A Contrastive Corpus-based Analysis of Rhetoric in Asian, American, and European Low-Cost Carriers' Slogans

Ramsey S. Ferrer
Philippine State College of Aeronautics
De La Salle University-Manila
`ferrer.ramsey@gmail.com`

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has drastically affected various industries, and aviation is the hardest hit (Suau-Sanchez et al., 2020). This predicament has turned all flyers across the globe into flying a low-cost carrier (henceforth, LCC) for pragmatic reasons. Attracting airline customers in a competitive market during this extra challenging time is inextricably linked to the strategic manipulation of linguistic resources in airline slogans. However, there has been a scarcity of contrastive analysis of rhetorical and linguistic devices used in LCCs' slogans that promote their global and local identities ascribed to airlines' culture and belief systems. Juxtaposed from McQuarrie and Mick (1996), Nilsen & Nilsen (1978, 1979), and Praba's (2017) theoretical and analytical frameworks, this study takes a corpus-based approach to analyze the rhetorical figures and linguistic devices operating in thirty (30) LCCs' slogans as represented in the three traffic conference areas which were ranked World's Best LCCs (2019-2021) by Skytrax. Findings reveal that many rhetorical figures and linguistic devices are employed in LCCs' slogans through *phonetic*, *syntactic*, and *semantic devices*. Moreover, these linguistic devices co-construct the overall rhetorical appeal of the slogans may have influenced passengers' airline choices during the pandemic. The study likewise reveals socio-cultural embeddings inferred from the airline slogans. Therefore, it can be construed that airline slogans lend awareness to sociocultural nuances framed in American, European, and Asian LCCs through the rhetorical and linguistic resources that aid in making their global and local presence and thus their identity concerns during the pandemic.

Introduction

The world witnessed the wrath of COVID-19 and how it has posed a global risk to health and economies since 2019. As of February 6, 2022, there are 414 million confirmed cases and more than 5 million fatalities related to COVID-19 (Worldometer, 2022). This pandemic has drastically affected various industries. The impact is undeniably remarkable in millions of entities (e.g., passengers, employees, companies, etc.) falling into poverty and recession. Across all industries, the aviation sector is among the hardest hit (Suau-Sanchez et al., 2020), which is seen in airline companies' predicament to survive while maintaining their credibility in a competitive market during this extra challenging time. In addition, a dwindling number of passengers has led airline companies to halt and cease almost all their operations (Sun et al., 2020a). While this difficulty has posed challenges to various legacy airline companies, it has turned all flyers across the globe into flying a low-cost carrier (henceforth, LCC) for pragmatic reasons, which put a premium on LCCs as their airline choice. Moreover, competition has been observed in how LCCs survive while attracting customers continuously in this unprecedented period.

Attracting airline customers is inextricably linked to the strategic manipulation of rhetorical devices and other linguistic resources in airline branding, trademarks, and identities that promote the credibility and resilience of LCCs. One tangible marketing strategy to attract customers with various linguistic and rhetorical devices is seen in airline companies' slogans. Airline companies that thrive on existing in unfortunate situations have to present themselves and persuade others to use their services (Laosrirattanachai, 2018) via vehicular language that carries its rhetorical appeals (e.g., emotions, reasons, and character). Such rhetorical appeals in slogans are framed through rhetorical figures and linguistic devices that may appeal to airline passengers' perception of how LCCs have made their global and local presence, and thus their identity concerns during an unprecedented time.

Hence, language in airline marketing is deemed necessary as other rhetorical resources that significantly attract customers through LCCs' slogans.

A significantly considerable number of studies have been conducted that analyze various domain-specific slogans. Such studies have been conducted to show the contrastive features of language and other rhetorical figures in different slogans; for instance, U.S. and E.U. legal protection for slogans (Petty, Leong, & Win, 2015), advertising and inspirational slogans (Fuerter-Olivera, 2001; Smirnova, 2016), corporation brand slogan (Miller & Toman, 2016), tourism slogans (Gali et al., 2017), political and advertising slogans (Keranforn-Liu, 2020), political party slogans (Koc & Ilgun, 2010). While there have been studies that employed either contrastive rhetoric and linguistic analysis or non-linguistic analysis to account for the rhetorical figures and linguistic devices used in domain-specific slogans, there are only a very few studies on how such rhetorical and linguistic devices are used in airline slogans, particularly those that are used in LCCs. The scarcity of literature on airline slogan analysis has attempted to propound the significance of slogans as a contributory feature to airline companies' marketing strategy. These slogans can be unique and appealing if constructed through linguistic perspectives, as these may help co-construct the airlines' identities. Kurniawan (2018) found that the Airline slogans used worldwide can be categorically considered phrases through a syntactic and semantic analysis of airline slogans in five continents. The majority of airlines benefit from using we are different and unique claims. Analyzing 120 food advertising slogans, Sudcharit (2015) revealed twelve figurative types: *alliteration, metonymy, hyperbole, antithesis, assonance, onomatopoeia, metaphor, pun, personification, parallelism, smile*, and *rhetorical question*. In Sudcharit's (2015) study, alliteration and parallelism appeared most frequently. Skorupa and Duboviciene's (2015) study analyzed various slogans from advertising and commercial English slogans. Their study found that figurative language should be used to attract customers. Using ideational metafunction, however, Laosrirattanachai (2018) investigated several words employed in the advertising slogans of airlines in 2016. Laosrirattanachai (2018) revealed that their slogans range from 3 to 4 to 5 words. In addition, *Airline*, *fly*, *of*, *your*, and *to* were the most frequent. In terms of ideational meta-function, it was found that participants, followed by, circumstances and processes respectively, appeared to have been demonstrated in these slogans. It is worth noting that while these studies have involved the majority of airlines as representatives of the world continent, most of the airlines involved in these studies to show airline slogans' linguistic characteristics are selected based on their presence in the global arena. These have not considered the LCCs performing well in the aviation industry. The current study argues that the LCCs, gaining either a global or local presence in the international aviation community, likewise strategically manipulate rhetorical figures and linguistic devices in their slogans, thus attracting more airline passengers to avail of their services, especially during the time of the pandemic.

Studies on advertising slogans are an interesting area for investigating how various airlines probe their marketing strategy and use a strategic manipulation of rhetorical figures and linguistic resources to gain customers and build trust and confidence in them. However, most of the studies in the existing literature have focused on the majority of airlines. As a result, contrastive analysis is scarce on how the rhetorical figures and linguistic devices operate in low-cost carriers' slogans that promote their global and local identities ascribed to airline companies' culture and belief systems. Hence, this paper explores how airline slogans are constructed and interpreted from a linguistic perspective through a contrastive analysis of their rhetorical figures and linguistic devices. Likewise, this attempts to uncover the socio-cultural attributions embedded in LCCs' slogans.

1.1 Research Questions:

1. Which rhetorical and linguistic devices are categorically and specifically employed in LCCs' slogans?
2. How do the slogans rhetorically appeal in American, European, and Asian LCCs to attract more airline passengers?
3. What socio-cultural inferences can be drawn from American, European, and Asian LCCs' slogans?

1.2 Theoretical/ Analytical Framework

The present study employs a modified framework to be used for the analysis of the LCCs' slogans. This framework juxtaposes the theoretical/ analytical frameworks used in the studies of

Miller & Toman (2016) and Kurniawan (2018). Although both studies have analyzed slogans, these were used in two domains: airline slogans and corporation brand slogans. The decision to use these two studies is seen in their theoretical underpinning, which will address the gap in analyzing rather sophisticated and dynamic socio-culturally constructed slogans of LCCs. Furthermore, to illustrate the rhetorical devices found in the study, the researcher employed an analysis of rhetorical devices, which are categorized mainly based on two schemes and tropes, based on Leigh's taxonomy (1994) cited in Monsefi & Mahadi (2017) and Laongpol (2021).

On the one hand, *Schemes* relate to syntax, word order, word omissions, insertions, letters, and sounds rather than the meaning of words. On the other hand, *Tropes* are another type of wordplay presentation that can change the ordinary meaning of words through comparison, connotation, and word choices by unusually using language. A *trope* is an artful deviation from the ordinary or principal signification, while a *scheme* is an artful deviation from the typical arrangement of words. In addition, a *trope* uses a word unusually or unexpectedly, while a *scheme* is a creative alteration in the usual order of words. In an attempt to analyze the rhetorical devices categorically, Miller and Toman (2016) yielded a large category of rhetorical devices into schemes and tropes. They analyzed specific linguistic devices categorically assigned in corporation brand slogans. Although the term linguistic devices are used by Miller and Toman (2016) rather than rhetorical figures, a specific category of linguistic devices (e.g., phonetic, syntactic, semantic) may not always capture the rhetorical construction of slogans. This is seen in the preliminary data analysis, where some rhetorical figures (in McQuarrie and Mick's terms) do not fit the specific linguistic devices. For instance, most slogans in the study have been accounted for to show the limitation of specific phonetic and syntactical devices over semantic devices. More specifically, a phonetic device *'rhyme'* differs from *'rhythm*. *Rhyming* is the practice of choosing similar-sounding words at the ends of each line, while *rhythm* is an audible pattern or effect created by introducing pauses or stressing certain words. While both can be considered phonological, these two may not share the same phonological properties but can further be explained via a syntactical device. However, to add to this dilemma, not all devices fit into the specific category of *orthographical*, *morphological*, and *syntactical devices*. For example, very little linguistic evidence in LCCs' slogans uses an *orthographic unusual or unconventional spelling*, *abbreviation*, and *word repetition*.

Analyzing the LCCs' slogans would require a categorical analysis of syntactic devices (e.g., *word, phrasal, sentential*) rather than specific, such as Praba's (2017). The current study argues that the intermarriage between rhetorical figures and linguistic devices co-constructs the rhetorical appeals of LCCs' slogans to attract more airline passengers. As a response, the present study used a modified theoretical framework based on the taxonomies of McQuarrie and Mick (1996) on rhetorical figures and Nilsen & Nilsen (1978, 1979), and Praba (2017) on linguistic analysis. This was employed in response to the first research question that accounted for the categorical and specific linguistic devices used in LCCs' slogans. Moreover, the interface between rhetorical figures and linguistic devices embedded in a slogan's rhetoric can aid in constructing its rhetorical appeals. This argues that the rhetorical figures and linguistic devices are used to show how the rhetoric of a slogan appeals to airline passengers, gives them their first impression, and eventually helps them decide whether to avail of the airline services. It can be argued that the rhetoric in airline slogans appeal to airline passengers' emotion and reasons which may be influenced by how they have perceived the airlines' values and cultures attributed to such slogans. Culture is defined as "actual practices and customs, languages, beliefs, forms of representation, and a system of formal and informal rules that tell people how to behave most of the time and enable people to make sense of their world through a certain amount of shared meanings and recognition of different meanings. Slogans are therefore seen as an embodiment of the values and cultures of the airlines, the people who work for these airlines, and probably, the people who have been attracted to these slogans as they may have found a sense of membership in the community. However, airline passengers may have different views of socio-cultural attributions to slogans, as these may vary according to their experiences and socio-lingo-cultural profile. The passengers' perceptions and impressions of airline slogans are derived from the meaning they form. Meaning lies in the power of the slogan to appeal to airline passengers' emotions and reasons. The rhetorical appeal is tied to the socio-cultural meaning perceived that may have made an

impression among airline passengers. Hence, the present study likewise employs Aristotle's popular concept of rhetorical appeals, i.e., *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*, to analyze how airline slogans rhetorically appeal in American, European, and Asian LCCs to attract more airline passengers.

2   Methodology

The current study takes a corpus-based approach to analyze a collection of airline slogans from LCCs worldwide. A corpus-based analysis in contrastive rhetoric studies has been significant as a tool for identifying rhetorical figures and linguistic devices in various domain-specific slogans. However, it is worth noting that airline selection is established first (see Table 1). There was a stringent process in selecting the LCCs in the present study as there are thousands of LCCs worldwide.

2.1   Selection Criteria for LCCs

2.1.1 LCCs must be selected from the three traffic conference areas established by the International Air Transport Association (IATA):

Traffic Conference Area 1 (TCA1)— North and South American continents
Traffic Conference Area 2 (TCA2)— European continents
Traffic Conference Area 3 (TCA3)— Asian continents

Using the traffic conference areas is vital in clustering the LCCs based on their geographical locations on the map. The study considered these areas established by IATA over those formed by the International Civil Aviation (ICAO). This is because the ICAO does not cover the commercial matters of international airlines. At the same time, the IATA traffic conference areas were established because the traffic conferences deal with all the international air traffic matters involving passengers, cargo, and mail-in specific areas worldwide. Choosing ICAO would defeat the purpose of the study, which is to determine the linguistic devices present in the slogans of LCCs that are primarily concerned with how airlines attract more passengers and eventually avail of airline services. Hence, IATA's traffic conference areas were adopted as the main categorical criterion for selecting the LCCs.

2.1.2 LCCs must have gained an international reputation through worldwide rankings.

Different indices measure the performance of airlines as several entities rank the best airlines worldwide. Although Bazar (2019) investigated how airlines are ranked in various criteria, his study was focused on how best airline rankings are processed and indexed. It is expected that the legacy airlines that have been performing well established their reputation, as seen in the worldwide rankings produced by Airhelp – his primary source of data on worldwide ranking. In addition, the recent ranking provided by Airhelp was in 2019. However, there is no ranking by Airhelp yet, and selecting Airhelp would defeat one of the study's aims: to determine which Airline appeals to the clients during the pandemic. Hence, the present study considered the worldwide ranking provided by Skytrax annually. Since 1999, Skytrax has ranked 100 airline companies annually and evaluated the performance of the airlines based on cabin services, ground handling services, Airline, and flight products. Hence, the selection of airlines was based mainly on the worldwide rankings produced by Skytrax. Skytrax surveyed 13.42 million eligible entries that were accounted for from 2019 to 2021. This was before and during the pandemic.

Interestingly, Skytrax ranks the airlines and generates the following: World's Best Low-cost Carriers and World's Best Long Haul Low-Cost Airlines 2021 (to name a few). With the worldwide ranking provided by Skytrax, it would now be easy to determine which of the LCCs would be sampled. Following the first criterion above, the LCCs must come from the three traffic conference areas. During the preliminary sampling, it was found that in the 2021 World's Best LCCs, only three LCCs were from TCA1 and seven from TCA2. Surprisingly, ten LCCs from TCA3 emerged. Given the disproportion in the data, the researcher looked into the best LCCs in 2021, as may be represented in the TCA of IATA, which is also available on the website of Skytrax. Hence, additional seven best LCCs in TCA1 and three LCCs from TCA3 complete the thirty airlines as the representative samples of the study (See Table 1).

TCA		LCC	Origin	Slogan	No. of Words
TCA1	1	Southwest Airlines	USA	"Low fares. Nothing to hide. That's TransFarency!"	7
	2	Air Canada rouge	Canada	"Your world awaits."	3
	3	Frontier Airlines	USA	"Low Fares Done Right".	4
	4	Spirit Airlines	USA	"Less Money. More Go"	4
	5	Sun Country Airlines	USA	"Fly at the speed of life"	6
	6	Sky Airline	Chile	"Turn around and fly"	4
	7	Easyfly	Colombia	"Easyfly makes it easy to fly"	6
	8	Gol	Brazil	"The new Gol. New times in the air."	8
	9	Viva Air	Colombia	"Fly More"	2
	10	JetSmart	Chile	"Fly SMART, fly your way.	4
TCA2	1	Vueling Airlines	Spain	"Love the way you fly"	5
	2	EasyJet	Switzerland	"This is Generation easyJet".	4
	3	Ryanair	Ireland	"Fly cheaper. The Low Fares Airline"	6
	4	Eurowings	Germany	'ideas get wings – cha(lle)nge the future of travel'	8
	5	Norwegian	Norway	"Norwegian Airlines, the way it should be."	7
	6	Jet2.com	UK	"Friendly Low Fares".	3
	7	Wizz Air	Hungary	"Looking ahead, only the sky is our limit."	8
	8	airBaltic	Latvia	"We Care"	2
	9	LEVEL	Spain	"It's your world."	3
	10	Pobeda	Russia	"Rest up in Stavropol"	4
TCA3	1	AirAsia	Malaysia	"Now Everyone Can Fly"	4
	2	Scoot	Singapore	"Escape the Ordinary"	3
	3	IndiGo	India	"Go IndiGo"	2
	4	Jetstar Airways	Australia	"All day every day low fares"	6
	5	Jetstar Asia	Singapore	"All day every day low fares".	6
	6	Flynas	Saudi Arabia	"The Kingdom's First Low-Cost Airline"	5
	7	Peach	Japan	"Customers' smiles come when safety is assured"	7
	8	SpiceJet	India	Red. Hot. Spicy.	3
	9	Spring Airlines	Japan	"Don't think, Just fly!"	4
	10	Air Arabia	UAE	"Air Arabia, Pay Less Fly More."	6
				Average No. of Words	**4.8**

Table 1. Sampled world's best LCCs' (2021) slogans representing TCAs

While it follows that selection of sampled airlines determined the LCCs with which the slogans of these airlines would be analyzed, a preliminary look at the number of words, which would be a point to consider in the unit of analysis, can be argued that each slogan's number of words ranges from 2 to 8. Relative to this, Laosrirattanachai (2018) revealed that the number of words in slogans ranges from 3 to 5, respectively. Essentially, the slogans of the LCCs carefully sampled from the worldwide ranking provided by Skytrax fit the required number. In addition, there were three Airline slogans with only two words;

these were also included.

The data were analyzed manually using three steps: The data were matrixed to show the traffic conference areas represented by the LCCs, the country of origin, and the weighted average of words of all airlines. Likewise, each slogan was read carefully to determine the rhetorical figures and linguistic devices in all slogans. Then, using the modified framework drawn out from the taxonomies of McQuarrie and Mick (1996) on rhetorical figures and Nilsen & Nilsen (1978, 1978), Praba (2017) on linguistic analysis of LCCs' slogans, and Aristotle's rhetorical appeals,

the data were read, analyzed, and labeled.

The analyzed matrix of the LCCs' slogans was then subjected to simple inter-coding reliability through the help of three inter-coders, of which agreement was reached via online consultation. The inter-coders were composed of two Ph.D. Applied Linguistics students and one Ph.D. in English degree holder; all of them are teaching in a graduate school. After the inter-coders' agreement (95%), the realization of the rhetorical figures, linguistic devices, and rhetorical appeals was discussed.

3   Results and Discussion

The first research question addresses which rhetorical and linguistic devices are categorically and specifically employed in LCCs' slogans. It can be construed that the phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and semantic devices are all used in LCCs' slogans (see Table 2). The most frequently occurring categories of linguistic devices are *syntactic* [100%] and *semantic devices* [100%], while *phonetic devices* [76.7%] appeared to be less occurring. The predominance of *morphological/ syntactical and semantic devices* is quite surprising in LCCs' slogans since this does not show a significant pattern in the previous studies (Miller & Toman, 2016; Sudcharit, 2015; Smirnova, 2016), which ranks phonologically related rhetorical devices as the highest.

3.1 Specific category of rhetorical figures and linguistic devices in LCCs slogans

However, considering the specific category of phonetic devices, the results show the unity of a phonologically related linguistic device; slogans heavily rely on *alliteration* [33.3%]. This supports the findings of Skracic et al. (2016), which revealed a high frequency of use in some slogans in yachts or boats in nautical magazines. It can be construed that the phonetic device *alliteration* aids airline slogans to be remembered easily. Recalling when a slogan alliteration is repetitive (Supphellen & Nygaardsvick, 2002; Gali et al., 2018) is more manageable. For example, 'Friendly Low Fares' (Jet2.com) shows the repetition of the first consonant sound /f/. This contrasts with Koc & Ilgon's (2010) finding, revealing *Rhyme* as the most frequent in political party slogans. While *alliteration* tops all the phonetic devices, other linguistic devices likewise occur in LCCs' slogans, such as *Assonance* [16.7%], *Rhyme*

[13.3%], *Initial Plosive* [6.7%], and *Consonance* [3.3%], and *Blending* [3.3%] respectively. For instance, *assonance* is seen in "This is Generation easyJet" (EasyJet); *rhyme* in "Easyfly makes it easy to fly" (Easyfly); *initial plosive* in "The Kingdom's First Low-Cost Airline" (Saudi Arabia), and *blending* in "Low fares. Nothing to hide. That's TransFarency!" (Southwest Airlines). In terms of morphological/ syntactical devices, all LCCs' slogans' linguistic devices vary in *word*, *phrase*, and *sentential* level with a few *morphological* and *repetitional* construction occurrences. It can be deduced that LCCs' slogans are characterized as *sentential* [50.0%], followed by *phrasal* [20.0%] and *abbreviation* [13.3%]. This is followed by a few occurrences of *word/ phrase repetition* and, very rarely, one occurrence of *orthographic unusual or unconventional spelling* [3.3%] and *word* [3.3%]. On the one hand, *sentential* construction is shown in "Now Everyone Can Fly" (Air Asia), *phrasal* in "Less Money. More Go." (Spirit Airlines), and *abbreviation* in "Air Arabia, Pay Less Fly More." (Air Arabia). On the other hand, *word/phrase repetition* is also present in "Fly SMART, fly your way" (JetSmart), and occurrence of *orthographic unusual or unconventional spelling* in "Low fares. Nothing to hide. That's TransFarency!" (Southwest Airlines). While it can be construed using Praba's (2017) syntactical category would reveal that the LCCs' slogans employed *sentential* construction, Miller & Toman's (2016) categorization would show that only *abbreviation*, *word/ phrase repetition*, and *orthographic unusual or unconventional spelling* were present in the airline slogans. This concludes that the LCCs used a relatively longer slogan over phrasal slogans used in political and other advertising slogans. Regarding the semantic devices, the present study shows a significant pattern in the previous studies (Koc & Ilgon, 2010; Smirnova, 2015; Muhabat, 2015; Skracic et al., 2016; Miller & Toman, 2016; Keranforn-liu, 2020), divulging a high concentration of *metaphor* [33.3%] in slogans. It can be argued that airline slogans such as those of LCCs likewise employ *metaphor* to mention products and services indirectly efficiently (Keranforn-liu, 2020) and thus aids in attracting more airline passengers. This is followed by *personification* [26.7%] and *self-reference* [13.3%]. However, there seems to be a relative occurrence of *hyperbole* [6.7%], *antithesis* [6.7%], *paradox* [3.3%], *metonymy* [3.3%], *asyndeton* [3.3%], and *pun* [3.3%], respectively.

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Phonetic Devices		
Alliteration	10	33.3
Assonance	5	16.7
Consonance	1	3.3
Initial Plosive	2	6.7
Blending	1	3.3
Rhyme	4	13.3
Total number containing Phonetic Devices	23.0	76.7
Morphological/ Syntactic Devices		
Orthographic unusual or unconventional spelling	1	3.3
Word/ Phrase Repetition	3	10.0
Word	1	3.3
Phrasal	6	20.0
Sentential	15	50.0
Abbreviation	4	13.3
Total number containing Syntactic Devices	30	100
Semantic Devices		
Personification	8	26.7
Metaphor	10	33.3
Self-reference	4	13.3
Paradox	1	3.3
Hyperbole	2	6.7
Metonymy	1	3.3
Pun	1	3.3
Antithesis	2	6.7
Asyndeton	1	3.3
Total number containing Semantic Devices	30	100
Rhetorical Figures		
Schemes in slogans	21	23.3
Tropes in slogans	34	37.8
Neither	12	13.3
Total number of rhetorical figures in slogans	67	74.4
Rhetorical Appeals		
Logos	9	30.0
Ethos	5	16.7
Pathos	16	53.3
Total number of Slogans containing rhetorical appeals	30	100

Table 2. Distribution of rhetorical and linguistic devices in the world's best LCCs (2021) slogans

For example, *metaphor* is seen in 'ideas get wings – cha(lle)nge the future of travel' (Eurowings), *personification* in "Fly at the speed of life" (Sun Country Airlines), and *self-reference* in "The new Gol. New times in the air." (Gol), *hyperbole* in "Looking ahead, only the sky is our limit." (Wizz Air), *antithesis* in "Less Money. More Go." (Spirit Airlines), a *paradox* in "Low Fares Done Right." (Frontier Airlines), *metonymy* in "The Kingdom's First Low-Cost Airline" (Saudi Arabia), *asyndeton* in "Red. Hot. Spicy." (SpiceJet), and *pun* in "Low fares. Nothing to hide. That's TransFarency!" (Southwest Airlines).

Analyzing the rhetorical figures, the LCCs' slogans employed more tropes [37.8%] over schemes [23.3%], while others can be neither [13.3%]. It can be deduced that tropes are more frequently used in the category of semantic devices, while schemes occur in phonetic devices. The current study reveals a similar finding that supports the high occurrence of schemes in phonetic devices and tropes in semantic devices (Miller & Toman, 2016) but shows deviance regarding the overall slogans analyzed. Miller & Toman (2016) found out that schemes are mainly used to incorporate brand slogans rather than tropes. The present study reveals that tropes are more frequently employed in airline slogans, specifically among LCCs. This suggests that LCC's slogan favors its construction through comparison, connotation, and word choices rather than word order, word omissions, letters, and sounds. Thus, LCCs' slogans are more concerned about what and how they mean than how they are arranged and sound. Therefore, it can be inferred that LCCs' slogans attract more airline passengers through semantic devices instead of phonetic devices. The airline slogan's appeal to attract more customers is related to the meaning of the rhetorical and linguistic resources rather than the sound.

3.2 Specific category of rhetorical figures and linguistic devices in LCCs slogans

Looking closely at how slogans rhetorically appeal t **Sampled world's best LCCs' (2021) slogans representing TCAs** o airline passengers that aid their decision to choose LCCs to fly, the present study reveals that LCCs' slogans heavily rely on the rhetoric of pathos [53.3] followed by logos [30.0%] and ethos [16.7%]. Concomitantly, pathos appears predominantly in all of the slogans of the LCCs as representatives of TCA1, TCA2, and TCA3. This means that slogans from the

Americas, Europe, and Asia LCCs emphasize pathos to appeal to airline passengers' emotions. This rhetorical appeal is gleaned more predominantly from TCA2, suggesting that European LCCs are more drawn from making their slogans appeal to airline passengers' emotions over logic and authority presence. While this also occurs predominantly in TCA1, suggesting the same rhetorical appeals from the American LCCs, its use in TCA3 suggests that Asian LCCs' slogans appeal to airline passengers' emotions but remain intuitive to logic and authority presence. Therefore, it can be construed that American, European, and Asian airlines construct slogans where rhetorical appeals operate to attract more customers to avail of their services.

The present study results suggest that linguistic and rhetorical devices are frequently employed in airline slogans, precisely that of LCCs. Although the LCCs' slogans' number of words ranges from 2 to 8, a closer look at the syntactic devices reveals that slogans at the sentential level may appeal rhetorically to airline passengers. It can be argued that LCCs' slogans may not favor the sound that creates an impression among the airline passengers but can appeal rhetorically to passengers' emotions through the slogans constructed in length. This is seen in how the average number of words in LCCs' slogans in TCA2 [5.0] was employed more than in TCA1 [4.8] and in TCA3 [4.6]. Although slogans need to be simple, these seem to be moderately complex (Miller & Toman, 2016) in using linguistic devices. Using these linguistic devices can influence airline passengers' memory (Nilsen & Nilsen, 1978) which may generate positive affective responses (McQuarrie and Mick 1996). These linguistic units are contained in phonetic, syntactic, and semantic devices. The most frequently occurring category of phonetic devices shows that American and Asian LCCs commonly employ alliteration and Rhyme in their slogans. However, the most common syntactic category of linguistic devices is sentential, which is heavily seen in European LCCs'. The commonly utilized semantic device appears to manifest predominantly in European LCCs' slogans.

However, the use of tropes in airline slogans reveals a different pattern from the previous studies on domain-specific slogans. It can be deduced that tropes are more frequently used in the category of semantic devices, while schemes occur in phonetic devices. The current study reveals a similar finding that supports the high occurrence of schemes in phonetic devices and

tropes in semantic devices (Miller & Toman, 2016) but shows deviance regarding the overall slogans analyzed. Therefore, it can be concluded that tropes operate more than schemes in LCCs' slogans. Specifically, tropes are heavily used from TCA1, suggesting that American LCCs are more concerned about the meaning of the slogans than the sound and construction. Therefore, it can be inferred that LCCs' slogans attract more airline passengers through semantic devices instead of phonetic devices. Finally, the rhetoric of pathos appears to be gleaned from the LCCs' slogans of European airlines, which prioritized an appeal to emotion over logic and authority presence. Therefore, it can be construed that American, European, and Asian airlines construct slogans where rhetorical appeals operate to attract more customers to avail of their services.

Looking at how rhetorical figures, linguistic devices, and rhetorical appeals operate in airline slogans, it can be construed that LCCs in American, European, and Asian LCCs frame their slogans by establishing a strategic manipulation of linguistic recourses that aim to have made their global and local presence and thus their identity concerns during the pandemic. While airline companies thrive on existing in unfortunate situations, they still have to present themselves and persuade others to use their services (Laosrirattanachai, 2018) via a vehicular language that carries its rhetorical appeals (e.g., emotions, reasons, and character) and their identities during the pandemic. Therefore, LCCs' slogans observed relatively more complex linguistic units than simple ones. Although it can be sensitized that the simpler a slogan is, the easier it is to appeal to airline passengers, I argue that the complexity of a slogan creates a strong impression among airline passengers when focused on its meaning. This can be inferred from how European LCCs' slogans are predominantly framed in length but still manage to have made their global and local presence, and thus identity concerns during an unprecedented time. The same can be observed in American and Asian LCCs slogans that thrive on making their presence and creating identities through a relatively lengthy linguistic pattern.

3.2 Socio-cultural inferences from American, European, and Asian LCCs' slogans

Indeed, rhetorical figures and linguistic devices co-occur in LCCs' slogans to create a rhetoric that would appeal to passengers' airline choices. It is undeniably argued that the LCCs' slogans

analyzed in the present study have revealed contrastive rhetoric that would create an impression among airline passengers. It has been seen that American LCCs pay more attention to the semantic aspect of slogans than the phonetic features. On the other hand, while European LCCs tend to focus on the length of the slogans that would affect the overall impression among airline passengers, Asian LCCs would emphasize a relatively lengthy slogan to appeal to the same impression while maintaining a collective identity and authority presence. It is then worth mentioning that the slogans of LCCs have socio-cultural embeddings that may contribute to attracting airline passengers. For example, the slogans of the Asian LCCs have been observed to show how they project a collective identity and authority presence, as seen in the slogan of Flynas (Arabia), The Kingdom's First Low-Cost Airline. This slogan arguably protrudes that Arabia airline enjoins the community it serves to project solidarity, unity, and collective identity. AirAsia's "Now Everyone Can Fly" slogan can illustrate a similar observation. Malaysia has projected Air Asia's slogan to embed a socio-cultural feature of Asian collectivism among airline passengers. This sociocultural inference can be interpreted by Boiger et al. (2012), concluding that people in East- Asian cultural contexts emphasize adjusting themselves to fit in with (the role requirements of) their social environments (Morling & Evered, 2006; Morling, Kitayama, & Miyamoto, 2002; Weisz, Rothbaum, & Blackburn, 1984, cited in Boiger et al., 2012).

Moreover, Confucian values—like respect for authority and desire for harmony—are highly respected in Asian societies. The concept of mien tsu, which stands for prestige, is a function of social status and constant pressure to live up to the community's expectations. In Asian societies, individuals consume commodities that measure their social class or enhance their status. Asian individuals feel a strong need to improve their position in society. It can be inferred that indexicality in airline slogans can be construed from Asian LCCs' slogans which symbolize solidarity, unity, and collectivism. However, some socio-cultural inferences can also be gleaned from American and European LCCs' slogans. For example, Southwest Airlines (USA) slogan, "Low fares. Nothing to hide. That's TransFarency!", Spirit Airline's (USA) "Less Money. More Go", Sun Country Airline's (USA) "Fly at the speed of life," and Frontier Airline's (USA) Low Fares Done Right" have favored the

use of semantic devices that create an impactful meaning among airline passengers. It can be argued that the American LCCs' slogans may have projected their identity that fosters a unique concern as they make their local and global presence. This can be explained in Boiger et al.'s (2012) argument that American contexts tend to construct action to influence their environment to make the environment fit their concerns.

On the other hand, the European LCCs' slogans have also manifested socio-cultural inferences that attract more airline passengers. Most European LCCs pay attention to the complex morphology of slogans, as evident in lengthy construction, rather than the semantic and phonetic aspects. This infers that European LCCs project a culture that identifies them. This is seen in Eurowings' (Germany) slogan 'ideas get wings – cha(lle)nge the future of travel' and Norwegian (Norway) "Norwegian Airlines, the way it should be," which projects selfhood characteristic of Europeans while maintaining their commitment to others as evident in their egalitarian values. This can be referred back to numerous attempts of European LCCs to include a self-reference strategy in constructing their slogans. A distinctive European value can be inferred from the excessive use of self-reference, which endorses selfhood, but remains committed to serving others. It can be deduced that European LCCs strongly support Harmon – egalitarianism rather than hierarchy. Their LCCs ' slogans show commitment to others and egalitarianism rather than individualism.

4 Conclusion and Recommendation

This study analyzed the rhetoric of thirty LCC slogans, carefully selected from the three traffic conference areas established by IATA. The world's best LCCs of the year 2021 named by Skytrax include LCCs from TCA1: Southwest Airlines (USA), Air Canada rouge (Canada), Frontier Airlines (USA), Spirit Airlines (USA), Sun Country Airlines (USA), Sky Airline (Chile), Easyfly (Colombia), Gol (Brazil), Viva Air (Colombia), JetSmart (Chile). From TCA2, World's Best LCCs include Vueling Airlines (Spain), EasyJet (Switzerland), Ryanair (Ireland), Eurowings (Germany), Norwegian (Norway), Jet2.com (U.K.), Wizz Air (Hungary), airBaltic (Latvia), LEVEL (Spain), Pobeda (Russia). Finally, from TCA3, Skytrax named World's Best LCCs, which include AirAsia (Malaysia), Scoot (Singapore), IndiGo (India), Jetstar Airways (Australia), Jetstar Asia (Singapore), Flynas (Saudi Arabia), Peach (Japan), SpiceJet (India), Spring Airlines (Japan), and Air Arabia (UAE).

This study revealed a corpus-based analysis that many rhetorical figures and linguistic devices are employed in LCCs' slogans through phonetic, syntactic, and semantic devices. In addition, such linguistic devices co-construct the overall rhetorical appeal of the slogans that may have influenced passengers' airline choices during the pandemic. Furthermore, the study argued that rhetorical figures, linguistic devices, and rhetorical appeals are features of airline slogans in American, European, and Asian LCCs. Finally, the present study reveals snippets of socio-cultural embeddings inferred from the airline slogans as evident in American, European, and Asian LCCs. It has been concluded that American LCCs' slogans project individualism through semantic devices. And while Asian LCCs' slogans index collectivism to show solidarity and unity, European LCCs have conducted selfhood as characterized by the use of self-reference in their slogans but maintain a commitment to others as a manifestation of egalitarian values among Europeans. Although the study has empirically investigated the linguistic features of airline slogans, specifically among LCCs that have made a strong presence during the pandemic, further research can be explored, including other prestigious airline companies that rank the world's best airlines since only Skytrax was chosen as the primary database as it is considered the most relevant data source for this study. In addition, other entities such as Star Alliance, Sky Team, and One World groups may be incorporated into future studies.

References
Ozlem Deniz Basar. 2019. Comparison of world airline rankings with different criteria: Best airline ranking and EVAMIX method rank. *American Research Journal of Humanities Social Science, 2*(3): 38-46.

Michael Boiger, Batja Mesquita, Annie Y. Tsai, and Hazel Markus. 2012. Influencing and adjusting in daily emotional situations: A comparison of European and Asian American action styles, *Cognition & Emotion*, 26(2):332-340.

Coronavirus cases: Worldometer. (n.d.). Retrieved February 6, 2020, from https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/

Pedro A. Fuertes-Olivera, Marisol Velasco-Sacristan, Ascension Arribas-Bano, and Eva Samaniego-Fernandez. 2001. Persuasion and advertising English: Metadiscourse in slogans and headlines. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 33:1291-1307.

Nuria Gali, Raquel Camprubi, Jose A. Donaire. 2017. Analysing tourism slogans in top tourism destinations, *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management,* 6(3):243-251.

International Air Transport Organization. *Provisions for the Conduct of the IATA Traffic Conferences.* https://www.iata.org/

Loic Keranforn-Liu. 2020. *The linguistic characteristics of political and advertising slogans: A contrastive analysis.* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Toulouse] Department of the English World Studies. Repository. https://dante.univ-tlse2.fr/access/files/original/

Erdogan Koc and Ayse Ilgun. 2010. An investigation into the discourse of political marketing communications in Turkey: The use of rhetorical figures in political party slogans, *Journal of Political Marketing,* 9(3):207–224.

Iwan Kurniawan. 2018. The language of airline slogans: A linguistics analysis. English Education: *Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris,* 11(1):59–81.

Jitsuda Laongpol. 2021. A contrastive study on rhetoric in COVID-19-related news headlines from native and non-native English online newspapers, *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies,* 27(1): 47-61.

Piyapong Laosrirattanachai. 2018. An Analysis of Slogans of Airline Business Using Ideational Metafunction. *Humanities Journal,* 25(1):316-343.

Edward F. McQuarrie and Mick David Glen. 1996. Figures of rhetoric in advertising language. *Journal of Consumer Research,* 22(2):424-438.

Darryl W. Miller and Marshall Toman. 2016) An analysis of rhetorical figures and other linguistic devices in corporation brand slogans. *Journal of Marketing Communications,* 22(5):474-493.

Roya Monsefi, Tengku Sepora Tengku Mahadi. 2016. Wordplay in English online news headlines. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies,* 7(2):68-75.

Fakharh Muhabat, Mehvish Noor, and Mubashir Iqbal. 2015. Advertisement of School Slogan: Semantic Analysis. *European Academic Research*, 3(1):419-433.

Don L.F. Nilsen. 1979. "*Language Play in Advertising: Linguistic Invention in Product Naming.*" In Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1979, edited by James E. Alatis and G. Ricahrd Tucker, 137–143. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Don L.F. Nilsen and Alleen Pace Nilsen. 1978. *Language Play: An Introduction to Linguistics.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House Pub.

Ross D. Petty, Susanna H.S. Leong, and May O. Lwin. 2015. Slogans: U.S. and E.U. legal protection for slogans that identify and promote the brand. *International Journal of Advertising,* 29(3):473-500.

U Praba. 2017.. Grammar Analysis. Pamulang. Penerbit UT.

Tomislav Skračić and Petar Kosović. 2016. Linguistics Analysis of English Advertising Slogan in Yachting. Transactions on Maritime Science, 5(1);40-47.

Pavel Skorupa and Tatjana Dubovičienė. 2015. Linguistic characteristics of commercial and social advertising slogans. *Coactivity: Philology, Educology,* 23(2):108-118.

Skytrax. 2021. World's best low-cost carriers 2021. https://www.worldairlineawards.com/worlds-best-low-cost-airlines-2022/

Tatjana Smirnova. 2016. Sound of a slogan: appealing to audiences in the global market. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 236:125-130.

Pere Suau-Sanchez, Augusto Voltes-Dorta, and Natalia Cuguero-Escofet. 2020. An early assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on air transport: Just another crisis or the end of aviation as we know it? *Journal of Transport Geography*, 86: 102749.

P. Sudcharit. 2015. Figurative language in food advertising slogans (A Special Study Report for the Degree of Master of Arts Program in English for Professional and International Communication). King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok.

Xiaoqian Sun, Sebastaian Wandelt, and Anming Zhang. 2020. How did COVID-19 impact air transportation? A first peek through the lens of complex networks. *Journal of Air Transport Management,* 89:101928.