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Abstract

The transitivity analysis of Meghan Markle’s interview at “The Oprah Winfrey Show” has been carried out to find out how the experience of racial discrimination has been represented in language. It is descriptive-qualitative research where the data has been analysed by employing the Hallidayan Transitivity Model. The results reveal that the utterances do construe an experience of racism as Meghan had a Black American identity. Her unborn child was mocked for his/her complexion, and was denied security, title, and an equal status in the Royal family. She also experienced bullying at the international level through international media and had to leave the UK. The most dominant processes are the mental and verbal processes. The mental processes show that she understood, perceived, and therefore got affected by racial discrimination. The verbal clauses show that she was verbally bullied and questioned by the Royal family. While the material and behavioural processes show her effective response towards racism and the discrimination, the relational clauses identify it. The language used is highly objective since circumstances are bringing validity and detail to her experiences.
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1. Introduction:

Human beings construe their experiences in language and so cannot detach themselves from the feelings felt at the time of the event while narrating its experience. This means that the narration becomes a literal repetition of the event (Gayraud & Auxemery, 2022). This is why representation
of experiences is one of the best ways to help people learn from and understand each other (Son, 2008). One such human experience is the experience of racial discrimination and the language that represents it has its literal repetition. The present research contributes to the area of socio-ethnic politics of racial discrimination and the psychology of racism in the west by looking at the language which construes the experience of racial discrimination. It takes the language of the interview of Meghan Markle at *The Oprah Winfrey Show* to study racial discrimination as its object of study and employs racism and racial discrimination as interchangeable synonyms. Racial discrimination is the discrimination based on racism, which is ‘the ideology that makes use of essentialized phenotypical, biological, and sometimes cultural differences to express and reinforce inequalities’ (Miles, 1982). Racial inequalities, a common consequence of racial discrimination, not only occur in organizations and institutions but also in all walks of life including education, employment, livelihood, health, justice, etc (McGregor-Smith, 2017). United Kingdom has a long history of migrations and with each wave of migration came a rich tapestry of relations between communities (Vertovec, 2007). Thus, the history of UK contributes to ethnic diversity in the country (ibid.), and therefore, it is stained with slavery, racism, and xenophobia (Rzepnikowska, 2019). Also, UK’s colonial history explains the establishment of race relations in Britain as colonialism has, apart from vibrant economic links, created a racial order between the colonial subjects and White British, so therefore, these colonial subjects suffer from internal divisions (Ozbilgin, 2018). This discrimination has also spread its wings to the Buckingham Palace, and the present study seeks to find out the same through a transitivity analysis by determining the process types in Meghan Markle’s language. Transitivity is used as a tool of analysis to explore how language construes experiences. Transitivity studies the conveyed feelings, opinions, thought processes, ideas, and aims in a piece of language. In this research, the transitivity processes of the speaker, her ideas, emotions, and thoughts, regarding the racial discrimination going on in the Buckingham Palace, are sought which are embedded in her utterances in the interview. The utterances will be analysed to check for the presence of racial discrimination. This implies, language helps in expressing experiences and narrating events. This construal of experiences in a language is governed by a set of rules and grammar that facilitate meaningful communication (Banga & Suri, 2015; Rabiah, 2018). The grammar of a language is considered as the heart of the language (Saaristo, 2015), and so has a vital value to language functioning. The functional grammar, developed by Halliday in SFL,
where clause is the unit of analysis, deals with language functions and contextual use. It represents language as a system of meanings that construe human culture, human experiences, and are produced and reproduced in the contexts of culture and the contexts of situation. As, it explores the functioning of language within a socio-cultural context, the focus automatically lies on the situation that is reached upon by systematically linking the social environment and the functional organization (Teich, 1999).

Halliday (1994) mentions that language has developed in response to the three kinds of social-functional needs. The foremost need is to be able to construe human experiences in terms of what is going on around us and inside us (called the ideational metafunction: a combination of logical meta function and experiential metafunction); second, to be able to create an interaction with the social world (interpersonal metafunction); and third, to be able to formulate messages that help us package our meanings in terms of what is new or given (textual metafunction). This research deals with the first social-functional need, the experiential metafunction, by analysing the transitivity to see how the experience of racial discrimination is construed in language by Meghan Markle. The experiential metafunction construes, as Sudarto (2011) argues, the experience of a process and the participants involved in it along with its circumstances. It shows how the human experiences are meaningfully construed in language, thereby displaying actions, sayings, feelings, ideas, and behaviours (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Halliday (1994) gave six process types. The first one is the material process, which is the process of physical actions, physical happenings, and physical doings. The one who performs the actions is the ‘doer’ while the object of the action is the ‘goal’. The mental process comprises of ‘perception, affection and cognitive abilities’ sensed by a ‘senser’. The senser senses a ‘phenomenon’. Relational process is about ‘having’ and ‘being’. It can either be attributive or identifying. A verbal process is about saying a verbiage which is said by a sayer to a receiver. A behavioural process construes a psychological and physiological behaviour and behaver as its major participant. An existential process depicts the process of existence. Circumstances are the indispensable part of each process type, comprehended by either prepositional or adverbial phrases, and can be categorized as: the circumstance of extent (level) and location (place, space), of manner (means, quality, comparison), of cause (reason, purpose, behalf), of contingency (condition, concession, default), of accompaniment (comitative, additive), of role (guise, product), and of a matter and angle.
In an interview at *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, a famous talk show of the United States, ran by Oprah Winfrey, airing from Chicago, Meghan Markle, as the daughter-in-law of King Charles, as the Duchess of Sussex, as a world-famous personality and as the wife of Prince Harry - the grandson of the late Queen Elizabeth, represents her experience of racial discrimination. This representation is of immense importance in terms of research, because firstly, Meghan, as a member of the Royal Family i.e., the British Monarchy, has lived in the Buckingham Palace and therefore her experience of racial discrimination serves the first-hand experience; secondly, it adds to how humans represent and narrate challenging experiences like racial discrimination in words; and thirdly, celebrities influence audience through their experiences, feelings, and ideas (Hidayat et al, 2019), and Meghan Markle is no less than an international celebrity.

The single limitation of the study is that only the relevant clauses, which are identified and labelled, are analysed in this study. The clauses that are not relevant to the idea of racial discrimination, the embedded clauses, and the clauses that cannot stand alone in terms of meanings are not included in the data of this research. In the identified clauses, the processes, participants, and circumstantial elements are also labelled. The interpretation of extracts reveals how the experience of racial discrimination is represented by the interviewee in the interview.

**Research Question:**
How has Meghan Markle represented her experience of racial discrimination in the Buckingham Palace in an interview at *The Oprah Winfrey Show*?

**Research Objective:**
To explore the experience of racial discrimination in Buckingham Palace as represented by Meghan Markle in an interview at *The Oprah Winfrey Show*.

2. **Literature Review:**
SFL, according to Halliday (1994), is defined as a theory of meaning as per choice by which a language is interpreted as networks of interlocking options: ‘either this, or that, or the other’, ‘either more like the one or more like the other’, and so on. It deals with the certain functional components of adult language which correspond to the metafunctions of language and, according to Bloor and Bloor (1995), have a systematic relationship with the lexicogrammar of the language that is used. Language construes our experience of the outside world and to shape our messages in a manner that they can correspond to their context, to the other messages around them and to the wider context in which the messages are exchanged.
The three categories of ideational, textual, and interpersonal functions are used as the basis of exploration of meanings (Thompson, 1996). The ideational function (experiential function and logical function) deals with the experiences and in this research, only the experiential metafunction will be analysed for an interview of Meghan Markle with Oprah Winfrey, with its focus on transitivity for racial discrimination. Teo (2000) studied the racial differences presented by the Australian newspapers and found the political, social, and cultural divisions between the indigenous people and the immigrants.

Wodak and Reisigl (1999) worked on racism and provided approaches to analyse racist pieces of language. Further, Manan (2001) conducted a transitivity analysis of the Malaysian newspaper to see how social and political identity can be exhibited through lexical choices, while Rodriguez (2006), through transitivity analysis, found that British newspapers help to realize ideological, social, political, and cultural practices, by the way the news is designed. A systemic functional grammar analysis of the representation of African Americans in the Ferguson news coverage in CNN and Fox News was conducted by Nguyen (2020), as a research thesis, where transitivity was employed to uncover the possible racist language in the news. Zahra and Rabbani (2021) studied the transitivity system of Maya Angelou’s biography to explore how racial discrimination, and the oppression that follows, has been represented by her.

Another transitivity analysis, conducted by Zahoor and Janjua (2016), of the tribute-giving song ‘I am Malala’ studies the construction of the character of Malala Yousafzai. Alvi and Baseer (2011a), similarly, did a transitivity analysis of Barack Obama’s speech to find out Obama’s persuasive linguistic constructions. In another research about Obama, Alvi and Baseer (2011b), through transitivity analysis, investigated his art of spin in his three popular speeches to explore that Obama employs material processes of action and event and mental processes of affection to persuade the public. Later, Baseer and Alvi (2012) did a transitivity analysis of another of Obama’s speeches to reveal that Obama uses the circumstance of location, space and time, and reason to bring reliability and authenticity to his statements. Ardiansyah (2016) conducted a transitivity analysis of the selected speech of Pope Francis to study the identity, works and responsibilities of a pope, while Zhang (2017) did one of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump’s First Television Debate to see ideological constructions.
The present study employs transitivity analysis to find out how the element of racial discrimination occurring in the Buckingham Palace is construed by Meghan Markle in her interview.

3. Methodology:

In this research Hallidayan transitivity analysis (1994) has been employed. Transitivity describes the whole clause to show how speakers refer to their experiences of the real-world. The focus of transitivity is the transfer of thoughts, experiences, and ideas, and the processes are the constituent elements through which this task is achieved.

The six types of process are determined by the verbal groups present in each clause. They are classified as: Material (major type), Mental (major type), Relational (major type), Verbal (mental plus relational processes), Behavioural (material plus mental processes), and Existential Process (relational plus material processes). A speaker usually employs various processes to express himself and transitivity functions as a tool to reveal how the experiences and their meanings are construed by speakers.

Circumstances, in the form of prepositional phrases usually, are the irremovable constituent of each process type. They can be divided as: Extent and Location (time and place), Manner (means, quality, and comparison), Cause (reason, purpose, and behalf), Contingency (condition, concession, and default), Accompaniment (comitative and additive), Role (guise and product), Matter and Angle.

In the present study, the video interview has been fetched from YouTube through purposive sampling and then transcribed for analysis. The relevant parts of the text representing discrimination were extracted, presented as paragraphs, broken down into clauses (boundaries marked by a double slash //), each clause was numbered (as 1, 2, 3), and then analysed because clause is the unit of analysis in Functional Grammar. The embedded clauses that cannot stand alone are not included. A descriptive-qualitative model is employed to do the transitivity analysis to see how the experience of racial discrimination has been represented by the interviewee. During data analysis, for each clause the process, participants, and circumstances and then their respective types are identified. Also, the ellipted items (marked by ^) are added back into the text to clarify the meanings construed thereby helping in analysing the representation of racial discrimination by Meghan Markle in the interview. Furthermore, Oprah Winfrey, the interviewer, has been referred to as OW and Meghan Markle, MM, and Prince Harry, PH, are the interviewees.
4. Discussion and Results:

Following are the relevant extracts from the interview that are analysed through transitivity model to see how the experience of racial discrimination going on at the Buckingham Palace has been represented by Meghan Markle.

4.1. Kate made Meghan cry:

In the first extract, as given in the appendix, a total of twelve processes represent racial discrimination. Out of these twelve material processes are the most dominant ones with a score of four. They construe the doings and happenings happened at the Buckingham palace. The first material process comes where OW asks if Meghan had made Kate cry? It is a material process followed by a goal, Kate, showing that it is not a natural happening but a deliberate action that has been done and has an effect that resonates. Also, this material process has a doer, you, thereby showing that it is not natural, and someone is responsible for it. It also shows that the general idea is you, which is in this case Meghan, is directly responsible for this action. The range, cry, at the end of the clause shows what the material action done by someone on something/someone, maybe by Meghan on Kate, has resulted in someone weeping. To this question, Meghan responds with an ellipted answer of ‘No I ^ did^ not^’. In this utterance there is no goal present but only an ellipted actor, I, and an ellipted material process, did not, which shows that the action done by her was not enough impactful to have affected another human being, such as Kate. This absence of goal has mitigated the effect of the utterance as well as the material process of doing under consideration. Then, she was asked by OW that where (circumstance) did it (the whole narrative) come from? Though it is only a verbal narrative but the use of come as a material process has made it an action that has a huge effect (on Meghan and other people) and is no more just a verbiage without a receiver or target. The clause began with where, which is a circumstance of place. This addition of circumstance to a material clause brings validity to it, giving the impression that a material action did take place.

Meghan was then asked by OW about any possibility of the existence of any such situation where Kate could have wept, in the form of existential clauses. This has decreased the effect drastically as there is a shift from a material clause of doing to an existential clause, i.e., from the actor as solely responsible to nobody responsible at all for the action, because existential clauses lack the first participant. An addition of circumstance of place, where, to this clause has once again brought validity to it. To this question, Meghan replies with an answer, which is structured in a
similar way as a question in the form of an existential clause to **emphasize** and **reemphasize** the fact that nobody was responsible, not even herself. She also added ‘**the reverse happened**’ which is a **material clause** again. This addition of material clause soon after the occurrence of three existential clauses adds value to its meaning showing that nothing wrong was done by anyone to **Kate**, not even by **Meghan**, yet **something bad happened to the interviewee/speaker, Meghan**. The use of **happened** as the material process of happening and not of doing shows that Meghan just wanted to add to the information but did not mean to blame anyone for the sad happening.

Meghan is then asked if she knew about the lie in Kate’s weeping in the form of **mental clauses**. Mental clauses construe feelings, emotions, reactions, and perceptions. The two mental clauses stated above, construe **perception of the phenomenon** which in this case is a **lie**. They show how **Meghan**, and **everyone**, had perceived (knew) that it was all lie about **Kate** weeping. To these mental clauses, there is an addition of circumstance of time (**all along**) and of location (**around**) to emphasize on the whole of the **time, duration and place** where the lie got perpetuated, thereby bringing **temporal and special details**, thus **validity** to her utterance. To this Meghan responded with another **mental clause** where the first participant i.e., **senser** is **everyone**, followed by **in the institution** as the circumstance of location to represent that **everyone** but Meghan in the Royal Family was involved in the formation of lie, perpetuation of lie, and in the understanding of lie as an untrue rumour. This clearly implied that she was **marginalized**, and everyone was against her, as part of **racial discrimination** that occurred. OW then, in the form of a verbal clause, asked that why wasn’t the validity of Kate’s weeping questioned? The presence of verbal clause shows that it’s a mere verbal condemnation and **no material action could have been taken against it**.

Meghan answered irrelevant, saying **that’s a good question** in the form of a relational clause that is identifying in nature and identifies the nature of the question in order to elude it.

**4.2. Meghan needed help:**

In the second extract there are six clauses, and the most dominant type of process to construe the experience of racial discrimination is verbal clause implying that it is more of a **narration** of the past events than anything else. Meghan has used verbal clauses to **report her conversations** with the institution of the Royal Family and to **verbally justify** why she is **narrating the conversation** in the show. She began with a mental clause where she **recalled** a memory of how **Harry** had supported **her** by **cradling her**. She then shared the event of her seeking help. For this purpose, she used a **material clause** of **I went to institution** instead of a mere verbal clause to present it as
an effort, as a concrete step that she had taken to seek help. It also shows that it wasn’t merely a cry for help but also a deliberate physical action where she physically approached them. This is to signify how badly she was in need of help, when she was going through racial abuse, and how seriously she tried to find it. She said that she told them she needed help (in the form of an additive verbal clause to support the material clause). The clause has a sayer as I and a receiver of the verbiage as them and so it is inferred that since the location has taken place successfully, it might also be considered effective. But it is presented as an ineffective one since she adds that she was replied with the clause, she cannot (get help), with a reason as verbiage to justify. The justification was that it wouldn’t be good for the institution, meaning thereby that a human’s mental health was less significant than the reputation of the Royal family. Meghan Markle presents that the Royal family did not want to get their reputation tarnished for being involved in racism and so therefore they declined her call for help. She then justifies the reason she is narrating all of it in the form of a circumstance of cause that says because there are so many people who afraid to voice that they need help. This addition of verbiage as a justification by them and the circumstance of cause as a justification by her shows that Meghan wants her justification to be more valid and more reasonable than theirs, since circumstances bring validation to the experiences construed in language. To this she also added a mental clause that how she as a senser knew that how hard it is to just voice a call for help? And then how hard it becomes when you are responded with a no and are asked to give up. All of these reveals how her mental health was being affected by the racial abuse she was going through at the Buckingham Palace. There is a circumstance of manner, personally, which adds validity to her feelings and to her conclusion of the situation.

The two mental clauses in the above extract construe how racism has affected her mental health. She narrates the response of Harry towards her deteriorating mental peace in the form of a mental clause saying that she remembers it. Also, she shares her feelings that how one feels when one needs help, while going through racial discrimination.

4.3. The question on the complexion:

In the third extract from the interview representing the racial discrimination there are eleven clauses out of which eight are verbal since this extract mostly reports the conversations that were held between Meghan and the Royal Family. Meghan shares how these conversations had an element of racism in them. The extract begins with a verbal clause that has two verbiages ‘he
won’t be given security’ and ‘not going to be given a title’ and a receiver we (Meghan and Harry) and two circumstances to time (Months when I was pregnant and all around the same time) to make it sound more valid. But it can be noticed how the first participant, that is the sayer, is missing. This shows that though Meghan has shared the information that consists of racial comments, contributing to racial discrimination, but failed to name, shame, or blame the speaker, thereby showing the power of the first participant and implying the Royal family. Then a behavioural clause follows that construes their behaviour of concern. Then comes another clause that reports a conversation where the verbiage is ‘about how dark his skin might be’ followed by a circumstance of time (when he is born). Meghan Markle uses the circumstance of location (in this case, of time) to show that this discussion on her child’s skin colour and these racist comments about him were made even before the child was born. It also presents how the conversations that the Royal family had about the unborn child of Meghan and Harry were racist in nature because they targeted his biological uniqueness and race-based differences of a human being in the verbiages. These verbiages commented on his skin tone, his colour, and his race and on the fact that due to his dark complexion he might lack security and title. The narration of the possibility of he kid getting robbed off his basic human rights like security also adds to how Meghan Markle represented racial discrimination in her interview.

OW, then asks, that who (sayer) is having (verbal) that conversation (verbiage) with you (receiver)? The question is in the form of a verbal clause having a sayer, a receiver, a verbiage and a verbal process showing that OW believes that the location had taken place successfully and the message got conveyed without any confusion. Then to show, that she herself is confused and a bit speechless about the conversation, she asks a question in the form of an existential clause to show that her focus is not on who but on what. To clearly represent the experience of racism, Meghan responds in an existential clause, along with an addition of several before conversations as a circumstance of extent to show that her claim is clear and valid as the conversations had occurred more than once so there is no need to be confused about it. In the beginning of the verbal clause the receiver was we, implying that Meghan too was among the receivers who were told all this racist stuff but later while repeating it as an answer to a question Meghan declares the receiver was not her but Prince Harry in an elliptical verbal clause ‘With Harry’. This reference to PH helps her shed the liability and responsibility about the authenticity of the information from her shoulders.
Also, to verify and validate the verbal clauses and to add weightage and objectivity to the construal of experience of racial discrimination, circumstances of matter like ‘About how dark your baby is going to be’ and ‘About potentially what that would look like’ are added in the elliptical verbal clauses by OW in her questions. This shows that not only the verbiage i.e., the utterance about the complexion of the child is racist but also are the rest of the additional details, like circumstances of matter, as shared by Meghan. It shows that the main subject under discussion was the complexion of the unborn child, which is a fully racist stance.

4.4. Rude and Racist:
The fourth extract from the interview construes racial discrimination by a total of twenty-three clauses, out of which nine are mental, seven are relational, three are verbal, two are behavioural and one is material based on the processes used. The most dominant type is of mental clauses construing Meghan Markle’s perception and understanding along with her interpretation of the racial discrimination. Meghan describes how she was bullied on social media at an international level by everyone and nobody from the Royal Family or its press team came to rescue her and how they were rude and racist towards her. Also, how her non-British race was targeted and how she lacked support from the Royal Family in terms of press teams and press releases, as everyone else had.

She, to reiterate her experience of racial discrimination, mentions in mental and verbal clauses how Kate was name-called as Katy-waity (but she doesn’t tell who called her that as the sayer is missing) and how everyone justified, in explicit utterances, this rudeness as part of what comes with being a member of the royal family. In a relational clause of identification, it is mentioned that rude and racist are not the same to provide a vivid comparison between the two, and to show that she knows the difference between the two. Therefore, she absolutely is representing and construing racism only in her language as she can sense which one she went through, and which one did she face.

Circumstances of contingency (especially if they know something is not true), circumstance of extent (that goes on the record) and circumstance of cause (to protect you) are used by Meghan, while representing racial discrimination, in order to show different possibilities that had and could have emerged as a result of all the abuse, bullying and racism, to show different services that could have been provided and to show the other sheer details that were missing and lacking in her case. Apart from these, the circumstances of cause and manner like similar to, really hard,
unfortunately, because this was different, being American, are also used by her to describe the sheerest of the details so that the impact and objectivity increases and the validity of the statement representing racial discrimination as truth gets a verification from the listeners.

Also, the only material clause is ‘and that didn’t happen for us’ which construes a happening and not the doing, but the actor is missing, implying the disinterestedness of the Royal family. This also shows that she just gave her statement to represent the experience of racial discrimination that they faced in the Buckingham Palace but didn’t explicitly blame anyone for those acts of racism. To cancel out the liability and to lessen the resonance of her statements, perhaps she had done that intentionally.

4.5. Leaving UK:

The fifth extract is the only instance where Prince Harry has explicitly made a statement about racial practices taking place in the Buckingham Palace while responding to OW. On the behalf of Meghan Markle, while representing racism, Prince Harry responded in a relational clause to the question ‘whether they (actor: Harry and Meghan) left (material process) UK (goal) because of the racial practices common in United Kingdom?’ saying, ‘it was a lot of part of that’.

The question is a material clause, where the material process is supplied with an actor, a goal and a circumstance of contingency thereby implying that a physical action of moving and shifting, from one place to another, has taken place that can have effects and resonance, as someone has totally moved from some place, because of a certain reason. While the question was material in nature, the answer had a relational clause which construed a vague yet directing thought that moving out due to racism was part of the decision thereby giving a hint to the listeners that racism may or may not be the sole reason behind leaving the Royal family, leaving UK and moving to US.

One of the reasons for the vagueness could be that Prince Harry wanted to normalise things by decreasing and mitigating the effects that Meghan Markle’s interview representing racial discrimination in Buckingham Palace could have on the Royal Family and the UK itself. It might have also been done to signal that the discussion/interview is coming to and end.

The results of the data answer the research question of how has Meghan Markle represented her experience of racial discrimination in the Buckingham Palace in an interview at The Oprah Winfrey Show? The results reveal that Meghan Markle’s language in the interview at The Oprah Winfrey represents the experience of racial discrimination practiced in the Buckingham Palace in
very clear expressions. It is evident that Meghan Markle faced racism due to her non-British, American race. She experienced racial discrimination directly and indirectly at multiple instances. She represents the experience of racial discrimination by having her unborn child targeted and mocked for his skin colour and complexion. She was told explicitly that her son would not be given security and title and all his life he may never have a status equal to the rest of the princes of the Royal Family. For this reason, she and her husband had to leave their home, the United Kingdom and move to the United States of America. While representing racial discrimination, she also mentions the experience of bullying and harassment at the international level on social media, mainstream media and otherwise because she was not given any press support unlike the rest of the members of Royal Family.

The results also reveal that at Buckingham Palace, members of the Royal Family are name-called. The experience of racial discrimination at the Buckingham Palace as represented by Meghan Markle in her interview at *The Oprah Winfrey Show* mostly constitutes of mental and verbal processes thus showing that she felt, understood, perceived, reacted, and was affected by the experience. Also, the verbal clauses construe her experience of being verbally bullied and harassed, questioned, and criticised. The other two process types, the material and behavioural, show her response and approach towards racism was strong, effective, and wholesome. The relational clauses show the comparison of the racial practices, identification of the racial discrimination thereby shedding any misconceptions and bringing validity to the representation of the experience. Also, the representation is highly objective since circumstances are used in high frequency thereby validating and exposing the sheerest details of racial discrimination at the Buckingham Palace.

The results also reveal that the experience of racial discrimination is represented mostly in the form of mental and verbal clauses, but Meghan Markle’s response to the racial practices has been construed in behavioural and material clauses most of the time to show that not only her behaviour was affected but also, she took concrete steps to help herself come out of the racial discrimination and racial inequality. At some instances, the relational clauses are also present that either identify or compare the acts and events occurring. It also shows that most of the practices of racial discrimination were verbal, in the form of conversations, questions, name-calling, and justifications. Also, the racial discrimination and inequalities led to the deterioration of her mental peace which is construed in mental clauses that present her cognition and understanding of
discrimination, perception of discrimination and reaction towards discrimination along with how it affected her. No physical abuse has been reported as part of the representation of racial discrimination.

The results further reveal that Meghan’s response to the racial discrimination was in the form of behavioural and material clauses. On one hand, she had not only approached the Royal Family, her husband for help and had left the title, the family, the perks and benefits accompanying, but had also left the country. On the other hand, the behavioural clauses show she behaved peacefully during those times to keep her nerves intact.

5. Conclusion:

The transitivity analysis of the interview of Meghan Markle at *The Oprah Winfrey Show* represents the experience of racial discrimination practiced in the Buckingham Palace in a very clear and concise manner using certain processes out of which mental processes are most dominant. It has also been established that she faced racism due to her non-British race. She had to face racial discrimination due to her American race. She was targeted directly as well as indirectly by targeting her child, who was not yet born, for his skin tone, colour, and complexion. She had to face the claims that her son would not be given any social security and title and that he might not have an equal status in the family, after he is born. Also, she, along with her husband, had to leave her home, UK, because of racial discrimination. The racial discrimination she represents also includes being bullied and harassed internationally, on social media and otherwise since she lacked social security by the Royal Family.
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Appendix:

Extract one. Kate made Meghan cry:

OW: 1 Did you (actor) make (process: material) Kate (goal) cry (range)?

MM: 2 No I^(actor) did^ not^ (process: material)!

OW: 3 So where (circumstance of place) did (process-) that (actor) come (-material) from? 4 Was (process: existential) there a situation (existent) where she might have cried (circumstance of place) 5 or was (process: existential) there a situation (existent) where she could have cried (circumstance of place)?

MM: 6 No there^ was^ (process: existential) no^ such^ situation^ (existent),// 7 the reverse (actor) happened (process: material)!

OW: 8 You(senser) knew (process: mental) all along (circumstance of time) 9 and people (senser) around (circumstance of location) knew (process: mental) that that wasn’t true. (phenomenon)

MM: 10 Everyone (senser) in the institution (circumstance of location) knew (process: mental) that wasn’t true (phenomenon).

OW: 11 So why didn’t (process-) somebody (sayer) just (circumstance of manner) say (-verbal) that (verbiage)!

MM: 12 That (token) is (process: relational identifying) a good question (value).

Extract two. Meghan needed help

MM: 1 And I (sensor) remember (mental) how he just cradled me (phenomenon), 2 and I (actor) went (material) to the institution (goal) 3 and I (Sayer) said (verbal) that I needed some word that could help (verbiage) 4 And I (receiver) was told (verbal) that I couldn’t, (verbiage) that it wouldn’t be good for the institution (verbiage) 5 I (Sayer) share (verbal) this (verbiage) because there are so many people who afraid to voice that they need help (circumstance of cause) 6 and I (senser) know (mental) personally (circumstance of manner) how hard it is to not just voice it but when you voice it be told no (phenomenon).

Extract three. The question on the complexion

MM: 1 Months when I was pregnant, (circumstance of time) all around the same time, (circumstance of time)so we (receiver) have (verbal) it (verbiage) in conversation (circumstance of place) that he won’t be given security (verbiage), not going to be given a title, (verbiage) 2 and also, we^ (receiver) have^ concerns (behavioural process) 3and we^ (receiver) had
conversations (verbal) about how dark his skin might be, (verbiage) when he is born (circumstance of time). //

OW: 4 Who (sayer) is having (verbal) that conversation(verbiage) with you (receiver)?// 5 There’s (existential) a conversation… (existent) //

MM: 6 There are (existential) several (circumstance of extent) conversations (existent). //

OW: 7 There’s (verbal) a conversation (verbiage) with you (receiver). //

MM: 8 There is (verbal) a conversation (verbiage) With Harry (receiver).//

OW: 9 There is (verbal) a conversation (verbiage) About how dark your baby is going to be (circumstance of matter)? //

MM: 10 There is (verbal) a conversation (verbiage) About Potentially what that would look like (circumstance of matter). // 11 It (verbiage) was narrated (verbal)to me (receiver)from Harry (sayer).//

Extract four. Rude and racist

OW: 1 Why (circumstance of cause) couldn’t (process-) you (behaer) make (-behavioural) peace with it (the toxic environment) (behaviour)?//

MM: 2 We couldn’t make peace Because this was different, (circumstance of cause) // 3 you (senser) know. (Mental process)//

OW: 4 It (Token) is (relational identifying process) different (value) because of the race (circumstance of cause)?//

MM: 5 And It is (token) is (relational identifying process) different (value) because of social media (circumstance of cause).//

OW: 6 Oh yes it is (token) is (relational identifying process) a different time. (value)//

MM: 7 …. Plus, It (token) is (relational identifying process) different (value) because my being American (circumstance of cause).// 8 It (phenomenon) translated (mental process) in a different way (circumstance of manner) across the pond (circumstance of location). // 9 So, you (senser) had (mental process) a noise level (phenomenon) that was very different (circumstance of manner). //

OW: 10 So, you (senser) felt (mental process) bullied (phenomenon) on the international level (circumstance of place).//

MM: 11 I (senser) think (mental process) the volume (phenomenon) of what was coming in, in the interest, (circumstance of matter) was greater (circumstance of manner) because of the social
media, (circumstance of cause) because of the fact that I was not just British. (circumstance of cause) // 12 And, that unfortunately, (circumstance of manner) if (circumstance of contingency) members of his family (sayer) say (verbal) well that’s what happened to all of us (verbiage) // 13 or if (circumstance of contingency) they (senser) can compare (mental process) what? The experience (phenomenon)// 14 that I (senser) went through is (mental process) similar to (circumstance of manner) what has been shared with us (phenomenon). // 15 Kate (receiver) was called (verbal) Waity Katy (verbiage), because^ she^ was^ waiting to marry William (circumstance of cause). // 16 Well I (senser) imagine (mental process) that (phenomenon) was really hard (circumstance of manner) // 17 and I (senser) do ^imagine (mental process). // 18 I (senser) can’t picture (mental process) what that film was like (phenomenon).// 19 This (token) is not (relational identifying process) the same (value). // 20 And if (circumstance of contingency) a member of this family (sayer) would (verbal-) comfortably (circumstance of manner) say(-process) that we’ve all had to deal with the things that were rude. (verbiage)// 21 Rude and racist (token) are not (relational identifying process) the same (value). // 22 and equally (circumstance of manner), you (carrier) have also had a (relational attributive) press team (attribute) that goes on the record (circumstance of extent) to protect you (circumstance of cause) especially if they know something is not true (circumstance of contingency). // 23 And that (goal) didn’t happen (material process) for us (beneficiary). //

Extract five. Leaving UK

OW:1 Did (material-) you(actor) leave (-process) the country (goal) because of racism (contingency)? //

PH (on the behalf of MM): 2 It (token) was (relational identifying) a lot part of that (value).//