

**HARRY POTTER AND DISCRIMINATION:
A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE
WIZARDING SOCIETY IN *HARRY POTTER AND THE
DEATHLY HALLOWS BOOK***

Paula Hirvonen

Master's Thesis

English

Department of Language and Communication Studies

University of Jyväskylä

May 2021

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistis- tiedekunta yhteiskuntatieteellinen	Laitos – Department Kieli ja viestintätieteiden laitos
Tekijä – Author Paula Hirvonen	
Työn nimi – Title Harry Potter and Discrimination: a Critical Discourse Analysis of the Wizarding Society in <i>Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows</i> book	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli – English	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Toukokuu 2021 – May 2021	Sivumäärä – Number of pages: 81
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>Harry Potter -kirjasarja on valtaisa kansainvälinen ilmiö, joka kerää faneja vielä yli vuosikymmenen jälkeen sarjan viimeisen kirjan julkaisemisesta. Kirjoissa seurataan velhopoika Harryn kasvutarinaa ja käsitellään muun muassa rakkauden, kuoleman, suvaitsevaisuuden ja ystävytyden teemoja. Kirjasarja on saanut osakseen kiinnostusta myös akateemisessa maailmassa ja sarjasta onkin tehty lukuisia tutkimuksia, joiden aiheet ovat vaihdelleet identiteetin rakentumisesta velhomaailman politiikkaan. Etenkin rasismi on ollut paljon tutkittu aihe, ja kirjat ovat saaneet osakseen merkittävän määrän kritiikkiä kuvaamansa syrjivän yhteiskunnan takia ja kuinka monet taikaolennot ovat merkittävän alisteisessa roolissa velhoyhteiskunnassa.</p> <p>Tämä tutkielma on kriittinen diskurssianalyysitutkimus <i>Harry Potter ja Kuoleman varjelukset</i> -kirjasta. Tutkimuksessa keskitytään siihen, millaista diskriminaatiota velhoyhteiskunnassa esiintyy ihmisten välillä ja miten diskriminaatio rakentuu kirjassa. Analyysimetodin tutkimuksessa hyödynnetään Fairclough'n (2015) kriittisen diskurssianalyysin kolmiulotteista mallia sekä Huckin'n (1997) analyysityökaluja. Kolmiulotteinen malli analysoi diskursseja kolmelta eri tasolta: teksti, diskursiiviset käytännöt ja sosiaaliset käytännöt.</p> <p>Tämä tutkimus paljastaa, että diskriminaatiota esiintyy kirjassa usein ja se on monipuolista. Diskriminaatiota esiintyi kirjassa avoimesti sekä epäsuorasti. Kirjassa esiintynyttä diskriminaatiota jäseneltiin van Dijk'n (1984) erittelemien seitsemän diskriminaatiotyypin mukaisesti havainnollistamaan millaista diskriminaatiota kirjan yhteiskunnassa esiintyy. Näitä olivat dominanssi, differentiointi, etäisyys, diffuusio, harhauttaminen, depersonalisaatio/tuhoaminen ja päivittäinen syrjintä. Diskriminaatio rakentui monin eri tavoin: sitä ilmeni eniten ihmisten välisissä keskusteluissa, mutta myös painotuohteissa sekä visuaalisena representaationa. Tutkimustulokset ovat yhtenäisiä tutkimuskentän aiempien tutkimusten kanssa: kirjassa esiintyy merkittävä määrä diskriminaatiota ja kirja epäonnistuu diskriminoivien käytänteiden ja ajatusmallien tuomitsemisessa.</p>	
Avainsanat – Keywords: critical discourse analysis, Harry Potter, discrimination	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository:	
Muita tietoja – Additional information:	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	4
2	BACKGROUND	8
	2.1 Discourse	8
	2.2 Critical discourse analysis.....	10
	2.3 Methods and approaches.....	14
	2.4 Previous studies using Fairclough’s three-dimensional model.....	17
	2.5 Previous studies on Harry Potter.....	19
3	CONTEXT OF THE DATA	30
	3.1 The history of discrimination in the wizarding society.....	30
	3.2 Blood Statutes.....	32
4	DATA AND METHODS	36
5	ANALYSIS.....	40
	5.1 The first dimension: text.....	41
	5.1.1 Dominance	41
	5.1.2 Differentiation.....	46
	5.1.3 Distance.....	48
	5.1.4 Diffusion	51
	5.1.5 Diversion.....	56
	5.1.6 Depersonalisation / Destruction	57
	5.1.7 Daily Discrimination.....	60
	5.2 The second dimension: discursive practice.....	64
	5.3 The third dimension: social practice	69
6	CONCLUSION.....	75
	REFERENCES.....	81

1 INTRODUCTION

J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter is a worldwide phenomenon that still draws fans and interest even though the last book of the original book series, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*, was released over a decade ago in 2007. Harry Potter book series includes seven books and they have been directed into eight blockbuster films. The franchise has also published couple more cannon books: *Quidditch Through the Ages* that tells the history of the popular wizarding sport Quidditch, *Tales of the Beedle the Bard*, which is a wizarding children's story collection, *the Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them* which is a school handbook of magical creatures, and *the Cursed Child* stage play script. The franchise is still blooming, and the current big thing is *the Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them* film series that has now released the first two films and the series will be extended with three more films. The films are loosely based on the title book and the adventures of the book's author Newt Scamander.

The magnitude of the success of the original Harry Potter series is evident in numbers: seven books have sold 500 million copies being the best-selling book series of all time and the eight films based on the original book series grossed \$7.7 billion making it third highest-grossing film franchise of all time. The series has devoted fans and for example fan-run website mugglenet.com is still popular and active and the series is a popular topic for fanfiction: in fanfiction.net Harry Potter is the most popular topic with over 826 000 fanfictions.

As Harry Potter has been introduced to public already in 1990s, it can be assumed that most people are fairly familiar with the basics of the story: a young boy Harry Potter finds out he is a wizard and starts his journey to learn magic in Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry and to fight back evil forces of dark magic. Throughout the series Harry faces dangerous adventures and learns new things about magic and life and grows from a small boy to a man and a hero who saves the wizarding world from the evil tyrant Voldemort. Voldemort is the main villain of the series and his aim is to rule the wizarding world, subjugate Muggles and remove Muggle-borns from the wizarding world. The essential themes in the books are death, love, and tolerance that are constantly present in all the books. The wizarding society lives along with the non-magical world, the Muggle world as the wizards call it, hidden from the view but being still part of the 'normal' world too. J.K. Rowling's wizarding world is, in many senses, reflecting today's real world: the political climate is unstable, there is corruption and both casual and overt racism against other races exists.

The book series starts when Harry is only 11 years old. Voldemort murdered Harry's parents when he was a baby and Harry has never known anything about the wizarding world as he has lived with his Muggle relatives, who tried to deny the existence of magic. After Harry learns that he is a wizard and the wizarding world exists, he starts to learn its customs and beliefs and is quickly integrated into this new world and starts developing his identity as a wizard. From the onset, Harry faces the fact that wizarding world is divided, and that racism and discrimination are evident in the society: the wizarding society is divided by the blood purity debate and magical creatures are treated as inferiors and subjugated.

In the seventh book, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* (from here on I will refer to Harry Potter books with abbreviated names, such as *Deathly Hallows*), Harry is already of age. He has faced adventures, evil, and sorrow that have forced him to grow up fast and face harsh world from early onset. 17-year-old Harry is the hero and only saviour of the wizarding world and the future of whole Britain lays on his shoulders. The series has grown from a children's story to dark and serious novel of prejudice and hate. The wizarding world has entered a full-scale civil war with Voldemort and his devoted servants, Death Eaters, trying to take over the wizarding world and Harry with his friends are trying to stop him. Discrimination and pure blood supremacy have become overt, and it is constantly present.

Harry Potter books have also received interest in the world of academia. Many critical essay collections on Harry Potter books have been published throughout the years including essays

that study wide range of subjects from identity construction and racism to feminist studies and similarities between the real world and the magical world of Harry Potter (see Anatol, 2003 & 2009 and Reagin 2011). Discrimination and racism against magical creatures such as centaurs and house-elves has been a major topic of Harry Potter studies (see Rana, 2009 and Trosclair, 2011). Studies on the discrimination between humans has not been studied exhaustively and therefore I have chosen to focus on the discrimination that manifests in the wizarding society between humans, in order to fill this gap in the research field. I will present more Harry Potter studies in the chapter 2.5.

Discrimination is also an essential theme in critical discourse analysis. A separate branch from discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis is focused on issues of language and power, such as imbalance of power structures in discourses and in what ways these discourses shape the prevailing policies and society (Van Dijk, 2015). In the present study, I aim to construct a critical discourse analysis of the wizarding society in *Deathly Hallows* and study how discrimination is constructed in the book and what types of discrimination can be detected. The purpose of the present study is to critically examine the remarkably popular piece of literature and provide an explanation of the discrimination it presents and illustrate how literature is a valid field for critical discourse analysis. The recent general discussion of racism and discrimination and J. K. Rowling's controversial statements about trans-rights prove that there is a need for thorough critical evaluation of the magical world she has created and how discrimination is produced in the book series that is still exceedingly popular.

The method of analysis in the present study is Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model and Huckin's (1997) tools of analysis are used to support the analysis. The analysis is categorised according to van Dijk's (1984) 7 Ds of discrimination. The data of the present study is *Deathly Hallows* novel. As it is the last book of the series, the context of the data is explained in more detail in chapter 3 to further elucidate the analysis. I chose to focus only on the last book to narrow down the data from the whole series because the final book culminates the series and it would have been too excessive to analyse all seven books for the present study.

The present study is constructed in the following structure: first I will provide the theoretical background of the present study including discourse, critical discourse analysis, and previous studies on critical discourse analysis studies that also use Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model and previous studies on Harry Potter that align with my topic. Secondly, I will introduce the wizarding world of Harry Potter series more closely by explaining relevant

history and structure of the wizarding society in order to present context for the data and analysis. Then I will introduce the data of the present research, and explain how I collected it, and what methods I will use to analyse the data. After that I will analyse the data in chapter 5, and finally present conclusions of the current study in chapter 6.

2 BACKGROUND

In this section, I will go through the theoretical background of the present study starting from defining discourse and then proceeding to critical discourse analysis and presenting different methods of analysis of the field. Finally, I will go through a selection of critical discourse studies that have utilised the same method of analysis as the present study and see how Harry Potter has been greeted in the academic world and present previous studies that align with my topic.

2.1 Discourse

Discourse is a wide concept that has multiple definitions, and it is used in several fields, but it is often described as being “language use beyond the sentence” (Yule, 2014: 140). The dictionary definitions of discourse differ significantly from the definitions of researchers of academic fields; the dictionary definitions tend to treat discourse in a more constricted sense than academics (Mills, 2004). The examples of Collins Concise English Dictionary’s (1988) and Longman Dictionary of the English Language’s (1984) definitions indicate that the general usage of discourse is mainly pointing to some sort of formal conversation and holding forth discussion on a specific subject (Mills, 2004: 1–2).

Mills (2004: 3) points out that within different research fields, the theoretical range of meaning is significantly broader as the term discourse holds different meaning in different disciplines, for example “advertising discourse” in linguistics refers to different thing than “racist discourse” in psychology. The definition of discourse also varies within disciplines as different researchers are defining and using the term in their own words. Mills (2004: 5–6) also claims that it is not possible to narrow down the definition of discourse to just one meaning because of the complex history and the significant number of different ways in which many theorists, or in some cases even by the same theorist, use the term. As an example, Mills presents the various definitions by Michel Foucault:

“Instead of gradually reducing the rather fluctuating meaning of the word ‘discourse’, I believe I have in fact added to its meanings: treating it sometimes as the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements.”

(Foucault, 1972: 80, cited in Mills, 2004: 6)

The first definition is the widest one, as it includes every utterance or text that have some meaning, making ‘discourse’ a general umbrella term. Mills (2004: 6) states that the second definition is concerned with being able to identify different discourses, that are groups of utterances that share regulating similarities and are coherent. This enables things such as a discourse of femininity and a discourse of imperialism etc. Mills continues by arguing that the third definition has most resemblance to other theorists’ definitions of discourse, and that the definition refers to the rules and structures that produce specific utterance and text, rather than focusing on themselves.

As stated above, the definition of discourse varies from discipline to other. In the field of linguistics, some scholars see ‘discourse’ as being concerned with language use, while some consider ‘discourse’ as being connected with the analysis of the text above the sentence level and that discourse is an extended unit of language that has some kind of internal organisation, coherence, or cohesion, and for other linguistics the term ‘discourse’ is inseparable and defined by the context surrounding it (Mills, 2004: 8).

Social psychology and critical discourse analysis have also their own various definitions, though all of them include meanings originating from linguistics, and cultural theories (Mills, 2004). Mills states that social psychology and critical discourse analysis both integrate the notion of power relations and it manifests in utterances that enforce discrimination such as racism and sexism, but whereas social psychology derives its methodology from discourse analysis and conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis utilises features from linguistics, and cultural theory enabling more complex models of functions and effects of discourses (Mills,2004:8).

Blommaert (2005: 2–4) sees discourse as language in action that makes one’s environment socially and culturally meaningful and it comprises “all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use”. Because the social nature of discourse, there cannot be “non-social” “non-historical” or “non-cultural” use of discourse as discourses are created when people experience a thing in a specific way that is defined by one’s social, historical and cultural background (Blommaert, 2005: 4).

Blommaert’s (2015) vast definition highlights the multi-dimensional nature of discourse. According to Fairclough (2015: 58), discourses indeed consist of different dimensions: *texts*, *interactions*, and *contexts*. He proposes that when considering language as discourse and as social practice, analysing text and analysing processes of production and interpretation is not enough but the analysis also has to take into consideration the relationship between texts, processes and their social conditions. These social conditions include the immediate situational context and the more remote institutional and social structures. This multi-layered structure creates the basis for three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015), which works as the method of analysis in the present study. I will introduce three-dimensional model later in chapter 2.3.

2.2 Critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis has established a stable place in the field of humanities and social sciences and its frequently used abbreviation CDA indicates that the approach is widely

accepted as a legitimate method of analysis (Breeze 2011: 493). However, van Dijk (2015: 466) insists that critical discourse analysis is, against the general misunderstanding, not a method of analysis but a whole research field with multiple cross-discipline methods of discourse studies and other related fields such as the humanities and social sciences.

Indeed, Van Dijk (2015) proposes that to avoid this confusion, the field of critical discourse analysis should rather be called critical discourse studies to highlight its multidisciplinary form and to emphasise that it is precisely a field of study and not a method of analysis. In this chapter, I will discuss critical discourse analysis as a field of study and not as a method of analysis but conform to its established spelling CDA.

The most prominent scholars in the field of critical discourse analysis are Fairclough, van Dijk, and Wodak. According to Fairclough (2015: 6–7), critical discourse analysis consists of critique of discourse and explaining how it affects the existing society and ways which the existing society could be improved. He also states that critique, explanation and call for action are all characteristic for all social sciences and not just CDA, and that it is precisely CDA that brings in the critical approach to discourses and the explanation of the relation of these discourses to society at large and other social elements such as power relations and ideologies.

Amoussou & Allagbe (2018: 12) argue that when considering critical discourse analysis, the word ‘critical’ should not be understood in the common sense of being negative or criticising. Instead, ‘critical’ should be understood as sceptical: the purpose of critical discourse analysis is to question and challenge the existing power structures and ideologies in the society and to present prevailing inequalities. Van Dijk (2015: 466), describes critical discourse analysis as “discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social-power abuse and inequality are enacted, reproduced, legitimated, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” and that the analysts aim to understand, expose, and impose change for social inequality. He also claims that critical discourse analysis may also be considered as a social movement of politically committed analysts.

Van Dijk (2015: 469) states that in the centre of most CDA studies is the notion of social power, which he defines as *control*, with which a group is able to control the acts and minds of other members of the group or other groups. Contributing factors in gaining a power base for such control are for example money, status, fame, and information. Different types of power can be

found by analysing the resources with which the power has been gained and exercised, such as rich people can gain control with their money or media with their knowledge and information.

Van Dijk (2015: 469), however points out that power is usually temporary and different situations can contribute to the power balance, for example a teacher has control over students only in the classroom, and outside school time the teacher is reduced from this power. The groups that are subjected under the control can also resist the power, accept it, or even find it 'natural', hence the group being dominated may into some extent affect the conditions they are in. Van Dijk (*ibid.*) also argues that if the inequality is embedded for example in legislation, the oppressed group has little means to resist their dominated position, and sometimes the oppression is exercised in a more subtle ways that go unchecked in everyday life such as things like cultural norms, sexism or racism.

Blommaert (2005: 1–2) proposes that critical discourse analysis should not be considered to be a discourse analysis only against power. He insists that it is the power *effects*, outcome of power and what power does to people and how it impacts them, that should also be the focus of critical discourse analysis and that it is the power's feature of differentiating, selecting, including and excluding that results in inequality which, according to Blommaert, is the deepest effect of power. He also claims that by analysing power and its effects and what it results in, we are also analysing the conditions of power, that is how power regimes are organised in societies. In Blommaert's (2005: 4) view, critical discourse analysis on contemporary societies is essentially analysis of *voice*, which he defines as being the way people make themselves understood or fail to do so, and that in order to do this people need to utilise the discursive means that they have within the context.

According to Breeze (2011: 495), general understanding is that critical discourse analysis can be seen to contain two elements: political ideology and power relations in society, and how language contributes and manifests in them. What critical discourse analysis is can be summarised as being a critique of society that starts with a critique on discourses within the society. Critical discourse analysts have emphasised the distinction between CDA and other 'non-critical' linguists or discourse analysts by arguing that CDA takes analysing further than just describing and interpreting to explaining more elaborately how and why language shapes existing society and what are the forces behind this (Fairclough 1989, cited in Breeze, 201: 497).

According to Amoussou & Allagbe (2018: 12–13), there are common assumptions, aims and definitions that a theory must meet in order to be considered as part of critical discourse analysis. These are, for example, being problem- or issue oriented, being inter- or multidisciplinary, focusing on power, inequality, or ideologies, aiming to uncover, reveal or disclose underlying ideologies, and trying to form proposals for how to fight injustice. These criteria are based on Fairclough & Wodak's (1997) eight basic principles or tenets of CDA: 1) addresses social problems, 2) power relations are discursive, 3) discourse constitutes society and culture, 4) discourse does ideological work, 5) discourse is historical, 6) the link between text and society is mediated, 7) discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory, 8) discourse is a form of social action.

The present study lands within these frames that Amoussou & Allagbe (2018) and Fairclough & Wodak (1997) have determined. This study is multidisciplinary and problem oriented as it combines critical discourse analysis with literature and aims to uncover underlying ideologies and address social problems by examining how discrimination is present in the wizarding society and how power relations are present within the society. I will include explanations of the society and history in order to connect the discourses into a boarder social context of the wizarding society and further reason my findings.

Even though critical discourse analysis has established a permanent role among academia, it has also gained significant criticism. In her article, while summarising the critics that CDA has gained, Breeze (2011: 494) states that the criticism has focused on how CDA researchers have been unable to create a reproducible method of analysis that could be utilised in different studies, and how CDA researchers have been unable to establish an objective standpoint which disables deterministic assumptions and findings. She also states that this has led to accusing critical discourse analysts of randomness deriving from researchers' personal motivations rather than from purely academic principles, and that CDA's foundations are not as robust as its practitioners believe it to be. According to Breeze (*ibid.*), another argument has been that some CDA practitioners choose to focus on just one feature or aspect, such as the use of passives, and derive assumptions and conclusions out of these ignoring the rest of the text or societal context that could ultimately contradict these findings, which leads to biased research that is affected by the researcher's own purposes, political stance, and agenda.

In the present study, I intend to avoid this biased randomness by using an established method of analysis and analyse the data in diverse ways focusing on several linguistic features and

observing how these features affect and are affected by the social context. I will also provide context for the data in chapter 3 so that my conclusions are further reasoned with evidence.

2.3 Methods and approaches

Even though critical discourse analysis has been criticised for its lack of methods of analysis, there are some established methods of analyses that can be reproduced in critical discourse analysis studies. In this chapter, I will present some of the most prominent CDA researchers, Wodak, van Dijk, and Fairclough and the methods of analysis they have produced, and what methods I will use in the present study.

Discourse-Historical Approach by Wodak approaches discourse essentially as a form of social practice. “‘Discourse’ is understood as a complex of interrelated context-dependent semiotic acts (in the sense of semiotic tokens) that are situated within specific fields of social actions and belong to conventionalized genres and subgenres (in the sense of semiotic types)” (Wodak & Reisigl 2015: 583). Discourses are not stationary; a discourse of a specific topic may start in a specific field and then evolve into other fields, and discourses can cross specific fields, overlap, and be otherwise linked to other discourses (ibid.). In Discourse-Historical Approach, a central concept is context which includes features such as the immediate language, the intertextuality and interdiscursivity, the language-external social variables, and institutional frames, and the broader socio-political and historical context (Wodak & Reisigl, 2015.).

There are several features that can be recognised in discrimination of racialised people which all feature positive self-presentation and negative ‘other’-presentation: 1) nomination strategies, 2) predicational strategies, 3) argumentation strategies 4) perspectivation, framing or discourse representation 5) intensifying strategies and mitigation strategies (Wodak & Reisigl, 2015:585). Nomination strategies are used to construct and represent social actors: ingroups and outgroups can be formed and enforced via membership categorisation devices such as referencing by tropes, metaphors, and metonymy. Predicational strategies can be identified as stereotypical attributions of positive and negative features of implicit or explicit predicates. Argumentation strategies can be used to legitimise positive and negative

characteristics and to justify racist discrimination of racialised Others. Perspectivation, framing and discourse representation are used when a person expresses their involvement and point of view in a discourse. Last, intensifying and mitigation strategies can “both qualify and modify the illocutionary force of racist, antisemitic, nationalist, sexist, or ethicist utterances” (ibid.).

Socio-Cognitive Approach by van Dijk (2008) perceives discourse as a form of social practice. Van Dijk (2015: 468–469) identifies two levels of analysis: macro and micro. The micro level consists of language use, discourse, verbal interaction and communication, and the macro level refers to power, dominance, and inequality between social groups. He also provides several points that are helpful when analysing the societal macro-micro gap; member-groups (using discourse as a member of a specific group), action-process (an individual’s social acts are part of social groups’ actions, such as the reproduction of racism), context-social structure, and personal and social cognition (such as memories, knowledge, and opinions of an individual and a group as a whole that influence the used discourses).

Van Dijk (1984: 40) also distinguishes “the 7 Ds of discrimination” that are used to rationalise prejudice: dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion, depersonalisation/ destruction, and daily discrimination. By dominance, he refers to maintaining power imbalance between the discriminators and discriminated people and keeping the discriminated ones under control. Differentiation refers to different treatment between groups as an act to discriminate the subordinated group. Van Dijk sees the act of differentiating as “a social act of function related to the cognitive function of seeing them differently” (ibid.). The third D, distance, refers to maintaining physical distance between the discriminators and discriminated group, for example by refusing immigrants moving to a country or a neighbourhood, or even by keeping them out of family e.g., through marriage. Diffusion refers to spreading beliefs and prejudices about the discriminated group, for example, through prejudiced talk. Diversion can be manifested by directing the blame of social or economic problems to the discriminated group. Depersonalisation and destruction refer to treating the discriminated group as inferior and hurting or destroying them. Daily discrimination is combining these other discriminating features to small everyday activities and discriminating in small, undetectable manners.

Van Dijk (1984) also differentiates two forms of racist discourses; the first form is often seen as “everyday racism” and it can be both explicit and subtle. It is targeted at ethnically different group by dominant group who verbally interact with the dominated ones, and it involves all

levels of language. The second form of racism is about the dominated group, but it occurs in the communication between the dominant group members. This is the type that may appear in informal everyday communication and in “elite discourse” such as parliamentary debates, news reports, entertainment media, and laws, and it emphasises the differences of the ‘us’ and ‘other’ by favouring the in-groups over outsiders. Furthermore, van Dijk (1984) distinguishes three main topic types in racist discourses: 1) the topics that emphasise the difference of the oppressed group, hence distancing the ‘Others’ from the we-group 2) the topics that emphasise the we-group’s norms and rules breaking behaviour of the ‘Others’, and 3) the topics that refer to the ‘Others’ as a threat to the we-group.

Fairclough (2015) derives his three-dimensional model of critical discourse analysis that can be used as a method of analysis in CDA studies from his three stages of discourse: text, interaction, and context. The first dimension is the linguistic description where text and its formal properties are analysed. The second dimension is the interpretation that is concerned with the relationship of the texts and interaction. In this stage, both the process of production and the process of consuming need to be considered. The third dimension is the explanation of the relationship between interaction and social context; the context is formed by social conditions of interpretation and social conditions of production.

Three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015) is the method of analysis of the present study alongside Huckin’s (1997) tools of analysis, which I will present in chapter 4. I will use Fairclough’s method in the present study to analyse the different dimensions of discourses that are present in the data. The focus of my analysis is the text produced within the wizarding society, how it is produced and consumed by the members of the society, and how these discourses affect the wizarding society at large, i.e., my focus will be the events within the book and I will rule out the text production of J.K. Rowling and consumption of the readers and the social context of the real world where Rowling and the readers exist. I will also use van Dijk’s (1984) 7 Ds of discrimination in order to categorise the data according to what type of discrimination the text examples represent.

2.4 Previous studies using Fairclough's three-dimensional model

In this chapter, I will present previous studies using Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model. As previously stated, critical discourse analysis focuses on critique of discourses and their relations to existing societies and other social features such as power relations and ideologies. Three-dimensional model can be utilised to analyse different types of texts, and the texts can also include visuals such as advertising pictures and video.

Anttila (2019) has utilised three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015) in her study of women's role and their activism in the fight against the terrorist group Boko Haram. In her study, Anttila studies what type of vocabulary is used to describe women's role and their activism as well as how power relations, hegemony and ideology are present in discursive practices. The data of the study consists of newspaper articles of two prominent Nigerian newspapers and statements from women-led #BringBackOurGirls movement. Anttila concludes that the discourse produced by the mainstream media was reproducing the patriarchal ideology that prevails in Nigeria, and that the discourse produced by women activists was more counter-hegemonic, but both discourses divided women's role into victimhood, agency, relation roles and symbolic roles, whereas the representation women's activism was divided into three categories of awareness-raising, formal advocacy and peace-building, and negative influencing.

Eirtola (2014) has utilised Fairclough's three-dimensional model in her study of representations of aboriginal Australians in newspapers *The Australian* and *The Sydney Morning Herald*. She studies how Aboriginals are represented in news texts, when they are considered newsworthy, what lexical and grammatical choices are used and how they affect the representation is affected and constructed, and whose voice can be heard in the texts, and to what extent Aboriginals represent themselves. Eirtola (2014) concludes that Aboriginal people are considered newsworthy in mainly four circumstances: 1) when "social and other problems" occur in the communities, including for example alcohol abuse and violence and school absence, making the communities look violent, poor, and uneducated, 2) when Aborigines are seen as "the underdog and receiving help and support", including questions

such as funding, living standards and health care, and problems that are connected to their unequal social status, presenting them as struggling and problem-ridden communities, 3) when Aborigines are “causing or being problems to others”, including issues such as ethnic conflicts, heritage issues, and environmental protest, presenting Aborigines as a nuisance and a burden because their traditions inconveniences other Australians, and 4) when Aborigines are “showing progress and catching up with the rest”, including news of, for example, educational achievements, or the success of Aboriginal athletes, nevertheless still implying that Aboriginal people are inferior who need to catch up with the rest. However, the last category presents Aborigines in a more positive way than other categories which mainly focus on the problems.

In Eirtola’s (2014) study, the lexical and grammatical choices proved to be versatile. The lexical choices, for example, presented Aborigines both as troubled and as victims: men are often presented as threatening and violent and women and children as vulnerable and victims, and on the other hand, the whole Aboriginal community is presented as underdogs who need help. The communities are presented both causing problems and having them. They are also presented as a remote group from other Australians and this creates a distinction between “us” and “them”. Eirtola (2014) concludes that Aborigines are represented mostly by prestigious Aborigines and the common Aboriginal people are used as a source the least, although this is rather typical feature for news discourse as elite people are favoured as sources.

These two studies study minority groups of women and Aborigines and their representation and how the prevailing power relations in their social contexts affect and are affected by the discourses present in the texts, and present how three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015) can be used to analyse these different features of representation. Anttila’s (2019) and Eirtola’s (2014) studies also represent the more common type of studies conducted with the model: they both use news articles as their data, which is typical for studies conducted with this method.

Three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015) is still rather uncommon method of analysis in literature studies. Moghadam & Kolahi (2015) however use three-dimensional model to analyse Persian translation of *Slaughterhouse-five* by Kurt Vonnegut. Their study combines qualitative and quantitative research by conducting a qualitative comparison of the original text and its translation using Fairclough’s (2015) three-dimensional model and quantitative analysis of percentages and frequencies of discursive elements and statistical data about text manipulation. Alongside the three dimensions that Fairclough (2015) provides in his model, the study also includes lexicalisation, pattern of transitivity, active and passive voice,

nominalisation, mode, modality, thematic structure, information focus, cohesive devices. The results of the study indicated that translator's conscious manipulation of the text occurs most frequently in lexical choices and a significant number of grammatical deviations are done unconsciously.

Another literature study that utilises three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015) is conducted by Bezar, Azhar & Akhter (2018). They provide an example of how the method can be utilised to analyse poems. Their study focuses on discourses of "*Ah! Sun-flower*" by William Blake, and how description and interpretation levels lead towards explanation of the poem, and how the discourses present in the poem "reflect authoritative ideology, social structures and unequal power relations of Blake's contemporary England (Bezar et al., 2018: 60). The description and interpretation of the poem includes lexical, grammatical, phonological and graphological features, and the last dimension provides an explanation of the relationships between the poem as a text and its discursive practice and Blake's contemporary social environment. The study proposes that the authority of the church is present in the poem and industrial revolution has influenced the nature of Blake's poetry making it darker, although these conclusions were not solely derived on the basis of "*Ah! Sun-flower*" poem.

As I have now presented, three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015) can be used to analyse variety of different types of texts in a variety of study fields. The studies by Moghadam & Kolahi (2015) and Bezar et al. (2018) prove that three-dimensional mode is also an applicable method of analysis for literature even though it is still rather unusual method in the field. I will now proceed to introduce previous studies on Harry Potter series that align with the topic of the present study.

2.5 Previous studies on Harry Potter

Harry Potter is not only a phenomenon in popular culture: the book series has been studied in several different fields from literature to social sciences. Popular research topics have been identity construction (Rana, 2009; Grigoryan, 2013), otherness (Anatol, 2003, 2009; Baltzar, 2007; Grigoryan, 2013; Rana, 2009), gender and race issues (Horne, 2010; Trosclair, 2008), ideology (Kyrönlahti, 2001; Reagin, 2011; Trosclair, 2018), and society and politics (Hall,

2003; Lehtonen, 2003; Park, 2003; Westman, 2002). Being an extremely popular piece of literature, Harry Potters and therefore J.K. Rowling have faced considerable amount of criticism. However, significant amount of Harry Potter studies are mere critical essays and there are no mentions of specific methods of analysis that could illustrate how these studies were conducted and how these findings and claims have been reached. With the present study, I aim to add into the field of Harry Potter studies a methodologically executed critical discourse analysis study and see whether the findings of the present study are comparable with the findings of previously conducted critical essays.

Racism and discrimination have been widely discussed issue in the book series and they have raised several studies with conclusions on both sides: whether the books are racist and harmful, and whether the books discuss the racial issues in a constructive way highlighting the problems in our modern society (Anatol 2003, 2009; Carey, 2009). Rowling has faced criticism especially about race and discrimination issues and how the wizarding world is politically constructed; these critics have claimed that the books are full of racism and bigotry that goes unchecked and unchallenged and Rowling's efforts to address these issues are merely weak (Anatol 2003, 2009; Rana 2009).

In her book 'Creating Magical World', Rana (2009) discusses otherness and identity construction in Harry Potter novels. She sees that the process of othering and the juxtaposition of 'us' and 'Others' is significant factor in building Harry's identity as a courageous and brave wizard throughout the book. Rana (ibid.) raises the issue of othering through examples of the evil Other, the subhuman Other, the uncivilised Other, the exotic Other, the conventional Other, the real-life Other and females as Others by giving examples of characters that are being othered and are facing discrimination and racism because of being othered.

Rana (2009) has placed house-elves under the label of the subhuman Other. In Harry Potter books, house-elves are small, human-like magical creatures that are bound serve wizarding families their whole lives. The family that the house-elf serves owns the elf and the elf can gain freedom only through receiving a piece of clothing from their master, but this is considered to be shameful for the elf even among house-elves. The slavery of house-elves is discussed in the book series itself and it has raised a significant amount of criticism (see Anatol, 2009; Carey, 2009; Horne, 2010). Rana (2009) argues that the process of othering house-elves includes demeaning them as of less intelligence, being incapable of living alone and their 'natural' tendency to serve humans. She claims that "If the novels actually opposed the house-elves'

enslavement, the characterisation of the elves would, at least in some cases, have to contradict some of these prejudices. It does not [...]" (Rana, 2009: 43). She provides several examples of wizarding cruelty or ignorance considering house-elves highlighting the injustice society system oppressing the house-elves, for example, a house-elf called Winky got sacked because she was found in a crime scene, and Dobby the house-elf who has to physically punish himself every time he says something bad about his family, and Harry's best friend Ron claiming that house-elves like being enslaved.

According to Rana (2009: 54), "the exotic Other is one to which we can feel superior but which we also admire because we perceive (or construct) it as interesting and intriguing". As an example of the exotic Other, Rana introduces the problematic relationship between centaurs and humans. Centaurs are half-human and half-horse, and it is easy for wizards to other centaurs by dehumanising them and considering them as sub-humans as they are only part humans. Rana argues that centaurs are seen as mythical and noble but at the same time also dangerous, wild, and inferior other that the wizards are justified to rule. What makes this further problematic is that centaurs (like goblins) have their own brand of magic and they do not recognise the wizarding superiority. Rana (2009) labels Muggles (non-magical people) and Squibs (non-magical person born in a wizarding family) as the conventional Other. She argues that even though discrimination of Muggle-born (offspring of non-magical parents) wizards and witches is strongly condemned, discrimination of the non-magical Other is not condemned. After Harry has integrated to the wizarding world, the non-magical world where Harry was raised becomes the Other and everything that belongs in it. Rana (2009: 59) argues that "Both the Muggles and the Squibs presented in the novels are morally and intellectually inferior to the wizards" and agrees with Mendlesohn who she cites that Muggles in particular are treated in ways that "range from contempt to at best patronizing curiosity" (Mendlesohn 2002: 177). Rana goes on arguing that only the extremist racism of Voldemort towards Muggles is condemned, and the more subtle discrimination is not questioned or remarked upon. Rana (2009: 103) claims that presenting the Others in negative light reinforces Harry's identity, and without the negative depiction of Others, Harry would be an uninteresting character. Rana's study condemns the wizarding world as a racist system where witches and wizards systematically oppress other species and ignore them, and as according to Rana, the book fails to condemn this issue, the reader is invited to identify with the wizards and accept their bigotry.

Trosclair (2018) has conducted another study on otherness in Harry Potter series. In her paper, Trosclair examines racial ideology towards magical creatures and social hierarchies within the series through Victorian era narratives. In the wizarding world, there are numerous magical creatures of which many have human-like features. The difference between humans and some magical creatures is not always self-evident, and wizards have addressed this question by creating a scale between Beings and Beasts that determines according to qualities such as magical capabilities and physical appearance (pure-blood extremists have campaigned for even Muggles to be labelled as Beasts rather than Beings due to their lack of magical abilities [Reagin, 2011]). Trosclair (2018: 4) explains that “These magical creatures are ‘Othered’ when labelled by the wizarding community as a Being or a Beast, and the creatures’ level of ‘Otherness’ depends on their bloodlines or physicality — some are half-humans, while others may have human-like characteristics”. This enables wizards to dominate rest of the magical world. In her study, Trosclair provides three main examples: Hagrid the half-giant, Firenze the centaur, and Remus Lupin the werewolf, who all taught Harry at Hogwarts.

Hagrid is the one who introduces Harry to the wizarding world with its wonders, and subsequently to the downside of it when Hagrid faces discrimination due to his giant heritage. According to Trosclair (2018) the giants are considered to belong into the Beast category because of the stereotypic of violent behaviour, and after the revelation of his half-giant heritage, Hagrid is rejected by the magical society and his status as a Being is compromised and pushed closer to a Beast. Trosclair also claims that because of Harry’s refusal to comply with the societal norms, Hagrid is able to keep his voice and express the emotional stress of being rejected from his society.

Firenze is a centaur that Harry meets in the Forbidden Forest in his first school year and who later on becomes a teacher at Hogwarts. Trosclair (2018) argues that when Firenze accepts a post at Hogwarts, he is stuck in between of not being accepted either in the wizarding world nor being anymore part of his herd. As Rana (2009) claims above, centaurs are seen as noble yet savages, but when Firenze becomes teacher, Harry and other students learn about a new social community beyond their own, the cultural differences, and the political friction between wizards and centaurs.

Remus Lupin faces systematic prejudice and racism throughout the books. There are laws within magical world designed to keep him and other werewolves purposely further away from the society in order to protect the public. According to Trosclair (2018), Remus drifts between

being a Beast or a Being, as the werewolf is considered a Beast but he as a wizard is of course a Being. Harry learns more about the unfairness of the wizarding society from Lupin; that not all werewolves are dangerous, yet they still face systematic discrimination.

Trosclair (2018: 100) claims that “These three characters become voices of difference within the magical society, and, unlike their Victorian counterparts, their voices are heard.” She also argues that Harry learning about the social differences and injustice within the magical community through the experiences of his three teachers, and questioning the social standards, creates perspective for the readers to learn about understanding and accepting social differences within their own world.

Previous studies on Harry Potter and werewolves have connected the prejudice treatment of werewolves to the one of people who have infected HIV: people express irrational fear of getting infected even from touching an inflicted patient (see Westman, 2002; Whited, 2002; Anatol, 2003). Brugger (2011) also compares the fearful treatment that werewolves face to what paedophiles face. She illustrates that even paedophiles who control their paedophilic urges face anger and revulsion if their inclination is revealed and they certainly would not be allowed to work with children, as in the case of Remus Lupin who refrains from biting of people and actively seeks help to his condition but still has to resign from his job as a teacher at Hogwarts because of the backlash from the parents after him being a werewolf has become public knowledge. According to Brugger (2011), Greyback, the other werewolf introduced in the series, on the other hand is an example of a paedophile who actively prays for young victims and pursues his predilection. His specific taste for children is also emphasised on several occasions in the book series.

In her essay, Horne (2010) also focuses on othering and race questions by discussing two traditions of antiracism education: multicultural antiracism and social justice antiracism. When discussing the previous studies and criticism that the book series has faced, she raises a valid point that when we discuss racism, different definitions of racism and antiracism impact on how we interpret a text and hence the results and findings of the analysis. According to Horne (*ibid.*), a multicultural approach to antiracism focuses on individuals and their self-growth and self-education about racism and reflecting their own prejudices and biases, whereas social justice pedagogies focus on societal, political, and economical structures and the racism embedded in them, i.e., racism does not lie only in individuals but society at large.

Horne (2010) illustrates this difference by explaining how Harry and Hermione approach the issue of house-elf enslavement. In the fourth book, Hermione discovers that the unjust treatment of house-elves occurs even in Hogwarts. Alongside her efforts to boycott the mistreatment of elves on a personal level, Hermione takes a stand against this oppression of house-elves by founding The Society for the Promotion of Elvish Welfare, abbreviated as S.P.E.W. Her approach to the issue is clearly social justice pedagogical as her attempt is to improve house-elves' status in the wizarding society. Hermione's aim is to secure house-elves wages and better working-conditions and inform the public about the unjust treatment of house-elves, and on the long run have an elf representative in the Department for the Regulation and Control of Magical Creatures in the Ministry of Magic. After she fails to attract the interest of her fellow students to the cause, she takes a more direct action by knitting clothing for the house-elves and hence freeing from their slavery. Horne (2010) argues that Hermione's efforts are presented in a humorous way and ridiculed, hence implying Rowling's critique towards social justice approach. Rowling's depiction of Hermione's societal fight and S.P.E.W. has been a target of criticism, as even the name S.P.E.W. is ridiculous and Hermione's efforts are merely laughed at by other characters and her efforts are fruitless (see Anatol, 2009; Carey, 2009)

According to Horne (2010), Harry, on the other hand, fights the issue on a more personal level. She claims that Harry learns about the house-elves and their ways, the inequity, and the oppression, and shows support for elves through his own behaviour, trying his best to treat the house-elves with kindness. He does not challenge others' mistreating of house-elves straightforwardly and keeps his thoughts to himself. Throughout the book series, Harry meets different house-elves, hears their stories, and learns about their institutional oppression. He also learns from the hard way about elves loyalty, first holding grudge for Kreacher-the house-elf and then forgiving him after learning his reasons and motivations. Horne (2010: 84) argues that Harry's personal experience is the biggest influence on his attitude towards house-elves rather than common societal beliefs. She further claims that by the end of the series Harry, and simultaneously the reader, has learned the central lesson of multicultural antiracism: kindness, respect, and sympathy. However, Rana (2009) points out that Harry treats Kreacher poorly by ordering him to do things he does not want to do, and Harry's actions are not questioned at all, even though Harry condemns other people who treat house-elves poorly.

In her essay, Reagin (2011) discusses the ideology of the Death Eaters and national socialism in Harry Potter world by scrutinising the similarities between the Nazi ideology and Hitler and the Death Eaters and Voldemort. On a cursory review, it is easy to see the similarities between the two groups as both are extremely racist groups that take over the society and aim for genocide but Reagin argues that they are not, in fact, as parallel as it seems. She argues that Grindelwald, a dark wizard preceding Voldemort's reign whose aim was to gain rule over Muggles and overthrow the Statue of Secrecy that was imposed in order to hide wizarding from Muggles, in fact resembles more Hitler than Voldemort, and that Voldemort is more motivated by his personal gain and power than societal control.

Reagin (2011) claims that even though there are significant differences between Hitler's Nazi regime and Voldemort, such as oppression of women and homosexuals which is not visible in the wizarding world, the fact remains that the Death Eater ideology of pure-blood supremacy highly resembles the Nazi ideology of antisemitism. According to the Nazi ideology, even a small amount of Jewish blood would "contaminate" the family tree: a person with 1/16 of Jewish heritage could be condemned as being a Jew, hence justifying oppressive treatment (Koonz, 2003: 171). Voldemort and Death Eaters echo the same ideology by believing that a single Muggle in the family tree would contaminate the family and the pure-blood status would be lost (Baltzar, 2007). Both ideologies support absolute pedigree, but I perceive that it seems virtually impossible for all supporters to be adequate to fulfil these standards. For example, even the leaders do not fit the standards: Voldemort himself was a half-blood since his father was a Muggle, and Hitler's physical appearance was rather far from the ideal Aryan man with his dark features and his alleged Jewish roots remain a topic of speculation to this day.

Reagin (2011) is just one of the Harry Potter scholars who have discussed the similarities between the magical world and the real world we live in. Lehtonen (2003) studies extensively the similarities between contemporary British society and J.K. Rowling's wizarding world. Lehtonen has chosen five areas she focuses on her comparison: boarding school, social classes, gender roles, ethnicity, and power and control in the two societies, and she scrutinises these areas through actions, speech, and attitudes of the characters. Lehtonen claims that even though Harry Potter books are fiction, the contemporary British society is strongly present in the story and that some level of societal criticism is recognisable in the story. Westman (2002) also discusses contemporary British culture in the novels and spectres of Thatcherism in them. She acknowledges the similarities between Margaret Thatcher's adamant style of rejecting

multiculturalism, isolationist nationalism, her dislike of unions, and amplifying police forces and Voldemort's reign but claims that it is the legacy of the two that is more similar than their actual reigns. Voldemort and Thatcher both face their downfall, but their ideology did not leave with them; in Harry Potter novels, when Voldemort has been defeated for the first time, his ideologies of social inequalities and injustice lives on with new regime of Cornelius Fudge, and Westman (2002: 307) claims that this also happened after Thatcher with John Mayor and Tony Blair.

These social inequalities and injustice are prominent from the outset of the series as the blood purity debate is present in every book. Westman (2002: 314) raises a valiant point when she compares the wizarding slur 'Mudblood' which refers to Muggle-borns and real world's highly offensive slur 'nigger': both words are highly charged and reveal the user's racist attitudes but also the attitude of the receiver as to whether the receiver accepts or challenges the use of such demeaning word. These types of loaded words create racist discourse which in turn can be used to reinforce racism within a society, for example using the n-word is highly derogatory and promotes the power imbalance within a social context. These types of language and power correlations are a common topic in the field of critical discourse analysis and therefore CDA provides a valid perspective to evaluate what power relations literature can convey.

Westman (2002) further claims that being a pure-blood refers not only to one's blood purity but also supporting the ideology of social class segregation and the supremacy of pure-bloods. I, however, disagree with this claim: there are numerous pure-blood characters in the book who are actively opposing such supremacy ideology and fight against such derogatory discourses by for example strongly condemning the use of the racist slur.

Westman (2002: 321) also compares the Quidditch World Cup riot scene in *Goblet of Fire* to football hooligans and their riots and the hooded wizards torturing the Muggle family to notorious Ku Klux Klan or the British National Party and the National Front. She compares nationalist pride to "wizarding pride"; different nations gather up under the idea of being wizards rather than representatives of different nations. The wizards unite against Muggles, and the Muggle family that manages the campsite where the scene occurs are attacked by the Death Eaters. Other people are rather joining and cheering to the Death Eaters than standing against them and protecting the Muggles provides an example of how the underlying racism against Muggles flares up in such an uncontrollable event where individuals are hard to distinguish and hold accountable for their actions.

Westman (2002: 323) further explains the prejudices of ‘good’ people who are not necessarily supporters of pure-blood ideology but who maybe even unconsciously repeat their prejudices, such as Harry’s best friend Ron Weasley. Even though Ron is raised in a good and tolerant family, he also holds common prejudices present in the wizarding society; he sees werewolves as dangerous and contagious and giants as violent savages. Ron reveals the societal background of this commonly held prejudice of giants’ violence by reassuring Harry that “[...] they just like killing, everyone knows that” (*Goblet of Fire*: 373–374). Westman sees that house-elves are not only seen as slaves and other race, but they can also be seen as a lower societal class comparing them to the British working class. According to Westman (2002: 232), the tensions between wizards and magical creatures as well as between different blood based social classes echo the tensions between race and class in real the contemporary British politics.

Park (2003: 179) discusses the social classes in Harry Potter books and claims that J.K. Rowling’s own middle-class background is visible in the stories and that the reader learns just as much about the writer than we learn about Harry and the wizarding world. She argues that only Rowling’s own class, the middle class and therefore Harry’s class, is the only social class that is not criticised, disregarding the Dursleys. The upper class is represented by Malfoys and the working class by Hagrid and the house-elves. According to Park (2003: 184), the Malfoys’ wealth, particularly the Malfoy Manor and conspicuous consumption, attitudes towards the importance of blood purity, poverty and labour, and even physical looks point to the fact that they belong to the upper class of the society. She also argues that Rowling reveals her resentment towards the upper class by exhibiting her upper-class characters, e.g., the Malfoys, as cruel and untrustworthy. For example, Draco Malfoy tries to get Hagrid sacked and incarcerated, and with his father Lucius Malfoy in the school government harassing and threatening the other governors, is temporarily successful in his attempt.

On the other side of the class spectrum is the working class. Park (2003) claims that Rowling presents her working-class characters with imperfect English, such as Hagrid, Stan Shunpike, and the house-elves. Hagrid and the house-elves are all emotional characters who, according to Park, are presented with a purpose to humour the reader. She also cogently condemns the humorous way that the house-elves are portrayed as she finds no reason for amusement in slavery and argues that this invitation to laugh at the house-elves is a significant reason why the books fail to condemn the awful treatment of the house-elves and their slavery (Park, 2003: 185).

According to Park (2003), the middle class is unquestionably the biggest class in the wizarding world, but it is criticised the least. She claims that the most significant criticism of the middle class is expressed in the parodical Dursleys. The Dursleys are proud to be perfectly normal and present a stereotype of neighbour-spying, self-important materialists. Baltzar (2007) argues on the contrary. In her view, the wizarding world is divided only into two; the noble and the not-noble, hence there is no such thing as the British middle class in the wizarding world. Baltzar argues that this is strongly due to the absence of the working class as there appears not to be real working-class professions, excluding gamekeeper Hagrid. All the professions that are presented in the novels are traditionally perceived as middle-class professions, like the Ministry workers and Hogwarts' teachers.

Baltzar (2007) insists that in the real British society, one's profession is the factor that determines whether one belongs into the working class or the middle class, whereas in the wizarding world, it is the blood purity that defines which class one belongs in, and profession and wealth are only secondary criteria. Baltzar (2007: 59–60) further argues that blood purity single-handedly determines whether a wizard belongs to the nobility or not, and wealth is only a secondary criterion that only determines one's place within the class that one's blood purity has pointed them to be in. Hence, the wealthy pure-blood wizards, such as the Malfoys, are at the top of the wizarding society, which is evident in the novels. Baltzar (2007: 62) acknowledges that other Harry Potter scholars oppose her views but finds Park's views of wizarding world's middle class "utterly incomprehensible". Baltzar points also that Park's criticism of Rowling's idolising of the middle class and her own ideas of the class in Harry Potters are actually due to "her apparent personal dislike and contempt of the middle class".

According to Mendlesohn (2002), wealth has a very significant role in the wizarding world and claims that for example Hogwarts and the popular sport Quidditch are reserved only for the rich people. Baltzar (2007: 62) however points out quite the opposite as students are accepted solely for their magical abilities and Quidditch is available also for the poor, providing the Weasleys as an excellent example of how extremely poor family is part of both, as all members of the family have attended Hogwarts and nearly all the children play Quidditch. Baltzar also strongly opposes Park's (2003) views that the novels are against inherited wealth and at the same time despise those without money; Baltzar (2007: 63) justly points out that Harry himself has inherited his fortune from his parents and is glad to share it with Weasleys, who are poor but nevertheless good people with highest morals. Hagrid and Remus Lupin are also example

of poor yet respectable characters and the only ones disregarding the poor are the snobbish Malfoys.

Even though she makes a clear cut between nobles and not-nobles, Baltzar (2007) however also claims that the class structure of the wizarding world is much more complex than the one in the real Britain, but that the most important determinant of class is the blood purity. Unlike Park (2003), Baltzar does not include Harry in the middle class, as according to her there is no such thing in the wizarding world, and on the contrary, she argues that Harry belongs, in fact, to the wizarding nobility as he is both a pure-blood and wealthy. I, however, find this claim debatable since having a Muggle-born mother, Harry is in fact “only” a half-blood even though his father’s side of the family are all pure-bloods. Baltzar (2007: 64) further argues that “[...] Rowling obviously has in mind a society where a person’s rank is based on merit. Rowling’s intention of a class free society can be made clear with the way she depicts those who play attention to class issues in the novels: the witches and wizards who see a class division are very negatively portrayed.”

From the previous Harry Potter studies I have now presented, it is evident that critical discourse analysis provides significant perspective for the Harry Potter academia, as most of the studies address issues of power imbalances within the wizarding society. The present study will add to this number by presenting a methodologically executed CDA study of the discrimination in the wizarding society in *Deathly Hallows* and see if the findings correlate with the previous studies. Next, I will provide relevant context for the data of the present study by briefly explaining the history of discrimination in the wizarding society and how the blood status-based class system within the wizarding society is constructed.

3 CONTEXT OF THE DATA

In this chapter, I will present relevant context for the wizarding society in order for the reader to better understand the structure of the society, and to reveal how ingrained discrimination is in the society. I will go briefly through the history of discrimination in the wizarding society and briefly introduce the class society structure and the social context it brings to the analysis.

3.1 The history of discrimination in the wizarding society

As the previous studies I presented have concluded, racism is a recurring issue in the Harry Potter series. This is especially prominent in *Deathly Hallows* where the slowly built conflict of the wizarding society escalates into the Second Wizarding War. The rebirth of Voldemort and consequently the new rise of the pure-blood supremacy reinforced the underlying racist prejudices towards Muggle-borns and Muggles within the wizarding community to the verge of genocide.

However, these issues are deeply ingrained into the wizarding society and by no means a new phenomenon. The issues of pure-blood supremacy are already introduced in the very first book of the Harry Potter series when Harry meets his soon-to-be nemesis Draco Malfoy who argues

that magical education at Hogwarts should be reserved only for old wizarding families (*Philosopher's Stone*: 61). In the second book of the Harry Potter series, *Chamber of Secrets*, the severity of the issues becomes more evident when professor Binns of History of Magic tells the students a story of how Hogwarts was settled by four great witches and wizards over a thousand years ago.

One of the founders of Hogwarts, Salazar Slytherin, wanted to reserve the school only for pure-bloods and exclude students who had Muggle parents, “believing them to be untrustworthy” (*Chamber of Secrets*: 165). Slytherin was so obsessed with the idea that he went through extreme measures to ensure the education at Hogwarts would be kept within all-magic families: he hid a monster into the castle that would kill all the Muggle-born students after he himself had left the school after the other founders disagreed over the blood purity issue. This reveals that discrimination of Muggles and Muggle-borns is centuries old, and pure-blood supremacy has also previously led to extremely violent measures.

Deathly Hallows occasionally sheds light on how these old racist prejudices have prevailed throughout the century and what consequences they have had. It becomes evident that violent racism against Muggles has resurfaced again even before Voldemort's reign (*Deathly Hallows*: e.g., 291). Almost 100 years before the events of *Deathly Hallows* another Dark Wizard, Gellert Grindelwald, sought to rule over Muggles, justifying his violent and racist actions that it was “for the Muggles' own good” and that seizing control was “for the greater good” (ibid.). The aim was to overthrow the Statue of Secrecy that forced witches and wizards into hiding from Muggles' eyes, and to seize control over Muggles.

This led to conflicts and Grindelwald was ultimately captured and sentenced to prison. Notwithstanding the conflict that it had resulted in, the racist ideology of wizarding supremacy remained vital. During Voldemort's reign, the discrimination and the persecution of Muggles and Muggle-borns raised again leading to another conflict over the same issues. The discussion revolving around *The Life and Lies of Albus Dumbledore* also raises the issue of racism towards Squibs in the wizarding community, and how those attitudes have prevailed over decades, and how oppression of Squibs is still a common practise.

3.2 Blood Statutes

I find Baltzar's (2007) claims to be most similar to how I comprehend the class structure of the wizarding society: I perceive that the wizarding society's class system is prominently based on the blood purity and the segregation between the pure-bloods and the rest is distinct, and financial status is of secondary importance, merely determining status within one class.

In *Deathly Hallows*, the wizarding society is clearly divided, as the events in the book are mainly circulating around blood purity debate and how pure-blood supremacists are trying to oppress other classes. The division is most prominent between different Blood Statutes which are pure-bloods, half-bloods and Muggle-borns. This also seems to be the hierarchy within the society. There are also Muggles and Squibs, but they are regarded rather outsiders in the system as they do not possess magical powers and are therefore not vital part of the wizarding society. Werewolves do not exactly fit into this class system as they can be of any Blood Status but as their position in the wizarding society is subordinate and I will analyse some excerpts that discuss werewolves, I find it important to explain their position in the society. I will now briefly introduce different Blood Status's of the wizarding society.

A pure-blood is someone whose family and ancestors are all witches and wizards. The pure-bloods are presented as being the most prestigious class in the wizarding society, and the family trees continue through centuries. Pure-blood families are considered prestigious and in some cases the families have fortunes of so-called "old-money" that is inherited from generation to generation. In *Deathly Hallows*, most of the appearing pure-bloods are presented as evil and supporting the pure-blood supremacy ideology. However, the Blood Status of the "good" pure-bloods is not as articulately underlined. The whole class structure of the wizarding society seems to exist mainly because pure-blood supremacists want to make a statement and stand out as better people because of their ancestry.

However, maintaining a completely pure blood line proves to be difficult: "The pure-blood families are all interrelated,' [...] 'If you're only going to let your sons and daughters marry pure-bloods your choice is very limited; there are hardly any of us left.'" (*Order of the Phoenix*: 105). By removing the unfit members of the family, the rest of the family were able to continue

pretending to be fully pure-blood family. This aligns with what I already argued in chapter 2.5 considering the findings of Baltzar (2007) and Reagin (2011) about the Nazi ideology and the infeasibility of maintaining completely pure blood line. It seems practically impossible to fully uphold the ideology and tradition of pure family line as even the most fanatic supporters of the ideology have Muggle blood in their families.

A half-blood is a person who is a witch or a wizard, and their ancestry includes both magical and non-magical blood. Harry himself is a half-blood as his mother's parents were Muggles. Half-bloods are the majority class in the wizarding society as the number of pure-bloods has declined significantly. As Ron states: "Most wizards these days are half-blood anyway. If we hadn't married Muggles we'd've died out" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 127–128). This is further endorsed by the fact that even Voldemort himself is a half-blood as well as the evil Ministry official Umbridge, who both pretend to be pure-bloods and support the supremacy ideology even though they have Muggle heritage. It seems that even the pure-blood supremacists are aware of this inevitable decline of their pure blood lines as half-bloods effectively escape criticism about their Muggle relatives.

Muggle-borns are people who have magical powers but are born for Muggle parents. Muggle-borns are equal members of the wizarding society with access to magical education and job opportunities. As Muggle-borns are born into a Muggle family, they become aware of the co-existing magical world usually only aged eleven when they receive their letter of acceptance from Hogwarts and start their magical education. However, even though majority of witches and wizards accept Muggle-borns as a natural part of the wizarding world, Muggle-borns face discrimination from pure-blood supremacist who do not accept them as valid members of the wizarding society but as inferiors who should not be part of the wizarding community and should live amongst Muggles. They believe that Muggle-borns cannot acquire as good magical skills as pure-bloods and half-bloods as they have not inherited any magical skills and are introduced to the wizarding world so much later. During the book series, this has been proven to be a false belief as Hermione is a highly skilful witch, whereas Harry's classmate Neville Longbottom, a pure-blood, is struggling with even some basic spells.

As previously stated, discrimination towards Muggle-borns is visible in the series already from the start. In the second book, a racist slur "Mudblood" is introduced: Draco Malfoy calls Hermione a Mudblood and later Ron explains that it is the most insulting word to call a Muggle-born and it refers to so-called dirty and bad blood heritage (*Chamber of Secrets*: 127). Ostry

(2003: 92) and Westman (2002: 314) compare “Mudblood” to the racist n-word as it has the same cultural shock value, although the book series does not provide evidence whether the historical origins are anywhere near compatible. Mudblood term is only used by pure-blood supremacists, but after Voldemort has taken over the Ministry, Mudblood becomes more acceptable, even preferable term to refer to Muggle-borns, as even Ministry’s official publications and some of the employees use the term.

“A Squib is someone who was born into a wizarding family but hasn’t got any magic powers. Kind of opposite to Muggle-born wizards, but Squibs are quite unusual” (*Chamber of Secrets*: 159). Squibs are an oppressed class who have faced systematic discrimination in the wizarding society over the years. In *Deathly Hallows*, the problematic issue of Squibs is addressed only when debating whether Dumbledore’s sister was a Squib. In the Harry Potter series, there are only two Squibs introduced throughout the series and both of them have miniscule roles and are portrayed rather annoying: Argus Filch is an evil janitor who torments students of Hogwarts, and Harry’s neighbour Mrs. Figg is a slightly foolish cat lady. This highlights how non-existent role Squibs have in the wizarding society.

Muggles are people with no magical powers. They are unaware of the co-existing magical world, except in the cases when a member of the family is part of the wizarding community, such as Harry’s relatives the Dursleys. Muggles are rather invisible in the book series and the only remarkable characters are the Dursleys with whom Harry lives. Pure-blood supremacists are hostile towards Muggles and during Voldemort’s regime, Muggles were killed for no purpose (*Deathly Hallows*: 356). In general, Muggles seem to be treated condescendingly even by the “good” characters, such as Arthur Weasley who is rather obsessed with Muggles, and as Mendlesohn (2002) states “attitudes to the nonmagical range from contempt to at best patronizing curiosity”.

Occasionally witches and wizards try to hide their Muggle ancestry to benefit them. For example, Voldemort killed his own father and his new family after learning that he was a Muggle in order to establish his pure-blood supremacist ideology. Ministry official Umbridge pretends to be a pure-blood and related to old prestigious pure-blood families to gain more respect in the Ministry, and another ministry official, Cresswell, tried to forge his family tree to pretend he was not a Muggle-born in order to avoid interrogations considering his ancestry.

Werewolves are ordinary witches and wizards or Muggles who have been bitten by a werewolf and consequently are transformed into one. Werewolves in the Harry Potter series do not significantly differ from other werewolves in the popular culture: werewolves live rather normal human lives except during the full moon when they transform into beasts that have no human conscious and act and hunt like animals. In the Harry Potter series, only two werewolves are introduced: Remus Lupin and Fenrir Greyback. These two men live significantly different lives even though they share the same ailment and face the same discriminating regulations and racist prejudices. Lupin worked one year as a Defence against the Dark Arts teacher at Hogwarts and is a member of the anti-Voldemort alliance the Order of the Phoenix, and altogether tries to adjust to the wizarding society that nevertheless treats him as a threat, whereas Greyback is described as “perhaps, the most savage werewolf alive today” and he rather embraces the werewolf side of him as he has made his mission to inflict as many as possible (*Half-blood Prince*: 313–314).

Werewolves face substantial discrimination. People do not trust them in fear of being attacked by a werewolf and the Ministry has even passed anti-werewolf legislations that makes it virtually impossible for a werewolf to get a job (*Order of the Phoenix*: 271). After Voldemort has taken over the Ministry in *Deathly Hallows*, werewolves’ position in the wizarding society is even further compromised.

4 DATA AND METHODS

The data of the present study is J. K. Rowling's book *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. In my thesis, I chose to focus on the last book since it is concluding a seven-piece book series and the continuous plot comes to an end. The limited length of the present study is also a major factor for why I chose to analyse only one of the books and not the whole series. *Deathly Hallows'* main events circulate around issues of racism and discrimination that stem from the class structure within the wizarding society and how Harry and his friends fight against the racist regime of the main villain Voldemort.

In the present study, I conducted the following steps: first I read through *Deathly Hallows* book and conducted deductive thematic analysis. According to Braun & Clarke (2012), thematic analysis is "a method for systematically identifying, organizing, and offering insight into patterns of meaning (themes) across a data set" and deductive approach refers to top-down data coding and analysing where the researcher has a set of concepts, ideas or topics that they can use to code and analyse the data. I had already an interest in critical discourse analysis, so the critical approach to language and power relations directed my data coding from the beginning. I started coding the data by underlining excerpts that were 1) racist or revealed background information on how or why racism occurred in the wizarding society, 2) expressing politically motivated power-abusing, and 3) presenting social class structures within the wizarding community. After I had conducted the preliminary coding, I had altogether over hundred

examples of the three themes I had chosen. This reveals that literature is valid data for both deductive thematic analysis and critical discourse analysis.

While coding the data, it became evident that there was a significant amount of discrimination in *Deathly Hallows*. For example, there was altogether 36 occurrences of the highly racist slur “Mudblood” and only in six instances it was not used as an insult. I decided to narrow my focus down to discrimination between humans in order to manage the significant amount of data. I reconstructed coherent excerpts from smaller units of sentences and lexical choices that represented discrimination in order to create understandable context to the examples instead of presenting loose examples of sentences and words. This formed 14 text examples that present discrimination between humans. Then I proceeded to search similarities between the examples that presented discrimination between humans, and whether they could be labelled in some manner. I used van Dijk’s (1984) 7 D’s of discrimination as my categories as they were distinctly represented in the data.

After categorising the data, I applied Fairclough’s (2015) three-dimensional model to analyse how discrimination is constructed in the examples. I started from the text level by presenting and describing examples of how discrimination acts and attitudes were present using Huckin’s (1997) tools of analysis. Then I proceeded to the second stage of the model, discursive practises, and I interpreted how discrimination is produced and consumed in the examples. I then proceeded to explain the social practices of how discrimination affects the society.

Huckin’s (1997) tools of analysis help analysing texts by providing features that directs the focus on not just what is said but how something is said and what meaning it produces. Huckin’s tools consist of several different features and they range from text level to word level. These tools can also be utilised to analyse visual cues that do not necessarily contain text. On the larger text level, there are genre and framing that set the “tone” of the text and how the text is meant to be read. Genre includes analysing the text by determining whether it is for example a speech, an informal conversation, an advertisement, a press release or a news article, and whether it is manipulated. For example, a news article is expected to be neutral and objective, but it may be manipulated to support a specific agenda. Analysing the framing reveals for example how context of the text is presented or what is the attitude of the producer of the text. This could for example mean that one group is presented as a virtuous one and another one is presented as being bad. These two set the mindset of how the text is “supposed” to be read.

Huckin (1997) has separated several different sentence-level tools of analysis such as foregrounding and backgrounding, omission, nominalisation, presupposition, and the use of passive voice. Foregrounding and backgrounding can both be found by analysing what is emphasised or de-emphasised: what occurs first in the text is foregrounded and what is latter is backgrounded. Ultimate backgrounding, for example removing some important factor that could change the message or interpretation of the text, is called omission. Omitting the agent of a sentence is usually enabled with nominalisation where verb is transformed into a noun or with passive verbs, for example news headlines like “25 Villagers Massacred” (passive verb) or “Massacre of 25 Villagers reported” (nominalisation) can be used to foreground the victims and delete the culprits (Huckin, 1997: 83).

Presupposition is used when some ideas are taken for granted in the text, meaning that what the text claims is absolute truth and there are no alternatives. Huckin (ibid.) provides an example of a politician who states that “We cannot continue imposing high taxes on the American people”. This statement is a presupposition that the tax rates are high even though the tax rates in America are relatively low compared to other western countries. According to Huckin (ibid.) presuppositions are common in public discourse, political speech and other persuasive rhetoric.

For the interpretation of a text, Huckin (1997: 84) provides connotations and modalities as tools of analysis. Connotation are created when a certain word or phrase is used in a specific context, and they include labels, metaphors and lexicon. As an example of labels, Huckin presents the political issue of abortions in the US, claiming that it is nearly impossible to discuss the different sides in neutral terms. People who oppose abortions may call abortion opposers as “pro-life” while the opponents may call them “anti-choice”, and these labels reveal the stance of the user of the word. One of Huckin’s (1997) tools of analysis that use connotations are metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 5) have defined metaphor as “understanding and experiencing one kind of a thing in terms of another”. Modality refers to tone of the text which degree of certainty or authority can be manipulated with words such as may, might, could, will, must, or phrases like “it seems to me”, “without a doubt” or “it’s possible” (Huckin, 1997: 84). Huckin’s tools do not provide tools for an in-depth analysis of features such as grammar or syntactics or phonological elements, and therefore I will rule these features out of my analysis.

As I presented in chapter 2.5, Rowling’s social background can be interpreted to be an affecting factor on the wizarding society (Park, 2003; Baltzar, 2007). Since the books are unable to

provide inclusive evidence for the debate and the space for this research is limited, I have chosen to focus on the actual events in the book and limit the text and the social context to the ones of within the book, and consequently leaving out the debate of what tools J.K. Rowling may have used to convey her own personal views and believes and how her background effects these within the text.

My research questions in the present study are the following:

1. What types of discrimination are present in the data?
2. How is discrimination constructed in the data?

In the next chapter, I will analyse *Deathly Hallows* using Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model, proceeding from describing text examples to interpreting their discursive practices and then explaining their social practices and answer the research questions I have presented above.

5 ANALYSIS

This analysis is a critical discourse analysis of the wizarding society in *Deathly Hallows*. This analysis aims to critically scrutinise the wizarding society and answer the research questions of what types of discrimination is present in the data and how is discrimination constructed in the data. The events of *Deathly Hallows* significantly revolve around issues stemming from social problems and discrimination and therefore it is a good data example for a critical discourse analysis, even though CDA is not commonly used to analyse works of literature.

I will analyse the types of discrimination and how discrimination is constructed in *Deathly Hallows* by using Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model and applying Huckin's (1997) tools of analysis. The analysis is divided according to three-dimensional model: first text level, second discursive practice and finally social practice. In the text level, I will present example text excerpts from *Deathly Hallows* and describe their formal properties using Huckin's (1997) tools of analysis. The tools of analysis that I will use in the present analysis are genre, framing, foregrounding, backgrounding, omission, presupposition, connotations, and modality. These tools enable interpretation of how discourses are produced and what meaning they construct.

I will divide the examples according to van Dijk's (1984) 7 Ds of discrimination categories. These categories are dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion, depersonalisation/destruction, and daily discrimination. After presenting and analysing the text examples on the first dimension, I will proceed to provide an interpretation of discursive

practises of how the discourses are produced and consumed. Finally, in the third dimension, I provide an explanation of social practises i.e., in what ways this specific excerpt is relevant in the social context of the wizarding world.

5.1 The first dimension: text

The first dimension of Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model is text. In this analysis, the text dimension is *Deathly Hallows* book and I analyse the text by presenting text excerpts from *Deathly Hallows* and describe their formal properties using Huckin's (1997) tools of analysis. As Huckin's tools do not provide tools for analysing grammar, I will leave this feature out of my analysis and focus on the word choices and the meanings they convey. The examples I will provide are divided according to van Dijk's (1984) 7 Ds of discrimination: dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion, depersonalisation/destruction, and daily discrimination.

5.1.1 Dominance

According to Van Dijk (2015), power imbalances and inequity within a society are significant subjects within the field of critical discourse analysis. The first category of Van Dijk's 7 Ds of discrimination is dominance by which he refers to maintaining power imbalance between the discriminators and discriminated people and keeping the discriminated ones under control (1989: 40). In this chapter, I will examine how discrimination through dominance is constructed in the data with four example texts.

In *Deathly Hallows*, the power imbalance is most prominent between wizards and Muggles and Muggle-borns. Voldemort pursues to increase this already existing power imbalance to further his cause and the most prominent examples in the books are from the Ministry of Magic after Voldemort has taken over the Ministry and influences its policies. As a first example, I present a statue located in the Ministry of Magic.

Excerpt 1

Engraved in foot-high letters at the base of the statue were the words: MAGIC IS MIGHT. [...] Harry looked more closely and realised that what he had thought were decoratively carved thrones were actually mounds of carved humans: hundreds and hundreds of naked bodies, men, women and children, all with rather stupid, ugly faces, twisted and pressed together to support the weight of the handsomely robed wizards.

‘Muggles,’ whispered Hermione. ‘In their rightful place. [...]’
(*Deathly Hallows: 198–199*)

The statue is a visual representation of the new Ministry policies. It does not produce dominance discourse in specifically ambiguous way: it portraits wizards ruling over Muggles, and the phrase “Magic is Might” is the pretext behind this setting. The ruling over Muggles is depicted in a very physical way: wizards are literally sitting on the Muggles, who are furthermore portrayed with ugly and stupid faces.

Focusing on Huckin’s (1997) tool of analysis foregrounding, connotations and framing, the statue can be interpreted to foreground the wizards’ superiority with handsome robes but also to foreground Muggles’ inferiority by depicting them ugly and stupid and being physically submitted by the wizards and therefore creating connotations of lesser power. This foregrounding also frames wizards as a superior and as a rightful ruler. Omission is the ultimate way to background hence downplay an entity, but this statue does not remove Muggles from the wizarding world but significantly foregrounds their inferiority by placing them firmly and indisputably under wizards. The phrase “Magic is Might” is used as a motto by the new regime, and it foregrounds that the ones who obtain magical powers are inevitably more powerful and superior to those who do not poses these powers, and hence can be rightfully dominated.

This statue can also be seen to advance another D from van Dijk’s (1984) 7 Ds of discrimination: the daily discrimination. The statue is placed in the Atrium where all the Ministry employees pass every day when they come to and leave work, ergo the statue is physically present in their everyday lives. Seeing this sort of visual cue of explicit oppression of Muggles on daily basis can numb people to its message and people learn to accept it and might unconsciously start reproducing this discriminating discourse. The fact that Muggles are depicted in such a demeaning manner further reinforces the discriminating acts and attitudes towards Muggle-

borns as their Muggle heritage is deemed so negatively and the Ministry constantly parallels Muggle-borns and Muggles and blames them of being criminals.

As a second example of dominance, I present a power-abusing Ministry employee called Yaxley who is also a Death Eater. He provides examples of how corruption and intimidation work at the Ministry and how power imbalance is also present between Ministry employees and not just between wizards and Muggle-borns. He exploits his higher status in the Ministry by bullying and threatening other Ministry workers for personal benefits. In the next example, Yaxley is threatening Reginald Cattermole (impersonated by Ron) who works as a janitor in the Magical Maintenance Department in the Ministry.

Excerpt 2

‘You realise that I am on my way downstairs to interrogate your wife, Cattermole? In fact, I’m quite surprised you’re not down there holding her hand while she waits. Already given her up as a bad job, have you? Probably wise. Be sure and marry a pure-blood next time.’ [...] ‘But if my wife were accused of being a Mudblood,’ said Yaxley, ‘– not that any woman I married would ever be mistaken for such filth – and the Head of the Department of Magical Law Enforcement needed a job doing, I would make it my priority to do that job, Cattermole. [...] if my office is not completely dry within an hour your wife’s Blood Status will be in even graver doubt than it is now.’

(Deathly Hallows: 200)

This is an example of Van Dijk (1984) dominance category as it is quite evident here that Yaxley is exploiting his status as the Head of the Department of Magical Law Enforcement. He taunts Reginald Cattermole about his wife and how she is unfit wife because of her suspected Blood Status, and that Mr. Cattermole should abandon her and marry another woman who is from a pure-blood family. Different types of power status abusing are a relevant subject in the field of critical discourse analysis (Van Dijk, 2015). For example, threatening an employee of lower status, hence maintaining and enforcing the power-imbalance between the two men reinforces inequality within a workplace.

It is easy to interpret that Yaxley is highly anti-Muggle-born, as he uses the derogatory slur “Mudblood” when referring to Cattermole’s wife and refers to Muggle-borns in general as

“filth”. Foregrounding and omitting (Huckin, 1997) elucidate how Yaxley produces his racist discourse: he is foregrounding how inferior he sees people who do not have magical heritage by calling them Mudbloods and filth and not suitable for marrying. He is also omitting Mary Cattermole’s name in order to reduce her to her unfavourable Blood Status and decreasing her, and Muggle-borns’ in general, worth as a human being.

Yaxley boasts about his position in the Ministry by implying that if Cattermole does not act according to his commands, Cattermole’s wife is going to be sentenced without a fair trial. Mr. Cattermole is forced to listen to Yaxley’s hateful speech about his wife and other Muggle-borns as he is in no position to protest or to defend his wife because of the power-imbalance between the two men. Yaxley is willing to exploit his position in the Ministry to persecute people who are accused of being “Mudbloods” without considering the consequences of his actions for the families of the convicted. The profit that Yaxley gains from this is minimum but Mr. Cattermole is at high risk of losing his wife which emphasises how unequal the situation is and how Yaxley is ready to execute injustice for such a small petty thing as drying his office, which he would probably be quite capable of doing by himself. Therefore, the bigger motivation for Yaxley seems to be the enjoyment he receives when he can abuse his power and control people. This example also reflects how the Ministry enables hierarchies and power-imbances between employees and how higher-ranking officials are able and perhaps even allowed to exploit their status’ to gain small favours.

Dolores Umbridge who is a character that is introduced already in the fifth book of the series, *Order of the Phoenix*. She is described as an evil woman who enjoys power and abuses it ruthlessly, but even though in *Deathly Hallows* she willingly pushes forward Voldemort’s agenda, she is nevertheless not a straightforward Death Eater unlike Yaxley. In *Deathly Hallows*, she works as the Senior Undersecretary to the Minister for Magic and as the Head of the Muggle-born Registration Commission, which is a commission that has recently been appointed to investigate Muggle-borns and how they have come to possess magical powers, as Voldemort’s new regime claims that magical powers can only be passed on if there is magical heritage in the family.

As a third example of dominance, I present an excerpt where Harry, Ron and Hermione are visiting the Ministry and they witness a glimpse of what the interrogations of Muggle-borns are like. The next example illustrates how it is clear from the outset that these hearings are nothing but unjust trials where the defendants have no means of defending themselves and the

verdicts are reached without thorough investigation or even proper hearing of the defendants: the sentences are predetermined and there is no possibility to complain.

Excerpt 3

‘No, no, I’m half-blood, I’m half-blood, I tell you! My father was a wizard, he was, look him up, Arkie Alderton, he’s a well-known broomstick designer, look him up, I tell you – get your hands off me, get your hands off –’

‘This is your final warning,’ said Umbridge’s soft voice, magically magnified so that it sounded clearly over the man’s desperate screams. ‘If you struggle, you will be subjected to the Dementor’s kiss.’

The man’s screams subsided, but dry sobs echoed through the corridor. ‘Take him away,’ said Umbridge.

(Deathly Hallows: 212)

Before the interview of Mary Cattermole, a man is dragged out of the courtroom by two Dementors and when he tries to resist the arrest, desperately insisting that he is a half-blood and trying to provide evidence of his magical heritage, Umbridge gives him the ultimatum that if he continues to struggle, he “will be subjected to the Dementor’s kiss”. A Dementor’s kiss means that a Dementor, sort of a magical creature that drains happiness and hope out of people, sucks out a victim’s soul leaving the victim alive but soulless and senseless. This is such a terrifying threat that the man surrenders even though he is being sent to prison where more Dementors will be guarding.

A Dementor’s kiss is an unreasonably severe punishment for an alleged theft of magical powers which furthermore highlights how arbitrary and unfair these interrogations and the resulting sentences are. The man tries to argue his innocence but Umbridge refuses to receive and accept his testimony. The immediate family history should be relatively easy to verify, especially if one’s father is a well-known designer, but the Commission seems to be significantly indifferent to investigate the evidence. The fact that the man is already being dragged away from the courtroom when he is still providing evidence for his wizarding heritage is explicit evidence of how insignificant these interrogations are for the sentences and how the discourse of these interrogations is highly anti-Muggle-born and Umbridge is openly hostile towards the convicted man.

The dominance that the Ministry exercises in these trials is extreme and excerpt 3 also fits another category of van Dijk's (1984) 7 Ds of discrimination: depersonalisation/destruction. Depersonalisation and destruction refer to treating others as inferior and hurting or destroying them (van Dijk: 1984: 40), and Umbridge is ultimately dominating the man by threatening the man's life, who is in no position of defending himself even though he might be falsely convicted. More on depersonalisation/destruction in the chapter 5.1.6.

Dominance is a significant category of discrimination in *Deathly Hallows* and some of the other categories of 7 D's of discrimination and their examples feature dominance as a part of the discrimination that they construct. Dominance, ergo power imbalance, and reinforcing it is Voldemort's main medium to reach his goal of erasing Muggle-borns from the wizarding society. The issues of dominance have been regarded as problematic feature in the Harry Potter series also in the previous research. For example, the subordinate status of house-elves has previously raised significant criticism: house-elves have been compared to slaves and their treatment is described as inhumane (see Horne, 2010; Park, 2003; Rana, 2009). This analysis demonstrates that it is not only magical creatures that are dominated within the wizarding society but that there are explicit power-imbalances between wizarding people.

5.1.2 Differentiation

Differentiation refers to different treatment between groups as an act to discriminate the subordinated group and create inequality. Van Dijk (1984: 40) sees the act of differentiating as "a social act of function related to the cognitive function of seeing them differently". In this chapter, I will study differentiation discrimination with one example: the interrogation of Mary Cattermole, which follows in *Deathly Hallows* right after excerpt 3 where the man was being dragged out of the courtroom.

The Muggle-born Registration Commission that is present in the interrogations of Muggle-borns consist of only three people: Umbridge, Yaxley and Mafalda Hopkirk (who Hermione is impersonating). In the hearing, Hopkirk works as a mere stenographer, while Umbridge and Yaxley are in charge of interrogating the defendant and there are no third-party members to contradict their decision or to defend the accused Muggle-born. Umbridge and Yaxley do not

hide their own racist attitudes towards Muggle-borns and Yaxley even calls Mrs. Cattermole a Mudblood during the interview saying, “The brats of Mudbloods do not stir our sympathies” when Mary voices her anxiety for her children (*Deathly Hallows*: 213). The prosecutors’ negative attitudes towards Muggle-borns highlights the prevailing racist discourse. The following example reveals how Muggle-borns are receiving unequal differentiating treatment from the oppressing group of pure-blood supremacists.

Excerpt 4

‘A wand was taken from you upon your arrival at the Ministry today, Mrs Cattermole,’ Umbridge was saying. ‘Eight and three-quarter inches, cherry, unicorn hair core. Do you recognise that description?’ [...] ‘Could you please tell us from which witch or wizard you took that wand?’

‘T – took?’ sobbed Mrs Cattermole. ‘I didn’t t – take it from anybody. I b – bought it when I was eleven years old. It – it – it – chose me.’ [...]

‘No,’ said Umbridge, ‘no, I don’t think so, Mrs Cattermole. Wands only choose witches or wizards. You are not a witch. I have your responses to the questionnaire that was sent to you here – [...] ... indeed, there are few pure-blood families to whom I am not related ... a pity,’ she continued, in a louder voice, flicking through Mrs Cattermole’s questionnaire, ‘that the same cannot be said for you. Parents’ professions: greengrocers.’

Yaxley laughed jeeringly.

(*Deathly Hallows*: 214–215)

This example represents differentiation of the van Dijk’s (1984) 7 D’s of discrimination because Muggle-borns’ magic wands are confiscated, and they are refused the right to carry magic wands and hence are treated differently. In the wizarding society, for example house-elves and goblins are forbidden to carry a magic wand and this differentiation is reducing Muggle-borns to the level of non-humans.

Genre, framing, and presupposition (Huckin, 1997) help to examine the example: the genre is a formal legal trial and Mrs. Cattermole is framed as a criminal which creates the base on how the scene is set. It is apparent that when Umbridge asks from whom had Mary stolen the wand, she presupposes that there are no other alternative ways for her to have gained the wand as she claims that “Wands only choose witches or wizards” and that Mrs. Cattermole is not one.

The fact that Mary's parents' professions are brought up and jeered at reveals that background checks and evidence are used selectively and only to enforce the Ministry's agenda, just like the previously convicted man's testimonies were not considered as they contradicted with what Umbridge and Yaxley wanted to hear. By jeering at Mary's parents' professions, Umbridge and Yaxley imply that people working in those professions could not possibly have magical powers further implying that such job is not prudent for a witch or a wizard.

The reason why wands that have been confiscated from the defendants are not returned to their owners is that the Ministry is refusing Muggle-borns, and only Muggle-borns, the right to carry a magic wand because of the alleged thefts of magical powers. This forces Muggle-borns to give up their ability to produce spells, enabling the Ministry to further oppress them as Muggle-borns have no longer physical means to defend themselves, for example from being attacked by the guarding Dementors. This example of differentiation does not only illustrate inequality between different Blood Statuses, but it also represents the previously introduced category of dominance because of the significant power-imbalance and control that the Ministry exercises over Muggle-borns by forcing them to give up their most important channel of their magical powers. Confiscating the only weapon with which the oppressed group could defend themselves, the oppressing group reinforces their status as dominators and further weakens the oppressed groups status.

The next chapter discusses discrimination through distance, but discrimination by differentiation is also strongly present in the upcoming examples. Besides Muggle-borns, Squibs also suffer from discrimination that combines differentiation and distance.

5.1.3 Distance

Distance refers to maintaining physical distance between the discriminators and the discriminated group, for example by refusing immigrants from moving to a country or a neighbourhood, or by keeping them out of the family e.g., by forbidding children to marry immigrants (Van Dijk, 1984: 40). In *Deathly Hallows*, the most prominent way of distance discrimination are the efforts that are put into removing Muggle-borns from the wizarding

community. In this chapter, I will examine distance discrimination and present two examples of discrimination through distancing: Muggle-borns and Squibs.

The interrogations discussed in the previous chapters contribute to the distancing that occurs in *Deathly Hallows*. In the next example, Lupin explains how Voldemort's coup has affected Hogwarts and its policies.

Excerpt 5

“Attendance is now compulsory for every young witch and wizard,” he replied. “That was announced yesterday. It’s a change, because it was never obligatory before. Of course, nearly every witch and wizard in Britain has been educated at Hogwarts, but their parents had the right to teach them at home or send them abroad if they preferred. This way, Voldemort will have the whole wizarding population under his eye from a young age. And it’s also another way of weeding out Muggle-borns, because students must be given Blood Status – meaning that they have proven to the Ministry that they are of wizard descent – before they are allowed to attend.”

(*Deathly Hallows: 173*)

In this example, the distance discrimination is constructed by denying Muggle-borns access to magical education. Lupin explains that most of the young witches and wizards in Britain have been educated at Hogwarts, but home schooling has previously been an alternative option as well as other magic schools abroad but after Voldemort's coup in *Deathly Hallows*, attendance at Hogwarts has become compulsory. The Blood Status interrogations and the resulting sentences are used to remove and keep out Muggle-borns from the wizarding society. The Blood Status separations are not solely used to sentence adults to prison, but they are also mandatory for children who wish to attend Hogwarts.

The interrogations enable preventing young Muggle-borns from getting magical education and this means that the children are consequently prevented from becoming fully qualified witches and wizards. Denying the children the access to magical education is an effective way to remove young Muggle-borns from the wizarding community as they will not be allowed to integrate into it in the first place. For children who have Muggle parents, Hogwarts is the first touch to the wizarding society and the place where they learn to use magic and learn the customs of the society.

The Blood Status debate and the discrimination through distancing in *Deathly Hallows* is mainly focusing on Muggle-borns. However, they are not the only ones who are shunned away from magical education and the wizarding society. Squibs have been victims of distance discrimination evidently for over a century. In *Deathly Hallows*, the subject is discussed only briefly during speculations of Albus Dumbledore's family history. In the next example, Ron's 107-year-old aunt Muriel discusses the problematic issue of Squibs and what kind of discrimination they have faced throughout the years and what has been the prevailing attitude towards them.

Excerpt 6

‘Dumbledore’s mother was a terrifying woman, simply terrifying. Muggle-born, though I heard she pretended otherwise –’ [...] ‘– proud and very domineering, the sort of witch who would have been mortified to produce a Squib –’ [...] ‘In our day Squibs were often hushed up. [...] ‘Squibs were usually shipped off to Muggle schools and encouraged to integrate into the Muggle community ... much kinder than trying to find them a place in the wizarding world, where they must always be second class; but naturally Kendra Dumbledore wouldn’t have dreamed of letting her daughter go to a Muggle school –’
(*Deathly Hallows: 129–130*)

This example explains explicitly how Squibs have been discriminated through distancing. Muriel describes how Squibs have been denied the access to magical education and pressured to leave the wizarding community altogether and to integrate into the Muggle community. “Shipped off” is also a phrase that resonates boarding schools which further emphasises the distancing as Squib children are secluded from their wizarding families. The general attitude towards Squibs seems to have been highly discriminating: as Muriel states, Squibs were treated as second class citizens in the wizarding community because of their lack of magic powers and they were encouraged to live their lives as Muggles. She even implies that having a Squib child could have been deemed mortifying. This, and the fact that “Squibs were often hushed up” and that Kendra allegedly would not have her daughter attend a Muggle school, implies that being a Squib or having one in the family was considered shameful and something to be hidden from public. Muriel also claims that Kendra was ashamed of being a Muggle-born which further

explains why she could have been ashamed to have a Squib child: she could have blamed herself of having not enough magic in her to pass it on to her daughter.

As the two examples are rather similar situations, both of these previous examples also represent the discrimination category of differentiation. The rather obvious reason is that both Squibs and Muggle-borns are treated differently by the discriminating group: Squibs are discriminated because of their lack of magical powers and Muggle-borns because of their lack of magical heritage. Both discriminated groups are sought to be excluded from the wizarding community by treating them as inferiors and denying them access to education.

The difference between the two cases is that the discrimination against Squibs is apparently widely accepted in the wizarding world as it does not raise any objections even when Muggle-born-rights are advocated and hence is also an example of daily discrimination that goes without questioning it, whereas on the contrary the discrimination towards Muggle-borns in *Deathly Hallows* is machinated by Voldemort and pure-blood supremacists and it is deemed reprehensible by the common people.

5.1.4 Diffusion

Diffusion refers to spreading beliefs and prejudices about the discriminated group, for example, through prejudiced talk (Van Dijk, 1984: 40). In *Deathly Hallows*, Muggle-borns are the main group that face discrimination through diffusion of false beliefs and prejudiced talk. A significant amount of the prejudiced talk and false information considering Muggle-borns is machinated by Voldemort and the Ministry of Magic under his command. In this chapter, I present three example excerpts and study how they represent diffusion and how the discrimination is constructed.

After plotting his revolution at the beginning of *Deathly Hallows*, Voldemort's success starts to become visible rather fast. The Ministry, and hence Voldemort after he has seized the power, has a strong grip of the most prominent news media the *Daily Prophet* and this is evident from a news article that Hermione reads after Voldemort has taken over the Ministry of Magic:

Excerpt 7

“Muggle-born Register”, she read aloud. *“The Ministry of Magic is undertaking a survey of so-called ‘Muggle-borns’, the better to understand how they came to possess magical secrets. “Recent research undertaken by the Department of Mysteries reveals that magic can only be passed from person to person when wizards reproduce. Where no proven wizarding ancestry exists, therefore, the so-called Muggle-born is likely to have obtained magical power by theft or force.*

“The Ministry is determined to root out such usurpers of magical power, and to this end has issued an invitation to every so-called Muggle-born to present themselves for interview by the newly appointed Muggle-born Registration Commission.”

(Deathly Hallows: 172–173)

Diffusion is evident here as the article reinforces the prejudiced talk against Muggle-borns, for example by suggesting that there is no such thing as a Muggle-born and that they have only stolen their magical powers from real witches and wizards. This example is a newspaper article that spreads false information about Muggle-borns and implies that there is something precarious about Muggle-borns that the Ministry is now trying to investigate.

Excerpt 7 can be analysed using genre, omission, presupposition, diffusion, framing, foregrounding, connotations, and modality (Huckin, 1997). Genre is easy to interpret that the genre is news as the article is published in a newspaper and it reports a news piece. This urges the impression that this article is a reliable source of information, especially when it is published in a prominent newspaper. The article is written in a passive voice, and in the genre of newspaper, this creates an impression of objectivity. The passive voice reinforces an impression that this is not a personal writing or an opinion of a specific reporter but based on factual statements from the Ministry, even though the discourse of the article is highly anti-Muggle-born and there are no direct statements from the officials. The author of the article and who is the source of the information are omitted, which gives the reader a sense that the author is just reporting events and presupposes that the information is plain facts.

It is evident that this article uses diffusion and frames Muggle-borns suspicious and somehow false, reinforcing the anti-Muggle-born discourse that has been prevailing since Voldemort overthrew the Ministry. This is achieved by repeating “so-called Muggle-borns”. This repetition of “so-called” is an example of foregrounding: Muggle-borns are presented as

suspicious by stressing that they are ‘so-called’ Muggle-borns and therefore implying that there most likely are no such things as Muggle-borns. The article claims that Muggle-borns are “likely to have obtained magical power by theft or force”, and this significantly echoes Voldemort’s claims of Muggle-borns being “these thieves of their [wizards’] knowledge and magic”, making Voldemort’s influence evident (*Deathly Hallows*: 18).

Connotations can be created, for example, with metaphors. By using metaphors, a writer can reinforce negative or positive connotations that these figures of speech create for the receiver. The article uses the metaphorical phrase “to root out”. Rooting out refers to pulling weeds from the ground. The metaphor compares Muggle-borns with weeds that need to be eradicated from a garden. Weeds are invasive, undesirable plants that take over space and nutrients from desired plants and hinder their growth; by removing weeds the other plants get more nutrients from the ground and thrive. By using this metaphor to refer to Muggle-borns, they are connected to these unfavourable attributes of weeds and it implies that Muggle-borns would be taking over pure-bloods’ society and deteriorating their societal position. Calling Muggle-borns “usurpers” further emphasises the discriminating anti-Muggle-born discourse and that they do not belong in the wizarding society and that they are trying to gain a position in the society that they are not entitled to.

The author of the article has also used the modality “is likely to”. According to Huckin (1997: 84), modalities can be used to manipulate the tone of the text and the level of authority and certainty. The modality “is likely to” reinforces the probability of a foul play when obtaining magical powers, but it also leaves room for doubt which in turn justifies the need for the interviews of the Muggle-borns.

In the second example of diffusion, Voldemort is having a meeting with his Death Eaters. Voldemort is highly racist towards Muggles and Muggle-borns and one of his main means of discriminating Muggle-borns and undermine their societal status is spreading misinformation about Muggles and Muggle-borns and this way influencing the common apprehension towards them. In the following example, Voldemort expresses his attitudes and introduces an abducted victim, the teacher of Muggle Studies at Hogwarts, Professor Burbage.

Excerpt 8

‘Yes ... Professor Burbage taught the children of witches and wizards all about Muggles ... how they are not so different from us ...’ [...]

‘Not content with corrupting and polluting the minds of wizarding children, last week Professor Burbage wrote an impassioned defence of Mudbloods in the Daily Prophet. Wizards, she says, must accept these thieves of their knowledge and magic. The dwindling of the pure-bloods is, says Professor Burbage, a most desirable circumstance ... she would have us all mate with Muggles ... or, no doubt, werewolves ...’

(*Deathly Hallows*: 17–18)

This is an interesting example of van Dijk’s (1984) diffusion as it presents diffusion in two ways: Voldemort indirectly blames Professor Burbage of spreading misinformation about Muggles and Muggle-borns by claiming that they are “not so different from us” which Voldemort perceives as lies, and on the other hand, Voldemort is himself at the same time spreading misinformation by claiming that Professor Burbage is wrong and that Muggle-borns are different from wizards and that they are “thieves of their knowledge and magic”.

Presupposition, framing, and foregrounding (Huckin, 1997) are present in this example text. Voldemort uses presupposition by implying that everything Burbage says or believes is false, framing Burbage as a liar and himself as a voice of truth. Voldemort reports Burbage’s work in a mocking and distorting manner highlighting that everyone in the room ought to disagree with her. He claims that Burbage’s teaching is corrupting and polluting, implying that it is wrong and false, and that Professor Burbage tries to manipulate the students. It is apparent that in her article in the *Daily Prophet*, Burbage did not use the racist term “Mudbloods” but the politically correct “Muggle-borns”, but Voldemort distorts her words to stress his own opinion.

He also repeats on several occasions that what he is reporting are only Burbage’s ideas (“Professor Burbage wrote,” “she says”, “says Professor Burbage” and “she would have us”), foregrounding that these are her opinions and implies that she is wrong. Voldemort refers to Muggle-borns as “thieves of their knowledge and magic” which surely is not what Burbage wrote, but Voldemort’s own views. At the end, he juxtaposes Muggles and Muggle-borns with werewolves by suggesting that mating with Muggles would be as bad as mating with a werewolf, which has been determined as disgraceful behaviour, nearly bestiality. This comparison also dehumanises Muggles and Muggle-borns to the same level with werewolves

in their eyes, reducing them to mere beasts, and this feature makes the excerpt also an example of depersonalisation, which I will discuss in more detailed in chapter 5.1.6.

The third example of discrimination through diffusion is renewed Muggle Studies at Hogwarts. Shortly after the previous example, Voldemort took over the Ministry. Professor Burbage was murdered by Voldemort and a new teacher was appointed for Muggle studies. In the next example, Voldemort's influence over Hogwarts and its curricula becomes evident.

Excerpt 9

‘Alecto, Amycus’s sister, teaches Muggle Studies, which is compulsory for everyone. We’ve all got to listen to her explain how Muggles are like animals, stupid and dirty, and how they drove wizards into hiding by being vicious towards them, and how the natural order is being re-established. I got this one,’ he [Neville] indicated another slash to his face, ‘for asking her how much Muggle blood she and her brother have got.’

(Deathly Hallows: 462)

In this example, a Hogwarts student Neville Longbottom explains to Harry, Hermione and Ron how the new regime had affected the curricula at Hogwarts and how biased the new Muggle Studies are. Van Dijk's (1984) diffusion is highly evident in the example as Professor Alecto is spreading hateful prejudices in classroom and intending to influence young pupils' opinions and perceptions of Muggles.

It is evident that the new Muggle Studies are producing significantly charged anti-Muggle discourses as they are compared to animals and are described being stupid and dirty. Muggle Studies was previously a voluntary subject that studied Muggles and their lives from the point of view of the wizarding world. The new curricula also twist the setting so that the Muggles "drove wizards into hiding" even though wizards themselves created the strict Statue of Secrecy to hide their society from Muggles. Alecto and Amycus are Death Eaters who have been appointed to teach at Hogwarts which makes Voldemort's influence on education rather evident. Claiming to re-establish the natural order implies that it is natural for wizards to rule over Muggles and that Muggles are inferior by nature.

Alecto is abusing her position as a teacher to force Voldemort's ideology on students who, because of the power imbalance between a teacher and students, cannot argue or contradict her doctrine especially under the new regime. Because of this, the example is also an example of the previously discussed category of dominance in chapter 5.1.1.

5.1.5 Diversion

Diversion can be manifested by directing the blame of social or economic problems to the discriminated group (van Dijk, 1984: 40). In *Deathly Hallows*, Muggle-borns are blamed for social problems such as stealing magic powers. In this chapter, I will present an example of an official pamphlet by the Ministry of Magic that is pressed after Voldemort's coup:

Excerpt 10

MUDBLOODS

and the Dangers They Pose to a Peaceful Pure-Blood Society

Beneath the title was a picture of a red rose, with a simpering face in the middle of its petals, being strangled by a green weed with fangs and a scowl.

(*Deathly Hallows*: 205)

This example represents diversion of the 7 Ds of discrimination (van Dijk, 1984) because it directly blames Muggle-borns of threatening the peaceful wizarding society. The title of the pamphlet presents Muggle-borns as a dangerous entity that is threatening the pure-blood community with a picture below the title to enforce the message.

The pamphlet is producing overtly anti-Muggle-born discourse as it uses the racist term "Mudblood". Genre, presupposition, framing, and connotation (Huckin, 1997) can be identified in the pamphlet. The genre of this example is an official pamphlet and as such it is assumable that it is reporting only facts which in this case is a false assumption. Presupposition is present as the pamphlet presupposes that Mudbloods are threatening pure-bloods and

presents it as a fact. This presupposition is in turn framing Muggle-borns as a dangerous entity that is hostile towards the wizarding society.

The picture beneath the title uses connotation by illustrating the conflict with a visual metaphor. This picture presents a red rose that is strangled by a green weed while it actually refers to people. The rose represents the “Peaceful Pure-Blood Society”, and the strangling weed is representing “Mudbloods and the Dangers They Pose”. Using a picture of a weed creates connotations between Muggle-borns and the unfavourable features of weeds just like in the previously discussed *Daily Prophet* article (excerpt 7). The act of strangulation can be seen as a comparison to Muggle-borns overtaking and smothering the pure-blood society and their policies. The green weed is also depicted having fangs and a scowl to create a more threatening and dangerous sense.

This example can also be placed under the category of diffusion: the pamphlet presents the pure-blood society as the peaceful entity, even though the truth is the other way around and the pure-blood supremacists are the ones who are targeting and persecuting Muggle-borns. The subheading claims that there is some sort of danger that the pure-blooded witches and wizards are facing and that the Muggle-borns are behind this. It also emphasises that the Mudbloods are the ones who are dangerous and threatening, and that the Ministry of Magic is just responding to these hostilities and trying to protect the otherwise peaceful society.

5.1.6 Depersonalisation / Destruction

Depersonalisation and destruction refer to treating the discriminated group as inferior and hurting or destroying them (van Dijk, 1984: 40). Van Dijk has placed both depersonalisation and destruction under the same D, but for the sake of clarity, I will make a difference between depersonalisation and destruction in the present study so that depersonalisation refers to dehumanising and objectifying the discriminated groups and destruction refers to killing and physically harming the discriminated groups. In this chapter, I will examine one example of depersonalisation and one example of destruction.

As an example of depersonalisation, I present an informal conversation between Voldemort and his Death Eaters. In the first chapter of *Deathly Hallows*, there is a gathering of the Death Eaters and Voldemort in which they are planning a revolution to overthrow the Ministry of Magic. The conversation changes from planning to personal matters as Voldemort starts to express his dissatisfaction towards his followers. Bellatrix Lestrange is the most devoted servant of Voldemort, yet he suddenly starts to taunt Bellatrix and her family, humiliating them in front of the other Death Eaters.

Excerpt 11

‘I’m talking about your niece, Bellatrix. And yours, Lucius and Narcissa. She has just married the werewolf, Remus Lupin. You must be so proud.’ [...]

Bellatrix’s face, so recently flushed with happiness, had turned an ugly, blotchy red.

‘She is no niece of ours, my Lord,’ she cried over the outpouring of mirth. ‘We – Narcissa and I – have never set eyes on our sister since she married the Mudblood. This brat has nothing to do with either of us, nor any beast she marries.’

‘What say you, Draco?’ asked Voldemort, and though his voice was quiet, it carried clearly through the catcalls and jeers. ‘Will you babysit the cubs?’

(*Deathly Hallows*: 16)

Voldemort uses sarcasm to ridicule Bellatrix and her family, but the discrimination through depersonalisation targets werewolves. Bellatrix echoes with Voldemort’s view on werewolves to prove that she is still agreeing with him even though she at the same time tries to defend her family’s honour. This example represents depersonalisation as Voldemort and Bellatrix both dehumanise werewolves and compare them to animals.

The example contains two features of Huckin’s (1997) tools of analysis: foregrounding, and omission. While talking about Remus Lupin, Voldemort is foregrounding Lupin’s condition of being a werewolf rather than talking about him primarily with his name, consequently dehumanising him. This foregrounding defines firstly Remus Lupin as a werewolf rather than as a person and the negative attitude towards werewolves becomes more evident when Bellatrix proceeds to refer to Lupin as a “beast” further dehumanising him, reducing him to his condition and comparing him to an animal.

Bellatrix also uses omission when he talks about her unfavourable relatives: she does not mention her other sister, Andromeda, by name even though she uses Narcissa's name, signifying the fact that they are estranged with the third sister, and refers to Andromeda's husband with the racist term Mudblood. By using the slur, she omits his real name and reduces him to his unfavourable Blood Status, and by not using his name she is again highlighting that they are estranged and perhaps not even on the first-name basis. Voldemort continues to dehumanise werewolves by referring to the unborn children as 'the cubs' suggesting that werewolves do not produce children but animals.

After getting enough of humiliating his devoted servant, Voldemort proceeds to address Bellatrix in a more serious tone but these words are also directed for the group at large. The next example follows soon after the previous example:

Excerpt 12

'Many of our oldest family trees become a little diseased over time,' he said, as Bellatrix gazed at him, breathless and imploring.

'You must prune yours, must you not, to keep it healthy? Cut away those parts that threaten the health of the rest.'

'Yes, my Lord,' whispered Bellatrix, and her eyes swam with tears of gratitude again. 'At the first chance!'

'You shall have it,' said Voldemort. 'And in your family, so in the world ... we shall cut away the canker that infects us until only those of the true blood remain ...'

(Deathly Hallows: 16–17)

This example represents destruction as Voldemort is indirectly instructing his followers to kill their unfit relatives and other people who do not fit his eugenics. He also uses depersonalisation by objectifying Muggles and Muggle-borns by using a metaphor to compare them to a plant disease. Voldemort is generally stating that this unfavourable occurrence in Bellatrix's family is not an unusual situation and that this is a phenomenon that affects all of the wizarding families and precautions are necessary.

Another tool of analysis by Huckin (1997) is how modalities are used. In this example, by using "must" and "shall", Voldemort produces sense of urgency and that what he has just said is a

fact that cannot be questioned and the actions he is instructing or commanding others to do are inevitable necessity to further advance their cause. By this, he is also presupposing that his followers will obey him without arguing or hesitating.

Voldemort uses a common metaphor of ‘family tree’ and that the tree becomes diseased over time. In the example, the disease in question that is plaguing the tree means cross-Blood Status marriages that makes a break in the pure-blooded family line. By using the word ‘prune’, he continues to use the metaphoric comparison of people and plants by comparing unfavourable marriages to diseased branches that need to cut off in order for the rest of the tree to survive. “We shall cut away the canker” refers not only to disinherit family members but to physically cutting away the members of the family that do not uphold the pure-blood tradition, meaning Voldemort urges his followers to kill their unfit kin. Voldemort also uses diversion as he blames Muggles and Muggle-borns of social problems when he claims that they are infecting the pure-blooded family trees.

5.1.7 Daily Discrimination

As previously stated, daily discrimination is combining the previously described six features of 7 D’s of discrimination by including discriminating acts and attitudes to small everyday activities and discriminating in small, even undetectable manners (van Dijk, 1984: 40). In *Deathly Hallows*, daily discrimination is directed to the discriminated groups of werewolves, Squibs, Muggles and Muggle-borns. In this chapter, I present examples of daily discrimination towards werewolves and Muggles.

Discrimination towards werewolves is present throughout the series and after Voldemort has taken over the Ministry, these issues become even more prominent than before. Werewolves are shunned out of the community and any affiliations with werewolves are considered inadvisable to say the least, as Lupin’s wife Tonks says it: “The Ministry’s being very anti-werewolf at the moment and we thought our presence might not do you any favours.” (*Deathly Hallows*: 116). In the next excerpt I present, Remus Lupin reasons why he is intending to leave his wife and unborn child to join Harry, Hermione and Ron in their adventure and explains the racist attitudes he faces as a werewolf.

Excerpt 13

‘Don’t you understand what I’ve done to my wife and my unborn child? I should never have married her, I’ve made her an outcast!’ [...] ‘You have only ever seen me amongst the Order, or under Dumbledore’s protection at Hogwarts! You don’t know how most of the wizarding world sees creatures like me! When they know of my affliction, they can barely talk to me! Don’t you see what I’ve done? Even her own family is disgusted by our marriage, what parents want their only daughter to marry a werewolf? And the child – the child –’ [...] ‘My kind don’t usually breed! It will be like me, I am convinced of it – how can I forgive myself, when I knowingly risked passing on my own condition to an innocent child? And if, by some miracle, it is not like me, then it will be better off, a hundred times so, without a father of whom it must always be ashamed!’

(Deathly Hallows: 175–176)

This example describes the daily discrimination that werewolves regularly face. Distracted Lupin describes how him being a werewolf hinders his and his family’s life on everyday basis. Even though the other discrimination categories are not explicitly present in the example, it can be identified that the daily discrimination in this case includes features of differentiation as werewolves are treated differently, and feature of distance because people avoid them and they are made outcasts. It is evident that Lupin has faced considerable amount of discrimination and prejudice because of being a werewolf, and consequently he even seems to have assimilated some of the attitudes of daily discrimination himself as he is reproducing the discriminating prejudices for example by indicating that a werewolf father is something to be ashamed of or that a werewolf is not a good match for marriage.

Framing (Huckin, 1997) is present in the example as Lupin frames himself as the culprit and as an unfavourable individual by blaming himself over the treatment that his wife and unborn child are facing and will face because of their affiliations with him, for example when he says: “what I’ve done” and “I’ve made her an outcast” and “how can I forgive myself”. Lupin also refers to himself as a werewolf by saying “creatures like me” hence dehumanising himself, which in turn is an example of depersonalisation discussed in the previous chapter. However, this can also be interpreted as being irony and he is just reflecting and exemplifying the prevailing attitudes.

Lupin also seems to have adopted some of the attitudes of daily discrimination he faces when he states that “what parents want their only daughter to marry a werewolf” suggesting that he agrees that a werewolf is not a good match for marriage and perhaps he would be opposing such marriage too because he is aware of the social stigma that werewolves and their families suffer from. Lupin also states that werewolves usually do not have children and he does not know whether his condition is heritable but is nevertheless convinced that it will be. This suggests that werewolves are so ostracised from the society that they are not able to maintain a normal social life and that marriages and children are so unheard of amongst werewolves or perhaps so hushed-up that there are no known precedents of Lupin’s situation.

During the full moon when werewolves transform, they become very dangerous but are otherwise like any other normal people. It would be perhaps rather understandable explanation if other people were scared of werewolves because of being afraid to be bitten and afflicted themselves. However, other less self-explanatory prevailing prejudices against werewolves are evident from the text. Lupin states that people barely talk to him when they discover his affliction, and that his wife’s, Tonks’s, parents are “disgusted” by the marriage and that his unborn child will always have to be ashamed of his father because of his ailment.

Being disgusted and ashamed refers to more pejorative apprehension of the condition than simple sensible fear for one’s own safety. Tonks’s parents are not afraid of what might happen to their daughter if Lupin got out of control during the full moon but are “disgusted” exemplifying the prejudiced attitudes and how werewolves are considered appalling and inferior. Furthermore, being ashamed of someone else’s condition is reflecting how taboo the issue is. Brugger (2011) compared the treatment that werewolves face to what paedophiles face and I believe that the example excerpt exemplifies Brugger’s point: werewolves nor paedophiles do not have to act based on their urges to be ostracised by the society.

Another example of how daily discrimination is present in *Deathly Hallows* is the epilogue “19 years later” at the end of the book, that gives a small glimpse of the wizarding society 19 years after the Battle of Hogwarts that ends the actual events of the book. In the epilogue, Harry and Ginny are meeting Ron and Hermione to see their children off as the children head to Hogwarts.

As the epilogue is only few pages long, not much can be extracted from it. However, the small glimpse is enough to shed light on what daily discriminating attitudes at least the main characters are upholding.

Excerpt 14

‘Parked all right, then?’ Ron asked Harry. ‘I did. Hermione didn’t believe I could pass a Muggle driving test, did you? She thought I’d have to Confund the examiner.’ [...]

‘As a matter of fact, I *did* Confund him,’ Ron whispered to Harry, as together they lifted Albus’s trunk and owl on to the train. ‘I only forgot to look in the wing mirror, and let’s face it, I can use a Supersensory Charm for that.’

(*Deathly Hallows*: 604)

The fact that Ron chose to bewitch the examiner and therefore cheat on the test suggests that the attitudes towards Muggles have remained rather condescending and belittling: Ron disregards the driving test rules because he believes that as he is capable of using magic to avoid collisions, he does not need to retake the exam when he “only forgot to look in the wing mirror” consequently disregarding Muggle laws (*Deathly Hallows*: 604). His confession does not stir any objections and his actions are accepted without questioning.

Cheating in a driving licence test with magic is such a petty thing to do that I find it a good example of how Muggles are discriminated in small unnoticeable ways in everyday life by wizards, even by the ones who were opposing Voldemort’s rule and fought against injustice. This example of daily discrimination combines differentiation, as wizards treat Muggles as unequal by cheating them, and using magic to overcome their laws is reinforcing the power imbalance between Muggles and wizards, hence an example of dominance.

I have now analysed data with 14 text examples. The examples were categorised according to van Dijk’s (1984) 7 Ds of discrimination to illustrate what types of discrimination is present in the data. Next, I will proceed from text to the second level of Fairclough’s (2015) three-dimensional model, discursive practice, and interpret how discriminating discourses in these texts excerpts are constructed and consumed.

5.2 The second dimension: discursive practice

Fairclough's (2015) second dimension of three-dimensional model is discursive practice. This dimension focuses on interpreting how a discourse is produced and consumed. In this chapter, I will provide an interpretation of the discursive practices in *Deathly Hallows* using the examples from the previous text dimension of Fairclough's model.

In the category of dominance (chapter 5.1.1), I gave examples of the statue in the Ministry (excerpt 1), Yaxley bullying Cattermole (excerpt 2), and the man who was dragged out of the interrogation room (excerpt 3). The statue produces discriminating discourse through visual representation of oppression of Muggles and Muggle-borns. It depicts in a straightforward and physical way how witches and wizards have the right to rule over Muggles and consequently Muggle-borns. The statue also verbally furthers this discourse with the slogan "Magic is Might" that places witches and wizards in a superior position compared to oppressed group of Muggles and Muggle-borns. This resonates with Westman's (2002) comparison of "wizarding pride" to nationalist pride: Magic is Might represents ideology that unites wizards against Muggles.

Yaxley is producing the discourse of dominance discrimination while extorting Reginald Cattermole (excerpt 3). In this example, the production of the discriminating discourse is not entirely straightforward. Yaxley expresses his dominance by humiliating and threatening Cattermole but as the actual discrimination through dominance is about maintaining the power-imbalance between the discriminators and discriminated people hence the discriminating discourse of dominance is actually produced both when he is threatening Mr. Cattermole and also when he is referring to Muggle-borns as filth and with derogatory term Mudblood. The power-imbalance between the two Ministry employees is evident as Cattermole is a janitor and Yaxley is emphasising his status as the Head of the Department of Magical Law Enforcement, and Yaxley abuses this power when he is forcing Cattermole to dry his office by threatening to sentence his wife without a fair trial. Because of his weaker power-position, Cattermole cannot defend himself or his wife and the discourse remains anti-Muggle-born. Yaxley also abuses his power and takes advantage of Cattermole's weaker position to taunt him by producing racist discourse towards Muggle-borns by calling them filth and Mudbloods.

In excerpt 3, the discriminating discourse is produced by Umbridge who abuses her power by threatening the man who was dragged out of the courtroom with the Dementor's kiss. The discourse of the interrogations and the excerpt is significantly anti-Muggle-borns. This is evident when Umbridge sentences the man without a fair trial and is willing to destroy the man's soul when he is protesting and trying to defend himself. The man's testimonies are not heard and Umbridge abuses the power-imbalance between the participants to oppress the accused Muggle-borns.

In the example of differentiation discrimination (excerpt 4), the discriminating discourse of differentiation was produced by the fact that Mary Cattermole's magic wand had been confiscated and she is treated as an inferior and a criminal. Anti-Muggle(-born) discourse is also produced when Mary's parents' professions are a subject of ridicule and belittling.

Both examples of distance, the exclusion of Muggle-borns from Hogwarts (excerpt 5) and Squibs (excerpt 6) were reporting discriminating discourse but did not produce it. In excerpt 5, Lupin explains how Muggle-borns are refused to attend Hogwarts because they need to be given Blood Status first and Muggle-borns are not considered witches and wizards by the new regime. The discriminating discourse is produced through anti-Muggle-born legislation that ostracises them from education and wizarding society at large by the government of the wizarding society, the Ministry of Magic. In excerpt 6, Aunt Muriel also merely explains and describes the discrimination that Squibs face without really expressing her own views on the matter but the general attitude towards Squibs can be interpreted from the excerpt as she does not try to disapprove or contradict the discrimination she is reporting in any way. The anti-Squib discourse seems to have been prevalent and widely approved in the wizarding society and it has been produced by the Ministry as the Squibs were not allowed to enter magical education as well as by the common wizarding people. The distribution of the anti-Squib discourse has evidently resulted in deeming Squibs as shameful and inferior.

As an example of diffusion, I presented the *Daily Prophet* article (excerpt 7). The article is evidently distributing anti-Muggle-born discourse. All the features that I analysed using Huckin's (1997) tools of analysis are reinforcing prejudices against Muggle-borns as the article is published in a seemingly reliable source and the reader might not be able to question these claims. For the common citizens of the wizarding community who read the article and hence consume the discourse it is distributing, it may seem reliable information as it is featured in a prominent newspaper and it even presents seemingly reliable sources of the Ministry of Magic

and a research conducted by the Department of Mysteries. There is no mention of how this research has been conducted but it is hard for a reader to question this knowledge as it is a presupposition for a news piece to report facts. This diffusion of false information reinforces the power imbalance within the wizarding society as the common people are receiving biased information and hence manipulated by the government.

The second example of diffusion I presented was Voldemort discussing Professor Burbage and her article in the *Daily Prophet* (excerpt 8). In this example, the discriminating discourse is constructed by Voldemort as he blames Muggle-borns of being “thieves of their knowledge and magic” (*Deathly Hallows*: 18) and calling them Mudbloods. He also parallels Muggles with werewolves who he also despises and discriminates, creating both anti-Muggle and anti-werewolf discourses.

I presented Neville Longbottom reporting on the new Muggle Studies as the third example of diffusion (excerpt 9). This is another example where the text is produced by someone else than who is producing the discriminating discourse. The anti-Muggle-born discourse is spread like propaganda at the school, as Muggle Studies is now compulsory for all students. The Death Eater teacher Alecto is producing, distributing and diffusing significantly hostile narrative of Muggle-borns, and her teaching is consumed by students who, especially young students, might not have the means to use critical thinking skills with which they would be able to question the education system and its teaching.

Diffusion is also present in the example of diversion discrimination. As an example of diversion, I presented the official pamphlet by the Ministry of Magic (excerpt 10). The pamphlet is written using overtly racist term Mudblood that immediately creates a discriminating anti-Muggle-born discourse. The fact that the Ministry of Magic is using the overtly racist term in their official pamphlet is communicating for the community that using the term is acceptable or even preferable. Furthermore, it reveals the Ministry’s own stance on the blood purity debate. This example uses both verbal and visual texts to create anti-Muggle-born discourse as the picture beneath the title is a metaphorical representation of the dangers that the Muggle-borns are allegedly posing and it reinforces the discriminating message that the pamphlet conveys.

The examples of depersonalisation (excerpt 11) and destruction (excerpt 12) were fragments of conversation between Voldemort and Death Eaters. Here again, the aggressive anti-Muggle discourse is created explicitly as the term Mudblood is once again used, werewolves are

compared to animals, and Muggles are compared to infectious disease that needs to be exterminated. This is not a surprising finding since these texts are produced overtly racist group.

In chapter 5.1.7, I presented an example of werewolves where Lupin reports the daily discrimination that he and his family face (excerpt 13). The example text is a description of the discriminating acts and attitudes that create anti-werewolf discourse. People avoid contact with werewolves which evidently leads to alienation from the wizarding community. These discriminating acts and attitudes that werewolves face on daily basis seems to be very common and widely accepted just like the discrimination of Squibs. Lupin even reproduces werewolf-discriminating discourse when he directs the blame on himself and not on the racist and oppressive social system that ostracises werewolves and their families because of their ailment. Daily discrimination through distancing is also evident in the case of werewolves as they and their family are made outcasts of the wizarding society because of prejudices the common people hold and marriages with werewolves are generally not approved. Lupin's own attitudes can be interpreted to reflect the prevailing anti-werewolf discourse, but this can also be a false assumption and he is just using irony when he refers to himself as a creature and states that werewolves are not good matches for marriage.

The second example of daily discrimination I presented is discrimination against Muggles (excerpt 14). The discriminating discourse is constructed by small unnoticeable acts that are deemed harmless and hence accepted; in this example Ron disregards Muggle-laws hence places himself being above the law and Harry does not questions his means or motives even though he was raised in the Muggle society. Westman (2002) has also used Ron as an example of how wizards from good, tolerant families reproduce discriminating discourses that prevail in the wizarding society. The Muggle-discriminating discourse in this example is significantly less aggressive than the one that Voldemort produces but it is nevertheless evident.

The production of discriminating discourses in *Deathly Hallows* is mostly stemming from Voldemort and his racist ideology, whether it is he himself producing it or people who sympathise with his cause. Altogether, Voldemort's discrimination tactics cover several categories of van Dijk's (1984) 7 D's of discrimination but the most prominent type of discrimination is depersonalisation/ destruction although dominance and diffusion also play a highly significant role in his actions. Depersonalisation and destruction are most evident when he seeks to kill Muggle-borns, which is his main motivation for dominating the wizarding community and the driving force of the conflicts in the book. He takes advantage of the already

prevailing power imbalance between wizards and Muggles and he seeks to expand wizarding domination and depersonalise Muggle-borns. Voldemort uses diffusion to spread his anti-Muggle propaganda, and as a result creates diversion.

Other Ds of discrimination are also part of his tactics but some of them are merely consequences of his actions that other people react by producing more prejudiced discourses, such as daily discrimination which is applying the other Ds of discrimination into everyday actions and attitudes. He uses differentiation to alienate Muggle-borns from the magical society by placing them under suspicion and politically denying them from carrying a magic wand, which is an essential tool to channel one's magical powers. He also seeks to physically distance Muggle-borns from the wizarding community by for example refusing them to participate in magical education and sentencing them to prison.

The discriminating discourses in *Deathly Hallows* are produced in conversations between the characters, publications, and people reporting on discriminating behaviour, and on one instance through a visual cue. In the examples where the producer of the text was merely reporting the discriminating acts and attitudes of others thus not producing their own discriminating discourses, the tools of analysis by Huckin (1997) proved to be impractical.

Three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015) is commonly used to analyse news pieces and other texts produced in the real world (e.g. Eirtola, 2014; Anttila, 2019). Analysing a work of literature proved to be problematic as the texts operate on two levels: on the other hand, the book is a work of literature produced by the author and the consumers of the discourses that the author creates are the readers of the book, but discursive practice can also be seen as occurring between the characters within the book and how they produce and consume the discourses present in the fictional world. I have focused on discursive practices within the story because interpreting what J.K. Rowling may have intended to create or has unconsciously created would involve a substantial amount of speculation over her social context and motivations that would affect the text and its discourses.

Next, I will proceed to the last part of three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015), social practice, and examine and explain the relationship between these texts and their discursive practices and the larger social context of the wizarding society.

5.3 The third dimension: social practice

The last dimension of Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model is social practice. The third dimension focuses on explaining the relationship between text, interaction and social context, binding the text and its discursive practice into the broader social context of prevailing social ideologies and political hegemony.

The examples of depersonalisation (excerpt 11) and destruction (excerpt 12) that I presented in chapter 5.1.6 illustrate the basis of where the discrimination stems from in *Deathly Hallows*. These examples significantly attribute to the social practices that are present in the data as they expose what attitudes Voldemort and his followers hold and what actions they are willing to take in order to advance their cause, and it becomes evident that they influence and advance discrimination throughout the book. Voldemort and his followers form a rather small but powerful group who are able to take over the only political entity of the wizarding society which enables them to advance their racist agenda and diffuse discriminating discourse throughout the society. In the examples, Voldemort's racist ideology is presented explicitly as he instructs his followers to kill Muggles and Muggle-borns as well as when he dehumanises them and werewolves. After Voldemort takes over the Ministry of Magic, his ideology becomes political hegemony.

The Ministry of Magic has a very important role in the book series as it is the only political institution in the wizarding society. It has one Minister for Magic (who is comparable to a Prime Minister) and several departments that have their own Heads of Departments. There does not seem to be free elections and the Minister for Magic and the Heads are merely appointed. There are no opposition parties who could contest the prevailing policies, making it virtually impossible to oppose the Ministry's amendments or for outsiders to participate in politics. This totalitarian governance results in polarised political discourses as there is only one entity producing the discourse consequently disabling free dialogue. Since there are no opposition parties, the Ministry can propose and pass any laws they want and manipulate the information that the press and the people receive from the Ministry. This significant power imbalance

enables political diffusion of prejudices and discrimination that furthers the Ministry's own agenda and complicates the means that common people have to question the Ministry's policies.

Voldemort takes over the Ministry early in the book. Consequently, his ideology and influence are significantly evident in the Ministry's policies and his influence is visible throughout the book and in nearly every example I have presented. Voldemort's ideology therefore significantly influences the social practice of the data. In fact, the discrimination of Squibs (excerpt 6) and werewolves (excerpt 13) seem to be the only examples of discrimination that has been prevailing previously and is not straightforwardly accomplished by Voldemort. Arguably the daily discrimination of Muggles (excerpt 14) is also prevailing discrimination as it seems unlikely that Ron would be directly influenced by Voldemort especially after 19 years.

The Ministry's (and consequently Voldemort's) power is apparent, as all the examples of dominance and differentiation categories (excerpt 1–4) are located in the Ministry and the example of diversion (excerpt 10) is produced directly by the Ministry. The texts present a corrupted political system that evokes inequality both within the Ministry as well as within the wizarding society at large. The Ministry of Magic enforces unequal rights and societal opportunities with their discriminating one-party politics and discriminating legislations and policies. The political discourses in the examples are highly anti-Muggle(-born) and they represent oppressive system where pure-blood supremacists rule over others.

The examples of dominance result in different types of social practices. The statue (excerpt 1) is a symbolical representation of the oppression of Muggles that reflects the current political hegemony. As previously mentioned, being exposed to this type of visual cue on a daily basis may result in reproducing the discriminating discourse it represents and hence further increase discriminating acts and attitudes towards Muggles and consequently Muggle-borns.

Yaxley (excerpt 2) can be both interpreted as being an individual abusing his power, but his actions can also be explained as being more societally meaningful. He represents a corrupted political system where employees of higher positions can abuse their status and force their subordinates to obey them by threatening them and/or their families. As the Ministry of Magic is the only political organisation in the wizarding community, the corruption is even more significant societal problem as Ministry employees of high status can basically pass any laws and regulations that benefit them and the common people have no means to oppose them, even when they are oppressive or even lead to genocide. This is further enhanced in excerpt 3 where

Umbridge threatens the convicted man with the Dementor's kiss. The discourse that the Ministry is producing is significantly anti-Muggle and anti-Muggle-born and as it is the political hegemony it inevitably reflects into the society at large and to acts and attitudes of the members of the society.

The Ministry has a significant role in several examples. The overtly hostile discourse against Muggles and Muggle-borns becomes part of the Ministry's policies and consequently prevailing political hegemony after Voldemort's coup. For example, excerpt 10, the official pamphlet pressed by the Ministry, transmits a strong message. It is the Ministry's official statement and stand on the blood purity debate, and it inevitably sends a message to the community that this should be the stand of every member of the wizarding society. By blaming Muggle-borns of posing a threat to the peaceful society, the Ministry is presenting Muggle-borns as hostile and as this is an official statement from the Ministry, people who are reading this pamphlet and receiving the discourse it reproduces may assimilate with it and start believing that there is a legitimate threat and consequently start avoiding or even hating and persecuting Muggle-borns, hence advancing the discriminating discourse.

The Muggle-Born Registration Commission is producing significantly anti-Muggle-born discourse by being openly hostile towards them (excerpt 3&4). Political discrimination is especially evident in the categories of differentiation and distancing as Muggle-borns, Squibs and werewolves are being ostracised from the wizarding community (excerpt 5, 6, 13). For example, confiscating magic wands from Muggle-borns and refusing them the access to magical education further enables their oppression and ostracising from the wizarding community because, as Muriel stated (excerpt 6), people without magical skills are always treated as second class citizens, and without the means or skills to produce magic, Muggle-borns are reduced to the same level with Squibs. The fact that people without magical skills are deemed inferior reveals that the prevailing discourse in the society is against Muggles and Squibs and how this discriminating discourse is commonly reproduced by not only the Ministry but also by the wizarding society at large. The political oppression of Muggle-borns therefore can result in increasing disdain towards the oppressed group and reinforce the anti-Muggle-born discourse.

Although 107-year-old Muriel says "in our day" it seems that there have been no significant improvements in the Squibs' human rights as still over hundred years later there are no Squib-students at Hogwarts and there are only two Squib characters introduced during the seven-piece

book series. Notwithstanding the fact that half of the classes at Hogwarts do not require magical powers per se, such as History of Magic, Ancient Runes, Herbology, Care of Magical Creatures, and Astronomy, and that Squibs are able to see and visit Hogwarts unlike Muggles, Squibs are nevertheless not allowed to attend Hogwarts but are addressed to Muggle schools. Distancing young Squibs from the wizarding community and denying them access to magic education effectively discourages them to stay in the community in which they were born in.

Another discriminated group is werewolves who face substantial discrimination by the Ministry through legislation and by the wizarding society at large. The example of daily discrimination of werewolves (excerpt 13) reveal how thorough this discrimination is and how it hinders werewolves on every aspect of their life. The prevailing discourse in the wizarding society is significantly anti-werewolf and they are discriminated and ostracised in many ways. Acquiring a job is hindered through legislation and maintaining a job is hindered by general discriminating acts and attitudes towards werewolves. Family relations are also difficult as werewolves are not considered good choices for marriage or parents as the families of werewolves are also shunned because of their affiliations with werewolves. These attitudes and actions prevent the oppressed group from being an equal part of the wizarding society and ostracising them altogether disables them from advocating their rights and proving that they can be fully functional members of the society.

This example of discrimination truly resonates with van Dijk's (2015:496) statement that the oppressed groups have little resources to resist their unequal treatment if the oppression is embedded in legislation or when it is executed in an inconspicuous manner. Werewolves are oppressed in so many ways and so severely that it seems to be an easier option to give in and leave the community than fight for one's rights. For the oppressed groups, defying discriminating legislation is difficult and as I have presented in this analysis, the Ministry is highly corrupted and anti-werewolf which makes it even more difficult to advocate werewolves' rights.

Legislation is not the only way the Ministry controls and influences the wizarding society. The Ministry is able to spread its agenda like propaganda through the newspaper and forcing the anti-Muggle ideology to children by changing the school curriculum at Hogwarts. The prominent newspaper the *Daily Prophet* is significantly influenced by the Ministry especially evidently after Voldemort has taken over the Ministry. Excerpt 7, the *Daily Prophet* article, presents an example of how the Ministry can diffuse anti-Muggle-born discourse to the society

and further influence society's opinion on the matter. The article is able to portray Muggle-borns in a suspicious light and frame them as false that some readers may believe and start reproducing this information as facts and so the message is spread even further within the society.

Exposing involuntary young children to such extremely racist discourse that Voldemort is spreading is comparable to brain-washing (excerpt 9). Dehumanising Muggles to animal-level makes discriminating behaviour easier as Muggle-borns' feelings and status' are reduced to the level of an animal and this further enables the attitude that ruling over Muggles is for their own good. Children are exposed to this hateful discriminating discourse from early stages of their education, and this seems to be an effective way to influence children's opinions and world view, as Draco Malfoy, Crabbe and Goyle whose fathers were Death Eaters and who were exposed to these views all their lives and ended up supporting Voldemort's eugenics themselves too. The fact that Neville was severely punished for asking whether his teacher had Muggle blood implies that there is no possibility for open discussion on the blood purity debate in the Muggle Studies and that opposing views are silenced with violence and fear.

The epilogue (excerpt 14) is arguably free from Voldemort's influence, as the events take place 19 years after Voldemort has been defeated. However, the example illustrates how Muggle-discriminating acts and attitudes are still prevailing within the wizarding society. Rana (2009) argues that only the extreme racism of Voldemort is contested in the series, and the subtle discrimination of Muggles is not questioned. I, however, argue that the discrimination of Squibs is equivalent to the discrimination of Muggles as their discrimination is not contested at any point even by the "good characters". Squibs have faced substantial discrimination throughout the years and the issue is not questioned or even discussed in the book series besides brief mentions, such as excerpt 6, but is silently accepted.

Muggles and their laws seem to be deemed as unimportant and they can be disregarded just because it is more convenient for wizarding people. This condescending attitude towards Muggles suggests that the Second Wizarding War was after all a war to liberate Muggle-borns but not Muggles themselves as they are still being treated as inferiors.

Altogether, the epilogue conveys that there have been no significant changes in the wizarding society and that the old discriminating actions and attitudes are still present long after Voldemort has been defeated. To be fair, I do not perceive this as a major surprise as the

discriminating presumptions have already prevailed for centuries and persevered through major conflicts before. In fact, I would find it perhaps even more surprising if there had been a major turn of attitudes after this specific conflict as in a bigger scale it did not significantly differ from the previous ones.

6 CONCLUSION

The aim of the present study was to create a critical discourse analysis of *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* book and answer the research questions of what types of discrimination were present in the data and how discrimination was constructed. The focus was only the discrimination that manifests between humans and all examples of discrimination towards magical creatures were excluded from the analysis. This was due to the limited amount of space in the present study as analysing magical creatures would have required analysing the societal position of the said creatures within the wizarding society, their social features and history, and other context that would have created more meaning. The oppression and discrimination of magical creatures has also been the topic of several previous studies (Rana, 2009; Trosclair, 2018; Horne, 2010) and I chose to focus on human interaction in order to bring new perspective into the field.

In total, 14 example excerpts presenting discriminating acts and attitudes were selected from the data and analysed. The method of analysis that was used to analyse these example texts was Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model, and Huckin's (1997) tools of analysis were utilised to describe the formal properties of the texts on the first dimension. After recognising different types of discrimination, the examples were then divided by the types of discrimination they represented into categories according to van Dijk's (1984) 7 D's of discrimination. These

were dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion, depersonalisation/destruction, and daily discrimination.

The analysis of the data proved to be occasionally more complicated than I had anticipated: some of the example excerpts were only reporting discriminating discourses and not straightforwardly producing them which made using Huckin's (1997) tools of analysis impractical. The interpretation of discursive practices in these reporting examples proved to be challenging: the production of the discrimination was not present in these examples and therefore I could not fully interpret it. It was also occasionally difficult to separate the different dimensions from each other, especially text and discursive practice, as describing the text also resulted in interpreting it to extent. Also the fact that discursive practices in literature work on two levels, within and outside the story, make literature a challenging data for utilising three-dimensional model (Fairclough, 2015). This perhaps explains why the method has not been popular method of analysis in the field.

However, using Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model provided a method for in-depth analysis of the different layers discourses hold which Huckin's (1997) tools of analysis and van Dijk's (1984) categories would not have enabled. Fairclough's (2015) model specifically binds the text and its production and consumption into the wider social context and explains the relationship between these discourses and their discursive practices and the society they manifest in, or as in the case of the present study, how the discrimination is present, constructed and experienced in the wizarding society. The third dimension of Fairclough's (2015) model enabled the examination of discrimination discourse as a wider societal phenomenon and explaining what differences these discourses make in the society.

The answer to my first research question "what types of discrimination are present in the data" can be answered with van Dijk's (1984) 7 D's of discrimination: dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion, depersonalisation and destruction, and daily discrimination. Discrimination manifested in all these forms. There was also significant amount of overt discrimination, as the racist slur "Mudblood" was used in the overall data 36 times, although only four instances was present in the example excerpts that I presented, and overt hostility towards Muggle-borns was present in eight examples.

The most frequent type of discrimination in the data was dominance: three of the examples represented this category and three of the other examples had features of dominance, even

though they primarily represented another type of discrimination. As previously described, critical discourse analysis is focused on language and power and what this relation brings into the social context, and van Dijk's (1984) discrimination category dominance is concerned with power imbalance between the discriminating and the discriminated group and how it is used to maintain control over the discriminated group. As Voldemort's main goal was to dominate the wizarding world and dominance discrimination is effectively present in his actions and attitudes, it was rather predictable that dominance would be visible also in examples that were categorised under other types of discrimination.

As the definition of van Dijk's (1984) daily discrimination is that it combines other discrimination categories into everyday life in small undetectable acts and attitudes, it was inevitable that the examples in this category would represent other categories of discrimination as well. However, I did not expect that nearly all of the examples had features from other categories too. Differentiation was most frequently present in other categories with four examples representing another category as well as differentiation. Using van Dijk's (1984) categories revealed that the discrimination that was present in the data was not simple but ambiguous and constructed with different features of discrimination.

The answer to my second research question "how discrimination is constructed in the data" is that discrimination was mainly constructed between people interacting with each other, but there was also visual cues, such as the statue (excerpt 1) and press releases (excerpt 7 & 10). Discrimination was constructed in numerous ways. Huckin's (1997) tools of analysis enabled to detect features in the text examples that revealed how discrimination was constructed. Foregrounding, backgrounding, omission, presupposition, framing, connotations and modalities were all features that were partially constructing discriminating discourses, and framing was the most frequent with six examples using it.

Voldemort proved to be a major influencer behind the discriminating discourses that were present in the data: the discrimination of Squibs and werewolves and the daily discrimination of Muggles in the epilogue were the only examples where Voldemort's influence was not directly or indirectly present. This was strongly due to the fact that Voldemort took over the Ministry early in the book and was then able to diffuse discrimination through political discourse, which was also a frequent feature in the examples.

In *Deathly Hallows*, discrimination is targeted mostly towards Muggle-borns by pure-blood supremacists. The previous studies on the book series have also raised similar issues towards magical creatures with human-like intelligence such as centaurs, goblins and house-elves who have been discriminated for example by legislation (Rana, 2009; Trosclair, 2008). This indicates that methodological critical discourse analysis is able to produce parallel results and conclusions as literary analyses in addition to providing evidence behind these results. Critical discourse analysis offers perspective and explanations for how discrimination is constructed and what are the forces behind it, such as power imbalances between groups.

Another interesting focus that I was not able to fit into the present study is that how education, upbringing and other social environmental factors affect the wizarding children and how they grow up to understand equality and discrimination. There are example characters in the book who provide examples of how social environment and upbringing influence children: Voldemort grew up as an orphan and started hating Muggles after learning that his father, who had abandoned his mother, was a Muggle, Draco Malfoy reproduces the same pure-blood supremacy ideology as his father, Severus Snape grew up in a broken family and was drawn to Dark magic already as a schoolboy, and on the other hand, Ron Weasley is from a good, tolerant family but nevertheless holds prejudices about werewolves and giants. As Harry Potters are essentially children's books, the upbringing and education that such extremely popular series present are important topics to study.

As I have presented in chapter 2.5, Trosclair (2018) and Horne (2010) have both reached the conclusion that the reader learns about kindness, respect, understanding and acceptance through Harry and his fight for social justice, whereas Anatol (2003, 2009) and Carey (2009) have claimed that Rowling has created a magical world that struggles with similar societal problems as contemporary societies, such as discrimination, corruption and racism, and fails to condemn these issues. The findings of the present study prove that there indeed is a significant amount of discrimination, racism and corruption present, and the series does not really provide any solutions for these problems, especially in the case of discrimination against non-magical people. Nevertheless, I argue that whether the discrimination, racism, and corruption are a subconscious reflection of Rowling's own environment and attitudes or a calculated way to create a plausible fictional society that co-exists alongside ours remains unanswered.

Lehtonen (2003) claims that the wizarding society, with its imperfections, strongly resembles contemporary British society and Park (2003) insists that Rowling's middle-class background

is evident from the books as, according to Park, all the main characters represent the middle class and the middle class is not criticised in any way, except for the cartoonish Dursleys. As I have previously presented, Baltzar (2007) insists the opposite. According to her, middle class is non-existent and the wizarding society is divided by Blood Statuses. I feel that it is evident that Rowling is aware of the class division in the British society, but I argue that the class division in the wizarding society and its purpose is another feature that can be seen either as Rowling's subconscious reflection of her own social environment or as a consciously created feature which makes the wizarding society more plausible or even identifiable. The books, and consequently the present study, do not provide an inclusive answer to this debate.

As the books are written from Harry's point of view, and non-magical people are portrayed as dull and uninteresting, the reader is invited to side with wizards and sympathise with Muggle-borns but also to accept the discriminating norms against some other discriminated groups within the wizarding society, such as Squibs, as the discrimination is not questioned as a bigger societal problem. Rana (2009) has also come to this same conclusion and emphasises that it is the fact that the books fail to condemn the systematic oppression of Others that makes the reader to accept the bigotry. This study has also come to the same conclusion as Rana (2009) that it is only Voldemort's extremely racist discrimination of Muggle-borns that is condemned, and the discrimination of other oppressed groups is not questioned.

As I have previously stated in chapter 2.5, Rowling has also been criticised especially about the way house-elves are portrayed (Anatol, 2009; Carey, 2009; Horne, 2010). Horne's (2010) claim that Rowling is criticising the social justice approach of antiracism education by ridiculing Hermione's fight for house-elves' rights and the lack of addressing discrimination and racism as larger societal phenomena in the books is also remarkable considering Rowling's recent controversial trans-phobic statements. She seems to be producing similar discriminating discourse in her books as in real life as she fights against the oppression of women but at the same time dismisses gender minorities with ignorant statements. In the light of the present study, this resembles the way the discrimination of Muggle-borns is condemned but the discrimination of Muggles and Squibs is dismissed. I argue that this is a valid reason for further evaluation of discriminating and racist discourses within literature. By examining literature, we can further understand how popular culture creates, reproduces and reflect discrimination and racism that occurs in our societies.

The present study is just one example of how Fairclough's (2015) three-dimensional model is applicable to fictional texts, but I conceive that this method is reproducible also in future studies. The present study highlights the multidisciplinary essence of critical discourse analysis as a study field, and how literature is a valid field to combine with CDA. CDA provides perspective to analyse discourses and the power imbalances that stories produce, convey and reflect. The significant popularity of Harry Potter series is in itself a valid reason for studying the novels but also because they are ultimately, despite the significant number of adult readers, children's books and their themes and morals have therefore extra value for the reader, as children's books usually are expected to give children a lesson. One of the main themes in the Harry Potter series is tolerance, but the present study and numerous critical essays previously have conducted that discrimination is clearly present. These inconspicuous racist and discriminating features in literature are an important reason why critical evaluation and critical discourse analysis are needed in literature: to challenge the perceptions and ideas that popular culture can produce, reproduce, and reflect.

REFERENCES

Primary references:

Rowling, J.K. (1997). *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. London: Bloomsbury. Rowling, J. K. (1998). *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. London: Bloomsbury. Rowling, J. K. (2003). *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. London: Bloomsbury. Rowling, J. K. (2007). *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. London: Bloomsbury.

Secondary references:

Amoussou, F. & Allagbe A. A. (2018). Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 11–18. [online] <http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0601002>

Anatol, G. L. (2003). *Reading Harry Potter: Critical essays*. Westport (CT): Praeger. Anatol, G. L. (2009). *Reading Harry Potter again: New critical essays*. Santa Barbara:

Praeger.

Anttila, E. (2019). *Victims or activists?: A critical discourse analysis on the roles of women and women's activism in the fight against Boko Haram in Nigeria*. University of Jyväskylä.

Baltzar, B. (2007). *Power and Evil in J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter Novels*. University of Tampere.

Bezar, S. A., Azhar, M. A. & Akhter, M. S. (2018). Fairclough's Three-dimensional model: Critical Discourse Analysis of Blake's "Ah Sun-flower!". *New Horizons*, 12(2), 59. [https://doi.org/10.2.9270/NH.12.2\(18\).05](https://doi.org/10.2.9270/NH.12.2(18).05)

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic Analysis. In Cooper, H., Camic, P. M., Long, D. L., Panter, A. T., Rindskopf, D. & Sher, K. J. *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-000>
- Breeze, R. (2011). Critical Discourse Analysis and Its Critics. *Pragmatics*, 493–525. [online] DOI: [10.1075/prag.21.4.01bre](https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.21.4.01bre).
- Carey, B. (2009). Hermione and the House-Elves Revisited: J.K. Rowling, Antislavery Campaigning, and the Politics of Potter. In Anatol, G. L. *Reading Harry Potter again: New critical essays*. Santa Barbara: Praeger.
- Collins Concise English Dictionary* (1988) ed. Hanks, P., Collins. Glasgow.
- Dijk, T. A. v. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse: An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Dijk, T. A. v. (2008). *Discourse and context: A socio-cognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dijk, T. A. v. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., Schiffrin, D. & Adger, C. T. *The handbook of discourse analysis* (Second edition.). Chichester, England: Wiley Blackwell.
- Eirtola, K. (2014). *Representations of Aboriginal Australians in the media: A critical discourse analysis of two newspapers*. University of Jyväskylä.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (Third edition.). London: Routledge.
- Grigoryan, M. (2013). Wand-ering Between Worlds: “Other” Identities in Harry Potter. In Bell, C. E. *Legilimens!: Perspectives in Harry Potter studies*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Hall, S. (2003). Harry Potter and the Rule of Law: The Central Weakness of Legal Concepts in the Wizard World. In Anatol, G. L. *Reading Harry Potter: Critical essays*. Westport(CT): Praeger.
- Horne, J. C. (2010). *Harry and the Other: Answering the Race Question in J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter*. The Lion and the unicorn (Brooklyn), 34(1), pp. 76-104. [doi:10.1353/uni.0.0488](https://doi.org/10.1353/uni.0.0488)

- Huckin, T.N. (1997) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In T. Miller (eds.), *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications*. United States Information Agency: Washington, DC.
- Koonz, C. (2003). *The Nazi Conscience*. London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Kyrölahti, M. (2001). *Viisasten kiveä etsimässä: Ideologia, kasvatus ja moraalit Joanne K. Rowlingin Harry Potter -suosikkikirjassa*. University of Jyväskylä.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lehtonen, S. (2003). *Contemporary British society in the magic world of J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter books*. University of Jyväskylä.
- Longman Dictionary of the English Language* (1984) ed. Gay, H. et al., Longman: Harlow.
- Mendlesohn, F. (2002). *Crowning the King: Harry Potter and the Construction of Authority*. In Whited, L. A. *The ivory tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a literary phenomenon*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Moghadam, N. H. & Kolahi, S. (2015). *Critical Discourse Analysis of the English Text-Slaughterhouse-five and its Persian Translation through Ideological Approach*. *International journal of English language and translation studies*, 3(2), 10-17.
- Park, J. (2003). *Class and Socioeconomic Identity in Harry Potter's England*. In Anatol, G. L. *Reading Harry Potter: Critical essays*. Westport (CT): Praeger.
- Rana, M. (2009). *Creating magical worlds: Otherness and othering in Harry Potter*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Reagin, N. R. (2011). *Harry Potter and History*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Toivakka, J. (2020). *“Red-haired teacher slain”: Critical discourse analysis of newsreportings in the case of Roseann Quinn*. University of Jyväskylä.

- Trosclair, L. (2018). *Fantastic Beasts or Beings, and Why Define Them? Examining Racial Ideology towards Magical Creatures and Social Hierarchies within J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series*. University of Louisiana at Lafayette.
- Westman, K. E. (2002). Specters of Thatcherism: Contemporary British Culture in J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series. In Whited, L. A. *The ivory tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a literary phenomenon*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Whited, L. A. (2002). *The ivory tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a literary phenomenon*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Wodak, R. & Reisigl, M. (2015). Discourse and Racism. In M. Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., Schiffrin, D. & Adger, C. T. *The handbook of discourse analysis* (Second edition.). Chichester, England: Wiley Blackwell.
- Yule, G. (2014). *The study of language* (5th ed.). Cambridge University Press.