
VIEWING, LISTENING AND READING ALONG: LINGUISTIC AND MULTIMODAL CONSTRUCTIONS OF VIEWER PARTICIPA- TION IN THE NET SERIES SKAM

Elisabeth Muth Andersen
University of Southern Denmark

Søren Vigild Poulsen
University of Southern Denmark

Abstract

This paper investigates how SKAM viewers are positioned as participants through semiotic resources in the net series, i.e. the filmic means for making meaning, including representations of the characters' embodied and digitally mediated communication. For this purpose, we combine perspectives from linguistic-multimodality studies of modes for communication and studies building on Goffman's (1981) work on participation frameworks, i.e. the various ways of participating in co-present and/or mediated communication.

The article aims to complement existing media studies of immediacy in SKAM and viewers' sense of co-presence with characters in the net series (Jerslev, 2017, Sundet, 2017). It does so by showing how participant frameworks are multimodally constructed at a fictional level and a communicational level. Within each of these frameworks, the viewer is positioned in distinct ways. We describe how the viewer is placed, i.e. physically positioned, in the interactional space of the depicted characters, and how the characters' communicative means are interactionally organised, accomplished and made available for interpretation by the viewer. Furthermore, we show how characters monitor each other in the shared space of a schoolyard, how embodied and digitally mediated communicative features are foregrounded, and how the viewer is provided access to these resources in ways that reflect and create specific viewing positions in the communicative frames of the characters.

We argue that these integrations of semiotic modes exploit affordances related to speech, writing and embodiment, that the positionings mainly work to create a

sense of presence and identification for the viewer, and that representations of digitally mediated communication (writing) on the viewer's screen specifically expose how the digitally mediated communication space of one of the characters is integrated with the digitally mediated viewing space.

Keywords: Participant frameworks, semiotic resources, social interaction, viewer position

1. Introduction

The net series SKAM has been studied in terms of how it relates to and attracts viewers. Kann-Rasmussen and Balling (2017) point out that the use of the internet as a distribution platform, the distribution of small clips in ways that imitate real time and the fact that the distribution time has not been announced in advance, as well as the use of social media in relation to SKAM offer ways for viewers to participate, for example by providing access to public discussions about topics related to SKAM and by providing more information about the characters than is accessible in the clips themselves. Sundet (2017) outlines narrative devices used in SKAM to establish emotional investments for viewers and suggests that, besides the use of reel time and social media to distribute clips and information about the characters on various platforms which afford active participation from SKAM viewers, SKAM is a character-driven drama which invites viewers to take the perspective of the main character. Jerslev (2017) focuses on how a sense of presence and immediacy in the here and now is invited through audio-visual strategies of the production. In terms of time, Jerslev suggests that the written indications of time that clips are initiated with and that match the distribution time as well as the unpredictability in terms of the distribution time are devices to create presence for the viewer. This means, as Jerslev (2017) points out, that the viewers cannot prepare for the event in advance and this contributes to inviting an intense viewing event. In terms of place, Jerslev (2017) suggests that close-ups are used as a strategy to create immediacy. Supplementing Sundet (2017)'s point that SKAM is character-driven, Jerslev (2017) observes that viewers are often presented with talking and listening faces. She also notes that camera techniques are used to focus on one face and blur the other when a dialogue is presented (2017:78). Thereby, viewers are invited to focus on facial expressions and movements of particular characters.

This paper elaborates on existing studies of SKAM by showing that multiple forms of participation, in which the viewer is positioned in different ways, are presented simultaneously in a scene from the series, and how these are constructed with distinct modes of communication. This study therefore approaches SKAM from a linguistic and multimodal perspective and investigates how viewers are invited to participate in a specific viewing situation. We draw on the concept of "participation frameworks" coined by

Goffman which, among other things, is used to outline two communication frameworks for TV fiction in recent publications (e.g. Brock 2015, Dynel 2011, Messerli 2017); the fictitious framework that includes the depicted characters and the real communicative framework comprising the creators and the viewers connected through the depicted drama.

Using this framework, we intend to show how viewers of SKAM are invited to participate in the viewing of SKAM on two levels: a fictitious level and a real level (Brock 2015); we describe and analyse how a participation role is constructed for the viewer on each level by the production crew using film resources and depictions of characters' interaction, and we argue that the methodical and extensive use and coordination of semiotic modes on both levels anchor the viewer both physically and socially in the setting and thereby invite a sense of immediacy and co-presence on the viewer's part as previously described in media studies of SKAM.

2. Viewer participation in telecinematic discourse: A linguistic and multi-modal perspective

This paper investigates viewer participation in the telecinematic discourse in SKAM from a linguistic point of view (Dynel 2011, Messerli 2017). The concept of telecinematic discourse refers to "the language of cinema and television" (Piazza et al. 2011:1) investigated not only in terms of the characters' verbal dialogues, but as "integrated multimodal (verbal and visual) fictional narratives" (Piazza et al. 2011:1).

Participation is a central topic of investigation within pragmatics of fiction (Jucker & Locher, 2017). Fiction involves complex communicative acts (i.e. the cultural artefacts) that connect a creator and a recipient. Several models to illustrate participation structures in telecinematic discourse have been suggested (Brock 2015, Bubel 2008, Dynel 2011). The models have in common that they rely on Goffman's concept of "participation framework" (Goffman 1981:137) and that they suggest to describe participation structures of telecinematic discourse in terms of two communicative levels. According to Dynel's (2011) terminology, level 1 includes communication between the characters in which everyday-type participation roles are often represented (Brock 2015:30), and level 2 includes the use of cinematic and discursive strategies by members of the film crew including e.g. scriptwriting, editing and shooting. All participants that contribute to the production are referred to as "the collective sender". In level 2 the communication between the characters in level 1 is included as the resource(s), and the TV viewer (and listener) is referred to as the "recipient" (Dynel 2011:1632), used here as a technical and theoretical term. We, however, use the term "viewer" instead since the term recipient may also be used to refer to participant roles in the fictitious participant framework of the characters when someone is the recipient of talk. Apart from these participants, Dynel suggests a role of "metarecipient" (2011:1633) which refers to participants who use metalanguage and specialist terminology to describe the media product.

Each level described above involves specific participants and may be referred to as “participant frameworks” (Goffman 1981:137). Goffman coined the concept which “refers to the range of ways that persons within perceptual range of an utterance are able to position themselves in relation to it” (Hutchby 2014:87). Originally the term was mainly used for spoken utterances, but it is now also used for mediated interaction and includes participants within “perceptual range’ of written or otherwise mediated linguistic emissions” too (2014:87). For each of the two communicative levels, participants and their possibilities for participation using communicative means can be identified.

Further, participation roles can be described for all participants according to every utterance or action being produced, and their participation statuses are accomplished locally through actions of all participants.

In terms of participation status related to speaking, Goffman distinguishes three roles: that of “animator”, “author” and “principal” (Goffman 1981:144). The animator vocalises the utterance, the author formulates it, and the principal is the one whose beliefs are expressed through the speech. In ordinary interaction, speakers perform all three roles much of the time, but in some types of social interaction it is not always the case. That applies, for example, to interview situations in which interviewers may perform the role of animator of questions formulated by others and expressing the beliefs or intentions of others (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2000). The three roles that comprise the “production format” (Goffman 1981:145) of speaking may also be used to describe speech in film and TV fiction; Messerli (2017:32) suggests that actors animate speech formulated by creators/producers and that the scripted nature of the interaction in fiction explains differences in turn-taking when comparing with spontaneous naturally occurring speech (for a comparison, see Chepinchikj & Thompson 2016).

Participation frameworks, of course, also include hearer roles. As with speaker roles, hearer roles are accomplished in interaction; a hearer may be treated and treat him/herself as an “addressee”, as a non-addressed “third party” or as an “overhearer” (Goffman 1981:132). Whereas speakers, addressed recipients and co-present third parties are ratified participants which is mutually accomplished through joint engagement in interaction (Goffman 1981:130), overhearers are treated as non-ratified participants, i.e. “nonparticipants” (Dynel 2011:1629). When co-participants are aware of an overhearer’s presence, the overhearer’s participant role is referred to as “bystander” (Goffman 1981:132), and when the interactants are not aware of his or her presence, he or she is referred to as an “eavesdropper” according to the Goffmanian terminology (Dynel 2011, Goffman 1981:132).

A central question within research on participant roles in telecinematic discourse concerns the status of the viewer (Brock 2015:28). As mentioned, viewers are referred to by Dynel (2011) as “recipients”, arguing that viewers are ratified recipients since the collective senders produce the cultural

artefact for them and therefore should not be viewed as overhearers or even eavesdroppers. This applies to level 2 in Dynel's model referred to above, i.e. the real communication between the collective sender and the viewers as recipients. Brock (2015:32) suggests that a fictitious participation slot is also constructed for the viewer in the inter-character participation framework in level 1 in genres of standard comedies which he considers. He suggests that camera distance, height and focus imitate the position of someone present and that, since the camera is tolerated but largely ignored, the camera resembles a natural overhearer. Brock (2015) also notes that this is a collaborative achievement: A position is constructed for the viewer using cinematic resources, but the viewer must play along and suspend disbelief in order for this to work. Messerli (2017:38) provides a similar observation, namely that viewers may imagine becoming immersed in the fictional layer as a present overhearer (level 1), while at the same time appreciating the underlying layers that make the construction possible (level 2).

Shots depict fictitious characters in specific settings which means that the viewer is positioned relative to the characters and the social setting they are depicted in. Hence, cinematic resources may be used to create a sense of presence for the viewer in the setting of the characters. According to IJsselsteijn and Riva (2003), presence can be divided into physical and social presence, and at the intersection of these two categories we have "co-presence or a sense of being together in a shared space" (2003:7). In order to describe the cinematic resources used to establish experiences of participation and presence for the viewer in SKAM, we therefore consider both the imitations of physical positioning of the viewer through camera work, which may imitate physical presence, and how the viewer is provided access to social interaction between the characters, which may support the sense of physical presence and also imitate social presence, thereby creating a sense of co-presence for the viewer.

The imitations of physical positioning of viewers through camera placement and settings as well as the placement and movements of the depicted characters' bodies relative to it indicate and imitate bodily distances. In interpersonal communication, specific physical distances between the participants provide access to particular types of communicative resources and information about the participants. Physical distance matters, for example, in terms of access to speech, visual monitoring of co-participants, possibilities of sensing smell and using touch as a resource in social interaction. These associations are also used in visual mass media such as TV. Hjarvard (2002), citing Hall (Hall 1959, 1966), notes that specific distances between people are associated with basic meaning. Very close distances of less than 0.5 metres are associated with "intimate" relationships, distances of 0.5 – 1.2 metres are described as "personal" relationships, 1.2 - 3.0 metres are referred to as "social-consultative", and distances of more than 3 metres are called "public"

(Hjarvard 2002:244). Correspondingly, Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) take inspiration from Hall to argue that the size of image frame (in both still and moving images) represents a distinct relationship between the viewer and depicted characters.

3. Multimodal film analysis

We follow Livingstone and Lunt (2013) who propose to combine Goffman's framework with Hodge and Kress's (1988) social semiotic account of meaning-making. Livingstone and Lunt (2013) point out how social semiotics enables an analytical awareness of the complex and dynamic ways meaning-making resources beyond language are employed in contemporary communication.

As argued by Livingstone and Lunt (2013), mediated communication materialises in ways other than face-to-face interaction, which affords constructions and reworkings of participation between involved parties that may differ from what has been seen and described in interactions that do not involve (broadcast, digital or social) media using e.g. Goffman's terms.

Besides the complexity of participant frameworks in SKAM related to the fictional communication level as described above, communication between the characters is represented by using not only talk, gesture etc., but also by representations of the characters' use of digital communication which therefore calls for a multimodal approach to describing the resources for meaning-making.

Communication accomplished using writing involves technologies such as mobile phones in SKAM, and many scenes in the series depict the characters' production of communicative actions using technologies. Viewers can monitor characters looking at their mobile phones and touching them, i.e. reading and writing, and, thus, access to the communication is provided through access to a small screen.

The data investigated in this paper is another example of complex communication processes. In this setting, communication modes traditionally described as belonging to "distinct spheres of inquiry" (Livingstone & Lunt 2013:81) create hybrid forms of mediated networked communication.

To elaborate on how we conceptualise the ways that language (in combination with other modes of communication) constructs how the viewer is positioned as a participant in SKAM, we adopt a social semiotic multimodal perspective on film. Multimodality is the social semiotic study of modes for communication (Kress 2010, Kress & van Leeuwen 1996, 2001). A mode is a semiotic system such as language, music, still images, and colour. Each semiotic system makes available to a group of sign makers a set of semiotic resources, that is: "[t]he actions, materials and artefacts we use for communicative purposes, whether produced physiologically – for example, with our vocal apparatus, the muscles we use to make facial expressions and gestures – or technologically – for example, with pen and ink, or computer hardware and software – together with the ways in which these resources can be organised. Semiotic resources have a meaning potential, based on their past uses, and a set of affordances

based on their possible uses, and these will be actualised in concrete social contexts where their use is subject to some form of semiotic regime.” (van Leeuwen 2005:285).

Each mode enables sign makers to represent experience, i.e. the ideational metafunction, to enact social relations, i.e. the interpersonal metafunction, and to organise meaning into a text that functions in a communicative context, i.e. the textual metafunction (Halliday 1994). Multimodal film analysis investigates film as a multimodal text in which resources from multiple modes co-create meaning. Multimodal film analysis grows out of art studies, gestalt psychology, media and film studies, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), and visual design studies. In one of the first multimodal film studies, O’Halloran (2004) combines neo-formalistic and cognitive film theory (Bordwell 1985, Bordwell & Thompson 1994) and a SFL’s approach to visual art (O’Toole 1994) in her analytical framework that takes the *mise-en-scène* as the point of departure for a film analysis. However, as pointed out by Boeriis (2009), this framework is underdeveloped in terms of analytical delicacy, and it relies too heavily on film productional-technical concepts rather than on semiotic concepts. Another important work is Wildfeuer (2014) which integrates media studies, cognitive theory and multimodal research of layout, comics, and still and moving images. Yet, this approach does not operate with a grammar for moving images which makes it incompatible with social semiotics in the SFL tradition. To this day, Boeriis (2009, 2015) presents the most elaborated framework for film or moving images, combining and rethinking film studies (especially Bordwell & Thompson’s work), SFL, and social semiotics that allow for a stringent grammatical description of single film shots. We will take inspiration from these works in the analysis of the selected SKAM scene.

4. Data and method

For an exemplary analysis of constructions of participant frameworks in SKAM that position viewers on two levels, we will analyse the scene ‘Monday 14:15’ in episode six from the first season of SKAM. It is a scene of the yard of the high school where the season’s main character, Eva, and her boyfriend, Jonas, interact. In the scene, Eva is sitting at a bench with her two friends, Vilde and Noora, while much of the time she is looking at and interacting with Jonas who stands across the yard, chatting with two friends, Isak and Magnus. From previous scenes, the viewer knows that Eva suspects Jonas to be unfaithful.

We did a multimodal transcription of the scene, following the guidelines of Baldry and Thibault (2005) and van Leeuwen (2005), but in a simplified version. We define a shot as the temporal representation of content between two clips (Boeriis 2009:142-143). In the transcription, we categorised selected semiotic modes and their resources at each shot separately. Then we mapped out the modes and their meaning potential for cuing a participant framework.

Table 1 shows a sample of the transcription of the first five of the total 39 shots in the scene; we will be discussing specific modes and their interaction in the analysis in the following section.

Time	Shot	Visual frame	Moving image	Speech	Chat	Sound	Gaze	Facial expression	Gesture	Body formation
2.56-3.00	1	High school building, the words (in yellow) Monday and the time 14:15 non-diegetic displayed on the image	Ideational: Conceptual analytic whole-parts process Interpersonal: Public distance	-	-	Bird song	-	-	-	
3.00-3.03	2	Jonas, Isak and Magnus standing and talking in the schoolyard	Ideational: Conceptual classificational process Interpersonal: Public distance	Vilde: <i>Jeg skal jo snart møde William igen (.) og (.)?</i> 'I will soon meet William again'	-	Distant sound of cars Un-identifiable talk	Offer (visual information)	-	Neutral	Engagement: from side (Jonas towards Isak and Magnus)
3.03-3.05	3	Eva's face and upper body as she looks to her right	Ideational: Conceptual analytic whole-parts process Interpersonal: Close personal distance	Vilde: <i>(?) jeg tror vi har noe</i> 'I think we have something'	-		Demand / oblique to her right	Neutral	-	Engagement: body oblique to her left side
3.05-3.08	4	Ingrid and two other girls standing and talking in the schoolyard	Ideational: Conceptual classificational process Interpersonal: Public distance	Vilde: <i>på gang det er bare (?) det er ganske (sygt)</i> 'going on, it is quite (sick)'	-		Offer (visual information)	-	Arms crossed	Engagement: from side (Ingrid towards girls)

Table 1. Sample from the multimodal transcription of the schoolyard scene in season 1. The y-axis in the table displays the different shots in the scene, while the x-axis maps out selected, salient semiotic modes in each shot.

The identified modes we have categorised are: moving image, speech writing (in SMS chat), sound/music gaze, facial expression (mimic) and head movement, and gesture. On the basis of the multimodal transcription, we analyse and discuss how the (interaction of) multiple modes work to construct different levels of participation with distinct viewer positions.

5. Analysis

This paper argues that viewers are positioned on several levels simultaneously through coordination and interaction between telecinematic resources and depictions of inter-character communication, and that these interactions invite a sense of co-presence for the viewer during the viewing of SKAM.

We will therefore analyse the sequential unfolding of how viewers are positioned according to i) the communication between the TV producers and the recipients of the TV series (level 2), ii) the interactional communication of the fictional characters (level 1), and iii) the digitally mediated communication between the two main characters in the scene (Eva & Jonas) (level 1).

5.1. Physical anchoring of the viewer: Establishing time, place and physical placement

In the following, we describe significant communicative features in the first shots that are used in the real communication between the collective sender and the viewers as recipients (level 2) with special attention to time and place of the scene and the initial placement of the viewer as imitating a physical presence in relation to the fictional characters. While the analysis does not exhaust the filmic and discursive strategies of the film style (including mise-en-scene, cinematography, and editing), the focus on time, place and positioning of the viewer in terms of perspective, point out the specific ways that the scene positions the viewer relative to what is being said and done by the characters. These seemingly unnoticed features are prerequisites for how the viewer can engage in the interactions of the fictional characters.

Time is represented in written language in big yellow numbers and letters displayed on the screen (shot 1). Time and day of the week function as temporal circumstantial markers (Halliday 1994). The writing compliments the visual representation of the building in the daytime by adding more detailed information about when the scene takes place. Furthermore, the written indications of time and day add to the sense of “here and now”, as pointed out by Jerslev (2017), created through the distribution of scenes in real time on the net series’ website. In terms of the two levels of participation described for participation frameworks of TV fiction (Brock 2015, Dynel 2011), the production crew has made it possible for the set time of the inter-character interaction (level 1) to possibly clash with the viewing time of viewers (level 2) by foregrounding the time aspect of the scene and the viewing of it by synchronising the time frames of the two communicative levels.

Setting the scene is established in the first shots. This is done ideationally by displaying characters in the schoolyard of the high school; in multimodal terms, these are represented by ‘conceptional structures’, i.e. images that show not actions, but structures, classes or taxonomies, in the moving images (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996). In shot 1, we see an analytical structure, i.e. a whole and its parts, depicting the high school building where the following interactions happens. Eva’s upper body and face as she gazes (shots 3 & 5) are also represented as an analytical structure. As we shall describe in more detail, this way of presenting Eva brings the viewer to focus his or her attention on Eva’s face and its attributes which will come to play an important part in the following interactions with other characters. In shots 3 and 5, she is shown looking at something on her right side that is not in the frame, while her mimic is neutral and shows no apparent expressions. The next shots depict three distinct groups of students in the schoolyard; each group are involved in interactions between its members: In shots 2 and 7, Jonas, Isak and Magnus (the boy group) stand behind two unknown students; in shot 4, Ingrid with two friends next to another group of unknown students; and in shot 6, Eva, Vilde and Noora are depicted sitting next to each other. All these shots represent characters by “classificational processes” (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996), that is, they show members (the girls and boys) as belonging to the same class or unit (the girl and boy groups). So in terms of the participant frameworks established through depictions of groups of characters in these shots, groups of friends are established as organised physically close to each other, i.e. expressing a personal social relationship (Hjarvard 2002, Kress & van Leeuwen 1996), and some of them are depicted as engaged in interaction with one another as their bodies and faces are turned towards each other.

Example 1

Shot 1	Shot 2
High school building, the words (in yellow) Monday and the time 14:15 non-diegetic displayed on the image	Jonas, Isak and Magnus standing and talking in the schoolyard
Shots 3 and 5	Shot 4
Eva’s face and upper body as she looks to her right	Ingrid and two other girls standing and talking in the schoolyard
Shot 6	Shot 7
Noora, Vilde and Eva sitting aligned on a bench in the schoolyard, Noora and Vilde looking at each other, Eva looks to her right	Jonas and the boy group, Jonas gazes to his left (directly towards the camera)

As mentioned, cinematic resources such as camera height, distance and focus are used to create specific viewing positions for the viewer. According to Brock (2015), these resources may be organised to resemble the position of a natural overhearer and become “the main fictitious identification point for

the real TV viewer to slip into” (2015:33). In the SKAM scene investigated, differences in camera distance imitate how the viewer is physically placed in relation to characters. In shots 1, 2, 4 and 7, we have a public distance from which the viewer sees the scenario from an overall perspective, thereby the viewer should focus on the public space in which the scene is about to play out. In these shots, the camera distance helps the viewer to orient him or herself in relation to the girl and boy groups in the schoolyard. From this position, the viewer gets access to a privileged perspective from where he or she can observe the characters and their interaction(s). Regarding the shot of Vilde, Noora and Eva (6), the viewer sees them at medium distance as if we were standing in front of them as a fourth member of their group. From this position, the viewer can listen to their conversation and see them all at the same time. Thus, the viewer is placed in an interpersonal space, without being intimate. In the main interaction between Eva and Jonas, the camera displays a close-up of Eva’s head (shots 3 & 5), while Jonas is shown in a long frame (shot 4), thus in public distance (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996). As the scene continues, the camera shifts between close personal distance (to Eva’s head and face) and public distance (of Ingrid’s girl group 1 and Jonas’s boy group). This way, the camera distance positions the viewer in a closer relationship with Eva than with Jonas. From this, it follows, as pointed out by Jerslev (2017), with reference to studies of faces on film by Balázs (1970 [1923]), Deleuze (1983/1986) and Doane (2003), that the face shots invite rich interpretations of the fictional character’s emotions and reactions to interactions with others.

The shifts in shots (i.e. the ‘montage’) create other layers of imitation of the physical anchoring point of the camera. The scene entails many sequences of eyeline match (Janney 2012); the first shot shows what is seen (e.g. a group of characters as in shot 2), and the second shot shows the person from whose position the first shot is viewed (e.g. a close-up of Eva as in shot 3). This editing technique thereby contributes further to establishing a viewing position close to or even imitating that of Eva.

Also, (un)stability of the camera shots confers meaning that contributes to the viewing experience. Following Boeriis (2009), the stability of shots functions in social semiotic terms as a modality marker in the creation of a different degree of photographic realism, e.g. a naturalistic visual representation of reality. This marker represents a scale from a stable to shaky camera shot. In the first shots of the schoolyard where the viewer sees the girls and boy groups and Eva singled out, the camera shakes a little bit, indicating a hand-held camera. These small shakes subtly encode the individual experience of the schoolyard interactions that the viewer would also experience if present at the same time and place.

In sum, the description of specific semiotic resources in the first shots aims to show how the scene establishes the participant framework between the TV producers and the recipients of the TV series, i.e. the second level of communication in Dynel’s (2011) model, and positions the viewer in time and

space relative to the characters, i.e. provide them with a physically anchored fictitious viewer slot. With these features, the scene lays the foundation for how the viewer can experience the social interactions amongst fictive characters on the inter-character level.

5.2. Constructing the viewer as a physically co-present and involved over-hearer in a complex social setting

The depicted organisation of the communication between the characters in a TV production is also a cinematic strategy that contributes to positioning the viewer as a recipient (Dynel 2011). As described in the previous section, the viewer is anchored in the scenario shown through the positioning of the camera close to Eva and further away from Jonas, and the first shots introduced Eva and Jonas as co-present and able to monitor each other at a public distance (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996) and as each hanging out with a group of friends. In this section, we focus on how participants accomplish focused encounters in this social space. We show that their sequentially organised and coordinated actions are represented in ways that imitate methods used by ordinary participants in naturally occurring everyday interaction to initiate a focused encounter in a public space (Goffman 1963). We also show how different semiotic resources are used and integrated and reflect the physical placement of the participants relative to each other and how the viewer is provided access to communicative contributions in ways that reflect the viewer's placement close to Eva and Eva's involvement in the two inter-character participation frameworks that are represented: her interaction with her friends and her interaction with Jonas.

The viewer is first presented with shots that indicate a co-presence of characters in the public space of the schoolyard. Co-presence is described as a precondition for initiating focused encounters in face-to-face interaction (Hutchby 2014).

Example 2

Shot 2	Speech:	Shot 6	Speech
Jonas, Isak and Magnus standing and talking in the schoolyard	Vilde: <i>Jeg skal jo snart møde William igjen</i> og 'I am going to see William again soon and)'	Noora, Vilde and Eva sitting aligned on a bench in the schoolyard, Noora and Vilde looking at each other, Eva looks to her right	Vilde: <i>jeg tror absolutt at</i> 'I absolutely think that'

Eva is placed next to her two friends who are engaged in a focused encounter, i.e. they are at a personal distance relative to each other (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996) (see e.g. shot 6): one of the girls, Vilde, tells about having sex with a boy recently, and the other girl, Noora takes on the role as recipient of the telling by gazing towards Vilde, providing minimal response and asking questions.

The viewer is introduced to this conversation in shot 2, as the voice of Vilde is heard saying: *Jeg skal jo snart møde William igjen og* (I am going to see William again soon and). This voice over continues until shot 5, and it is not until shot 6 that Vilde, Noora, and Eva are depicted together, and Vilde carries on talking: *jeg tror absolutt at* (I absolutely think that'. Eva, however, does not orient towards displaying reciprocity. Rather, Eva gazes in another direction and has a mobile phone in her hands. In multimodal terms, in the shots of Eva (3 and 5), her eyeline creates a vector towards a goal outside the camera frame, thus, the shots simply display her gazing, but the viewer does not know what she is looking at; the viewer sees the mere process of looking, and “[as] a result, the viewer is left to imagine who or what (s)he may be communicating with” (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996:66). In terms of her involvement as a participant in the interaction with the two co-present friends she is placed next to, she does not position herself as an addressee by way of gaze, verbal responses etc., i.e. by displaying engagement in the interaction (Goffman, 1981:130). As previous shots depict Jonas and his friends (see e.g. shot 2), viewers may imply that Eva is gazing towards Jonas, who has a mobile phone in his hands which he gazes at. One of the next shots shown below (shot 11b), depicts a change in Jonas’ gaze direction compared to shot 2. Hence, by way of the shot-reverse shots, viewers may infer that Eva and Jonas now have eye contact. Studies of entries into focused encounters in naturally occurring interaction show that mutual gaze and mutual orientation of bodies are characteristic of the phase before co-present participants initiate a verbal exchange (e.g. Mondada 2009). These shifts in shots occur while Vilde’s telling continues. This means that the viewer is involved as a hearing participant in the interaction between the girls and as a participant with visual access to the bodily formations and actions of characters in both groups, including the shifting orientations of Eva and Jonas. As the viewer is not presented with visual access to Vilde, who is the character who speaks the most in the scene, very much of the time, this means that the non-verbal actions, accomplished through bodily formations and gaze, are offered as significant semiotic resources for interpretation by the viewer and that the viewer is invited to follow and monitor Eva’s establishment of embodied involvement with Jonas. Thus, in sum, two inter-character participation frameworks that Eva participates in simultaneously, are represented for the viewer.

Besides being provided access to the depiction of two inter-character participation frameworks (level 1) occurring simultaneously through cinematic resources such as camera placement (level 2), the viewer is invited to pay attention to how the main character relates to these two interactions in terms of how she participates in them. This is mainly achieved through shifts in shots matching Eva’s eye gaze (Janney 2012) and thus imitating her visual attention and embodied involvement in the interactions, and through close-ups (Jerslev 2017) which allows the viewer to monitor and interpret Eva’s facial

and bodily gestures and talk (or lack thereof) in response to other characters' communicative actions.

5.3. Intimate viewer access through representations of technologically mediated communication between characters

The interaction between Eva and Jonas could have ended after having visually dramatised a conflict between the two through the representations of mutual monitoring and bodily communication, but it continues as another communication mode is added to the interaction: Jonas sends Eva a digital text using his mobile phone. This communication mode is added while the viewer continuously has access to Vilde's telling and can monitor Jonas and Eva's bodies in turn as the shots shift between them.

Example 3

Shot 11b	Text message	Speech + sounds
Jonas (and some other boys not very visible) standing and talking in the schoolyard, Jonas looking to his left away from the other boys	Jonas: <i>Smil a</i> 'Smile' (shown to as a speech bubble on the viewer's screen)	Noora: ((<i>coughs</i>)) <i>javel</i> 'I see' ((Sound from mobile phone indicating an incoming message))

As the transcription above shows, digital messages sent and received by the characters are presented for the viewer on the viewer's (TV or mobile) screen in speech bubbles.

Whereas "characters cannot acknowledge viewers' presence" in fictional TV discourse as noted by Dynel (2011:1631), i.e. on the inter-character level, when the messages are presented on screen, the film production crew acknowledges the presence of viewers as they provide them with special access to the textual messages exchanged between e.g. Eva and Jonas, i.e. on the real level. Further, the viewing of the written messages on a screen mirrors how characters also have access to the communication through a screen. The messages are not, in this case, shared between other co-present characters, i.e. Eva's friends who are physically very close to her, which means that viewers are included in communication which even friends are not included in. Thereby, viewers are provided intimate access to communication between Eva and Jonas only. Further, the viewer's screen may represent or imitate a double layer of visual perception simultaneously: The view caught by the camera at a selected spot in the schoolyard close to Eva and part of the view of selected characters' mobile devices when reading and writing text messages.

The view to the involved characters' bodies, also available to the characters themselves while they text each other, provides for the body to be used as a resource to accompany the text message. Hence, characters can indicate to each other that they have conducted a verbal action and that they

await a response. In the shot of Jonas shown above, he is depicted as gazing towards Eva after having sent the text message *Smil a* ‘Smile’ and, thus, in this case the shift in gaze from the mobile phone to Eva may be used to indicate an expectation that Eva responds next. The text may be understandable as an encouragement for her to change her visual appearance and acknowledge his presence by smiling.

Shifts in shots back to Eva guide viewers to monitor how Eva responds to Jonas. She is depicted as gazing downwards, i.e. as gazing at her mobile phone, after which she gazes up, obliquely, i.e. towards Jonas, at the same time as a text message appears on the viewer’s screen next to Eva’s head, saying *Smil selv* ‘Smile yourself’. Instead of conducting the action requested of her by Jonas, i.e. gesturing in the form of a smile, which he would be able to perceive because of their co-presence in the schoolyard, Eva responds by using the same communication mode as Jonas did.

Example 4

Shot 12a	Speech	Shot 12b	Text message	Speech
Eva’s face and upper body as she looks down	Noora: <i>hvordan var</i> ‘how was’	Eva’s face and upper body as she looks obliquely to her right	Eva: <i>Smil selv</i> ‘Smile yourself’	Noora: <i>det?’it?’</i> Vilde: <i>Det var lidt</i> ‘It was a bit’

As the scene continues, Vilde’s telling is still available audibly, and visually the shots mainly shift between Jonas (and his friends) and Eva. For example, they can both be seen to be mainly occupied with their mobile phones rather than with their co-present friends. The viewer is guided to such an interpretation as they are both depicted as being bodily oriented to their phones which may indicate reading and writing and otherwise monitoring their mobile screens, and as Noora and Vilde are seldom shown in the shots. Thus, camera shots and shifts imitate and depict Eva’s involvement with Jonas and lack of involvement with her friends.

The next few shots depict a situation in which the viewer is not only provided with a digitally mediated text that has been exchanged between the participants but is also provided access to the process of producing a text. The viewer can monitor Eva’s face and upper body. Most of the time Eva gazes down. To the right of her a text field is visible for the viewer. While the camera stays focused on Eva, the text field changes from being empty to the occurrence of more and more letters until it reads *FUCK YOU!* Next, the letters disappear, whereas the text field stays on the viewer’s screen for a moment, before also disappearing as Eva reengages in interaction with her co-present friends.

Example 5

Shot 36a	Text Message field	Speech	Shot 36b	Text message field	Speech
Eva's face and upper body as she looks down	((empty text field))	Noora: <i>det jo det som er vigtigst</i> 'that's what is most important'	Eva's face and upper body as she looks down	<i>FUCK YOU!</i>	Vilde: <i>det var kjæmpebra</i> 'that was very good'
Shot 36c	Text message field	Speech	Shot 36d	Text message field	Speech
Eva's face and upper body as she looks down	((empty text field))	Vilde: <i>men en ting bare</i> 'but just one thing'	Eva's face and upper body as she looks to her right		Vilde: <i>der er ingen som fortæller dig</i> 'no one tells you'

The depiction of Eva's gaze downwards and the changes that occur in the text field may be interpreted as involving the viewer in the production of a text that is deleted rather than sent. Few studies on naturally occurring, digitally mediated communication have focused on the production of texts and actions as such. However, work by e.g. Meredith and Stokoe (2014), focusing on Facebook chat, shows that participants who are in the process of writing sometimes do so-called self-initiated self-repair as they, for example, correct typos, delete and replace text etc. before sending it. This means that contrary to repair in spoken interaction, this type of repair is not visible for co-participants. In the case of the SKAM scene above, however, viewers are provided access to the production and deletion of the text as well as visual access to Eva's upper body and face as she conducts the actions, which was not available in Meredith and Stokoe's (2014) study as they used screen recordings as data. By providing the viewer access to a communication process of writing and deleting text which Eva is depicted as the only author of, and which co-participants ordinarily do not have access to, the production crew uses representations of digitally mediated communication to create another sense of viewer involvement in the interaction. Through these means, viewers have intimate access to Eva's immediate response to Jonas's action, which she then chooses to not provide him, or other co-participants access to by deleting the text instead of sending it. Thereby a sense of getting access to Eva's unregulated first response in the form of a text that is never sent is provided for the viewer in a complex social setting involving two groups of characters and several inter-character participation frameworks.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to show how viewer participation during the viewing of a scene from SKAM occurs on two communication levels: a fictitious one and a real one, and how cinematic resources used to represent

inter-character communication blur what is real and what is fiction and create a fictitious participation slot for the viewer. Building on research of participation frameworks in TV fiction (Brock, 2015, Dynel, 2011) and multimodal film analysis (Boeriis 2009, Kress & van Leeuwen 1996, 2001), our analysis shows that the participant roles of viewers on the fictitious level (level 1) are invited by carefully representing and coordinating characters' communicative resources on the real communication level (level 2). A fictitious viewing position physically anchored close to the main character is created and maintained through a relatively fixed camera placement, and the scene analysed depicts how Eva manages degrees of involvement in two inter-character participation frameworks simultaneously by using embodied resources, speech and text messages, which the viewer is provided special access to for monitoring.

Creating a participant position for the viewer on the fictitious communication level is, according to Brock (2015), an ideal way of overcoming disbelief and being drawn into the fictitious world. We suggest that the fictitious level and the real level of participation are highly coordinated and provide a sense of an integrated viewing position that blurs what is reality and what is fiction. That is, the camera is used as an imitation of the viewer both in terms of physical positioning and of eye gaze shifts in order to monitor characters' interaction, and the physical positioning is coordinated with restricted access to characters' interpersonal interaction that matches or imitates what presumably would be observable and monitorable from that position. Several semiotic modes are represented either in sequences or simultaneously in ways that both imitate everyday interaction and underscore a sense of physical and social presence, thereby inviting a sense of being there (Ijsselsteijn & Riva, 2003). Furthermore, the representation of both written and spoken language simultaneously makes the monitoring of several participation frameworks of the characters possible for the viewer, which, we suggest, may create a sense of immersion in the setting as it invites the viewer to pay attention to how several social relationships between characters are represented simultaneously and to how the main character navigates in this complex social setting.

The representation of the written exchange between Eva and Jonas requires some elaboration in terms of how the viewer is provided access to the written exchange. As our analysis showed, the viewers are provided access to the written exchanges on their screen, while they also have simultaneous access to one or more of the characters' bodies and embodied actions. Such a representation exposes the representation of the characters' communication (level 1) as a cinematic construction (level 2) because none of the characters would have visual access to the bodies of the other characters and their written message at the exact same time, and the written exchange would be accessible on the screen of their mobile phone, i.e. along with semiotic resources other than the singled out text message. However, even though text messages exchanged between the characters represented on the viewer's screen breaks

with the representation of the viewer as simply an “overhearer” as he or she is provided special access to the written exchanges, which is not possible through the physical anchoring of the viewer through camera placement, the specific representation of the messages on the viewer’s screen also imitates Eva’s viewing perspective: on a screen. Thus, again, Eva’s perceptual access to the communication is imitated through the representation of written messages, and, as we showed, the viewer gets intimate and exclusive access to Eva’s production of written messages.

So, in supplementing other studies with a linguistic and multimodal perspective, this study argues that the coordination and interaction between inter-character communicative resources represented through cinematic resources afford a sense of co-presence and immersion and in some instances intimate access into the fictitious universe of SKAM in viewing situations.

References

- Balázs, Bela (1970) [1923]. *The Close-up/ The Face of Man. Theory of the film: Character and growth of a new art*, ed. by Bela Balázs, 52-89. New York: Dover.
- Baldry, Anthony; and Paul J. Thibault (2005). *Multimodal transcription and text analysis: A multimodal toolkit and coursebook*. London and Oakville: Equinox.
- Boeriis, Morten (2009). *Multimodal Socialsemiotik & Levende Billeder. Multimodal Social Semiotics and Moving Images*. PhD thesis, University of Southern Denmark.
- Boeriis, Morten (2015). *Det analytiske nærbillede: om multimodal analyse af levende billeder i kontekst. Kontekst, sprog og multimodalitet: Nyere socialsemiotiske perspektiver*, ed. by Gundhild Kvåle, Eva Maagerø & Aslaug Veum, 103-122. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Bordwell, David (1985). *Narration in the fiction film*. London: Methuen.
- Bordwell, David; and Kristin Thompson (1994). *Film history: an introduction*. 7th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brock, Alexander (2015). Participation frameworks and participation in televised sitcom, candid camera and stand-up comedy. *Participation in public and social media interactions*, ed. by Marta Dynel & Jan Chovanec, 27-47. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bubel, Claudia M. (2008). Film audiences as overhearers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(1), 55-71.
- Chepinchikj, Neda; and Celia Thompson (2016). Analysing cinematic discourse using conversation analysis. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 14, 40-53.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1986) [1983]. *Cinema I: The movement-image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Doane, Mary Ann (2003). *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 14(3), 89-111.
- Dynel, Marta (2011). “You talking to me?” The viewer as a ratified listener to film discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1628-1644.
- Goffman, Erving (1963). *Behaviour in public places: notes on the social order of gatherings*. New York: The Free Press.

- Goffman, Erving (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hall, Edward T. (1959). *The silent language*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hall, Edward T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hjarvard, Stig (2002). Simulated Conversations. The Simulation of Interpersonal Communication in Electronic Media. *Realism and 'Reality' in Film and Media*, ed. by Anne Jerslev, 227-252. Northern Lights: Film and Media Studies Yearbook 2002. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Hodge, Robert; and Gunther Kress (1988). *Social Semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Houtkoop-Steenstra, Hanneke (2000). *Interaction and the standardized survey interview: The living questionnaire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchby, Ian (2014). Communicative affordances and participation frameworks in mediated interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 72, 86-89.
- IJsselsteijn, Wijnand. A.; and Guiseppe Riva (2003). Being there: the experience of presence in mediated environments. *Being there: concepts, effects and measurements of user presence in synthetic environments*, ed. by Guiseppe Riva; Fabrizio Davide; and Wijnand A. IJsselsteijn, 3-16. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Janney, Richard (2012). Pragmatics and cinematic discourse. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 8(1), 85-113.
- Jerslev, Anne (2017). SKAMs' lige her'og'lige nu': Om SKAM og nærvær. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Informationsvidenskab og Kulturformidling*, 6(2), 75-81.
- Jucker, Andreas H.; and Miriam A. Locher (2017). Introducing Pragmatics of Fiction: Approaches, trends and developments. *Pragmatics of fiction*, ed. by Miriam A. Locher; and Andreas H. Jucker, 1-21. Göttingen, Germany: De Gruyter, Inc.
- Kann-Rasmussen, Nanna; and Gitte Balling (2017). Endelig! Historien om en tiltrængt public service succes. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Informationsvidenskab og Kulturformidling*, 6(2), 82-88.
- Kress, Gunther (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, Gunther; and Theo van Leeuwen (1996). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. 1st edition. London: Routledge.
- Kress, Gunther; and Theo van Leeuwen (2001). *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Livingstone, Sonia; and Peter Lunt (2013). Mediated frameworks for participation. *Multimodality and Social Semiosis: Communication, meaning-making, and learning in the work of Gunther Kress*, ed. by Margit Böck & Norbert Pachler, 79-88. New York: Routledge.
- Meredith, Joanne; and Elizabeth Stokoe (2014). Repair: Comparing Facebook 'chat' with spoken interaction. *Discourse & communication*, 8(2), 181-207.
- Messerli, Thomas. C. (2017). Participation structure in fictional discourse: Authors, scriptwriters, audiences and characters. *Pragmatics in fiction*, ed. by Miriam A. Locher; and Andreas H. Jucker, 25-54. Göttingen, Germany: De Gruyter, Inc.
- Mondada, Lorenza (2009). Emergent focused interactions in public places: A systematic analysis of the multimodal achievement of a common interactional space. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(10), 1977-1997.

- O'Halloran, Kay L. (2004). Visual semiosis in film. *Multimodal discourse analysis: Systemic-functional perspectives*, ed. by Kay L. O'Halloran, 109-130. London; New York: Continuum International Publishing.
- O'Toole, Michael (1994). *The language of displayed art*. London: Leicester University Press.
- Piazza, Roberta; Monika Bednarak; and Fabio Rossi (2011). Introduction: Analyzing telecinematic discourse. *Telecinematic discourse: Approaches to the language of films and television series*, ed. by Roberta Piazza; Monika Bednarak; and Fabio Rossi, 1-20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sundet, Vilde Schanke (2017). «Det er bare du som kan føle det du føler»–emosjonell investering og engasjement i nettdramaet SKAM. *16:9 filmtidsskrift*.
- van Leeuwen, Theo (2005). *Introducing social semiotics*. London: Routledge.
- Wildfeuer, Janina (2014). *Film discourse interpretation: Towards a new paradigm for multimodal film analysis*. New York: Routledge.