

## EXPLORING THE REPRESENTATION OF THE SELF-SOCIETY CONFLICT THROUGH DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES IN ANGIE THOMAS' *THE HATE U GIVE*: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

**Wahid Ud Din**

Assistant Professor of English, Govt. Khawaja Farid Graduate College,  
Rahim Yar Khan, Punjab, Pakistan

[Sidiqui823@gmail.com](mailto:Sidiqui823@gmail.com)

**Noor Fatima**

M. Phil Scholar, NCBA&E, Rahim Yar Khan Campus,  
Punjab Pakistan

[Noormuzammil9570@gmail.com](mailto:Noormuzammil9570@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*Critical Discourse Analysis allows this study to investigate the language structures which develop self-society conflicts in Angie Thomas' The Hate U Give novel. The research examines selected passages from the novel to trace how the protagonist moves between competing social environments while allowing readers to take note of both social oppression and system-generated power structures. The research design combines qualitative methods to examine six major discursive techniques including lexicalization, polarization, actor description, victimization, modality, and metaphor which demonstrate both oppressive language functions and resistant linguistic use. Evidence shows that six discourse techniques display systematic methods for revealing ideological systems which constitute portrayals of identity conflict and justice. The analysis demonstrates how the novel intentionally opposes established group relationships by making the underprivileged Black community the basic in-group while it contests mainstream language patterns used to privilege white views. Through speech acquisition the protagonist illustrates the widespread community opposition which emerges against oppressive systems of power. Through this study discourse studies gain additional understanding because van Dijk's theoretical background reveals the specific text-based methods which literature uses to question prevailing power systems. This research demonstrate how particular discursive techniques establish and handle conflicts between personal identity and social structures to show the counter-discursive ability of present-day young adult literature in opposing official representations about identity conflicts and justice structures. These results lead to important consequences for analyzing literature as well as methods in critical discourse analysis and instructional approaches that deal with social justice narratives.*

**Keywords:** Critical Discourse Analysis, self-society conflict, oppression, The Hate U Give, racism, discursive strategies, van Dijk, lexicalization, polarization

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Introduction

International discourses are dominated by structural oppression, power-enshrined problems, and the pervasive inequalities that marginalized people must contend with. Angie Thomas's *The Hate U Give* is the ideal literary embodiment of the social opposition in modern-day America (Butler, 2018) as the novel exposes oppressional persecution alongside identity disputes and societal tensions. According to *The Hate U Give*, Starr Carter lives in two different worlds: Garden Heights, where Black people labor, and White-moneyed privileged society. Starr does a risky balancing act since she has to modify her identity, language, and behavior to fit in with each setting she enters. Her life becomes further complicated after witnessing cops execute her friend Khalil despite the fact that he was unarmed.

When she challenges the rationales for speaking up with fate and loyalty, Starr connects several societal pressures, revealing her deep emotional conflict throughout the book. The main theme of *The Hate U Give* is how an individual fights against social pressures that define or constrain them in their quest to rediscover who they truly are. Through her travels, Starr illustrates underlying societal problems that result from racism with deep roots, blind prejudice,

and class discrimination. Through its nuanced characters and poignant story, the book offers a social critique of life production through social systems (Reynolds, 2020).

Researchers can assess the linguistic tools that express power systems and affect social realities by using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 2013). CDA examination of literary texts shows how narratives both support and contradict prevailing ideological viewpoints. The CDA analysis approaches offer useful ways to expose ideological elements that are typically hidden in speech and text according to (T. A. Van Dijk, 2015). Because literary artifacts typically address current societal issues through their narrative components and character portrayals, they provide ideal settings for researching power dynamics (Fairclough and Wodak, 2019).

Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach to CDA integrates three crucial elements—discourse, cognition, and society—to offer a comprehensive interpretive framework for literary texts. This concept states that although texts exhibit social patterns, they are guided by cognitive organizational processes that arrange knowledge, attitudes, and ideologies (V. Dijk, 2008). Using this method, researchers examine how characters form their conceptual frameworks of values, beliefs, and perceptions through dialog and identify how they relate to broader social thought patterns (Rogers, 2011). ketamine to examine stories about marginalization and identity conflict due to its efficacious method of clarifying human mental processes (Hart, 2014) illustrates how van Dijk's methodology allows academics to examine how discourse participants' mental models of social events impact their capacity for comprehending and creating discourse (p. 127). The Hate U Give's literary characters struggle with social settings where they uphold their own identities by dealing with linguistic and cognitive social expectations (van Dijk, 2009). By giving some voices more weight than others, discourse access patterns serve as a crucial instrument for power abuse and domination (V. Dijk, 2006). Through the representation of characters, the employment of storytelling tactics, and the use of deliberately chosen language to promote predetermined ideological acceptance, literary works demonstrate power dynamics between reader views (Jeffries, 2020).

Literary novels are analyzed by the contemporary application of CDA because they provide forums for discussion between prevailing and opposing ideological viewpoints (Mulderriq, n.d.). On the basis of van Dijk's work, Machin and Mayr (2012) developed techniques for analyzing language elements, such as lexical choices, transitivity patterns, and modality systems, in order to investigate the social reality constructs present in literary texts. These analytical approaches can be used by researchers to pinpoint linguistic elements in *The Hate U Give* that symbolize characters and their relationships of power (R. Wodak & Meyer, 2016). According to van Dijk (2006, p. 729), social representations derived from common group ideology are the essential foundation for comprehending how literary writings discuss difficult social issues. Researchers can determine how ideological viewpoints are incorporated into character speech, narrative assertions, and text arrangement systems by using the sociocognitive model (KhosraviNik, 2010a). Young adult literature presents a diplomatic perspective on racial justice through the development of characters' critical thinking skills, which enables scholars to identify these ideological framing processes by examining the relationship between society and personal knowledge according to T. A. Van Dijk (2020) principles.

Researchers can fully comprehend how discourse operates between social structuring and mental processing by using van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Approach to CDA (V. Dijk, 2006). The approach establishes a unique connection in which discourse serves as a bridge connecting individual mental idea frameworks and social frameworks. Ideologies, according to Van Dijk, are common belief systems that allow members of social groupings to coordinate social behaviors and arrange their interpretations (T. A. Van Dijk, 2015). The three-pronged framework of analysis is a great tool for evaluating identity development narratives like *The*

Hate U Give that contain a variety of social messages because it allows researchers to examine textual elements along with their relationship to larger social behavior systems and mental frameworks (Al-Haq & Al-Sleibi, 2015).

By employing cognition as the link between speech and social realities, the socio-cognitive approach sets itself apart from other critical discourse studies (T. A. Van Dijk, 2016). According to V. Dijk (2008) while other CDA models simply examine social structures or textual elements, mental representations act as intermediates for social actors who both read and produce textual information, making them cognitive interfaces that link discourse to society. Researchers can examine how The Hate U Give establishes and challenges dominant ideas through the use of both character views and narrative techniques thanks to the three-part system. "Mental models" are the fundamental component of van Dijk's concept, representing individual comprehension of circumstances as people perceive language according to T. A. Van Dijk (2012) Human knowledge can be broken down into socially acceptable information bases and individual experiences, which together provide the essential framework for discourse communication and interpretation processes. This concept aids in the analysis of characters' interactions with intricate social settings as well as their growing comprehension of justice dynamics and identity creation (V. Dijk, 2018). Because Starr Carter represents a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, the mental models she employs for social interpretation become ideological battlegrounds throughout the narrative.

### **1.3 Research Motivations and Significances**

Through a demonstration of how van Dijk's socio-cognitive model illustrates identity and conflict building in contemporary literary discourse, this study aids literary analysis and critical discourse studies. The current study examines the language strategies used in The Hate U Give to illustrate self-society conflict and show how literary works give truthful accounts of marginalized life situations and establish oppositional spaces around prevailing standards (Gee, 2018). Through character development and narrative techniques, the authors of this study deepen our understanding of how young adult fiction tackles complex social-political issues (E. E. Thomas & Stornaiuolo, 2019).

### **1.4 Problem Statement**

There is research on social injustice in CDA and young adult literature, but there aren't many studies that apply van Dijk's sociocognitive model. This study makes use of van Dijk's socio-cognitive model of CDA, which shows how narrative techniques in Angie Thomas's The Hate U Give highlight the relationship between social institutions and personal identities.

### **1.5 Research Questions**

The research questions follow the framework analysis of theoretical models together with contextual understanding to answer multiple linked assessments.

1. What were the discursive strategies used in The Hate U Give to represent self-society conflict?
2. How did the discursive strategies used in The Hate U Give represent self-society?
3. How did the discursive strategies used in The Hate U Give represent systemic oppression?

### **1.6 Research Objectives**

This study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To identify the discursive strategies used in The Hate U Give to represent self-society conflict.
2. To explore the ways in which discursive strategies used in The Hate U Give represent self-society conflict.
3. To explore the ways in which discursive strategies used in The Hate U Give represent systemic oppression.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of self-society conflict in "The Hate U Give" by Angie Thomas employs a number of theoretical frameworks. The main foundation for this study is Critical Discourse Analysis and Van Dijk's sociocognitive model, but it also incorporates theories of self-society conflict, language, and power notions. Researchers can use the integrated model to examine how this literary work builds identities in situations of social bias and challenges power structures.

Discourse strategies that create frameworks for observing social inequity through reproduction and the emergence of new problems are revealed by statistical analysis. The strategy that connects discourse, cognition, and society is how the socio-cognitive approach to CDA distinguishes itself. T. A. Van Dijk (2015) believes that discourse and society are linked by mental mediation because, from his point of view, there is no direct relationship between the two (p. 64). This triadic theory states that conceptualizing discourse entails demonstrating how mental processes that serve as intermediaries link and change social reality. The best approach for examining literary texts that feature character identification issues is socio-cognitive analysis. Rogers (2011) discusses how this approach is used to help researchers understand how discourse participants' mental models for social situations affect speakers' communication (p. 127). Because these skills integrate both language and cognitive processes, characters in *The Hate U Give* demonstrate their ability to handle complex social situations that require constant balancing between personal identity and social expectations (T. A. Van Dijk, 2008). Since these subjective representations influence how people comprehend language, mental models serve as the central concept in van Dijk's model (T. A. Van Dijk, 2012). Mental models build the mental foundation for both discourse generation and interpretation by combining accepted societal facts with personal memories. The narrative thematizes these mental models as places of ideological conflict for protagonists like Starr Carter, who must interpret events via numerous social lenses.

Particular attention is paid to how power functions through speech in Van Dijk's paradigm. He highlights how "discursive access patterns" that elevate some voices while marginalizing others are frequently used to exercise control and dominance (van Dijk, 2006). These patterns appear in literary writings through narrative viewpoint, character portrayal, and linguistic decisions that encourage readers to take specific ideological positions (Jeffries, 2010). Van Dijk's method pays close attention to the ways that in-groups and out-groups are created through the use of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation techniques, which are easily seen in fictional depictions of social strife (T. A. Van Dijk, 2015).

Four complementary strategies are used in the "Ideological Square" concept (T. A. Van Dijk, 2014) to analyze how texts portray social groups: highlighting the positive aspects of in-groups, highlighting the negative aspects of out-groups, de-emphasizing the negative aspects of in-groups, and de-emphasizing the positive aspects of out-groups. By purposefully reversing patterns, the approach offers a useful way to assess how *The Hate U Give* challenges prevalent oppression and policing assumptions. Because novels create arenas for ideological conflicts between prevailing discourses, scholars now employ Critical Discourse Analysis to examine literature. This approach was developed to examine how literature employs particular linguistic components, such as words, sentence structures, and assertions, to create particular perceptions of social aspects (Mulderigg, n.d.). Scientists can better comprehend how *The Hate U Give* depicts social actors and their power dynamics through language by using research methodologies.

Individual-faceted identities that clash with social institutions and expectations give rise to self-society conflicts, which are the result of the interaction between personal goals and societal needs. The literary techniques that characters employ to reconcile their individual decisions with their society responsibilities are made clear by the conceptual framework. Self-



society conflict theory holds that because personal difficulties are positioned within structural frameworks that demonstrate how Mills (2007) characterizes personal concerns as representations of public issues, their nature goes deeper than personal issues.

These frameworks were created by academic specialists today through the use of intersectional methodologies. According to Collins (2012) social identity intersections between gender, race, and class elements create specific resistance modes that "urge a different understanding of black women's experiences precisely because they were simultaneously oppressed multiple ways" (p. 228). These intersections result in specific forms of marginalization. Beyond the confines of any single identity component, Starr's distinct response to injustice is determined by her specific combination of racial-ethnic and gender variables. Self-society conflict is analyzed psychologically because identity development is a continuous battle between societal validation and personal stability. According to Aronson (1995) stereotype danger makes it harder for members of marginalized groups to identify since it suggests that unfavorable assumptions about their social group may be confirmed. Steele and Aronson's (1995) description of stereotype danger is related to the way Starr keeps an eye on her behavior.

### **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Researcher's Adoption of Research**

According to Sarantacos,(2005), it is possible to do social science research in a qualitative context. In this study, the researcher employed both qualitative and descriptive research techniques. It is one of the most widely used research methods. It makes an effort to portray people and look into events in their natural environments, primarily using textual material and words to portray reality. (Denzin, 2020) summarized a number of qualitative research aspects with the statement, "Qualitative research is many things at once." It has a multi-paradigmatic focus. Practitioners of the multimethod approach acknowledge its significance (Lincoln and (Denzin, 2020)

Descriptive research includes surveys and various fact-finding activities. This study aims to accurately and systematically describe a population, situation, or phenomenon. It addresses questions about what, where, when, and how, but not why. It is an essential tool for scientific study that allows scientists to observe, record, and analyze the nuances of a certain topic.

#### **3.3 Theoretical Framework**

This study makes use of van Dijk's socio-cognitive model of critical discourse analysis. According to Van Dijk's socio-cognitive perspective, the relationship between discourse and society is cognitively mediated, which means that social structures and discourse are linked by a sophisticated socio-cognitive interface. Within the larger context of Critical Discourse Studies, van Dijk developed the Sociocognitive Approach, which focuses on the cognitive aspects of discourse production and comprehension (Van Dijk 2014a, b, 2015a, 2018). The cognitive interface via which discourses function is "the mental representations of language users as individuals and as social members," according to Van Dijk, who argues that social structures and discourse structures do not directly or linearly correlate (Van Dijk 2015a, p. 64). Using this model, the researcher examined six discursive techniques that van Dijk suggested in the chosen extracts because they suited the study's theme and were appropriate for the selected material.

##### **3.3.1 Population**

Young adult novels are Angie Thomas's best-known works. In 2015, Thomas received the Walter Grant, which is offered to unpublished authors or artists working on books for children or young adults. Among her favorites are "Blackout," "Concrete Rose," and "On the Come Up." The researcher chose the Hate U Give for this investigation. The Hate U Give was named a number one bestseller by both IndieBound and the New York Times. It was listed

among the best young adult novels of 2017 by a number of magazines, including "Publishers Weekly," "Shelf Awareness," "Kirkus Reviews," and "The Horn Book Magazine."

### 3.3.2 Sampling

One of the most important aspects of research design is sampling. In research, sampling is the process of selecting a subset of things from the specified population to include in the study. Since individuals might not always be the subset of objects to include in your inquiry, we call them items. For this investigation, the book *The Hate U Give* was chosen. The researcher extracted fourteen passages from the novel.

### 3.3.3 Sampling Technique

Purposive, handy, snowball effect, and theoretical sampling are just a few of the various sampling approaches available to researchers. The accuracy and reliability of the study's conclusions are significantly impacted by the choice of sampling strategy. Purposive sampling strategies were employed in this investigation. In qualitative research, this method is frequently employed to find and choose examples with a wealth of information in order to make the most use of scarce resources. This entails locating and choosing individuals, or groups of individuals, who possess a particular level of expertise or familiarity with a topic of interest.

### 3.4.4 Research Instruments

To ensure the quality and accuracy of the results, the tools used in a research process to gather, quantify, and evaluate data are crucial. These devices are referred to as research tools. Regardless of whether you are conducting qualitative or quantitative research, selecting the appropriate research instrument is crucial to obtaining precise and meaningful data for your study. The research tool for this study was the book by Angie Thomas. After closely reading the text, fourteen excerpts were chosen.

## ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Findings

The results of the critical discourse analysis of "*The Hate U Give*," which used van Dijk's six discursive methods to seven significant passages from the book, are presented in this chapter.

As stated in the introduction, this research identifies the discursive techniques that create self-society conflict in the narrative and demonstrates how language exposes police violence and systematic oppression.

### 4.2 Selected Discursive Strategies

By illustrating the techniques and structures, Van Dijk highlights the significance of knowledge in generating and organizing discourse. To properly absorb the text and communicate, language users must therefore activate a large amount of global knowledge. Furthermore, rather than through our non-discursive everyday experiences, we primarily learn about the world through discursive discourse and involvement. This illustrates the connection between discourse and knowledge study. Furthermore, according to Nasih & Abboud (2020), Van Dijk (2005) identifies some of the most widely used critical discourse analysis techniques and frameworks that are impacted by knowledge management. He proposes twenty-five strategies in all such as actor description, authority, burden, categorization, comparison, consensus, counterfactuals, disclaimers, euphemism, evidentiality, generalization, example/illustration, hyperbole, implication, irony, lexicalization, metaphor, national self-glorification, norm expression, number game, polarization; US-Them categorization, populism, presupposition, vagueness, and victimization. (p. 735-36) In this research only six will be explored by the researcher in this study because they are suitable for the chosen data since they fit the study's theme. Yet, next is a full description of the structures and strategies proposed by van Dijk:

#### 4.2.1 Actor Description

Actor descriptions include accurate and comprehensive details on a location, person, or object, as well as how that entity fulfills its function in a social setting, whether that function is good or negative.

#### 4.2.2 Lexicalization

Lexicalization is the process of coming up with a word to express a concept. According to the OED (1989), lexicalize means "to accept into the lexicon, or vocabulary, of a language," and lexicalization means "the action or process of lexicalizing." Lexicalization is a significant and well-known field of ideological expression and persuasion (van Dijk 1999:25). The process by which language users select words to convey particular meanings in their speech is known as lexicalization. Strategic lexicalization, or the employment of particular words to express specific intended meanings in speech, is one of the most often utilized methods in the linguistic analysis of spoken and written discourse. According to Fairclough (2013), words and phrases always have meanings derived from their frequent usage. He argues that ideological implications can be communicated through the deft use of language.

The analysis of lexicalization focused on

- Patterns of word choice in describing characters, events, and social institutions
- Evaluative language that constructs positive or negative representations
- Variations in lexical choices across different social contexts and speakers
- How lexicalization constructs particular perspectives on oppressional issues and self-society conflict.

#### 4.2.3 Victimization

It is structured by presenting members of the in-group as the victims of unfair or reprehensible treatment, while out-group members are portrayed negatively. The victimization strategy is employed to negatively portray the outgroup. Furthermore, it presents in-group members as the targets of unjust and unfair treatment by out-group members.

The analysis examined:

- How victimhood is attributed to different characters and groups
- How responsibility for suffering is assigned or deflected
- How competing narratives of victimization are represented
- The relationship between victimization discourse and broader social structures

#### 4.2.4 Modality

The discourse producer's goals are where modality is found (Trousedale, 2003; Van Dijk & cognition, 2011). In critical discourse analysis, modality encompasses much more than only the verbs may, might, can, could, will, would, should, must, and must. Rather, modality refers to the writer's (or speaker's) viewpoint and/or degree of confidence in the argument being presented. The modal auxiliary verbs may, shall, must, need, and others; phrase adverbs like probably, definitely, and unfortunately; and adjectives like necessary, unfortunate, and certain are only a few of the linguistic structures that are employed to signify modalities. Among the verbs and several nominalizations that are essentially modal are permit, predict, prove, duty, likely, desirability, and authority (Fowler 1985: 73).

Therefore, it has some relevance to the current study since it illustrates how information about the characters is expressed, namely in terms of necessity, possibility, and probability, as shown by modal verbs, pronouns, and modal phrases.

The analysis of modality focused on:

- How modal expressions (must, should, might, etc.) construct particular relationships to truth and obligation
- How certainty and uncertainty are distributed across different voices and perspectives
- How modality reflects power relations and ideological positions

- How modality constructs the relationship between individual agency and social constraints

#### 4.2.5 Polarization

There are two distinct groups of people: "us" and "them." Polarization divides individuals or ideas into two completely different groups. Polarization is one discursive strategy used to split people into two groups: the in-group and the out-group. Members of the outgroup are characterized and credited negatively, whilst members of the ingroup are characterized and credited positively. This discourse strategy seeks to establish polarity by playing the victim and emphasizing the other person's bad behavior. Here, the "out group's" unwanted behavior is associated with threats, while the "in group" is depicted as the victim of these threats.

The analysis examined:

- How binary oppositions are constructed between social groups
- How pronouns like "we" and "they" establish group boundaries
- How polarization relates to broader social divisions and power structures

#### 4.2.6 Metaphor

Metaphors are used to connect the qualities of two different objects by comparing them. Van Dijk (2006) defines this strategy as the invocation of a direct similarity between two things. Metaphors are more than just rhetorical tactics; they are cognitive frameworks that impact our understanding of complex social situations. Since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), which presented the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), it has been widely accepted that metaphor is not only a language phenomenon but also an essential tool that aids in our understanding of the world. Metaphor has a practical and social function. We believe that metaphors have the ability to create realities, especially social realities. A metaphor's capacity to make experience make sense could therefore be strengthened by acting as a guide for future actions. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) By providing a particular perspective for viewing and comprehending the world, a metaphor highlights one interpretation of reality while ignoring others. For CDA practitioners to select a certain viewpoint, ideological consideration is required. Fairclough (1995a) emphasizes the important function metaphor may play in CDA by stating that ideology comprises presenting the world from the perspective of a particular interest.

The analysis of metaphor focused on:

- The conceptual metaphors used to represent oppression, identity, and social conflict
- How metaphors frame the relationship between individual and society
- How metaphors naturalize or challenge particular social arrangements
- The ideological implications of specific metaphorical mappings

#### The Ideological Square

A "manifestation of the ideology schema's group relations category" is the Ideological Square (Dijk & cognition, 2011). In relation to the polarized ideology structure that underpins the discourse, it examines how "in-groups" and "out-groups" are portrayed in speech and writing and how they are articulated in stereotypical terms using the ideological pronouns "We versus They" or "Us versus Them" (Van Dijk & cognition, 2011). The ideological communication within a given discourse is composed of four steps:

- a) Emphasizing the positive and good (things/information/qualities) about US (in-groups);
- b) Emphasizing the negative and bad (things/information/qualities) about THEM (out-groups);
- c) To de-emphasize the negative and bad (things/information/qualities) about US (in-groups);
- d) De-emphasizing the negative and bad (things/information/qualities) about THEM (out-groups) (Van Dijk, 2005; Van Dijk & cognition, 2011).



### 4.3 Extract Selection Process

- In accordance with Wodak and Meyer's (2016) suggestion to "downsample" longer texts into units that can be analyzed, this study concentrates on seven significant passages from the book. There were several iterations in the selection process:
- **Initial reading:** To find passages that specifically address self-society conflict through the protagonist's experience, the complete book was read three times.
- **Preliminary coding:** The six discursive strategies—actor description, polarization, lexicalization, victimization, modality, and metaphor—were given special consideration while coding passages based on their applicability to the research issues.
- **Final selection:** Fourteen extracts were selected based on the following specific criteria:
  - **Representativeness:** Each extract represents a significant dimension of self-society conflict in the novel (code-switching, witnessing violence, media representation, activism, etc.).
  - **Discursive density:** Each extract employs multiple discursive strategies identified in van Dijk's framework, allowing for comprehensive analysis.
  - **Narrative significance:** Each extract represents a pivotal moment in the protagonist's development, marking shifts in her understanding of self in relation to society.
  - **Contextual diversity:** The extracts collectively represent diverse social contexts (home, school, media, protests, etc.) to allow for comparative analysis.
  - **Length and coherence:** Every excerpt is a comprehensive conceptual unit that can be examined separately while yet being connected to the larger story.

This methodical selection procedure guarantees that the snippets taken as a whole offer a thorough depiction of the discursive construction of self-society conflict throughout the book.

### 4.4 Data Analysis

Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis model, which uses mental representations as a mediator to investigate the relationship between micro-level discourse elements and macro-level social structures, is used in the data analysis process. This method enables a methodical examination of the ways in which discursive techniques in "The Hate U Give" create depictions of oppressive dynamics and self-society conflict.

### 4.5 Van Dijk's CDA Model: Cognitive Structures & Ideological Discourse

By illustrating the techniques and structures, Van Dijk highlights the significance of knowledge in generating and organizing discourse. To properly absorb the text and communicate, language users must therefore activate a large amount of global knowledge. Furthermore, rather than through our non-discursive everyday experiences, we primarily learn about the world through discursive discourse and involvement. This illustrates the connection between discourse and knowledge study.

According to Nasih & Abboud (2020), Van Dijk (2005) identifies some of the most widely used critical discourse analysis techniques and frameworks that are impacted by knowledge management. Only six of the twenty-five strategies he suggests will be examined in this study since they fit the study's focus and are appropriate for the selected data.

To do that seven extracts have been chosen from the novel "The Hate U Give".

#### 4.5.1 Analysis of Extract 1

"Williamson is one world and Garden Heights is another, and I have to keep them separate. I can't be the person from one world without becoming somebody I'm not in the other. The only place I'm just Starr is with my family, and sometimes I'm not even Starr with them. I'm an actor around them, but they're actors too, especially after what happened. We've been

putting on a play for almost six months, because as Momma puts it, certain things should be left in the past. And because we're good actors, it's like the Khalil I knew and the night he died never existed."

#### **4.5.1.1 Contextualization**

As she moves between her two different worlds Williamson Prep, the largely white school she attends, and Garden Heights, the predominantly Black neighborhood where she lives. this excerpt effectively conveys Starr's internal struggle. Following Khalil's death, Starr considers her dual identities and the emotional strain of concealing aspects of herself in different contexts.

#### **4.5.2 Analysis**

Analysis of first extract is as follows:

##### **4.5.2.1 Actor Description**

Starr describes herself and her family members' struggles with a role-playing mindset that prevents them from expressing themselves authentically using actor description. By stating that she acts with her family members, who also project false personas, Starr demonstrates a thorough understanding of her social position. Due to social pressure, which results in an internal conflict, this description depicts Starr assuming many social personalities in self-awareness. Since this social adjustment has become their innate means of survival, the term "good actors" highlights their high level of competence, which allows them to continue performing in public.

##### **4.5.2.2 Polarization**

The clear division between Williamson and Garden Heights as two universes with separate functions is how polarization manifests itself. According to the spatial metaphor, Williamson operates as a world apart from Garden Heights. Williamson and Garden Heights' polarization serves as an example of how society divides people into several social groups, with Starr existing at the intersection of these groups. This statement validates Starr's segmented state of being by demonstrating her perception of the two worlds as distinct entities that are incapable of coming together. The basic racial and economic tensions that are the main focus of the narrative are symbolized by the wide socioeconomic divide that separates Williamson from Garden Heights.

##### **4.5.2.3 Lexicalization**

Starr's deliberate word choice produces a performance-oriented framework for describing her experiences, which come across as manufactured. During staged performances, the figure assumes roles that mirror Starr's fictitious encounters with other people. The phrase "putting on a play" when discussing family ties implies artificiality since society has imposed artificiality on their real relationships. Starr's use of the phrase "I can't be" illustrates how social norms prevent her from being authentic. Language functions as a device that both creates the experience of these coexisting forces and illustrates the struggle between the ego and society.

##### **4.5.2.4 Victimization**

Starr and her family are shown in the film as victims of their surroundings, which causes them to create fake public personas. The speaker's use of the modal phrase "have to" conveys his unwillingness to uphold authority and his continued adherence to implicit societal norms. The family acts as victims since the remark about burying the past implies that they must deal with Khalil's untimely death in secret rather than in public. In addition to eliminating Khalil's loved ones' grieving experiences, the sentence demonstrates how society pressures have honorably destroyed his memory and the period of his death.

##### **4.5.2.5 Modality**

The language has modal aspects that convey obligations, possibilities, and needs. Starr describes her intense need to maintain her identities apart by utilizing the modal phrase

"haveto." Starr demonstrates impossibility through negative modality in "I can't be the person" to support her assertion that it is still difficult to sustain authenticity across settings. This phrase's use of the modality "should" illustrates the notion that there are circumstances in which we must leave them behind.

Her internal dedication to the society she lives in is demonstrated by the modal expressions in her speech, which depict Starr's worldview as it changes as a result of social forces.

#### **4.5.2.6 Metaphor**

Metaphor serves as a powerful tool in this paragraph. By using "worlds" as a metaphor, the book illustrates how societal divisions are transformed into tangible places that Starr experiences. The spatial analogy illustrates why she believes her several distinguishable features cannot be brought together. Since this method contrasts authentic behavior with performative behavior, the analysis uses long metaphors to depict social life by comparing people to actors in theatrical plays. Since enduring "a play for almost six months" indicates the necessary long-term upkeep of these performances, the metaphor illustrates how society forces people to participate through performative duties rather than actual existence. In the end, the writers use metaphor to show how their acting serves to totally eradicate Khalil's real presence.

#### **4.5.2.7 Connection to Self-Society Conflict and Systemic Oppression**

The excerpt illustrates the novel's central struggle between people and their societies. As she adopts numerous personas to get by in different social situations, Starr battles to preserve her genuine personality throughout her social journey. The need to adapt her communication style to various racial contexts fragments her sense of self and causes her to struggle with herself. By presenting actors as performers, dividing people into distinct worlds, and then using language to describe inauthenticity while portraying Starr as helpless, the text constructs its story of performance versus constrained behavior. Metaphors are used to transform abstract societal gaps into theatrical-stage concepts, and modality is used to express authenticity's impossibility. These techniques in the excerpt demonstrate how systemic racism works by forcing people to downplay aspects of their identities as they go about their daily lives in an effort to learn and succeed. In addition to being personal, Starr's struggle is emblematic of larger societal differences that force marginalized people to show different identities in various settings, leading to a severe detachment from true self-expression and human connection.

#### **4.5.3 Analysis of Extract 2**

"That's when I realize what he was doing. When I was twelve, my parents had two talks with me. One was the usual birds and bees. The other talk was about what to do if a cop stopped me. Daddy told me that in the event a cop stopped me, I was to hand over my license, registration, and insurance card. Tell them you are reaching for it before you move. Don't make any sudden moves. Don't argue. Keep your hands visible. Don't give them a reason to hurt you. I hope somebody had the talk with Khalil. Khalil's arms hang by his sides, too long to be hidden. He stares at the officer, who stares back. The officer's hand hovers over his gun like it's a comfort to him, the way my nana would rub her rosary beads. He barks at Khalil, 'I said get your hands up! You deaf or something?'"

##### **4.5.3.1 Contextualization**

This passage takes place at the crucial scene in which Starr watches as her childhood buddy Khalil is shot by the cops. As Starr watches Khalil and Officer One-Fifteen's interaction, she remembers "the talk" her parents had with her about how to act around the police—a discussion that many Black families in America have had. This excerpt emphasizes the terrible moment when Starr realizes that a perilous situation is developing and considers the cultural wisdom that Black communities have passed down as a means of survival.

#### **4.5.4 Analysis**

Analysis of second extract is as follows:

#### 4.5.4.1 Actor Description

The three main characters in this scene—Khalil as the weak subject, Starr as the observer, and the officer as the menacing authority—are all portrayed with actor description. Given that Khalil's "arms hang by his sides, too long to be hidden," it is clear that he is physically vulnerable and unable to hide his body. Khalil is shown as vulnerable and helpless in this description. On the other hand, the officer's behavior portrays him as aggressive and predatory; his hand "hovers over his gun" and he "barks" instructions. The disparity between these descriptions creates a power dynamic that places the officer in a negative position (aggressive, threatening) and Khalil in a negative one (vulnerable, potentially threatening in the officer's eyes). The larger power disparity in society between Black citizens and police enforcement is reflected in this discursive construction of actors.

#### 4.5.4.2 Polarization

The stark contrast between law enforcement (represented by the officer) and the Black community (represented by Starr, her family, and Khalil) creates polarization. "If a cop stopped me" introduces this us/them dichotomy right away. The set of directions—"Avoid making any abrupt movements. Avoid arguing. "Keep your hands visible"—which highlights the behavioral adjustments that Black people must make while engaging with police—further highlights the polarized relationship. The physical altercation recounted, in which "He stares at the officer, who stares back," serves to further solidify this division by providing a visual depiction of opposition. The polarization, especially with regard to relations with authority authorities, is a reflection of larger racial divisions in society.

#### 4.5.4.3 Lexicalization

The conversation is framed by intentional word choices that exhibit lexicalization. By using the verb "barks" to characterize the officer's speech, he is dehumanized and linked to violent animal behavior. Because Black communities share a common understanding of this shared information and consider it crucial, the phrase "I hope somebody had the talk with Khalil" demonstrates the usage of the definite article "the" to denote a specific educational discussion between Black people. The question from the police was, "You deaf or something?" The officer's use of derogatory remarks about Khalil's condition reveals their unconscious prejudice. The grammatical structure of the text, which emphasizes limited survival strategies, is formed by the negative directives ("Don't make," "Don't argue," and "Don't give"). The chosen vocabulary creates a reality that compels Black people to control their behavior because doing otherwise provokes violent responses from those in authority.

#### 4.5.4.4 Victimization

This portrayal of police as possible dangers who need to take defensive measures to keep themselves safe designates Black people as victims. This statement demonstrates that even when police officers act irrationally, they can still be aggressive and have the ability to harm Black people. Black kids have to hear "the talk" because the systemic violence that threatens them begins at a young age. According to Khalil's account, his long arms make him easily observable by others. Because the police officer maintains his hand close to his pistol, Khalil may have potentially fatal confrontations with them. The story illustrates how racial prejudice creates conditions in which particular people are not shielded from state aggression and force.

#### 4.5.4.5 Modality

Through affirmations of possibility as well as directives for obligation and prohibition, the modality fulfills its purpose. As "the talk" is being discussed, the speaker merely gives modal instructions, such as "I was to hand over." In addition to necessary directions, the statement employs negative imperatives and obligation phrases. Black people's freedom of expression and mobility are severely restricted in their dealings with police personnel, as seen by modal expressions. The use of the uncertain modal "hope" with a positive connotation and



the phrase "I hope somebody had the talk with Khalil" highlight the significance of the knowledge required for survival. When Black people contact with law enforcement, they are subject to specific limits that are systematically enforced by racial discrimination, as seen by the phraseology of modals.

#### **4.5.4.6 Metaphor**

The poet claims that the police handles his rifle in the same manner that his grandmother does, holding his rosary beads as a form of solace. There is an almost sacred connection between the police and his violent skills, as the gun's weapon-like qualities become a reassuring necessity that religious items serve as parallels for. The author uses this metaphor to demonstrate how the fundamental structure of policing culture contains threats of violence. The author uses "the talk" as a metaphor to illustrate how survival education is passed down through the generations as a major cultural practice for Black children. The author explores how institutional racism affects both the controllers and those they control on a psycho-emotional level using these figurative language techniques.

#### **4.5.4.7 Connection to Self-Society Conflict and Systemic Oppression**

This excerpt illustrates the self-society struggle by contrasting the need for personal safety with structural social injustices. Because she experiences both the institutional injustice that targets Black communities and the threat that Chris poses, Starr maintains a dual viewpoint. She must limit her mobility and self-expression because the racial lesson her parents taught her includes cultural adaptation skills necessary to withstand discrimination. Together, the discursive techniques create this conflict: victimization portrays Black people as always at risk of state violence; modality creates a reality of limited behavioral options; polarization draws a clear line between the Black community and law enforcement; lexicalization frames the interaction in terms of aggression and constraint; actor description establishes the power dynamic between vulnerable Black civilians and threatening authority figures; and metaphor exposes the psychological aspects of systemic racism. The excerpt illustrates how Black people are forced to defend themselves by acts that go against their natural tendencies due to racial discrimination, which causes a significant identity vs society conflict. The crucial incident forced Starr to gradually evolve as a person throughout the narrative, which made her doubt her own willingness to combat prejudice.

#### **4.5.5 Analysis of Extract 3**

"It seems like they always talk about what he may have said, what he may have done, what he may not have done. I didn't know a dead person could be charged in his own murder, you know? It's bullshit. And they make him look like he was a thug or something. The news shows the same pictures of him over and over, and I swear, if they find one bad thing on him, they'll use it. The media crucifies him like Khalil was Jesus, like he deserved it or something. But... they don't say the cop's name. He knows what he did, but there's no way to look at him and say 'He did it.' It's hell, because I feel so powerless. I feel like I can't help Khalil when he's the person who needs me the most."

##### **4.5.5.1 Contextualization**

Starr complains about the way Khalil is portrayed in the national media following his gunshot death. After witnessing the media dissect Khalil's personality while keeping the identity of the police officer a secret, she feels incredibly powerless. This public discourse highlights systemic patterns of victimizing Black people while shielding police personnel from accountability by continuing to try victims rather than their murderers in police shooting instances.

#### **4.5.6 Analysis**

Analysis of third extract is as follows:

#### 4.5.6.1 Actor Description

The conflicting portrayals of Khalil and the policeman reveal the actor's personality. Even though Khalil acts as the victim, he is negatively classified as a "thug or something" as a result of the way he is portrayed in the media. Framing studies show that black victims are described as negative actors, which dehumanizes them. The police officer's identity is kept secret even though his name is not mentioned. The text illustrates how actor description functions as a racist system for marginalization by repeatedly displaying photos in which the white officer vanishes from view while the Black victim stays visible. Through her sense of impotence and helplessness in the face of the injustice taking place in front of her, the author portrays Starr.

#### 4.5.6.2 Polarization

Polarization is created by frequently using "they" instead of the implied "us." In contrast to Starr and her community, the pronoun "they" can be used to refer to the media, authorities, and larger white society in a variety of ways. Racial and power dynamics are reflected in the distinct in-group/out-group separation that is produced by this. Phrases like "they make him look" and "they always talk" portray the government and media as a single, cohesive force working against Khalil and, consequently, the Black community. The phrase "I didn't know a dead person could be charged in his own murder," which sharply contrasts victim and offender and inverts their roles, is the epitome of polarization. The larger social divide between those who have the ability to shape narratives and those who are influenced by them is reflected in this polarization.

#### 4.5.6.3 Lexicalization

Strategic word choices that contextualize Starr's criticism of media depiction are examples of lexicalization. The word "bullshit" explicitly denounces the media narrative as disrespectful and untrue. The modal "will" is used in the hypothetical framing "if they find one bad thing on him, they'll use it" to convey certainty regarding media bias. Through rigorous word choice, the media performs a ceremonial crucifixion of Khalil, making him a sacred casualty. The word "like" is used several times in the phrases "like he deserved it" and "like he was a thug" to cast doubt on and disprove these claims. According to the reporter, those who see this comments suffer through emotional turmoil that is like going through hell. The text creates a reality through word choice, demonstrating how victims of color are frequently attacked in media accounts.

#### 4.5.6.4 Victimization

There are several types of victimization in the extract. Because police used force on Khalil before media outlets created stories depicting him as a violent criminal ("they make him look like he was a thug"), author Danette McGuire presents Khalil as a victim of two crimes. The way that Khalil was victimized twice by being "charged in his own murder" is conveyed in this succinct sentence. Starr feels helpless twice in one passage: "I feel so powerless" and "I can't help Khalil." This makes it difficult for her to assist Khalil. The media depicts Khalil's suffering in the same way that Jesus endured his unjust death by using images of crucifixion.

By physically harming racial minorities and deciding how these injuries are depicted in the media to cause emotional anguish for victims, the victimization pattern illustrates how institutional racism operates.

#### 4.5.6.5 Modality

In order to illustrate modality in a text, words that convey potential combine with assertions that create certainty and phrases that indicate incapacity. Because the word "may" appears repeatedly in "what he may have said what he may have done," Khalil's possible words and actions are still unknown even though they allude to his responsible behavior. This statement expresses full assurance, in contrast to the officer's awareness of what he did. Starr uses the modal "can't" to express her impotence with regard to Khalil. Starr claims that the

media frequently takes advantage of any unfavorable facts they may learn about a person to fabricate unfavorable stories that will never go away. When it comes to deciding what information is deemed probable, certain, and possible, the public discourse demonstrates how power operates.

#### **4.5.6.6 Metaphor**

This excerpt's consistent use of metaphor works incredibly effectively to explain injustice. Media outlets treat him for his crucifixion in the same way that they treated Jesus. The media's postmortem attacks against Khalil are transformed into a violent ritual that upholds the status quo in society through this religious image. Starr uses her emotional state as a metaphor for religious sorrow in this statement. By using the legal notion of "charging" a deceased individual with their own murder, the author illustrates the irrationality of victim blaming. By using metaphors to make abstract social issues concrete and emotionally impactful ideas, the story illustrates the psychological and spiritual aspects of seeing injustice.

#### **4.5.6.7 Connection to Self-Society Conflict and Systemic Oppression**

The excerpt demonstrates how Starr handles contradicting media reports that contradict her personal experience of Khalil and what she actually saw. She is unwilling to share her information and wants to defend Khalil because of the internal conflict caused by her exposure to public false narratives about him and her own experiences with the reality.

Together, the discursive techniques create this conflict: lexicalization frames media representation as violent and unjust; victimization places Khalil and Starr as victims of systemic forces; modality reveals how certainty and uncertainty are manipulated in public discourse; polarization divides those who control narratives from those who are subject to them; actor description draws attention to the disparate portrayals of Black victims versus white authorities; and metaphor turns abstract injustice into emotionally compelling concepts. These techniques demonstrate how institutional racism works by demonstrating its influence over public perceptions, which results in changes to public perception.

Across communities, marginalized people fight relentlessly to establish their reality and assert their basic humanity against the institutions of power that dominate public information. She illustrates how institutionalized oppression works by making disobedience appear impossible through her feeling of helplessness. This leads to intense conflicts between one's true beliefs and what society demands to be kept secret.

#### **4.5.7 Analysis of Extract 4**

"I've seen it happen over and over again: a black person gets killed just for being black, and all hell breaks loose. I've tweeted RIP hashtags, reblogged pictures on Tumblr, and signed every petition out there. I always said that if I saw it happen to somebody, I would have the loudest voice, making sure the world knew what went down. Now I am that person, and I'm too afraid to speak. But it's not just about fear. I'm sick of living in two different worlds. It's exhausting to be two different people. They think they know me, but they don't. Nobody does. Not completely. People either see Williamson Starr or Garden Heights Starr. They don't see me, the girl struggling to navigate between two worlds, each with their own landmines. As fucked up as it sounds, that bothers me the most."

##### **4.5.7.1 Contextualization**

This passage illustrates Starr's internal conflict following Khalil's shooting. She used to be certain that if she ever saw injustice, she would speak out against it, but now she is paralyzed by fear and the complexity of her dual identity. As she struggles to reconcile her idealistic self-image as an activist with her actual behavior in the face of actual danger and social constraints, the text perfectly portrays the turning point in her character development.

#### **4.5.8 Analysis**

Analysis of fourth extract is as follows:

#### 4.5.8.1 Actor Description

Starr's portrayal of herself in various settings is an example of actor description. By characterizing her former self as someone who would "have the loudest voice," she presents an idealized, courageous self. The fact that she now identifies herself as "too afraid to speak" demonstrates how trauma has altered her previous self-description. As she stands between conflicting environments, "The girl struggling to navigate between two worlds" paints a complete image of the protagonist's societal obligations. Because she plays various parts in different settings, she uses "Williamson Starr" and "Garden Heights Starr" to describe herself in two ways.

Through identity splitting, Black people show how institutional racism causes them to cut off parts of who they really are when they go into places where white people predominate, leading to a fierce conflict between the self and society.

#### 4.5.8.2 Polarization

Polarization is formed on the basis of two different worlds and two different groupings. There is a big difference between Garden Heights, which is primarily home to Black people, and Williamson, which primarily serves white pupils. This polarization is confirmed by the author through the exclusive phrase "People either see Williamson Starr or Garden Heights Starr" throughout the narrative. By demonstrating that how other people perceive her is not true to who she is, this term creates yet another social contradiction. The dual framing structure illustrates how the oppressive social trend of distinct lifestyle requirements in various social contexts forces Black people to keep their private lives and public selves apart. According to the narrative, there are perilous barriers in both worlds that work similarly to figurative landmines.

#### 4.5.8.3 Lexicalization

Starr's choice of words throughout the narrative establishes lexical frames for her feelings. The phrase "all hell breaks loose" is used to symbolize the social unrest that follows police killings, and this is when the religious imagery is most intense. The digital verbs "tweeted" and "reblogged" as well as the action "signed" depict Starr's prior activism, indicating that her participation was distinct from facing bodily danger. Identity switching results in mental exhaustion to the extent that "exhausting" is a suitable term. She sounds really upset when she acknowledges that her bewilderment over having numerous identities is worse than her personal peril. The "landmines" metaphor transforms intangible, harmful social circumstances into actual, physical dangers.

According to this description of reality, social situations become cognitively taxing for professionals to manage since they require constant alertness.

#### 4.5.8.4 Victimization

Victimization occurs throughout the extract. Black individuals are murdered because of their race, as the first statement explains. Because Starr endures both subjection to external societal norms that promote false identities and quiet enforced by fear, she continues to be a victim twice. She portrays herself in these words as someone who is limited by two different social contexts. Starr is constantly at risk of social injury because of the symbolic landmines that are present in both of her worlds. Racism functions systemically to produce hazardous real-life situations that compel victims to change their behavior in order to survive.

#### 4.5.8.5 Modality

Modality functions as a system to communicate hypothetical settings along with required and potential scenarios. The speaker uses conditional modality in the statement "I would have the loudest voice" to illustrate what would have happened in the past. Through the use of the "too" modal, the present reality illustrates an incapacity to communicate because of overpowering anxiety, despite the different chronological setting. The line illustrates how someone wants to leave their current situation but feels stuck with no way out. The negative



modality highlights how people don't fully recognize you in a variety of contexts, as in the remark "They don't see me." Through these verbalizing examples that highlight the distinction between acceptable and desired behavior, systemic racism restricts both authentic self-disclosure and recognized by others.

#### **4.5.8.6 Metaphor**

The metaphor serves as a useful tool for comprehending Starr's experiences. The author makes abstract social circumstances concrete by using the "two worlds" metaphor to represent particular physical places. The figurative scale then moves on to an allusion to landmines, which turn social mistakes and dangers into explosive weapons that can cause catastrophic damage. The author claims that the phrase "all hell breaks loose" conjures up theological imagery that personifies societal unrest as if it were an end-of-the-world occurrence. In order to gain impact and influence, the phrase "having the loudest voice" is figuratively translated into actual sounding volume.

By transforming intangible social barriers into practical danger zones that require exact movement, the metaphorical language illustrates how psychological features manifest when confronted with racist structures.

#### **4.5.8.7 Connection to Self-Society Conflict and Systemic Oppression**

By following Starr as she struggles with identity issues and falls short of her activist ambitions, the story effectively exposes self-society conflict. Internal struggles between Starr's fear and bravery, her several personal identities, and her pursuit of authentic living contrast with her expected social duties in a variety of settings are manifestations of the psychological stress caused by institutional racism. When Starr's multiple selves are portrayed, social rifts are created between contexts, code-switching effects are defined, she is positioned as a victim of external limitations, her desired power is shown to be out of reach, and social pressure is transformed into threats that can cause direct harm. These discursive strategies work together to construct Starr's psychological battle.

The passage demonstrates how racism damages people by destroying their sense of self, which results in severe emotional harm and prevents them from expressing themselves authentically. Starr makes it apparent that she is most troubled by the fragmentation of her identity since it is a more severe type of injury from racist systems than actual physical threats. Self-society conflict manifests both inwardly as one struggles to maintain harmony with oneself while juggling competing social demands and outside through action.

#### **4.5.9 Analysis of Extract 5**

"The cops finally let us go about an hour ago. I've never had so many white people stare at me before. I mean individually, I'm used to white people staring; there aren't a lot of black kids at Williamson. As a group though? Creepy. It was like watching a horror movie, but instead of zombies, I was being chased by people who wanted answers from me. Once those cops left, they all started talking. Why were the cops only talking to us? What happened? Khalil was Daddy's friend's son? He was killed? By a cop? What did he do? If he didn't do anything, why would the cop shoot him? Did I see it? Some kid asked, Was he a drug dealer? I think his name was Chance, but what difference does it make? I snapped at him and said, So what if he was? That doesn't mean a cop had a right to shoot him."

##### **4.5.9.1 Contextualization**

This excerpt takes place at a party after Khalil's death, after Starr and her friends are questioned by police. Starr's first experience of her white classmates' responses to the shooting is depicted in the scenario, highlighting the glaring disparities between their perceptions of police violence and her personal experience. The text emphasizes the insensitivity and microaggressions she encounters from people who ought to be her peers but instead see Khalil's passing with judgment and disinterest.

#### 4.5.10 Analysis

Analysis of fifth extract is as follows:

##### 4.5.10.1 Actor Description

The representation of several groups in this exchange is an example of actor description. Referred to as "staring" and likened to zombies in a "horror movie," the "white people" are portrayed as intrusive, dangerous, and dehumanized. The fact that the text refers to them as "people who wanted answers from me" illustrates how demanding and entitled they are portrayed. "Us" is represented in the text by Starr and her Black pals, yet they are closely watched by both police officers and then by their white peers. The author demonstrates how Khalil was socially depicted as a drug dealer despite the fact that he had already died through a series of leading questions. The narrative demonstrates how power relations enable white people to assert their authority over information and pass judgment on Black people who are under suspicion and examination.

##### 4.5.10.2 Polarization

Polarization is established in the text by our group's alternating placement with theirs. When the story starts after "us" (Starr and her Black coworkers), police officers release the students. Then, when they watch Starr's group, "many white people" join the racial division by establishing a separation. "What did he do?" was the query that white pupils posed to one another. White students' inquiries to Starr both presume his guilt and run counter to her assertion that "So what if he was?" Law enforcement should not terminate Jordan because he was a narcotics dealer. White students and Starr have differing perspectives on police killings, as seen by their conversation. While Starr argues for the universal right to exist, the white students look for justifications for the killing. There are glaring differences in how society views and defends police brutality against Black people.

##### 4.5.10.3 Lexicalization

Deliberate word choice that demonstrates lexicalization frames an interaction. The verb "stare" is used in the text to illustrate how white students use an aggressive yet degrading gaze. When white pupils observe the incident together, the adjective "creepy" gives it a negative emotional weight. By using metaphors, the author portrays white pupils as mindless zombies and likens social interactions to horror movies. The description uses pursuit language to depict individuals actively chasing Starr and pressuring her for answers. Implicit bias is revealed by his audience's frequent question, "What did he do?" which assumes wrongdoing. Starr's statement that she snapped demonstrates how emotionally unstable she is.

##### 4.5.10.4 Victimization

Different levels of victimization are depicted in this excerpt. About an hour after being freed by the police, Starr and her pals discover that their classmates question one another in an attempt to get answers ("people who wanted answers from me"). Through the narrative of the horror film, Starr plays the role of a survivor who is being pursued by dangerous individuals. The excerpt demonstrates how Khalil is victimized by post-mortem investigations that seek to establish that his death was justified because of his drug peddling or other activities ("Was he a drug dealer?").

Starr's response's defense mechanism demonstrates how police profiling causes African Americans to be victimized and have their rights diminished due to cultural preconceptions. Because it puts Black people in a never-ending cycle of having to demonstrate their human value and survival, the victimization myth highlights the operational aspect of systemic racism.

##### 4.5.10.5 Modality

In order to examine an issue and convey necessity and obligation, the modality employs a variety of terms. After their forced incarceration ended, the cops released Starr and her friends. Several white students' questioning voices demand explanations for why police officers solely spoke to them. What took place? A conditional statement asks why, if he had not

committed any crimes, the police would have shot him. According to this assertion, victim misconduct serves as the foundation for the justification of police aggression. Through a series of speculative scenarios, the assertion flips the conventional logic: "So what if he was?"

He refused to believe that police officers can shoot people just because they haven't committed a crime. By imposing criteria for the explanation process and assuming certain limitations for acceptable violence, the seeming expressions demonstrate how racial biases operate.

#### **4.5.10.6 Metaphor**

Starr discovers a powerful way to understand how racial criticism impacts her through the use of metaphorical language. This passage's primary metaphor compares these kinds of events to watching a horror movie in which the zombies are substituted by people who are demanding answers. In this scenario, white interrogators transform into scary creatures that pursue Starr in a horrific social interaction. The metaphoric structure turns interrogations into a physical pursuit. The author uses the metaphor "cops let us go" to characterize police questioning as a type of incarceration. The author uses these metaphors to illustrate how the psychological effects of coping with racist harassment change from abstract societal norms to actual physical oppression.

#### **4.5.10.7 Connection to Self-Society Conflict and Systemic Oppression**

By addressing her friends' responses to Khalil's passing, Starr exemplifies self-society conflict. As her white classmates analyze her and his death, they resist showing emotion, which causes her emotional anguish to be extremely conflicted. She wants to protect Khalil, but she also has to represent Black pupils in front of peers who are primarily white, which creates tension in the situation. Together, the discursive strategies create this conflict: victimization places Starr and Khalil as objects of unjustified suspicion; modality exposes the implicit assumptions about when violence is justified; lexicalization frames white scrutiny as invasive and threatening; actor description establishes contrasting portrayals of Black and white individuals; polarization divides different racial perspectives on police violence; and metaphor turns social scrutiny into physical threat.

Through everyday encounters, the clip illustrates how systemic racism forces Black people to defend their humanity and right to life. Starr began to find the strength to combat racial stereotypes at the expense of significant social risk, as seen by her encounter with an inappropriate question from a classmate. When people maintain their moral principles and commitment to justice while navigating difficult surroundings, the self-society conflict serves as a transforming process that fosters personal development and political understanding.

### **5 CONCLUSION**

This chapter presents end results obtained from critical discourse analysis of Angie Thomas' novel "The Hate U Give." Key research outcomes receive summary while implications from the findings are outlined and research limitations are addressed for future research possibilities. This study employed van Dijk's (2005, 2011) critical discourse analysis framework to examine how self-society conflict is constructed through language in "The Hate U Give." Through the analysis of seven selected extracts, we identified patterns in how six discursive strategies actor description, polarization, lexicalization, victimization, modality, and metaphor function to reveal the ideological structures that shape representations of racial identity and justice.

#### **5.1 Findings**

The study revealed that self-society conflict in the novel is primarily constructed through linguistic strategies that highlight the protagonist's navigation of in-group and out-group dynamics. The polarization strategy consistently frames Starr's existence through binary oppositions. This establishes distinct social territories with different behavioral expectations that create the central tension in her identity development.

The significant finding here is that the novel systematically reverses typical patterns of in-group/out-group representation. Rather than positioning the white majority as the normalized in-group (as is common in dominant discourse), the novel presents the Black community as the in-group through Starr's perspective, while portraying white-dominated spaces as foreign territories requiring constant navigation. This reversal challenges power hierarchies embedded in traditional discourse patterns while revealing how suppressed identity is constructed through specific linguistic choices.

Lexicalization reinforces this reversed polarization through specific word choices that assign different values to the same behaviors. These lexical patterns reveal how language itself participates in maintaining racial hierarchies while simultaneously providing tools for exposing these inequalities.

Actor description plays a crucial role by deindividuating the white people like officers while humanizing black people like Khalil through detailed personal characteristics. This strategy inverts typical media coverage of police shootings, where officers are individualized while victims are reduced to statistics or criminal records. The analysis found that the novel models linguistic resistance through discursive strategies that explicitly challenge dominant positive-self/negative-other presentations. Starr's transformation from silence to speech represents the development of counter-discourse that reverses power dynamics embedded in language.

This transformation appears through shifts in modality from inability ("I can't speak") to possibility and intention ("I can do this. I can talk"). The lexicalization evolves from passive, generalizing terminology to specific, politically charged vocabulary that explicitly names power dynamics. The ideological significance of this transformation lies in its modeling of how marginalized individuals can reclaim discursive power by rejecting patterns that position them as the out-group. By declaring "Khalil's voice doesn't have a heartbeat no more, but mine does, and I can use it for him", Starr rejects the silencing of Black perspectives and asserts her community's right to define their own reality a direct reversal of dominant discourse patterns that privilege white perspectives as objective while dismissing Black perspectives as subjective or biased.

This study demonstrates that *The Hate U Give* employs specific discursive strategies to reverse traditional patterns of in-group/out-group representation, challenging dominant narratives about power, justice, and identity through strategic linguistic choices. The analysis reveals how the novel's protagonist navigates self-society conflict through an evolving relationship to language, moving from silence and code-switching to a powerful counter-discourse that centers marginalized perspectives.

Through its detailed examination of actor description, polarization, lexicalization, victimization, modality, and metaphor, this research illuminates how language functions as both a mechanism of oppression and a tool for resistance. The novel's strategic reversal of dominant polarization patterns demonstrates how literature can challenge the naturalized assumptions embedded in traditional discourse about power dominance and justice, providing readers with alternative frameworks for understanding systemic inequality.

In an era of continuing racial injustice and polarized discourse about police violence, this study underscores the importance of examining how language shapes our perception of self, society, and the relationship between them. Through its nuanced portrayal of self-society conflict, *The Hate U Give* invites readers to recognize how the words we use can either constrain or liberate our collective imagination of a more just society demonstrating the power of counter-discourse to challenge dominant narratives and create space for marginalized voices to be heard.



## 6. References

- Butler. (2018). (Cited in relation to The Hate U Give).
- Reynolds. (2020). in relation to the social analysis presented in The Hate U Give).
- Fairclough. (2013). Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0601002>
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse*. London: routledge. (Vol. 270).
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse studies: A Sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse studies*. ..London: Sage., (pp. 62–85).
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context. A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge.
- Wodak, fairclough and. (2019). Analysis of Fairclough' and Wodak's Model Within Prabowo's Speech). Kandai, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.26499/jk.v17i1.1551>
- Rogers, W. S. (2011). *Social psychology*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Hart. (2014). *Discourse, grammar and ideology*.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk. In *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511575273>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In *Language & peace*. (pp. 41-58).
- Jeffries, L. (2020). Opposition in discourse.
- Mulderrig, J. (n.d.). Introducing critical policy discourse analysis. In *Critical policy discourse analysis*. . . Edward Elgar Publishing., (pp. 1-22).
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). Critical discourse studies: History, agenda, theory and methodology. *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*, November.
- KhosraviNik, M. (2010a). Discourse, identity and legitimacy.
- KhosraviNik, M. (2010b). The representation of refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants in British newspapers: A critical discourse analysis. *Journal of language and Politics*, 9(1), 1-28.
- Al-Haq, F. A.-A., & Al-Sleibi, N. M. (2015). A critical discourse analysis of three speeches of King Abdullah II. *US-China Foreign Language*, 13(5).
- Dijk, V. (2006). Socio-cognitive discourse studies. In *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* Routledge. (pp. 26-43).
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2012). Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1989.11678711>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). Analyzing frame analysis: A critical review of framing studies in social movement research. 25(2), 153-178.
- Gee. (n.d.). Humanizing Asian Americans in educational research. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 1-21. 2018.
- Dijk, V. (2018). Designing for embodied being-in-the-world: A critical analysis of the concept of embodiment in the design of hybrids. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*. 2(1), 7.
- Thomas, E. E., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2019). Restorying the self: Bending toward textual justice. In *Harvard Educational Review* (Vol. 86, Issue 3). <https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-86.3.313>
- Mills, D. (2008). (2007). *A political history of social anthropology*. Berghahn Books.
- Collins, H. (2012). Social inequality, power, and politics: Intersectionality and American pragmatism in dialogue. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 26(2), 442-457.
- Aronson, J. (1995). Social identity, stereotype threat, and self-theories. *Contesting stereotypes and creating identities: Social categories, social identities, and educational participation*, 115-135.
- Jansen, D., and Warren, K. (2020). What (Exactly) Is Research Methodology? A Plain-Language Explanation & Definition (With Examples). GradCoach. Retrieved from <https://gradcoach.com/what-is-research-methodology/>.
- Sarantacos. (2005). CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN 3.1 Introduction. Thesis UUM Students.
- Denzin, L. (2020). Qualitative Research. In *Development Field Work: A Practical Guide*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473921801.n4>
- Trousdale, G. (2003). Grammaticalization, constructions and the grammaticalization of constructions. In *Grammaticalization and language change*. (pp. 167-198).
- Fowler, R. (2013). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. Routledge.