Orwell"s *Animal Farm. Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 29*(3), 2089-2111. https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.3.30

Khafaga, A. (2022). Caught on page! Micro and macro pragmatics of stage directions parentheticals in Tom Stoppard"s *Professional Foul. Journal of Pragmatics*, *193*, 27-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.03.005

Khafaga, A. (2023a). Strategic lexicalization in courtroom discourse: A corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *10*, 2217585. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2217585

Khafaga, A. (2023b). Beyond relational work: a psycho-pragmatic analysis of impoliteness in Shakespeare"s *King Lear*. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications*, *10*, 539. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02039-5

Kim, E., & Klinger, R. (2019). An analysis of emotion communication channels in fan fiction: towards emotional storytelling. *Proceedings*

of the Second Storytelling Workshop, Association for Computational Linguistics (pp. 56-64). Florence, Italy. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W19-3406

Knapp, M. L., & Hall, J. A. (2002). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction* (5th ed.). Victoria: Thomson Learning.

Kreidlin, G. E. (2002). *Nonverbal semiotics*. Moscow. Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.

Kyseliuk, N., Hubina, A., Martyniuk, A., & Tryndiuk, V. (2020). Non-verbal means of communication in the representation of the emotional state of joy in modern English fictional discourse. *Cognitive Studies* (Études cognitives), *20*, 2284.https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2284

LaFrance, M., & Henley, N. M. (1993). On "oppressing hypotheses" or differences in nonverbal sensitivity revisited. In: L. Radtke & H. Stam (Eds.), *Power/gender: Social relations in theory and practice* (pp. 287-311). London: Sage.

Lu, S. (2021). Elastic language in persuasion and comforting: A cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *187*, 115-117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.11.004

Marmot, R. A. (1986). *La communication non-verbale chez Maupassant* (*Non-verbal communication at Maupassant*). Paris: A-G Nizet.

Okeme, U., & Olagunju, T. (2024). Cohesive devices in George Orwell's *Animal Farm. Veritas Journal of Humanities*, *7*, 57-70

Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. Penguin Books Lt.

Pardo, M. L. (2001). Linguistic persuasion as an essential factor in current democracies: Critical analysis of the globalization discourse in Argentina at the turn and at the end of the century. *Discourse & Society*, *12*(1), 91-118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926501012001

Partington, A. (2003). *The linguistics of political argument: The spin-doctor and the wolf-park at the White House*. London & New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/97802032182

Pinto, D. (2004). Indoctrinating the youth of post-war Spain: A discourse analysis of a Fascist Civics textbook. *Discourse &Society*, *15*(5), 649-667. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926504045036

Poyatos, F. (1997). Aspects, problems and challenges of nonverbal communication in literary translation. In: F. Poyatos (Ed.), *Nonverbal communication and translation: New perspectives and challenges in literature, interpretation and the media* (pp. 17-47). Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.17.05poy

Richardson, M., Garner, P., & Donegan, S. (2019). Interpretation of subgroup analyses in systematic reviews: A tutorial. *Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health*, *7*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cegh.2018.05.005

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Hickson, M. L. (2008). Nonverbal behavior in interpersonal relations (6th edn.). Boston: Pearson.

Risdianto, F., Malihah, N., & Guritno, A. (2019). The analysis of presupposition in George Orwell's novella *Animal Farm. Journal of Pragmatics Research*, *1*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v1i1.1-12

Sedley, S. (1984). An immodest proposal: *Animal Farm*. In: Christopher, N. (Ed.), *Inside the myth. Orwell: Views from the left* (pp. 155-162). London: Lawrence and Wishart. https://doi.org/10.1075/ct.7.09so

Seraku, T. (2022). Interactional and rhetorical functions of placeholders: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *187*, 118-129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.10.023

Sornig, K. (1989). Some remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion. In: Wodak, R. (Ed.), *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse* (pp. 95-113). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/ct.7.09sor

Štěpánková, A. (2021). Emotions in non-verbal communication at pre-election debates: a review of resources on the importance of politicians' mimics at TV political debates and other forms of media messages. *The Journal of International Communication*, *27*(2), 126-147. https://doi.org/10.1080/13216597.2020.1855599

Streeck, J. (2008). A case study of the democratic presidential candidates during the 2004 primary campaign. *Research on Language and Social Interaction 41*(2), 154-186. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810802028662

Streek, J., & Knapp, M. (1992). The interaction of visual and verbal features in human communication. In: F. Poyatos (Ed.), *Advances in nonverbal communication: Sociocultural, clinical, esthetic and literary perspective* (pp. 3-23). Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.60.06str

van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, *1*(1), 17-28. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926595006001001

van Dijk, T. A. (ed.) (1997). Discourse as interaction in society. In *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, vol. 2 (pp. 1-37). London & New York: Sage.

van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 466-485). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch22

van Leeuwen, T. (2008). Discourse as the recontextualization of social practice: A guide. In: R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 144-161). Thousand Oaks: Sage. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195323306.001.0001

Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Critical discourse analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230514560_1

Welch, R. (1980). *Animal Farm*. Longman.

Wharton, T. (2009). *Pragmatics and non-verbal communication*.   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511635649

Wiener, M., Devoe, S., Rubinow, S., & Geller, J. (1972). Nonverbal behavior and nonverbal communication. *Psychological Review*, *79*(3), 185-214. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0032710

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (eds.) (2015). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (vol. 3). London: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/978085702802

Woodcock, G. (1984). *The crystal spirit. A study of George Orwell*. New York: Schocken Book.