

The Language of Liberation: A Dialogic Analysis of the Shawshank Redemption

Ali Khalifa A. Abdullatif¹, & Amany Hamed Mohamed²

¹ Associate Professor of Grammar and Morphology, Department of Arabic Language, College of Arts, King Faisal University, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia

² English Department, Faculty of Arts, New Valley University, Egypt

Correspondence: Dr. Ali Khalifa A. Abdullatif, Associate Professor of Grammar and Morphology, Department of Arabic Language, College of Arts, King Faisal University, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: aabdullatif@kfu.edu.sa

Received: May 4, 2026 Accepted: September 23, 2026 Online Published: October 16, 2026

doi:10.5430/wjel.v17n1p171 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v17n1p171>

Abstract

This study offers a critical discourse analysis of Frank Darabont's *The Shawshank Redemption*. It examines how dialogue in the film serves as a tool for psychological resistance, rebuilding identity, and achieving freedom within the prison setting. The analysis uses a linguistic approach that draws on Bakhtinian dialogism, Foucauldian counter-conduct, Butlerian performativity, and Gee's discourse theory. This approach shows that language, not just story, enables resistance. Through a qualitative, detailed analysis of selected dialogues, the study identifies key linguistic features: evaluative word choices, repeated sentence structures, contrasts in reference points, and metaphorical language. Together, these create what is called a "grammar of liberation." These tactics lead to larger shifts: claiming symbolic independence, repeatedly rewriting identity. The findings show that the film's language serves as self-work. It builds hope and selfhood despite institutional control. This study provides a framework for examining how discourse challenges oppression in films and other cultural works. It treats liberation as something achieved through language and performance, not just plot or theme.

Keywords: Dialogic analysis, Film dialogue, Liberation discourse, Prison narrative, Bakhtinian theory, Counter-conduct, Performativity

1. Introduction

Few films set in a prison convey a profound sense of freedom as *The Shawshank Redemption* (1994). Directed by Frank Darabont and adapted from Stephen King's novella, the story follows Andy Dufresne, a wrongly imprisoned banker. His intellectual resilience and mastery of language gradually change his fate and affect those around him. This film explores how language, particularly dialogue, acts as a medium for psychological resistance and identity reconstruction. In a prison setting, speech is not just a means of communication; it becomes a tool for survival, self-definition, and liberation.

1.1 Historical and Cultural Context

1.1.1 Temporal Setting and Social Transformation

The Shawshank Redemption (1994), based on Stephen King's *Rita Hayworth and Shawshank Redemption* (1982), unfolds between 1947 and the late 1960s - a time of significant social transformation in America, characterized by the emergence of the civil rights movement, evolving concepts of masculinity, and increasing doubt towards institutional authority (King, 1982). The narrative begins in 1947, during the "organization man" period (Whyte, 1956), when adherence to institutional norms shaped individual identity. Andy Dufresne, a banker, initially exemplifies this conformity, yet his moral growth within the prison context symbolizes a challenge to such uniformity. As the film reaches its conclusion in the late 1960s, his and Red's acts of liberation resonate with a nationwide trend towards personal authenticity and moral independence, reflecting wider cultural shifts that questioned the legitimacy of corporate and institutional power.

The film depicts the mid-twentieth-century America as a landscape of conflicting masculinities. Captain Hadley represents a violent, punitive form of masculinity, whereas Red initially embodies stoic endurance. In contrast, Andy exemplifies an intellectually and emotionally aware model that challenges the dominant ideals of post-war masculinity (Kimmel, 2012). His quiet resilience, emotional openness, and moral integrity redefine strength as being reflective rather than aggressive.

The friendship between Andy and Red reimagines male bonding, emphasizing vulnerability and empathy rather than bravado (Seidler, 2006). Through their mutual care and shared hope, they establish a humane model of masculinity rooted in emotional reciprocity and moral courage.

1.1.2 Racial Dynamics and Civil Rights Context

Casting Morgan Freeman as Red transforms the character from Stephen King's originally white-Irish American depiction into a Black man whose moral authority challenges the racial hierarchies of mid-century America. Although the film does not explicitly address racial

conflict, Red's reflective narration and ethical presence subtly critique the racial assumptions often found in prison narratives.

His journey from cynical survival to hopeful renewal parallels the broader struggles of African Americans seeking enfranchisement and identity during the Civil Rights Era. The film's depiction of interracial solidarity in Shawshank presents a liberal, aspirational vision—one in which shared humanity and agency overcome racial divisions, mirroring the 1990s ideals of post-racial harmony.

1.1.3 Religious and Spiritual Themes

The film contrasts Warden Norton's hypocritical religiosity, as he uses scripture to justify his cruelty, with Andy and Red's authentic spirituality. Their faith is rooted in friendship, hard work, and small acts of kindness. This contrast reflects a broader disillusionment with institutional religion prevalent in the late twentieth century, signalling a shift towards a more individualized faith based on compassion and moral action. The narrative suggests that true spiritual awakening comes not from strict dogma, but from real-life experiences and a commitment to moral integrity.

1.2 Rationale of the Study

This study addresses a gap in the current scholarship: while much research has examined the moral, thematic, and narrative aspects of *The Shawshank Redemption*, few have analyzed how its dialogues function as a form of resistance against institutional discourse. Traditional film criticism emphasizes visual aesthetics and plot, often overlooking linguistic strategies that allow characters to reclaim autonomy. Drawing on Foucault's (1995) concept of counter-conduct, this study highlights language as a site of resistance ~~within~~ in oppressive systems.

Dialogue is understood as a dynamic interaction of voices (Bakhtin, 1981), where internally persuasive discourse challenges authoritative speech. By integrating Bakhtin's dialogism with Foucault's theory of disciplinary power, this study shows that dialogic exchanges both resist authority and reshape personal and collective identities.

The film was selected for its rich interplay of religious, bureaucratic, colloquial, and philosophical discourses, that illustrate the struggle between control and freedom. Within the prison - a closed institutional space - words are not neutral; they enforce authority or open paths to liberation. From a linguistic perspective, dialogue sustains oppression while also enabling resistance, identity assertion, and envisioning life beyond confinement. This study analyzes how dialogue challenges institutional authority and identifies the linguistic strategies through which characters maintain autonomy and reconstruct their identities.

2. Literature Review

A structured literature search was conducted in Scopus and the Web of Science Core Collection to identify peer-reviewed journal articles published between 2021 and 2025. The search combined conceptual and methodological keywords such as "*film dialogue*," "*cinematic discourse*," and "*telecinematic discourse*" with terms related to carcerality, power, and resistance, including "*prison narrative*," "*carceral discourse*," "*dialogism*," and "*Bakhtinian analysis*." Additional searches incorporated traditions such as "*critical discourse analysis*" and "*feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis*." Only indexed peer-reviewed articles were selectively drawn upon to support key theoretical insights.

Recent scholarship on carceral discourse challenges traditional conceptions of public safety, contending that carceral systems operate less as neutral institutions of protection and more as racialized political projects (Drustup et al., 2024). Within this framework, safety is not universally experienced; instead, it is a stratified construct, discursively distributed through language that privileges certain groups while criminalizing others. Drustup et al. note that state's rhetoric of protection frequently legitimizes surveillance and incarceration under the pretext of maintaining order, thereby perpetuating insecurity for marginalized communities.

Counter-narratives from these communities expose the fragility of official constructions. Through Critical Narrative and Discourse Analysis, Drustup et al. (2024) illustrate how many Black, Brown, and working-class participants experience policing as a source of fear rather than security. Their accounts not only challenge dominant regimes of truth but also articulate alternative understandings of safety rooted in care and collective trust. However, resistance coexists with a residual carceral ideology, as evidenced in *The Shawshank Redemption* through its portrayal of survival, endurance, and the human struggle for dignity within constraints.

Beyond the state, institutional and corporate discourses reproduce similar rhetorical patterns. Schlembach and Hart (2025) show how corporations use bureaucratic neutrality to deflect blame for systemic abuse, reframing structural harm as individual misconduct. This linguistic sanitization parallels *Shawshank's* depiction of legality as moral camouflage, exposing how language upholds institutional violence.

Dialogic approaches informed by Bakhtin's theory extend this discussion into cultural representation. Tracey et al. (2023) argue that dialogism in documentary filmmaking fosters polyvocal, participatory authorship, an ethical challenge to top-down narration. Applied to *The Shawshank Redemption*, this perspective illuminates the film's conversational rhythm: freedom is constructed through dialogue, and mutual recognition rather than defiance alone.

Research on incarcerated authors supports this claim. Halliwell et al. (2022) and Symkovych (2025) demonstrate how prisoners reclaim moral and legal discourse to assert personhood and critique dehumanization. Language thus becomes a medium of agency, a lifeline between oppression and self-definition, precisely the journey mirrored in Andy Dufresne's strategic, redemptive use of words.

At the micro-level, interpersonal communication within prisons profoundly shapes experiences of legitimacy and safety. Greberman et al.

(2025) find that respect and responsiveness matter more than physical conditions, while Walker et al. (2024) reveal how gendered discourses allow women officers partial agency within patriarchal institutions. These dynamics resonate with the film's portrayal of masculine solidarity and moral negotiations within a rigid hierarchy.

Finally, linguistic studies of cinematic dialogue add depth to the methodology. Galiano (2023) shows how the omission or retention of pragmatic markers in translation affects textual coherence and the interpersonal, face-management functions of dialogue, underscoring the performative force of words. Attention to such linguistic micro-features provides a valuable lens for examining *The Shawshank Redemption*, where spoken exchanges between inmates and authorities continually redraw the boundaries between submission and resistance.

Taken together, this body of work shows that carceral power is sustained, and sometimes undermined through language. While previous research has richly explored ideology and representation, few studies integrate critical discourse analysis, dialogic theory, and fine-grained linguistic analysis of film dialogue. Thus, *The Shawshank Redemption* becomes not merely a story about freedom, but a linguistic negotiation of it, a film in which every utterance, hesitation, and act of address traces the possibility of liberation through speech itself.

Existing research on *The Shawshank Redemption* highlights this divide. Marlina et al. (2021) identify hope, justice, and redemption as central themes, yet treat them as narrative outcomes rather than as discursive achievements. Genre-based analyses (Mason, 2006) situate the film within prison and male-bonding traditions, but rarely explore how its dialogue enacts resistance or redefines selfhood.

Despite offering valuable thematic insights, these studies leave unexamined the linguistic mechanisms that mediate power, identity, and liberation. To address this gap, the present study integrates Bakhtinian dialogism and Foucauldian counter-conduct to investigate how *The Shawshank Redemption* employs authentic dialogue as a means of psychological, social, and discursive emancipation. By analyzing the film's conversational exchanges as sites where competing discourses intersect, this study demonstrates how language not only reflects institutional constraints but also enables transcendence of those constraints. In doing so, this research positions cinematic dialogue as a transformative practice—one that reshapes subjectivity, challenges authority, and affirms the potential of cinema as a medium of resistance and self-reconstruction.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study employs an integrated theoretical framework that combines Bakhtinian dialogism, Foucauldian discourse theory, and Gee's analytical model of discourse to investigate how linguistic interaction serves as a mechanism for resistance and identity reconstruction in *The Shawshank Redemption*. This tripartite framework provides complementary perspectives: Bakhtin elucidates the dialogic interplay of competing voices, Foucault uncovers the microphysics of power embedded in institutional language, and Gee offers systematic tools for analyzing how linguistic choices construct social identities and enact power relations. Collectively, these theories facilitate a rigorous examination of dialogue as a site where carceral control and liberatory speech converge, thereby establishing the foundation for subsequent analysis.

3.1 Bakhtinian Dialogism: Voice, Authority, and Persuasive Discourse

Bakhtin's (1981) theory of dialogism serves as the foundational lens for this analysis, conceptualizing language as inherently interactive and meaning as emerging through encounters with diverse voices. Two Bakhtinian concepts are particularly salient: the distinction between authoritative and internally persuasive discourse.

Authoritative discourse demands unconditional allegiance, allows no dialogic engagement, and functions as a closed system of meaning (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 342). In the prison context, institutional speech, such as the warden's pronouncements, the guards' commands, and the rules governing daily life, exemplifies this monologic authority, seeking to impose meaning without negotiation.

In contrast, internally persuasive discourse is characterized by openness to reinterpretation; it is "half ours and half someone else's" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 345), continuously shaped through dialogue and personal conviction. Andy Dufresne's language of hope, particularly in his discussions of freedom and survival, exemplifies this internally persuasive mode.

Heteroglossia, or the coexistence of multiple, often competing, language forms within a single social space, highlights how *The Shawshank Redemption* stages a struggle among institutional, bureaucratic, religious, and colloquial registers. This is evident in the film's contrast between official prison language, everyday inmate speech, and moments of personal testimony.

Bakhtin's framework reveals the prison as a dialogic arena in which authoritative discourse confronts resistant voices and meaning remains contested.

3.2 Foucauldian Power: Discipline, Resistance, and Subjectivity

Michel Foucault's work on disciplinary power and resistance constitutes the second theoretical pillar, providing a framework for understanding the operation of institutional discourse and the ways in which subjects contest it. Foucault (1995) characterizes disciplinary institutions as systems that regulate bodies through spatial distribution, temporal scheduling, and continuous surveillance. Within this framework, language functions as a disciplinary mechanism, that inscribes norms and shapes subjectivity.

The concept of *counter-conduct* (Davidson, 2011) is particularly relevant, referring to forms of resistance that operate within institutional boundaries by creating alternative logics of action that subtly subverts dominant power relations. The film's characters do not challenge the prison's authority through overt rebellion; instead, they employ linguistic strategies to carve out spaces of autonomy, reframe

institutional meanings, and assert ethical subjectivity within constraints imposed on them. Andy's strategic use of polite, professional language in interactions with the warden and prison administration exemplifies this dynamic: compliance becomes a means of subversion, and language serves as an instrument for counter-conduct.

Foucault's (1988) later work on *technologies of the self* further elucidates how individuals may use language to cultivate ethical identity through deliberate discursive practices. Andy's repeated hopeful affirmations, Red's evolving autobiographical narrative, and their mutual dialogic engagement—particularly in conversations about hope, freedom, and survival—constitute such technologies, enabling the characters to refashion themselves despite institutional pressures.

3.3 Gee's Discourse Model and Identity Construction

James Paul Gee's (2014) analytical framework provides a useful bridge between Bakhtin's dialogism and Foucault's theory of power by offering tools for close linguistic analysis. It distinguishes between discourse, as language in use, and Discourse, as a socially recognized way of speaking, acting, and being. This distinction enables examination of how characters adopt, negotiate, or resist dominant Discourses within the film.

Gee's framework is especially helpful for identifying the linguistic features through which meaning and identity are constructed. Situated meanings show how words such as "salvation" and "freedom" change according to context, while social languages reveal the registers associated with institutional authority or personal expression. Discourse models further expose the assumptions and values embedded in speech, as seen in the contrast between the prison's official language and the inmates' more individualized voices.

Applied to *The Shawshank Redemption*, Gee's model allows the analysis to move beyond broad thematic interpretations to the level of actual language choices. Evaluative lexis, deixis, syntax, and metaphor can then be examined as resources for enacting power, positioning speakers, and imagining alternative realities. In this way, Gee's framework complements Bakhtin and Foucault by linking micro-level linguistic details to larger questions of resistance and identity formation.

These three theoretical approaches are mutually reinforcing rather than simply additive. Bakhtin's dialogism establishes the relational nature of meaning and highlights the contest between authoritative and persuasive voices. Foucault's theory of power explains the institutional conditions that shape discursive possibilities and the forms of counter-conduct that emerge within them.

Gee's analytical model supplies the methodological tools needed to identify the specific linguistic features through which power and resistance are enacted. First, Discourses appear in the film's dialogue through identifiable lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic patterns. Second, these Discourses enter into dialogic interaction, revealing moments of authoritative imposition and internally persuasive response. Third, these verbal interactions can be interpreted as sites of disciplinary power and counter-conduct, where characters negotiate autonomy and reconstruct identity through language.

Thus, the integrated framework moves from linguistic observation to dialogic interpretation to sociopolitical analysis. It provides a robust lens for examining how *The Shawshank Redemption* uses dialogue to represent liberation within the constraints of its setting.

4. Research Questions:

The analysis addresses the following research questions:

How does dialogue in *The Shawshank Redemption* function as a form of linguistic resistance, transforming Bakhtin's "internally persuasive discourse" into a vehicle of Foucauldian counter-conduct within carceral institutions?

What lexical syntactic and pragmatic do key characters (Andy and Red) employ to negotiate identity and assert autonomy against institutional discourse?

How does the film's dialogic interplay between institutional and liberating speech construct alternative discursive spaces that reconfigure power, identity, and temporality within a prison setting?

5. Methodology

5.1 Research Design

A qualitative, descriptive approach was employed, drawing on critical discourse analysis and dialogic film analysis. The study examines how dialogue in *The Shawshank Redemption* demonstrates the reproduction, negotiation, and resistance to carceral power, as well as the reshaping of identities. Bakhtin's framework conceptualises dialogue as an interaction of voices rather than a simple exchange. Foucault's theories provide insight into how institutional language shapes individuals and how alternative speech can challenge such control. Butler's concept of performativity and Gee's discourse framework facilitate the examination of identity formation through repeated speech and social discourses.

5.2 Sampling and Procedure

Data were collected from selected sections of the film's original screenplay, verified transcripts, and cross-checked for accuracy. Instead of analysing every line, purposive sampling targeted scenes that highlight tensions between authority, resistance, hope, and changing identities. Dialogues involving Andy, Red, Norton, Hadley, Brooks, and Tommy were prioritised because these characters sit at the heart of the prison's power relations. by

Scenes were included when they referred to rules, discipline, self-definition, moral judgment, or future aspirations, or when shifts in tone or

stance suggested changes in power dynamics. After selection, the dialogues were segmented speaker and the communicative purpose of each turn. An initial coding scheme, informed by the theoretical framework, covered categories such as authoritative discourse, disciplinary language, counter-conduct, performative compliance and resistance, identity reconstruction, and liberatory speech. This scheme was then streamlined and adjusted as new patterns emerged during repeated readings.

Following coding, the data were grouped according to three recurring discursive functions: the language of institutional control, the discourse of hope and inner freedom, and the dynamic interplay of resistance and transformation in Andy and Red's conversations. Each group was subjected to close linguistic analysis, with theoretical concepts used to clarify patterns in the dialogue rather than overshadow them. Bakhtin's account of multiple voices and discourse types helped explain how different voices intersect and contest one another, while Foucault's work illuminated how institutional language produces obedience and how alternative speech practices open spaces for agency. Butler's notion of performativity showed how repeated speech acts construct identities and how breaks in repetition allow for change, and Gee's discourse tools helped link these local practices to broader themes of prison life and imagined freedom.

6. Data Analysis

This section analyzes selected dialogues from *The Shawshank Redemption* to examine how linguistic choices function as sites of resistance, identity negotiation, and psychological recovery. The analysis is guided by Bakhtin's dialogism, Foucault's microphysics of power, Butler's performativity, Gee's discourse theory, and Baxter's Feminist Post-Structuralist Discourse Analysis.

6.1 The Language of Hope and Inner Freedom

Andy Dufresne's discourse in *The Shawshank Redemption* shows how language can function as a form of liberation within a carceral setting. His speech is marked by moral lexis, repetition, simple syntax, and spatial metaphors, all of which create a discursive space of hope and transcendence. These features align with Bakhtin's notion of internally persuasive discourse, as Andy's words arise from conviction rather than institutional compliance.

The evaluative terms in Andy's statements, such as "good," "best," and "never dies," construct a moral vision that extends beyond immediate confinement. Their repetition gives hope, rhetorical force, and stability, while also performing identity through reiterated conviction in Butler's terms. Rather than simply describing hope, Andy's language enacts it as a resistant stance against despair.

Syntactically, Andy relies on parataxis, simple declaratives, and present-tense structures, which make his speech clear, direct, and universal. The absence of subordination mirrors the simplicity and openness of hope, while expressions such as "never dies" suspend meaning beyond prison time. From a Foucauldian perspective, this syntactic economy functions as counter-conduct, enabling Andy to assert a moral order that resists institutional control.

Deictic choices further reinforce this resistance. In "*They can't get that from you... It's in here*". The opposition between "they" and "you" constructs a divide between external authority and inner autonomy. The phrase "*It's in here*" locates freedom in an inviolable inner space, whether understood as the mind, heart, or soul. This internalization of freedom reflects Foucault's technology of the self and supports Bakhtin's view of meaning as dialogic and responsive.

Andy's reference to "*a place in Mexico... that has no memory*" extends this pattern through metaphor. The phrase also introduces polyphony through reported speech, widening the discourse beyond the prison and adding a liberatory, future-oriented dimension. In Gee's terms, this is a hybrid discourse in which competing voices converge to produce a vision of freedom.

Together, these features—moral lexis, repetition, parataxis, temporal transcendence, deictic opposition, metaphor, and polyphony—form a discursive architecture of hope. Language becomes a performative act of faith, a site for internal freedom, and a tool for reconstructing identity. Andy's discourse is dialogically alive, responding to and reworking oppressive voices (Bakhtin), operating as a technology of the self (Foucault), and enacting hope (Butler). Gee's framework situates Andy's speech within the struggle between carceral and liberatory Discourses. Thus, hope in the film is not just a theme but a linguistic praxis of resistance and self-fashioning—a testament to the power of words to reimagine freedom.

Table 1. The Language of Hope in The Shawshank Redemption

Linguistic Feature	Example	Function	Theoretical Interpretation
Lexis (Evaluative & Moral)	<i>good,</i> " <i>best,</i> " <i>never dies,</i> " <i>beauty,</i> " <i>memory</i> " (evaluative, affective vocabulary)	Builds an ethical worldview; affirms positivity	Bakhtin (1981): Internally persuasive discourse
Repetition (Performative)	Repeated moral terms: "good," "never," "they can't"	Reinforces belief; enacts conviction	Butler (1997): Performativity as identity enactment
Syntax (Parataxis & Simplicity)	Simple declaratives and paratactic structures (e.g., "Hope is a good thing. Maybe the best...")	Creates universality; clarity; timeless tone	Gee (2014): Alternative, accessible Discourse
Aspect & Modality	Present tense ("is"), absolute negation ("never dies")	Transcends temporal limits; asserts permanence	Foucault (1977): Counter-conduct through discursive freedom
Deixis (Spatial & Personal)	"They can't get that from you... It's in here" – pronouns and spatial deixis	Opposes control; affirms inner autonomy	Foucault (1988): Technology of the self
Metaphor (Spatial & Temporal)	"Place... that has no memory," "It's in here"	Imagines liberation	Butler (1997): Performative futurity; Foucault : Heterotopia
Polyphony & Reported Speech Register	"The Mexicans say..." Moral-aesthetic simplicity; reflective diction	Introduces multiple voices; expands meaning Elevates discourse; inspires reflection	Butler (1997): Performative futurity; Foucault : Heterotopia Gee (2014): Hybrid Discourse of moral and spiritual freedom

6.2 The Mechanics of Institutional Discourse

In *The Shawshank Redemption*, institutional discourse exemplifies what Foucault (1995) calls the microphysics of power: a system in which language disciplines subjects through surveillance, normalization, and control. Speech in this setting is not neutral but regulatory, because it restricts dialogic exchange and sustains monologic authority. From Bakhtin's (1981) perspective, such discourse is authoritative: it demands compliance rather than interpretation and forecloses alternative meanings through its declarative and finalizing force.

Warden Norton's statement, "*I believe in two things: discipline and the Bible. Here you'll receive both. Put your trust in the Lord; your ass belongs to me,*" condenses the logic of institutional power. The utterance combines declarative certainty, binary opposition, and imperative address. By linking "discipline" with "the Bible," it fuses coercion with moral legitimacy, while the abrupt shift from sacred to profane lexis exposes the appropriation of religion to naturalize domination. In Foucauldian terms, the line performs pastoral power; in Bakhtinian terms, it is monologic and unanswerable. It also reflects Butlerian performativity, since the utterance does not merely describe authority but enacts it. Gee's framework identifies it as a dominant discourse that sustains institutional ideology through language.

Captain Hadley's command, "*You eat when we say you eat. You piss when we say you piss. You shit when we say you shit,*" presents a more explicit form of linguistic violence. The repeated clause "when we say" establishes total temporal control, while the pronoun opposition between "we" and "you" reinforces institutional hierarchy. The focus on bodily functions reduces prisoners to regulated bodies rather than autonomous subjects. Language here governs daily rhythms and reproduces subordination through repetition. Gee's model further shows how the line operates as a Discourse of domination, making control appear ordinary and inevitable.

A more compressed but equally revealing example is "*Salvation lies within.*" Although the phrase sounds spiritual, its meaning shifts in the prison context. Its nominal structure and moral register give it the force of universal truth, but within the institution, it becomes a demand for obedience. Salvation is no longer framed as renewal or transcendence; it is redefined as submission. This is the logic of authoritative discourse: it appears open and elevated, yet fixes interpretation in advance. The result is a linguistic economy in which sacred language legitimizes discipline and positions the prisoner as a subject in need of correction.

Taken together, these examples show that the film's institutional discourse is marked by declarative modality, repetition, pronoun hierarchy, lexical reduction of the body, and religious appropriation. These features sustain monologic power, suppress dialogic exchange, and impose identity from above. In short, the film presents language as a technology of domination rather than dialogue.

Table 2. Linguistic Features of Institutional Discourse in The Shawshank Redemption

Linguistic Feature	Example	Function	Theoretical Interpretation
Declarative Modality	"I believe in two things: discipline and the Bible."	Projects epistemic certainty and closes negotiation.	Bakhtin: Authoritative discourse; Foucault: Disciplinary truth claim
Binary Opposition	"Discipline" vs. "Bible"	Merges moral and coercive codes	Foucault: Pastoral power; Gee: Dominant Discourse legitimizing control
Imperative Commands	"Put your trust in the Lord; your ass belongs to me."	Enacts sovereignty; demands compliance	Butler: Performativity of authority; Bakhtin: Monologic coercion
Repetition	"You eat when you say... You piss when we say..."	Enacts rhythmic subordination and temporal control.	Butler: Iterative subjection; Foucault: Biopolitical regulation
Pronoun Hierarchy	"We" vs. "You"	Constructs dominance; isolates the subject	Gee: Discourse of domination; Bakhtin: Dialogic asymmetry
Lexical Field (Bodily)	"Eat," "piss," "shit"	Reduces the subject to a biological entity	Foucault: Control of the body; Butler: Materialization of subjection
Religious Metaphor	"Salvation lies within."	Mask coercion in the sacred register	Foucault: Pastoral discourse; Bakhtin: Unanswerable utterance
Nominal Structure	"Salvation lies within" (no verb of agency)	Implies universality; denies dialogic engagement	Bakhtin: Authoritative truth claim; Butler: Constitutive speech act

6.3 Dialogic Dimensions in Andy–Red Discourse: Linguistic Realizations of Resistance, Transformation, and Hope

6.3.1 The Parole Hearings: From Performative Compliance to Authentic Discourse

Red's parole hearings show how institutional language shapes and controls what people say, but cannot fully suppress personal expression. In his first two hearings, Red uses what Butler (1997) calls *performative compliance*, repeating official phrases to meet the authority's expectations. The statement, "I've learned my lesson. I can honestly say I'm a changed man. I'm no longer a danger to society," follows the penitential-confession formula prescribed by the parole system

This statement uses words like "changed" and "dangerous," and phrases such as "I can" and "I'm no longer." But it leaves out personal details, sensory experiences, and explanations of how or why change happened. Without these, the speaker becomes what Foucault (1977) calls a *docile subject*, simply repeating official language. The statement is grammatically correct but lacks real meaning, acting more as a ritual than a true confession. Gee's (2014) Discourse model suggests that Red's speech fits the *Institutional Identity Kit*, showing rehabilitation through both word choice and tone.

During his third hearing, Red stops using official language and instead speaks openly and honestly: there's *not a day goes by I don't feel regret. Not because I'm here, or because you think I should. I look back on the way I was then: a young, stupid kid* In this instance, the shift from perfect aspect ("I've learned") to present progressive ("there's not a day goes by") signals temporal immediacy, which Bakhtin (1981) describes as *lived time* re-entering otherwise static institutional speech. The structure replaces self-justifying modality with confessional continuity, transforming penitence into *authentic discourse*. The phrase "*young, stupid kid*" serves as metapragmatic commentary, offering a colloquial self-description that elicits empathy rather than institutional judgment.

In terms of language, Red's words shift from closed statements to more open, conversational ones. When he repeats, "*I want to talk to him. I want to try and make some sense to him...*," he is speaking directly to another person, which Bakhtin calls addressivity. The words move from abstract ideas like "danger" and "lesson" to more emotional terms such as "regret," "kid," and "terrible crime." This change turns a formal confession into personal reflection. Now, Red's voice is his own, not just repeating what authorities expect.

The statement, "*Rehabilitated? Bullshit. Stamp the form if you want, son, but move it. I've run out of years to trade in bullshit,*" shows Red's complete freedom in how he speaks. Here, the profanity is not just for shock value, but to push back against official language. Calling the board member "son" reverses the usual power dynamic, reducing the board's authority. When Red says, "*I've run out of years,*" he takes control of his own time, turning it from something used against him into something he owns. In Bakhtin's terms, Red's words now come from his own experience, not from what others want him to say.

6.3.2 The Andy–Red Dialogues: Dialogue as Transformative Practice

The conversations between Andy Dufresne and Red Redding exemplify dialogic transformation, positioning language as a medium for mutual change. Bakhtin's (1981) concept of dialogism frames these exchanges as co-constructed, with both voices evolving through their interaction.

In the early scenes, Red's story, "*They march you in naked as the day you were born... and those bars slam home... that's when you know it's for real,*" uses vivid language and repetition to show how intense the prison experience is. The use of 'you' makes the moment feel universal, and the word "*slam*" captures the harshness of being locked up. Looking closely at the language, this speech shows the psychological effects of prison and turns one person's pain into a shared story.

Self-effacing humor, as in “Not for an old crook like me,” introduces self-referential irony, signaling both conformity to and distance from the prison Discourse. Within Gee’s framework, this results in a *hybrid Discourse*: Andy adopts the institutional lexicon (“crook”) while resemanticizing it to affirm individuality. Their complementary voices, characterized by Red’s pragmatic realism and Andy’s metaphorical idealism, establish a dialogic equilibrium that subverts monologic institutional language.

6.3.3 Philosophical and Metaphorical Exchange: Hope as Counter-Discourse

The metaphor, “*That’s all it takes, really... pressure and time*,” signals a shift from survival to reflection. The concrete nouns “pressure” and “time” function metonymically, representing both geological and psychological change. In Bakhtinian terms, this process constitutes reaccentuation, in which meaning shifts through dialogue. Red’s subsequent use of Andy’s metaphor demonstrates linguistic internalization and transformation through shared discourse.

Andy’s description of the Pacific, “*They say it has no memory*,” offers a utopian counter-language to Foucault’s carceral order. The phrase “no memory” resists the logic of surveillance and punishment, substituting transcendence for oblivion. Through Butler’s theoretical lens, this speech act iterates freedom and facilitates the recreation of the self.

Red’s closing narration, “*I hope I can make it across the border. I hope to see my friend and shake his hand*,” returns to the lexicon of hope previously dismissed as dangerous. The anaphoric repetition of “I hope” transforms Andy’s words into Red’s own, enacting Bakhtin’s concept of dialogic consummation. The use of present tense and direct modality (“I hope I can”) marks a shift from earlier uncertainty (“I can honestly say”). In this way, hope becomes both a linguistic and thematic emancipation, with language reconstituting identity beyond the institution.

6.4 Polyphonic Voices: Power, Resistance, and Moral Dissonance in Secondary Characters’ Speech

6.4.1 Brooks Hatlen: The Tragedy of Linguistic Institutionalization

Brooks’s way of speaking shows what Foucault (1995) calls disciplinary subjectification, or how people take on the language of institutions. When he says, “*I don’t read so good no more. These old eyes, you know?*” he is not just talking about getting older. Instead, he uses language that makes him seem smaller, shaped by years of control. The phrase “*don’t read so good*” does not fit his role as a librarian, but it helps him stay unthreatening. According to Gee (2014), Brooks’s original way of speaking has been replaced by the institution’s voice, hiding his true self. When he says “these old eyes,” he shows weakness in a way others accept, which Butler (1997) describes as a form of submission. Phrases like “The world went and got itself in a big damn hurry” show how out of place and reduced he feels. His suicide note, written in short, simple sentences and a casual style, shows he cannot express himself outside the rules of the prison. This analysis shows that Brooks’s language, which is broken and shaped by the institution, is both proof and a result of his psychological captivity.

6.4.2 Tommy Williams: Interrupted Linguistic Transformation

Tommy’s way of speaking shows how he is changing as he learns to use different kinds of language. He starts with slang, asking, “*What are you in for, old man?*” but later speaks more respectfully: “*Mr. Dufresne, how’d you know about rocks?*” This shift aligns with Bakhtin’s (1981) idea that people use multiple social languages at once. As Tommy learns, he gains new ways to speak, moving between the language of prison, casual talk, and more formal, academic speech (Gee, 2014). When he says, “*I don’t believe it! I passed!*” it shows he is becoming more than just an inmate—he is becoming a student. But this new voice is quickly taken away by the institution, as Foucault (1995) explains, when power stops his growth and erases his progress.

6.4.3 Captain Hadley: The Grammar of Institutional Violence

Hadley’s way of speaking shows how language can be used to control others. His repeated commands—“*You eat when we say you eat. You piss when we say you piss. You shit when we say you shit*”—fits Foucault’s (1977) idea that power works through small, repeated actions that discipline people. Each order is an example of what Butler (1997) calls the performance of violence, turning inmates into obedient subjects. Bakhtin says this kind of one-sided speech leaves no room for other voices. When Hadley says, “*What are you, one of them smart-ass college boys?*” he shows his dislike for anyone who speaks differently or has more knowledge (Bourdieu, 1991). Gee (2014) would say Hadley sticks to a tough, masculine way of speaking, using language to shame others and push his own beliefs.

6.4.4 Warden Norton: The Corruption of Sacred Discourse

Warden Norton uses both religious and official language to make his authority seem legitimate. When he says, “*I believe in two things: discipline and the Bible. Here you’ll receive both*,” he combines Foucault’s idea of strict control with Bakhtin’s idea of a voice that cannot be questioned. Norton’s use of religious language, as Butler (1997) describes, masks domination in the guise of faith. The phrase “*Salvation lies within*” combines the ideas of saving and tricking, reflecting Bakhtin’s notions of irony and the repetition of others’ words. Gee (2014) would say Norton’s way of speaking makes his rule seem holy, while Foucault’s theory shows how religious words can be used to control, turning something sacred into a tool for power.

Table 3. Linguistic Realizations of Institutionalized Voices in Secondary Characters

Character	Linguistic Features	Theoretical Lens	Discursive Function
Brooks Hatlen	Vernacular syntax (“don’t read so good”), parataxis, nostalgic deixis (“Dear fellas”)	Foucault’s disciplinary subjectification; Gee’s primary Discourse internalization	Language reflects total institutionalization; loss of self and voice ends in linguistic and existential erasure.
Tommy Williams	Register shift (slang → formal), exclamatory repetition, respectful address (“Mr. Dufresne”)	Bakhtin’s heteroglossia; Gee’s Discourse negotiation	Represents an emergent educational identity; linguistic transformation silenced by institutional violence
Captain Hadley	Repetition and imperatives (“You eat when we say...”), profanity, dehumanization	Foucault’s disciplinary power; Butler’s performative violence	Speech performs domination; language itself enacts institutional brutality
Warden Norton	Religious-bureaucratic fusion (“discipline and the Bible”), moralized ambiguity (“Salvation lies within”)	Bakhtin’s authoritative discourse; Foucault’s power-knowledge	Pseudo-sacred rhetoric legitimizes corruption; language sanctifies control

6.5 Temporal Voice, Masculinity, and Resistance: Linguistic Transformations in Shawshank

6.5.1 Red: Temporal Voice and Narrative Evolution

Red’s speech evolves from pragmatic cynicism to lyrical hope, illustrating how temporal awareness influences linguistic expression. Early statements such as “*I have to remind myself that some birds aren’t meant to be caged. Their feathers are just too bright*” integrate colloquial language with emerging metaphor. Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of *heteroglossia* characterizes this as a synthesis of prison vernacular and poetic reflection, while Gee (2014) interprets it as a *secondary Discourse* that mediates between institutional and individual registers.

Foucault’s (1995) framework highlights how Red’s speech negotiates *temporal power structures*. Institutional “dead time” is subverted through metaphorical language that reimagines confinement as *deep time*, a context in which growth remains possible. Butlerian performativity is evident in Red’s repeated, hopeful statements such as “*I hope to see my friend and shake his hand*,” which linguistically enact psychological liberation and assert identity beyond institutional definitions. Red’s narrative demonstrates that reflective discourse can transform oppressive temporal frameworks into sources of resilience.

6.5.2 Andy: Alternative Masculinity and Emotional Discourse

Andy’s speech exemplifies an alternative masculinity rooted in intellectual and emotional intelligence. In statements such as “*I tell you, those voices soared higher and farther than anybody in a grey place dares to dream*,” his register combines lyricism with practical instruction, contrasting with the aggressive speech of other inmates. Bakhtin’s concept of dialogic multiplicity elucidates how Andy’s language facilitates alternative masculine identities within the prison context.

Gee’s framework positions Andy’s discourse as a secondary Discourse that transforms prison routines into educational and aesthetic experiences. Foucault’s counter-conduct emerges as Andy adopts compliant roles to pursue subversive aims, such as building a library. Butlerian performativity is evident in Andy’s interactions with Red, where language enacts trust and hope, modeling humane masculinity under constraint. This linguistic analysis highlights how Andy’s speech reconfigures institutional norms through subtle adaptation and ethical engagement.

6.5.3 Resistance and Ethical Survival

The dialogue between Andy and Red exemplifies Foucauldian counter-conduct, as both characters employ linguistic strategies to navigate power hierarchies while maintaining autonomy. Andy’s use of formal, courteous language when addressing authority, such as the statement “*I believe I can help you with your accounts*,” conceals subversive intent while enacting both compliance and empowerment. Through Gee’s Discourse framework, these exchanges are shown to foster covert literacy practices and moral reasoning. This linguistic analysis demonstrates that speech functions simultaneously as adaptation and resistance within institutional power structures.

Butlerian performativity emerges as both men enact the roles of compliant inmate and ethical collaborator, using language to shape institutional perceptions and expand agency. Bakhtin’s framework reveals dialogic layering, where institutional control language intersects with transformative, ethical speech to generate alternative voices that persist within oppressive systems. This linguistic analysis underscores how strategic language performance both challenges and endures within power structures.

Table 4. Linguistic and Ideological Features of Narrative and Resistance Discourse

Character	Linguistic Features	Theoretical Lens	Discursive Function
Red	Metaphorical, retrospective, hopeful; temporal metaphors (“some birds aren’t meant to be caged”)	Bakhtin: heteroglossia; Gee: secondary Discourse; Foucault: temporal resistance; Butler: performative hope	Transforms institutional time; narrative voice mediates survival, memory, and liberation
Andy	Lyrical yet practical; blends emotional, intellectual, and ethical registers	Bakhtin: dialogic multiplicity; Gee: educational/alternative Discourse; Foucault: counter-conduct; Butler: performativity of ethical action	Challenges normative masculinity; enables learning, hope, and subversive influence
Andy & Red	Strategic politeness, ethical negotiation, layered meaning	Foucault: counter-conduct; Gee: Discourse blending; Butler: performative roles	Language mediates survival under oppression; cultivates alternative identity and ethical agency

7. Results

A micro-linguistic analysis of *The Shawshank Redemption* demonstrates that dialogue is central to resistance, identity transformation, and psychological liberation. Characters employ precise linguistic strategies to subvert oppressive discourse and enact agency, revealing language as Foucauldian counter-conduct and Bakhtinian internally persuasive discourse within the carceral system. This analysis foregrounds how specific features of speech—lexical choice, syntax, modality, and metaphor—enable individual and collective empowerment through language.

The first major finding concerns the linguistic construction of counter-hegemonic discourse. Andy Dufresne’s speech contrasts with the prison’s authoritarian register. His evaluative and moral lexis (e.g., *good, best, never dies*) constructs an ethical framework beyond institutional logic. Syntactic simplicity and parataxis in declaratives like “*Hope is a good thing*” establish a tone of timeless truth, directly opposing the bureaucratic complexity of institutional speech. Deictic opposition—contrasts such as *they/you* and *in here/out there*—maps a linguistic topography of power, delineating self from domination. Metaphorical framing, as in his image of the Pacific with “*no memory*,” articulates utopian escape from carceral temporality. In contrast, Warden Norton and Captain Hadley deploy imperative modality, syntactic repetition, and religious register to perform authority and legitimize control. This contrast in linguistic strategies clearly marks the boundaries between domination and agency.

The second key finding centers on the dialogic transformation of identity. Red’s evolving speech in parole hearings demonstrates a shift from performative compliance—formulaic phrases like “*I’ve learned my lesson*”—to authentic self-expression, as in “*There’s not a day that goes by I don’t feel regret*.” This linguistic progression marks the transition from Foucault’s *docile body* to a self-authoring subject. Andy and Red’s interactions further reveal identity as co-constructed through dialogue: Andy’s metaphors of “*pressure and time*” are revoiced and internalized by Red, illustrating Bakhtin’s concept of dialogic reaccentuation. Secondary characters echo these linguistic patterns. Brooks’s self-effacing syntax signals institutional dependency, while Tommy’s shift from slang to academic register marks emergent identity, ultimately silenced by institutional violence. These micro-linguistic shifts chart the processes of identity formation and erasure in carceral discourse.

The third main finding shows how dialogue helps people find meaning and build psychological strength. Conversations allow characters to reflect and share their experiences. For example, when Red remembers his first day in prison and says, ‘the bars slam home,’ he turns a personal memory into something everyone can relate to. Andy’s way of speaking, using phrases like ‘hope never dies,’ pushes back against the lifeless routine of prison and inspires renewal. Repeating hopeful statements helps create the feelings they describe and supports personal growth. In the end, language helps people make sense of their lives and regain a sense of control, making dialogue the main way to reclaim identity in prison.

8. Discussion

The findings confirm that dialogue in *The Shawshank Redemption* functions as a site of ontological labor. In this context, language not only represents reality but also actively constructs it. The integrated theoretical framework is employed to interpret these results, which are then compared with prior scholarship to underscore the study’s novel contributions.

The analysis demonstrates that character dialogues enact Foucauldian counter-conduct through specific linguistic strategies. While previous studies have focused on structural or narrative domination (Anderson & Karmer, 2025; Rodhan, 2025), this study advances the field by exposing the micro-linguistic mechanics of resistance. Andy’s use of formal, courteous language in his interactions with the warden generates autonomy through apparent compliance. These discursive acts simultaneously exemplify Bakhtin’s internally persuasive discourse (Bakhtin, 1981), as Andy’s subdued voice subtly challenges and ultimately destabilizes the warden’s authority. This extends Bakhtinian film analysis (Kavitharam, 2023; Tracey, 2024) by demonstrating dialogism as a pragmatic survival tactic. Key linguistic features—evaluative lexis, syntactic simplicity, and metaphorical projection—facilitate the transformation from institutional monologue to emancipatory dialogue.

This discussion advances the field by delineating the linguistic architecture of liberation that underpins *The Shawshank Redemption*. Rather than reiterating established themes of hope and freedom, the analysis specifies the linguistic construction of these concepts: simple syntax

provides clarity, the present tense asserts immediacy, and spatial metaphors foster psychological mobility. The film situates emancipation within the discursive realm, with physical escape representing the culmination of ongoing linguistic liberation. The reclamation of voice and the subversion of institutional temporality through dialogic exchange affirm the agentive and transformative power of language, positioning dialogue as a central practice of cinematic resistance. Linguistic evidence substantiates a Gee-based conception of identity (Butler, 1997; Gee, 2014). This study addresses a gap in prior scholarship, in which thematic analyses (Marlina et al., 2021) have overlooked the linguistic processes underlying identity formation. Red's rhetorical transformation during parole hearings—from formulaic penitence to authentic confession—constitutes a performative re-authoring of self that disrupts institutional ritual. Andy's consistent use of intellectual and emotional registers enacts an alternative masculinity, thereby adding nuance to genre-based analyses of male bonding (Mason, 2006). Gee's (2014) model clarifies how characters negotiate and blend multiple Discourses to construct hybrid identities that resist the prison's monolithic categorizations.

This analysis moves beyond common thematic observations by specifying the "linguistic architecture of liberation" in *The Shawshank Redemption*. Rather than simply invoking hope and freedom, it shows how these are linguistically constructed: through simple syntax for clarity, present tense for immediacy, and spatial metaphors for psychological mobility. The film positions emancipation as beginning in language, with physical escape as the climax of a prior, cumulative linguistic liberation. The reclamation of voice and the subversion of institutional time via dialogic exchange demonstrate the agentive power of language, offering a more nuanced account of cinematic resistance and positioning dialogue as transformative in its own right.

9. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the enduring impact of *The Shawshank Redemption* arises from its complex linguistic architecture of resistance. The principal contribution is the introduction of an integrated analytical model that synthesizes Bakhtinian dialogism, Foucauldian power dynamics, Butlerian performativity, and Gee's discourse analysis. This interdisciplinary framework elucidates how liberation is not simply represented but is discursively constructed through identifiable micro-linguistic strategies.

The core findings are threefold. First, liberation is fundamentally dialogic, emerging from the transformative exchanges between voices such as Andy's and Red's. Second, resistance is enacted through language, utilizing features including evaluative lexis, paratactic syntax, deictic shifts, and metaphorical framing, which together construct a potent counter-hegemony. Third, identity within the total institution is not erased but is continually reconstituted through subversive speech acts that challenge institutional interpellation.

This analysis demonstrates that *The Shawshank Redemption*'s transformative power resides not only in its narrative of hope but also in the specific linguistic mechanisms that enable hope and liberation. By examining how simple, direct syntax, present-tense immediacy, and spatial metaphors operate within dialogic exchanges, the study establishes that emancipation is first realized in language, preceding its manifestation in physical escape. Through the reclamation of voice and the subversion of institutional time, the film's protagonists illustrate the agentive, world-making capacity of dialogue. This linguistic perspective reconceptualizes the film's resistance as a sustained discursive practice, providing a deeper and more nuanced understanding of how cinematic language can facilitate genuine liberation.

Recommendation for Future Research

Future research should apply this micro-linguistic framework to a wider range of carceral narratives across media and genres, identifying which discursive strategies are universal and which are context-specific. Investigating the evolution of prison discourse in cinema could illuminate how societal changes shape linguistic resistance. Operationalizing features such as modality and deixis would support empirical studies in institutional settings. Extending this approach to other sites of oppression—like corporate or authoritarian environments—could test its broader applicability. Finally, incorporating multimodal analysis would clarify how nonverbal and paralinguistic elements interact with linguistic strategies of power and resistance.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend their sincere appreciation to King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia, for funding this research work through the project number [KFU252895].

Author contributions

Both authors contributed to the research and are jointly responsible for its content.

Funding

This work was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research, Vice Presidency for Graduate Studies and Scientific Research, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia [Grant No. KFU252895].

Competing interests

Not applicable

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

References

- Anderson, F. (2025). *Discourses on alternative solutions to prison*. Springer.
- Bakhtin, M. M., M. Holquist, C. Emerson, & M. Holquist (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. University of Texas Press.
- Baxter, J. (2003). *Positioning gender in discourse: A feminist methodology*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230501263>
- Bednarek, M. (2010). *The language of fictional television: Drama and identity*. Continuum.
- Bourdieu, P., G. Raymond, & M. Adamson (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.
- Caruth, C. (1996). *Unclaimed experience: Trauma, narrative, and history*. Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1353/book.20656>
- Davidson, A. I. (2011). In praise of counter-conduct. *History of the Human Sciences*, 24(4), 25-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695111411625>
- Foucault, M., & A. Sheridan (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M., Bouchard, D. F., D. F. Bouchard, & S. Simon (1977). *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews*. Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M., L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.) (1988). *Technologies of the self. Technologies of the self*, (pp. 16-49). University of Massachusetts Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.
- Kavitharam, T. R. (2023). Carnivalising the screen: Bakhtin's dialogism and the evolution of new-gen Malayalam cinema. *ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, 4(2), 1998-2003. <https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v4.i2.2023.3209>
- Kimmel, M. (2012). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. Oxford University Press.
- King, S. (1982). *Different seasons*. Viking Press.
- Kozloff, S. (2000). *Overhearing film dialogue*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520924024>
- Laub, D., S. Felman, & D. Laub (Eds.) (1992). *Bearing witness or the vicissitudes of listening. Testimony: Crises of witnessing in literature, psychoanalysis, and history*, (pp. 57-74). Routledge.
- Marlina, R., Aisyah, S., & Sari, I. P. (2021). A study on moral values represented in The Shawshank Redemption movie. *Allure Journal of Language, Literature, and Arts*, 1(1), 12-18. <https://doi.org/10.26877/allure.v1i1.9242>
- Mason, P. (2006). *Captured by the media: Prison discourse in popular culture*. Willan Publishing.
- Piazza, R., Bednarek, M., & Rossi, F. (2011). *Telecinematic discourse: Approaches to the language of films and television series*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.211>
- Rodhan, M. A. (2025). *Michel Foucault's power relations in prison literature: A study of Stephen King's novel The Green Mile and Heba Al-Dabbagh's novel Just Five Minutes: Nine years in the prisons of Syria*. (Thesis). Master's thesis, University of Tikrit, College of Education for Humanities.
- Saragih, G. M. (2021). White supremacy and structural racism in The Shawshank Redemption by Frank Darabont. *Journal of Critical Studies*, 4(2), 45-62.

Seidler, V. J. (2006). *Transforming masculinities: Men, cultures, bodies, power, sex and love*. Routledge.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203030554>

Tracey, M. (2024). The making of All that is buried: Dialog, chronotope, and decolonial filmmaking. *Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, 5(1), 101-117.

Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The organization man*. University of Pennsylvania Press.