

**A Critical Discourse Analysis of *Diana: In Her Own Words***

Submitted by:

**Marina Samir Fawzy Kaldas**

MA Degree in Linguistics

English Department

Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, Egypt

Under the Supervision of:

**Prof. Salwa Mohamed Farag**

Professor of Linguistics

English Department

Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, Egypt

**Dr. Mona Eid Saad**

Doctor of Linguistics

English Department

Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, Egypt

**Abstract**

This study aims at proposing a Critical Discourse Analysis of Lady Diana's confessional speech that has been broadcasted in 2017. Also, it highlights the importance of employing a range of analytical tools to uncover the ideological strategies in the persuasion of the audience and gaining their approval.

The documentary has been subjected to a critical analysis through Halliday's Transitivity and Modality; besides, it seeks to investigate the speaker's lexical choices and deixis. Additionally, nine of van Dijk's (2000) Categories of Ideological Analysis are employed. Furthermore, the researcher has divided the script to create five phases in Lady Diana's life: Tough Childhood, Royal Marriage: Jealousy and Cheating, Bulimia, Postnatal Depression and Suicidal Attempts, Tensed Relationships in the Royal Palace, and Confronting, Changing & Hoping Again.

The findings have made several contributions to the field of Critical Discourse Analysis, particularly with regards to the role of language and ideology in shaping public discourse and opinion. Additionally, the study has demonstrated the significant role of linguistic and ideological strategies in shaping the audience's perception of Diana and the other characters in the documentary.

After her fatal accident, public interest in Diana has remained high. Afterwards, many movies, books, novels and television shows were produced about her life. Thus, this study provides a detailed Critical Discourse Analysis of one of the most viewed confessional

## A Critical Discourse Analysis of Diana: In Her Own Words

documentaries, *Diana: In Her Own Words*. Hence, this analysis contributes to the scholarly understanding of Lady Diana's legendary life.

**Key Words:** Critical Discourse Analysis, Systemic Function Grammar, Transitivity, Representational Strategies and Categories of Ideological Analysis.

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى إجراء تحليل نقدي لأعترافات الأميرة ديانا من خلال الفيلم الوثائقي

“ Diana: In Her Own Words”

الذي بُث في عام 2017. يتمثل الهدف في كشف الاستراتيجيات اللغوية والأيدولوجية التي استخدمتها ديانا للتأثير على تصورات الجمهور واستحواذ موافقتهم. يتم ذلك من خلال استخدام أدوات تحليلية متنوعة بما في ذلك

Transitivity, Modality, Categories of Ideological Analysis, Lexical choices and Deixis

فبعد زواجها من الأمير تشارلز في عام 1981، أصبحت الأميرة ديانا معروفة بجهودها الخيرية والإنسانية. لقد أثرت جهودها في مجالات متعددة منها التوعية بمرض الإيدز، ومكافحة الفقر والبطالة، ودعم مرضى السرطان والجذام، بالإضافة إلى تقديم الدعم لمرضى الأمراض النفسية. وفاتها أثارت حزنًا شديدًا على نطاق واسع، وشهدت جنازتها بتقدير 2.5 مليار شخص حول العالم قد عانت الأميرة ديانا الكثير تحت سقف القصر الملكي وهذا ما تكشفه بنفسها في إعرافاتها المسجلة .

تكشف الرسالة دور اختيارات المفردات في إقناع الجمهور وكسب تعاطفهم وموافقتهم. كما يوضح الوثائقي كيف أن ديانا استخدمت تصنيفات فان ديك الأيدولوجية لتشكيل السرد الخاص بها والتأثير على تصورات الجمهور. قد بنت ديانا سردًا جذابًا ينبض بالمشاعر ويحقق تعاطفًا واسعًا أستحق الدراسة. فمن ثم، من خلال تحليل الخطاب النقدي، تساهم هذه الدراسة في فهم أعمق لصورة ديانا العامة وإرثها المستمر

**Critical Discourse Analysis of *Diana: In Her Own Words***

Submitted by:

**Marina Samir Fawzy Kaldas**

MA Degree in Linguistics

English Department

Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, Egypt

Under the Supervision of:

**Prof. Salwa Mohamed Farag**

Professor of Linguistics

English Department

Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, Egypt

**Dr. Mona Eid Saad**

Doctor of Linguistics

English Department

Faculty of Arts, Helwan University, Egypt

**1. Introduction**

Following her marriage to Charles Windsor, Prince of Wales, in 1981, Princess Diana's attention has been given to working for charitable causes. Due to her interest in AIDS awareness and prevention, banning the use of landmines, battling poverty and homelessness, various cancer trusts, Leprosy, as well as opening up the stigma surrounding mental illness, Diana Frances Spencer has become a legacy and has been known as "the people's princess". Her death has caused an unprecedented outpouring of public grief in the United Kingdom and worldwide, and her funeral was watched by an estimated 2.5 billion people. Public interest in Diana has remained high and she has retained regular press coverage in the years after her death. Afterwards, many movies, books, novels and television shows have been produced about her life. Thus, this study provides a detailed Critical Discourse Analysis of one of the most viewed confessional speeches by tackling the script of Lady Diana's documentary film, *Diana: In Her Own Words*.

This study, hence, aims at examining Lady Diana's speech through adopting Halliday's (1985) Systemic Functional Grammar, including Transitivity and Modality. Moreover, Lexical Choices and nine of van Dijk's (2000) Categories of Ideological Analysis (Positive self and Negative Other Presentation, Empathy, Victimization, Dramatization, Hyperbole, Illegality, Example, National Self Glorification and

Evidentiality) are applied to investigate their contribution to the persuasion of the audience and gaining their empathy and approval.

### 1.1 Objectives of the study

Through critical analysis using Systemic Functional Grammar (Transitivity and Modality), Lexical Choices, Deixis, van Dijk's (2000) Categories of Ideological Analysis, including Positive Self presentation and Negative Other presentation, Lady Diana's speech is analyzed. All these tools are presented against a backdrop of CDA. Thus, the study aims at achieving the following objectives:

1. Tackling the role of Halliday's (1985) Systemic Functional Grammar (Transitivity) in revealing the speaker's ideologies.
2. Showing how a set of van Dijk's (2000) Categories of Ideological Analysis has been employed in Princess Diana's confessional documentary aiming at persuading the audience.
3. Addressing the manner in which Princess Diana has presented herself positively and the other negatively through using van Dijk's (2000) Representational Strategies.
4. Demonstrating the role of Lexical Choices in the persuasion of the audience and gaining their empathy and approval.

## 2. Review of Literature

CDA is an interdisciplinary field of study concerned with exploring the relation between discourse and society. It addresses social problems, power relations, the relation between society and text, dominance and inequality. CDA, thus, is conducted through three main stages: description, where a detailed linguistic analysis is carried out; interpretation, where an attempt is made to find a relation between the linguistic findings and the social context; and explanation, where the analyst connects both the linguistic and the social to the cultural level (Fairclough, 1995a). According to Wodak and Meyer, CDA aims to analyze "opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (Wodak and Meyer, 2001, p.2). CDA is not a school of thought, specialization or paradigm. Rather, it covers a number of related approaches to the analysis of text.

### 2.1 Definitions of CDA

*Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social*

*power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context.*

*(van Dijk, 2001, p. 352)*

There are different schools for defining and theorizing Critical Discourse Analysis. More recently, van Dijk (2001) portrays the role of CDA that it “focuses on social problems, and especially on the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse or domination” (p. 96). It aims to challenge inequality, injustice, unfairness and democracy lack in society through a critical analysis of discourse. Thus, CDA regards discourse as an essential component of society and culture. It focused early on language as a text, but recently it focuses on language in use. And since the fact that it is a discipline of linguistics, it asserts that language can be analyzed not just on the level of morpheme (word, clause, or sentence), but also on the level of text. Hence, that language not to be analyzed as an abstract set of rules, but as a tool of social action.

## **2.2 CDA and Identity**

*“a sense of belonging to social categories”  
(De Fina, 2003, p.15).*

Jan Assmann (2006) states that identity is an issue of “consciousness, that is of becoming aware of an otherwise unconscious image of the self” (p. 130). Assmann (2006) also refers to collective identity that is composed by a certain group according to their social status. Furthermore, Malešević (2006), whom focal point is about ‘identity talk’, considers identity a significant ideological device; since he believes that individual or group identity can uncover the reasons behind some social actions\_ whether we justify it or not. According to his belief,

Identity has become a powerful ideological device wielded as much by academics as political entrepreneurs, social movements or state institutions. The fact that until very recently identity was almost unquestioned as a categorical apparatus of social analysis, as well as in ordinary life, is itself a good indicator of its omnipotent ideological status (2006, p. 3).

### 2.2.1 Identity and Narration

*“the nature of narrative can add to the possibilities of presenting different versions of the self”*

*Emmott (2002, p.174).*

Undoubtedly, there is a tight relationship between language and society which is deeply rooted as they influence each other and are constantly interacting. Language in narration is the main tool for showing authority and power and discourse is a form of social practice. Fairclough (1989) believes that a critical analyst is not only concerned with analyzing texts, but with analyzing the relationships between texts, processes, and their social conditions. Fairclough (1989) develops a three-dimensional framework of critical discourse analysis: description that deals with the formal properties of the text, interpretation that deals with the relationship between text and interaction, and explanation which focuses on the relationship between interaction and social context. In other words, text is a form of product, while narrative discourse is a social interaction process, where text is a part of it. For Fairclough, "language both constitutes and is constituted by society" (1992, p. 128). Thus, language and society are intertwined.

### 2.3 CDA and Interviews

It is needed to shed light on the relation between interviews and discourse analysis and how much weight is put on the people that produce that kind of discourse. By analysis, it can be discovered in the interview how the interviewee presents and understands him/herself in the context of the interview. Discourse analysis can be performed on everything from interviews, letters, diaries and public documents, to observations, movies, newspaper articles and professional literature (Søndergaard 2000). He believes that the purpose of an interview analysis would be to look for the truth about the nature of a phenomenon, causal relations or how things really are, and to discover that there is a true and external reality that should be observed. Additionally, the interview can also represent insights into how individual interviewees interpret themselves and how they interpret the phenomenon under study (Repstad 1987; Ryen 2002). What is worth mentioning that interviews can also provide non-linguistic data. The body in other words is one of many driving forces behind independently discovering the representations of reality: “My body has its world, or understands its world, without having to make use of my “symbolic” or “objectifying function” (Merleau-Ponty 1962, p. 140).

## **2.4 Power**

*"Manipulation not only involves power, but specifically abuse of power".  
van Dijk (2006b, p. 360)*

To critically track and analyze power in societies, it is needed to adapt Mayr's (2008) inquiries when she wonders: "the question what power is, where it is located and how it can be studied in or as language has been an important question in many critical language studies" (p.11). Moreover, she states that although power has always been pervasive in society and institutions, its conceptualization has been a matter of debate. van Dijk (2008) adds that discourse control is in fact a form of mind control; when people are expected to communicate according to certain norms and rules, their ideologies, attitudes and actions are affected. Hence, it can be demonstrated that discourse control can eventually lead to action control.

CDA, thus, is a linguistic set of tools used to reveal certain perceptions employed to influence others in a process of constructing in-group and out-group, which necessarily constructs power relations. However, language itself is not powerful, power is gained by powerful people's use of it (Wodak, 2001a; Wodak, 2009). In other words, CDA aims to know how exactly powerful speakers exhibit power and thus influence their audiences in discourse as well as investigating the involved discursive structures and strategies (van Dijk, 1993).

## **3. Methodology**

The analysis of the data in the present study focuses on Halliday's (2004) Transitivity which deals with the clause as a representation of the experiences of people in language use. Additionally, van Dijk's (1985) Modality is applied as well. Through the analysis, the light is shed on significant tools which are van Dijk's (2000) nine Categories of Ideological Analysis (Positive self and Negative Other Presentation, Empathy, Victimization, Dramatization, Hyperbole, Illegality, Example, Evidentiality and National Self-Glorification), Lexicalization and Deixis; through which the study can demonstrate that these formerly mentioned strategies are used by Lady Diana to persuade the audience and to win their sympathy and approval.

### **3.1 Transitivity**

*All figures consist of a process unfolding through time and of participants being directly involved in this process in some way; and in addition there may be circumstances of time, space, cause,*



*manner or one of a few other types. These circumstances are not directly involved in the process; rather they are attendant on it. All such figures are sorted out in the grammar of the clause. Thus as well as being a mode of action, of giving and demanding goods-&-services and information, the clause is also a mode of reflection, of imposing order on the endless variation and flow of events. The grammatical system by which this is achieved is that of TRANSITIVITY*

*(Halliday, 2004, p.170)*

As a matter of fact, Transitivity is considered to be a syntactic structure that articulates social meanings; and it is one among many other linguistic checklist items that van Dijk (1985) sets. He describes it (Transitivity) as a “fundamental part of the linguistic constitution of reality; therefore, they contribute to the formation of relations and differentials of power” (p. 70). More recent, Fowler (1991) elaborates that transitivity is “an essential tool in the analysis of representation, which has already proved extremely illuminating in critical linguistics” (p.70). Additionally, Machin and Mayr (2012) have portrayed Transitivity as the “study of what people are depicted as doing and refers to who does what to whom, and how” (p. 104). Hence, Transitivity poses questions as, who is depicted as Agent (and therefore empowered), and over whom (the affected)? How does it background the process itself? What is the ideological function? As for Goatly (2000), he believes that: “The conceptual aspects of ideology are not simply reflected in the vocabulary of a language, however. They are at work in the grammar and probably more dangerous there precisely because they are latent. The part of the grammar of the clause which is relevant to conceptualization, the representation of the world, is called *Transitivity*” (p. 59).

### 3.2 Modality

van Dijk (1985) states that the term ‘*modality*’ contains an array of devices that indicates speakers’ attitudes towards the proposition they utter, and towards their addressees as well. Thus, he classified and categorized these attitudes into the areas of “*validity*\_ the speaker expresses greater or less confidence in the truth of his proposition; *predictability*\_ the further events referred to are more or less likely to happen; *desirability*\_ practical, moral, or aesthetic judgments; *obligation*\_ speaker’s judgment that another person is obligated to perform some action; *permission*\_ speaker allows addressee to perform some action” (p. 72). Hence, these devices are ultimately significant in

respect of the interpersonalmetafunction; as they reveal the hidden attitudes and ideologies in the human's relationships.

Ultimately, van Leeuwen (2005) sums the *Modality* role as the tool used to create the truth or reality values of our propositions, to communicate and to provide more accurate ranges whether it is fact or fiction, proven truth or uncertain. Modality for Kress and van Leeuwen (2006, p. 154), is the measure to check credibility of a certain message. "Modality refers to the status, authority and reliability of a message, to its ontological status, or to its values as truth or fact" (Hodge and Kress, 1988, p. 184, as cited in Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006).

### 3.3 Categories of Ideological Analysis

*“The categorization of people in ingroups and outgroups, and even the division between 'good' and 'bad' outgroups, is not value-free, but imbued with ideologically based applications of norms and values”*  
(van Dijk, 2000, p. 78)

The strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation is one category of ideological analysis list that van Dijk sets (2000). He has mentioned 42 categories as tools serving the analysis process of ideologies; and this study sheds light on only nine:

#### 3.3.1♦ *Positive self-presentation and Negative other-presentation*

It is one among many persuasion strategies that can aim to imply a specific ideology and achieve audience or readers' admiration or even empathy. Above all, when the speaker follows that technique, \_ whether intentionally or unintentionally\_ he/she positively represents him/herself and negatively represents the other. **3.3.2♦ *Empathy***

van Dijk states that "the expression of empathy may be largely strategic and serve specially to manage the speaker's impression with the audience" (2000, p.68). Empathy is widely used in the political speeches to show sympathy with the ingroups, hence according to van Dijk (2000) it sometimes happens that accusations are directed because of lack of empathy.

#### 3.3.3♦ *Victimization*

Victimization with Dramatization and Polarization, create a perfect tied chain serving ideological analysis. It prevails the Us-Them ingroup and outgroup relationships.

### 3.3.4♦ *Dramatization*

van Dijk (2000) considers it a rhetorical device that “is a familiar way to exaggerate the facts in one's favor” (p.68). It is perfectly related to *hyperbole* (mentioned below) and *victimization*.

### 3.3.5♦ *Hyperbole*

Hyperbole can be interpreted as a device for deliberate exaggeration of meaning. "As is the case for *Dramatization*, hyperboles are semantic rhetorical devices for the enhancement of meaning...Sometimes such forms of hyperbole are implied by the use of special metaphors" (2000, p.73).

### 3.3.6♦ *Illegality*

van Dijk (2000) considers Illegality as a main part of the strategy of negative other- presentation. It basically revolves around mentioning other's breaching of the law, so that their image is negatively presented.

### 3.3.7♦ *Example / Illustration*

van Dijk illustrates this category as a powerful technique in argumentation through providing concrete examples “often in the form of a vignette or short story, illustrating or making more plausible a general point defended by the speaker. More than general 'truths' concrete examples have not only the power to be easily imaginable...and better memorable, but also to suggest impelling forms of empirical proof" (2000, p.70).

### 3.3.8♦ *Evidentiality*

It serves to use facts to support a claim. van Dijk (2000) stresses that "claims or points of view in argument are more plausible when speakers present some evidence or proof for their knowledge or opinions" (p. 69).

### 3.3.9♦ *National Self-Glorification*

van Dijk (2000) confirms that this category is the most common in political speeches. The speaker aims at praising and glorifying his/her own self, principles and history.

## 3.4 Lexicalization

*“Similar meanings may thus be variably expressed in different words, depending on the position, role, goals, point of view or opinion of the speaker, that is, as a function of context features.”*

*(van Dijk, 2000, p.77)*

Basically, lexicalization is one of van Dijk's (2000) categories of ideological analysis, which according to his belief it seeks to “express underlying concepts and beliefs in specific lexical items” (p. 77). Earlier,

van Dijk (1995) reveals how lexical selection is utilized to achieve the aim of negative other presentation: “outgroups, enemies or opponents are described in negative terms” (p.143). On elaborating ‘Distancing’ \_which is one of his Ideological Analysis Categories\_, van Dijk mentions that: “One of the ways US-THEM polarization may be expressed in the talk is by words that imply distance between ingroup speakers refer to outgroup speakers” (2000, p.67).

### **3.5 Deixis**

Reflecting its core function, the term “deixis” is derived from a Greek word that means pointing or reference. Despite of deixis’ universality, Levinson (2006) argues that it is still an “understudied” linguistic phenomenon. Three categories represent the basic types of deixis: person, spatial (place) and temporal (time). He (2006) describes deixis as a “notoriously tricky object of linguistic study” since the deictic terms themselves have fixed grammatical meanings (e.g. I, s/he, here, now), but the referent changes as the context does (p.97). Additionally, Lugea (2016) demonstrates that the three core categories of deixis “can be used to express relations between the discourse participant(s) and another entity by exploiting the dimensions of space, time or person to describe relations in the social realm” (p.26).

## **4. Analysis and Discussion**

The organization of the analysis starts with Halliday’s (2004) Transitivity, then van Dijk’s (1985) Modality is employed as well. After that, van Dijk’s (2000) nine Categories of Ideological Analysis are addressed. In addition, Deixis and Lexical Choices are tackled. Basically, the analysis has framed five phases in Lady Diana’s life: Tough Childhood, Royal Marriage: Jealousy & Cheating, Bulimia, Postnatal Depression & Suicidal Attempts, Tensed Relationships in the Royal Palace and, finally, Confronting, Changing & Hoping Again.

### **4.1 Tough Childhood**

Recalling her emotions towards her childhood in general, Lady Diana responses to the interviewer’s question: “*Your first memory after being born? Anything as a child?*”

00:08:57,500 --> 00:09:18,875

*"But there was still none of the arms around the shoulder, or the hugging. It was always the other things. Which was probably what he had too. I mean, yeah, it was a very unhappy childhood. Parents were busy sorting themselves out. Always seeing our mother crying."*

**First: Transitivity**

<i>But</i>	<i>there</i>	<i>was</i>	<i>still none of the arms around the shoulder, or the hugging.</i>	<i>It</i>	<i>was</i>	<i>always the other things. which was probably what he had too.</i>
Circumstance: Contingency	ϕ	Existential process	Existent	ϕ	Existential process	Existent
<i>I mean, yeah,</i>	<i>It</i>	<i>was</i>	<i>a very unhappy childhood.</i>	<i>Parents</i>	<i>Were</i>	<i>busy sorting themselves out.</i>
Softener	Carrier	Relational process	Attribute	Carrier	Relational process	Attribute

Table 1: Transitivity. Tough Childhood.

Recalling her childhood, Existential processes are mentioned, which serve the aim of introducing the addressee to something or information that is about to be newly introduced. Two Existential processes are utilized, one is negated and the other is affirmed. The second process includes Modality “*which was probably*”; Lady Diana tries to give an excuse for her father, so probability modal verb is used, in order to express her uncertainty about his intentions. Moreover, the mentioned Existent “*there was still none of the arms around the shoulder, or the hugging*” actually refers to no Existent; no arms to hug the children. Summarizing her childhood in a sentence, Lady Diana describes and identifies it through a Relational process as “*a very unhappy childhood*”. Additionally, another Relational process is used to characterize her parents, with the support of a Mental process, “*Parents were busy sorting themselves out. Always seeing our mother crying*” which gives details about how Lady Diana has perceived her mother at her childhood. Moreover, in this Mental process, Modality is used “*Always seeing*” to express the highest level of Usuality; it implicitly enhances the notion of the “*very unhappy childhood*”.

**Second: Categories of Ideological Analysis**

The Existential and Relational processes evoke empathy for Lady Diana, portraying her as a victim of a troubled childhood. Utilizing van Dijk's (2000) Categories: Empathy and Victimization, she is depicted as a victim of family instability, fostering audience sympathy. This narrative lays blame on her parents and Prince Charles for her unhappy childhood and lack of a loving relationship. Thus, her childhood disclosures prime the audience for forthcoming confessions.

**Third: Deixis and Lexical Choices**

Lady Diana employs Empathetic Deixis, shifting focus to her mother's misery, enhancing Empathy, Victimization, and Dramatization. Social Deixis: Relational emerges as she recalls her father's distant

behavior. Spatial Deixis: Index of Location is seen in "around shoulder." She switches between third person Deixis ("he") and first person plural Possessive Deixis ("our mother"). Her lexical choices amplify Empathy and Victimization: "a very unhappy childhood. Parents were busy sorting themselves out. Always seeing our mother crying." This paints her as an affectionate but fragile girl from an unstable childhood.

#### 4.2 Royal Marriage: Jealousy and Cheating

Expressing her feelings and thoughts towards this incident, Lady Diana continues:

00:28:18,198 --> 00:28:34,464  
 “So, rage, rage, rage. You know, "Why can't you be honest with me?" But, no, absolutely cut me dead. It was as if he's made his decision and if it wasn't going to work, it wasn't going to work. He's found the virgin, the sacrificial lamb and in a way he was obsessed with me”

First: Transitivity

So, rage, rage, rage.	You know,	"Why can't you be honest with me?"	But, no, absolutely cut me dead.	It	was	as if he's made his decision
Mental process: Emotive	softener	Verbiage: Phenomenon.  Relational process	Circumstance: Contingency  Mental process: Cognitive	Carrier	Relational process	Attribute (Mental process) Circumstance: Role: Guise
and if	it	wasn't going to work, it wasn't going to work.	He	's found	the virgin, the sacrificial lamb	and in a way
Circumstance: Contingency: Condition	Carrier	Relational process	Carrier	Relational process: Possessive	Attributes	Circumstance: Role: Guise

Table 2: Transitivity. Royal Marriage: Jealousy and Cheating.

This incident is loaded by various processes and Circumstantial Elements; basically, three Mental processes are mentioned \_some of them have been implied within the Circumstantial Elements. The explicit one is Emotive “rage, rage, rage”, and its repetition refers to its intense effect on Lady Diana. The second one means that Prince Charles ‘pretends’ not to recognize her knowing the bracelet matter, so her saying: “cut me dead” is considered to be a Cognitive Mental process. In addition, four Relational processes are mentioned: three Intensive and one Possessive: “He's found the virgin, the sacrificial lamb”. What is worth shedding light on, the last Intensive Relational process: “he was obsessed with

me”; it includes a contradiction, to an extent. Moreover, one Modality is mentioned in Lady Diana’s saying: “Why can't you be honest...?”; it relates to Prince Charles’ Capability, or actually incapability, to be honest with Lady Diana. No doubt, Circumstantial Elements serve a significant role in helping the audience conceptualize the situation in a more vivid and clear way.

#### Second: Categories of Ideological Analysis

Dramatization and Hyperbole dominate here; Lady Diana's emotive expressions, such as "rage, rage, rage," and "the sacrificial lamb," illustrate this vividly. Describing herself as such garners audience empathy, portraying her as a victim of Prince Charles's harsh treatment. This portrayal solidifies Prince Charles's negative image, eliciting empathy within just twenty-eight minutes of her documentary. Ultimately, her candidness captures hearts and minds, fostering a deeper connection with her audience.

#### Third: Deixis and Lexical Choices

Lady Diana utilizes Empathetic Deixis in her address, engaging the audience with phrases like "you know" and "Why can't you be honest with me?", drawing them into her emotional experience. Her choice of the word "honest" highlights Prince Charles's dishonesty and immorality. Expressions like "absolutely cut me dead" underscore her feelings of neglect and humiliation. Describing herself as "the sacrificial lamb" reflects her perception of her role with Prince Charles and in the public eye. Despite this, her assertion that "in a way he was obsessed with me" introduces a contradictory element, potentially confusing the audience. Overall, her final comment emphasizes the Social Deixis: Relational aspect, shedding light on the true nature of their relationship.

#### 4.3 Bulimia, Postnatal Depression and Suicidal Attempts

Responding to the interviewer’s question: “When you fell down the stairs?”, Lady Diana narrates:

00:56:31,638 --> 00:56:55,000

*“I threw myself down the stairs. Charles said I was crying wolf. And I said I felt so desperate, and I was crying my eyes out. And he said, “I’m not going to listen, you’re always doing this to me. I’m going riding now.” So, I threw myself down the stairs. Bearing in mind I was carrying a child. Quite bruised around the stomach.”*

First: Transitivity

## A Critical Discourse Analysis of Diana: In Her Own Words

<i>I</i>	<i>threw</i>	<i>Myself</i>	<i>down the stairs.</i>	<i>Charles</i>	<i>Said</i>	<i>I was crying wolf.</i>		<i>And I</i>	<i>said</i>
Actor	Material process	Affected	Circumstantial: Spatial	Sayer	Verbal process	Verbiage		Sayer	Verbal process
						<i>I</i>	<i>Was</i>	<i>crying wolf</i>	
						Carrier	Relational process	Attribute	
<i>I felt so desperate,</i>	<i>and I</i>	<i>was crying my eyes out.</i>	<i>And he</i>	<i>said,</i>	<i>"I'm not going to listen, you're always doing this to me. I'm going riding now."</i>				
Verbiage: Mental process: Perceptive	Behavior	Behavioural process	Sayer	Verbal process	Verbiage				
					<i>I</i>	<i>'m not going to listen,</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>'re always doing</i>	
					Behavior	Behavioural process	Actor	Material process	
					<i>This</i>	<i>to me.</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>'m going riding</i>	<i>Now</i>
					Goal	Circumstance: Recipient	Actor	Material process	Circumstantial: Temporal
<i>I</i>	<i>Threw</i>	<i>Myself</i>	<i>down the stairs.</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>was carrying</i>	<i>A child.</i>	<i>Quite bruised</i>	<i>around the stomach.</i>	
Actor	Material process	Affected	Circumstantial: Spatial	Carrier	Relational process: Possessive	Attribute	Relational process: Attribute	Circumstantial: Spatial	

Table 3: Transitivity. Bulimia, Postnatal Depression and Suicidal Attempts.

Princess Diana initiates her narrative using Verbal Processes, portraying Prince Charles negatively as he labels her a "*crying wolf*." This Relational Process signifies his disbelief in her, accusing her of feigning distress. Diana employs Mental Processes, expressing her desperation, and Behavioural Processes, illustrating her emotional turmoil by crying profusely. The Material Process, "*I threw myself down the stairs*," depicts her as both powerful and powerless, revealing her unstable psychological state. Despite possessing agency, she utilizes it self-destructively. The Relational Process, "*Bearing in mind I was carrying a child. Quite bruised around the stomach*," condemns her reckless behavior as a pregnant princess yet elicits empathy for her unstable mental state. Conversely, Prince Charles's response, "*I'm not going to listen, you're always doing this to me. I'm going riding now*," reflects a desire to avoid confrontation. Diana's varied processes emphasize her verbal expression, emotional experience, actions, and relational dynamics, underscoring her perspective in the documentary.

### Second: Categories of Ideological Analysis

Lady Diana's focus on her emotions and status prompts audience sympathy and disdain for Prince Charles. Her expression of feelings through Mental and Behavioural Processes elicits victimization and amplifies her Positive Self-Presentation, contrasting with Prince Charles's negative portrayal. Modality in his speech, as per van Dijk (1985), reveals disrespect and carelessness towards Diana, exemplified in his dismissal of her concerns as "*crying wolf*." This hyperbolic



description exacerbates his lack of compassion, further garnering sympathy for Diana as the victimized wife. Her dramatic statement, "*So I threw myself down the stairs Bearing in mind I was carrying a child,*" aligns with Dramatization, accentuating her plight for audience empathy. Overall, this narrative strategically portrays Diana positively and Prince Charles negatively, leveraging empathy from the audience. Moreover, it serves as an Example and Evidentiality, providing concrete evidence to support Diana's grievances against her husband.

Third: Deixis and Lexical Choices

Referring to her husband by his proper name, "Charles," a rarity in her documentary, Lady Diana strategically employs Spatial Deixis: Index of Location with expressions like "down" and "around." This incident primarily revolves around Social Deixis: Relational, illuminating the strained marital relationship between the interlocutors. Diana's emotive Lexical Choices, particularly describing herself as "so desperate," vividly depict her emotional state. By recounting Prince Charles's words, she highlights his callousness and disregard. Her statement, "was crying my eyes out," invokes Empathy, painting a poignant picture of a devastated princess confronting her harsh husband, prompting audience sympathy and disdain for Charles's actions.

#### 4.4 Tensed Relationships in the Royal Palace

Speaking of the Queen's reaction when Lady Diana has hurt herself:

01:14:57,077 --> 01:15:13,385

*"And she went for me, she said, "You mustn't let this side down". And I turned on her and I said, "Give me some credit that I haven't troubled any of you in my family for five years about this." And, obviously, their perception is very different now. They're annoyed by the lack of support from him."*

First: Transitivity

<i>And she</i>	<i>Went</i>	<i>for me,</i>	<i>She</i>	<i>Said,</i>	<i>"You mustn't let this side down".</i>	<i>And I</i>	<i>turned on her</i>	<i>And I</i>	<i>said,</i>
Actor	Material process	Circumstance: Goal	Sayer	Verbal process	Verbiage	Actor	Material process	Sayer	Verbal process
<i>"Give me some credit that I haven't troubled any of you in my family for five years about this."</i>									
Verbiage									
<i>Give</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>some credit</i>	<i>That</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>haven't troubled</i>	<i>any of you</i>	<i>in my family</i>		
Material process	Recipient	Goal	Circumstance: Reason	Phenomenon	Mental process	senser	Circumstance: Matter		

Table 4: Transitivity. Tensed Relationships in the Royal Palace.

<i>And, obviously,</i>	<i>their perception</i>	<i>Is</i>	<i>very different</i>	<i>now.</i>	<i>They</i>	<i>are annoyed</i>	<i>by the lack of support from him.</i>
Circumstance: Manner: Quality	Carrier	Relational process	Attribute Circumstance: Manner: Degree	Circumstance: Temporal	Senser	Mental process	Circumstance: Reason

Table 5: Transitivity. Tensed Relationships in the Royal Palace.

Describing the Queen's reaction to Lady Diana's self-harm with the knife, the narrative begins with a Material Process, "*she went*," followed by a Verbal Process. The Queen's utterance includes Modality, "*you mustn't*," implying a high level of Obligation, indicative of her power and authority. In response, Diana issues a Verbal Process, demanding to be given "*some credit*." This marks the first instance in her documentary where Diana, as the Recipient, receives acknowledgment from the Queen. She further justifies her request by highlighting her restraint, stating, "*that I haven't troubled any of you in my family for five years about this*," providing crucial Circumstantial Elements for better understanding. This incident underscores a significant Relational Process, indicating a profound shift in perception, with the Carrier "*their perception*" attributed as "*very different now*." Additionally, a mental process reveals a radical change in the royal family's attitude, stating, "*They're annoyed by the lack of support from him*."

Second: Categories of Ideological Analysis

Lady Diana recounts the Queen's reaction to her self-harm with the knife, portraying her as powerful and authoritative, evidenced by her assertive actions and orders. This Negative Other Presentation amplifies empathy and victimization towards Diana, supporting her claim of abandonment by the royal family, thus employing Evidentiality and Example/Illustration. Diana's firm stance in demanding acknowledgment for her worthiness counters the negative portrayal, casting her in a positive light. Surprisingly, a radical change in the royal family's attitude is noted, suggesting that Diana's assertiveness has influenced their perception, indicating a shift in their behavior towards her.

Third: Deixis and Lexical Choices

Referring to the Queen, Lady Diana intentionally avoids using her royal title or name, employing third person deixis: "*She went... she said*," indicating a sense of distance and unfamiliarity. Similarly, she refers to her husband using the third person pronoun in its object form, "*support from him*." Additionally, when addressing the royal family, she uses the inclusive pronoun "*any of you*." Expressions like "*went*" and "*turned on*" relate to Spatial Deixis: Index of Motion, aiding in visualizing the participants' movements during the event. The incident primarily applies Social Deixis: Relational, highlighting Lady Diana's relationships with the Queen, the royal family, and her own unstable psychological state. Diana's expressive lexical choices shed light on her feelings of neglect and underestimation by the Queen. By emphasizing her endurance without troubling the royal family, Diana conveys the extent of her patience. The audience can vividly imagine a bleeding and

devastated princess dealing with an uncompassionate husband and Queen. Nevertheless, her statement, *"They're annoyed by the lack of support from him,"* suggests a radical change in their attitude, indicating a shift towards compassion and consideration.

#### 4.5 Confronting, Changing & Hoping Again

Revealing the secretive dialogue between her and Camilla, Lady Diana mentions:

01:24:45,414 --> 01:25:13,525

*And she said, "I don't know what you're talking about." And I said, "I know what's going on between you and Charles and I just want you to know that." And she said to me, very interesting, she said to me, "You've got everything you've ever wanted. All the men in the world fall in love with you. You've got two beautiful children. What more would you want?" And I didn't believe what she said anyway. So I said, "I want my husband." And she said, "Well." And she looked down the whole time.*

##### First: Transitivity

<i>And she</i>	<i>said,</i>	<i>"I don't know what you're talking about."</i>	<i>And I</i>	<i>said,</i>	<i>"I know what's going on between you and Charles and I just want you to know that."</i>										
Sayer	Verbal process	Verbiage Mental process & Verbal process	Sayer	Verbal process	Verbiage										
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td><i>I</i></td> <td><i>know</i></td> <td><i>what's going on between you and C</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senser</td> <td>Mental process</td> <td>Phenomenon</td> </tr> </table>						<i>I</i>	<i>know</i>	<i>what's going on between you and C</i>	Senser	Mental process	Phenomenon				
<i>I</i>	<i>know</i>	<i>what's going on between you and C</i>													
Senser	Mental process	Phenomenon													
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td><i>and I</i></td> <td><i>just want</i></td> <td><i>you to know th</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senser</td> <td>Mental process: Desiderative</td> <td>Phenomenon</td> </tr> </table>						<i>and I</i>	<i>just want</i>	<i>you to know th</i>	Senser	Mental process: Desiderative	Phenomenon				
<i>and I</i>	<i>just want</i>	<i>you to know th</i>													
Senser	Mental process: Desiderative	Phenomenon													
<i>And she</i>	<i>Said</i>	<i>to me,</i>	<i>very interesting,</i>	<i>"You've got everything you've ever wanted. All the men in the world fall in love with you. You've got two beautiful children. What more would you want?"</i>											
Sayer	Verbal process	Receiver	Circumstance: Manner: Quality	Verbiage											
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td><i>You</i></td> <td><i>'ve got</i></td> <td><i>everything you've ever wanted.</i></td> <td><i>All the men in the w</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carrier</td> <td>Relational process</td> <td>Attribute: Possessed</td> <td>Senser</td> </tr> </table>						<i>You</i>	<i>'ve got</i>	<i>everything you've ever wanted.</i>	<i>All the men in the w</i>	Carrier	Relational process	Attribute: Possessed	Senser		
<i>You</i>	<i>'ve got</i>	<i>everything you've ever wanted.</i>	<i>All the men in the w</i>												
Carrier	Relational process	Attribute: Possessed	Senser												
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td><i>fall in love with you.</i></td> <td><i>You</i></td> <td><i>'ve got</i></td> <td><i>two beautiful children.</i></td> <td><i>What more would you want?"</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mental process</td> <td>Carrier</td> <td>Relational process</td> <td>Attribute</td> <td>Mental process: Desiderative</td> </tr> </table>						<i>fall in love with you.</i>	<i>You</i>	<i>'ve got</i>	<i>two beautiful children.</i>	<i>What more would you want?"</i>	Mental process	Carrier	Relational process	Attribute	Mental process: Desiderative
<i>fall in love with you.</i>	<i>You</i>	<i>'ve got</i>	<i>two beautiful children.</i>	<i>What more would you want?"</i>											
Mental process	Carrier	Relational process	Attribute	Mental process: Desiderative											

Table 6: Transitivity. Confronting, Changing & Hoping Again.

<i>And I</i>	<i>didn't believe</i>	<i>what she said anyway.</i>	<i>So I</i>	<i>said,</i>	<i>"I want my husband."</i>	<i>And she</i>	<i>said,</i>	<i>"Well."</i>	<i>And she</i>	<i>looked down</i>	<i>the whole time</i>
Senser	Mental process	Phenomenon	Sayer	Verbal process	Verbiage: Mental process	Sayer	Verbal process	Verbiage	Behavior	Behavioural process	Circumstance Extent

Table 7: Transitivity. Confronting, Changing & Hoping Again.

The secret dialogue between Camilla and Lady Diana, unveiled in her documentary, comprises five Verbal processes, three attributed to Camilla and two to Lady Diana. Camilla initiates with a negated Cognitive Mental process, denying knowledge of Diana's topic. In response, Diana affirms her awareness and desire to inform Camilla, employing two Mental processes. Camilla's reply is described as "*very interesting*," incorporating two Relational processes emphasizing Diana's possessions and asking a provocative question, implying criticism. Diana concludes assertively with a Desiderative Mental process, expressing her desire for her husband. Notably, the sole Behavioural process, "*looked down*," underscores how Diana's assertiveness embarrasses Camilla.

### Second: Categories of Ideological Analysis

In this statement, Lady Diana strategically portrays Camilla Parker in a negative light, highlighting her manipulative behavior and intimidation tactics, thereby enhancing Diana's own power. Camilla's dismissive remark, "*I don't know what you're talking about*," coupled with her insinuation about Diana's possessions, skillfully paints her in a negative image. Narrating the dialogue serves as undeniable evidence (Evidentiality) of Prince Charles' infidelity, ensuring audience resentment towards both Camilla and Prince Charles, further solidifying Diana's victimization. Diana's assertive declaration, "*I want my husband*," not only demonstrates her determination but also serves as National Self-Glorification, showcasing her assertiveness despite hidden fears, thus enhancing her Positive Self-Presentation. Additionally, her observation of Camilla, "*And she looked down the whole time*," underscores Diana's power and control over her, further bolstering her Positive Self-Presentation.

### Third: Deixis and Lexical Choices

Lady Diana employs two forms of deixis when referring to Camilla: second person deixis, as in "*want you to know... between you*," and subject form, as in "*And she said... she said to me*." When referring to Prince Charles, she mentions his proper name once, "*between you and Charles*," and utilizes first person deixis in the possessive form: "*I want my husband*." The expression "*looked down the whole time*" relates to Spatial Deixis: Index of Location. Overall, this statement primarily addresses Social Deixis: Relational, illustrating Lady Diana's tense relationship with Camilla. Diana's lexical choices convey control and power, despite her hidden fear. Her assertion, "*I know what's going on between you and Charles and I just want you to know that*," demonstrates her control and intimidates Camilla. Diana's polite attitude towards

Camilla, despite her envy-inducing words, highlights her decency and politeness. Lastly, the expression "*looked down the whole time*" suggests the shame and embarrassment Diana caused Camilla due to her firm and assertive words.

## 5. Findings and implications

Regarding Transitivity, two processes are used the most: **Relational** (110) and **Material** (98). The utilization of both processes has been instrumental in shedding light on Lady Diana's identity and unveiling the surprising confessions that lie ahead. Then, **Mental** processes are utilized (89) times, **Verbal** (76), **Behavioural** (32) and finally, **Existential** is used (21) times. In conclusion, through this exploration, we have come to appreciate Lady Diana's unwavering commitment to making a difference, her resilience in the face of adversity, and her ability to connect with people on a profound level.

Lady Diana's documentary film demonstrates the utilization of nine key categories of ideological analysis. These categories shed light on the persuasive techniques employed by Lady Diana in shaping her self-presentation, framing others in a negative light, and appealing to the emotions and empathy of the audience. Lady Diana, whether consciously or unconsciously, employs these categories to convey her message, and to elicit approval and empathy from the viewers. Ultimately, utilization of the Nine Categories of Ideological Analysis as follows:

Positive Self Presentation and Negative Other Presentation: 17

Empathy: 37

Victimization: 29

Dramatization: 21

Hyperbole: 12

Illegality: 10

Examples/ Illustrations: 12

Evidentiality: 12

National Self Glorification: 25

Apparently, this study has revealed that Diana's speech in the documentary is rich with various linguistic and ideological strategies that aim at persuading the audience and presenting herself positively. Through the employment of Transitivity, Diana has been able to portray herself as a victim of her marriage to Prince Charles and the royal family, as well as a warrior fighting against the injustices and inequalities that she has witnessed around her. Additionally, the use of Modality also has allowed

Diana to express her opinions and feelings more strongly and with greater conviction.

Overall, this study emphasizes language's role in shaping discourse and public opinion. Lady Diana's documentary exemplifies how language constructs narratives, garners empathy, and portrays oneself positively while negatively portraying others. Ultimately, it demonstrates the documentary's effectiveness in employing linguistic and rhetorical strategies to persuade and gain audience approval. Critical Discourse Analysis, including Systemic Functional Grammar, van Dijk's Ideological Analysis Categories, Lexical Choices, and Deixis, are vital in revealing the speaker's ideologies, persuasive tactics, and linguistic decisions.

## **6. Declaration**

### **6.1 Funding**

The authors did not receive any support from any organization for the submitted work.

### **6.2 Competing Interests:**

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

The authors declare that they have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

### **6.3 Data Availability:**

The author confirms that all data analyzed during this study are included in this published link:

<https://www.nogoum.tv/movies/video/diana-in-her-own-words/see/>. This link includes the documentary film which includes unseen footage and intimate secrets of the late Diana, Princess of Wales. Through this link, the film can be watched with English subtitles and translation. Moreover, the researcher has accessed the script of the film through this link: <https://ihavenotv.com/diana-in-her-own-words>

### **6.4 Ethical Approval:**

This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

## Works Cited

- De Fina, A. (2003). *Identity in Narrative: A Study of Immigrant Discourse*. John Benjamins.
- Emmott, C. (2002). "Split selves" in fiction and in medical "life stories": Cognitive linguistic theory and narrative practice. In E. Semino & J. Culpeper (Eds.), *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and cognition in text analysis* (pp.153-180). John Benjamins.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman- (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Goatly, A. (2000). *Critical reading and writing: An Introductory Course book*. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3<sup>rd</sup>ed.). London: Arnold.
- Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1988). *Social Semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge.
- Levinson, S. C. (2006). Deixis. In L. R. Horn and G. Ward (Eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 97–121). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lugea, J. (2016). A Text-world Account of Temporal World-building Strategies in Spanish and English. In M. Romano & M. Porto (Eds.), *Exploring Discourse Strategies in Social and Cognitive Interaction* (pp. 245-272). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Malesevic, S. (2006). *Identity as ideology: Understanding Ethnicity and Nationalism*. New York: Palgrave.
- Mayr, A. (2008). Introduction: Power, discourse and institutions. In A. Mayr (Ed.), *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Repstad, P. (1987). *Between Proximity and Distance: Qualitative Methods in Social Sciences*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Ryen, A. (2002). *The Qualitative Interview: From Theory of Science to Fieldwork*. Bergen: Fagbokforl.
- Søndergaard, D. M. (2000). Destabilising discourse analysis: Roads into empirical research inspired by post-structuralism. In H. Haavind, (Ed.). *Gender and Interpretative Method: Methodological Possibilities in Qualitative Research*. (pp. 60-104). Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1985). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (4): *Discourse Analysis in Society*. London.- (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Sage Publications.- (1995). *Discourse semantics and ideology*.

- Discourse & Society*,6(2), (pp.243-289)-(2000). *Ideology and Discourse: A multi disciplinary approach*. London-(2001).Critical discourse analysis. In D.Tannen, D.Schiffrin, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp.352-371). Oxford: Blackwell-(2001). Multi disciplinary Critical Discourse Analysis: A plea for Diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp.95-120). London:Sage-(2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse and Society*,17(2), (pp. 360-383)-(2006). Ideology and Discourse Analysis *.Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), (pp. 115-140). [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356460111\\_References\\_Van\\_Dijk\\_2006\\_Ideology\\_and\\_discourse\\_analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356460111_References_Van_Dijk_2006_Ideology_and_discourse_analysis) 12th May 2023-(2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2005). *Introducing social semiotics*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What Critical Discourse Analysis is about: A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp.1-13). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2009). The Semiotics of Racism: A critical discourse analysis. In J. Renkema (Ed.), *Discourse Of Course* (pp.311-326). John Benjamins.