

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

RELATIONSHIP OF URDU LANGUAGE WITH POWER IN PERSPECTIVE OF LINGUISTIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL DOMINANCE

Hina Saleem¹, Saifullah Zafar², Ayra Tariq³

^{1,2}NUML, Islamabad, Multan Campus

³Department of English ISP

Email: Saifullahzafar12@gmail.com Ayra.tariq@gmail.com

Hina Saleem, Saifullah Zafar, Ayra Tariq. Relationship Of Urdu Language with Power in Perspective of Linguistic, Social, And Cultural Dominance -- PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 19(3), 324-334. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords; Language Dominance, Standard Language, The Power Behind Discourse, The Power Behind Language, Urdu Language

ABSTRACT

In this study, the researcher aims to highlight the relationship between language and power from the perspective of social, cultural, and linguistic power that language gives to individuals and groups. Language is a tool to get power, and in the contemporary world, people are getting influenced by others through solid language skills. However, to understand the relationship between language and power, we first need to define these terms separately and then come towards the relationship between them. Such as, language is a system of communication used by people in a particular society, community, or/or country. At the same time, power is an influence that individuals or groups have over their followers. Therefore, power is determined by the followers. Hence, the people get four types of power through language; single word power, communitive power, narrative power, and authoritative power. Moreover, in Pakistan Urdu language is a state language, and the community that uses the Urdu language is considered elite class people and shows their language power over the speakers of other languages.

INTRODUCTION

According to Hall (1996), a language is a privileged tool through which human beings make sense about the things as well as it helps to produce and exchange meanings (as cited in Zou, 2012). Moreover, Zou (2012) argues that language has an eminence influence on the identity of people and power that the people have in society. She supports her arguments with the theory of Hall (1996) and her own experiences, such as she belongs to China but got education from Australia, so her native language was different from Australian native language

that created a problem for her during learning non-native language and she cannot ask questions about problems due to her less language power. Further, many linguists consider the language as a social, cultural, and psychological element for individuals and groups.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

From a linguistic perspective, identity is often constructed and performed as a knowing of a being, yet, sometimes, it is misinterpreted at the level of language and discourse. In the context of language and identity, individuals have continued to make sense of conflicting ways of knowing and, hence, competing ways of being. The language of influential people leaves an impact on the minds of the audience. For instance, any social power remains in the hands of the socio-cultural elite, and the language of the powerful is considered the dominant language of the society; hence, media gives more power to this socio-cultural language. Moreover, this power is not only restricted to the language, yet it also influences the socio-cultural, social, and cultural power structure of the society (van Dijk, 1995). The current research on cultural biases and identity crises clarifies that how individuals construct or co-construct the identities of others and determine their socio-cultural roles through the language (Akhtar et al., 2020). Discourse can be counted as a prerequisite aspect that supports in building implied and accurate meanings in the text (van Dijk, 2006; 2005; 1997b; 1998) that is under the target, especially in a context that is social and socio-cultural based (van Dijk, 2018). Although it describes the social practices, relations based on power, and abstract based considerations, furthermore, it is a way of communication in a speech by using powerful and persuasive words (discourse) or composed structure (written form) (Iqbal et al., 2020; Baig et al., 2019). A Language that is brought into utilization, having the final target of communication with other people in the form of a written text or with the usage of speech sounds to transmit ideas, feelings, and emotions, is called discourse. Conversation can be analyzed or observed in different manners with different endings when it is set, translated, and depicted, and even it needs to get clarified in a sense that in which way and why it shows or perform different functions. Discourse is considered an integral portrayal of the language concerned with actual practice possessing a specific approach, and it intends to deal with each type of person's intellectual ability (Iqbal et al., 2020). On the other hand, discourse analysis is a type of technical form possessing objectivity considering the material of discourse or any framework of basic necessity, and it deals with any way of communication to study the text in its context. Further, discourse could be divided into; socio-cultural based background, socially constructed ideology, the effects known as psychological, and the individual's interpretation that can be revealed through the analysis that consists of socio-cultural discourse (Aazam et al., 2019). The text can be divided into three undividable parts, i.e., used language, interactional words or sentences, and communication (van Dijk, 1997b; 2018). Furthermore, in recent times, the process of socio-cultural discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary approach functioning at both levels, whether it is at the microscale or macro scale formed at the social and linguistic levels. Socio-cultural Discourse

Analysis bases, sometimes, on the level of education which apprehends particular doctrines, personalities, issues (socio-cultural) related to legislation, philosophical ideas, and some other things having identification with it. Discourse Analysis can be merged with different types of analyses such as sciences concerning psychology that values philosophy.

That is why it is converted into the most utilized technique in the field of today's linguistics. It additionally unhides the systems of belief and relations of power, mostly found in socio-cultural discourse. Additionally, SCA is a combination of supposition recognized with human science on a small scale, society, and power. It is a typical method for clarification during the investigation of the discourse. There are a few critics who describe that there is not any method that might exist for SCA or to gather informative elements through SCA (Iqbal et al., 2020). Instead of this, it is a raw material to analyze content adopting an exemplary setting. The necessary task of SCA is to show the link of language, philosophical values, society, power, and other aspects (ibid). SCA (socio-cognitive approach) is a source for conducting speech discourse that appeared to be continuously well-famed and get more thoughtful things about individuals. To some extent, in the present age, to administer the discourse study in English speeches has become a big trend since the English language has a remarkable effect on the world. So, the individuals in politics, tend to be influential and persuasive in their speeches to get support in politics by touching the emotions of the masses.

Specific meanings can be understood when linguistic and persuasive devices are used in a socially described context. The researchers, scholars, as well as linguists, have also given considerable attention to the speeches of the day. These studies have highlighted problems concerning race, cast and identity, the transmission of culture, and other remarkable issues related to politics. Except for that, some of the studies were put in conduct at semantic, pragmatic, lexicon-grammar, and stylistic levels.

However, the researchers of recent times analyze the oral text employing SCA within linguistic and persuasive strategies IK uses in his speech to defame the real identity in social perspectives. For instance, Hassan (2018) argues that investigation in the qualitative aspect, applying the frameworks of CDA that should be conceptual, makes the spectators and researchers able to know the covert meaning of the given text at the initial stage through its concern with socio-cultural and social context.

Socio-Cognitive Approach

SCA is interested in the interconnections between knowledge, discourse and society while placing subjectivity in the centre of its framework. It looks into the correlative relationship between personal- and socially shared knowledge, and the significance of these correlations to discourse production and interpretation. Analogously, phenomenological sociology explores the interrelated structures of subjectivity, knowledge and the social world. It systematically analyses the conditions and forms of inter subjective understanding and the mutually constitutive relationship between subjective-

and objective knowledge. Given the considerable overlap between the subject matter of phenomenological sociology and that of SCA, the purpose of the article is to draw the attention of critical discourse analysts to a neglected but extremely resourceful field. Following a brief introduction to SCA, the article will address some of SCA's key concepts in conjunction with the phenomenological-sociological insight.

Critical Discourse Studies, also known as Critical Discourse Analysis, is a multi-methodical and multidisciplinary field interested in the discursive manifestation and reproduction of dominance, social control, power abuse, and of social inequalities. It is primarily interested in discourses produced by social actors who control public discourse, such as the political elite, business corporations or the media. Critical Discourse Studies takes discourse as a form of social practice and analyses its relationship with the social structures by which it is shaped. Critical discourse analysts typically inquire about, for example, the discursive legitimation and persuasion strategies of right-wing populist parties, and the impact of anti-immigrant/racist discourses on the community in the prevailing socio-political context (Wodak and Meyer [2015](#); Van Dijk [2011](#), [2015](#)). Within the overall framework of Critical Discourse Studies, the Sociocognitive Approach (hereinafter SCA) developed by Teun A. van Dijk focuses on the cognitive aspects of discourse production and comprehension (Van Dijk [2014](#), [2015](#), [2018](#)). Van Dijk argues there is no direct or linear correspondence between discourse structures and social structures but discourses function through a cognitive interface: "the mental representations of language users as individuals and as social members" (Van Dijk [2015a](#) p. 64). As Van Dijk points out, although discourse is socially conditioned and impacts upon the functioning of the society, both the formulation and interpretation of discourse is the aggregate function of the participants' underlying cognitive processes, personal- and socially shared knowledge:

Discourse is thus defined as a form of social interaction in society and at the same time as the expression and reproduction of social cognition. Local and global social structures condition discourse but they do so through the cognitive mediation of the socially shared knowledge, ideologies and personal mental models of social members as they subjectively define communicative events as context models. (Van Dijk [2014](#)).

SCA's aim is to track down and map the network of knowledge, beliefs, prejudices, attitudes that are directly or indirectly operationalised and triggered by individuals when producing and interpreting discourse, and explain how that cognitive apparatus actually determine discourse structures and their interpretation in a particular communicative situation. Using the example above, SCA would be interested in why leaders of right-wing political parties address their supporters in the way in which they do, and how people make sense of such discourse.

SCA is widely applied by critical discourse scholars due to its broad and integrative perspective. Van Dijk emphasizes that the framework he offers is not a method; it does not prescribe a step-by-step procedure for discourse analysis (Van Dijk [2014](#)). Rather, it draws on a multitude of methods and

concepts from wide ranging disciplines, such as social psychology, cognitive psychology, anthropology, sociolinguistics and sociology, all of which are instrumental in understanding the role of knowledge in discourse production and comprehension in a given society. Although SCA is, perhaps, the most comprehensive of its kind, one might wonder why phenomenological sociology, i.e. Alfred Schutz's phenomenologically founded sociology has gone off the radar. SCA defines itself as a "particular application" of the social constructionist tradition in social theory for that matter (Van Dijk 2018). When setting the scene for SCA, Van Dijk maintains: "it is not the social situation that influences (or is influenced by) discourse, but the way the participants define such a situation" (Van Dijk 2008, p. x). Although Van Dijk notes that this thesis would be obvious for phenomenological sociologists, he does not explain what he means by this, nor does he draw on phenomenological sociology in the forthcoming discussion. Nevertheless, the central thesis of SCA, in fact, relates to the most basic problems of phenomenological sociology: intersubjective understanding, the relationship between subjective and objective knowledge, and our own constitutive role in the construction of social meaning, situations, i.e. social reality. SCA also draws on Conversation Analysis, a field that evolved from Harold Garfinkel's ethnomethodology, which was predominantly based on Schutz's phenomenological sociology. However, the purpose of this article is not to trace back certain concepts of SCA to phenomenological sociology. Rather, it draws on various concepts developed by Schutz and his successors, Thomas Luckmann and Peter Berger that are relevant and might be productively integrated into Van Dijk's framework. Following a brief introduction to SCA, the article will discuss some of the key concepts used by SCA and introduce their quasi-counterpart (at least complement) in phenomenological sociology. It is out of scope to provide a thorough introduction to Schutz's framework, nor is my list of relevant concepts discussed below by any means comprehensive. I offer just one alternative selection; many others are possible, both in terms of Van Dijk's framework and the corresponding literature of phenomenological sociology. The model is designed according to the its elements.

Intersubjective Understanding and The Problem of Intended Meaning

To genuinely understand why a particular speech or text is structured in the way it is, researchers need to reconstruct the motives, interests, intentions and goals of the speaker. Conversely, to understand why and how discourse influences social actors as its audience, it is crucial to clarify why and how the content is relevant and comprehensible to the receiver. To put it simply, the puzzle SCA is interested in is what the speaker has in mind and how it is decoded by the receiver. Van Dijk argues that participants of communicative situations, for an effective interaction, need to "read" each other's mind in a metaphorical sense. To understand actions, including communicative actions, an intention has to be "attributed" to the observed conducts of the actors (Van Dijk 2012). Speakers adjust their style, selection of words to the presumed interests, relevance and knowledge of the receiver to make sure their intention is intelligible to the latter. However, as Van Dijk notes, intentions themselves are not "observable"; they can only be, more or less accurately, "inferred" by the receiver (Van Dijk 2012). It generally holds that both the speaker and the receiver construct subjectively meaningful mental models of one another's intentions, identity, knowledge and

of the entire setting to decrypt each other's messages and navigate in the communicative situation (Van Dijk 2012, 2015).

Mental Models

As Van Dijk maintains, mental models “define and control our everyday perception and interaction in general and the production and comprehension of discourse in particular” (Van Dijk 2014). We create mental models based on our past experiences stored in the Episodic or Autobiographical Memory. Mental models are “subjective representations of events or situations” with a schematic structure allowing us to categorise and identify ongoing experiences. This subjective representation also consists of the particular and personal emotions, opinions, sounds, gestures, visions accompanying the situation in which the experience unfolds (Van Dijk 2018). Van Dijk points out that the significance of a car, for example, varies when driving for pleasure and when cycling in traffic. Van Dijk calls this phenomenon “the multi-modal nature of knowledge” which derives from various emotions and sensory experiences (Van Dijk 2012). Navigating in the communicative situation, participants dynamically draw on and “update” their mental models, discourse thus becomes subjectively meaningful. In fact, as we shall see later, revision is needed only if a preliminary available mental model is not sufficient enough to make sense of something, and/or shows inconsistency with one's total configuration of experiences that are relevant in the context of the particular situation. Due to the uniqueness of mental models, the participants' respective interpretation of the same discourse is necessarily different (Van Dijk 2018).

The main two types of mental models that SCA defines are situation models and context models. Situation models or semantic models represent the individuals' subjective understanding of the situation, or their take on the subject matter, i.e. what the discourse is about, or the experience aims at. Semantic models are the cognitive correlates of the “intentional” and “referential” function of language. Context models or pragmatic models account for how individuals define the circumstances of an experience or the communicative situation in which they are involved in terms of relevance. Context models represent the “socially” and “communicatively” relevant characteristics of a situation. They help to avoid ambiguity and orient participants to act and speak appropriately (i.e. accordingly) in a particular social situation. They control the content, style and genre of discourses, depending on spatio-temporal factors, the institutional environment, the identity, status and role of participants, and their relationship. For example, we explain the circumstances of the same accident to a friend in a different manner than to the police (Van Dijk 2014, 2015, 2018). Although uniquely constructed, mental models are based on, and “instantiated” from, the socially shared generic knowledge of the participants which manifests in language. Thus, language is indicative of, and makes the subjective interpretations of participants mutually accessible. Essentially this is why individuals, using the same language, can understand each other in a conversation (Van Dijk 2014, 2018, 2012, 2014). Van Dijk has criticised cognitive- and social psychology for neglecting the socially shared nature of knowledge and the knowledge-based interaction between members of epistemic communities respectively. He claims that paying more attention to these issues,

and an analysis of how mental models function, i.e. the processes underlying discourse production and comprehension, would be instrumental in bridging the “notorious micro-macro gap” in social sciences (Van Dijk, 2012, 2014). I will demonstrate that phenomenological sociology could step up as a resourceful ally to SCA in this regard, as their fields of interests intersect significantly. The article will go on to introduce Schutz’s insight into the (in) accessibility of others’ intentions, and, drawing on his analysis of intersubjective understanding, it will address the process that controls discourse production and interpretation, and the function of language. The second part of the article will discuss some of SCA’s key concepts, such as personal- and socially shared knowledge, and legitimation from a phenomenological sociological perspective.

As it is a fact that language plays its pivotal role in daily communication, so it is a powerful source of discourse on different levels such as social and cultural levels (Zou, 2012). Language has strong angles and dimensions while communicating with each other in society. It can be seen on two levels: power in language and power behind the language (Fairclough, 1996).

Whereas power in the language is concerned there comes a situation when the speakers confront a situation in which power in language seems playing its significant role. For instance one of the speakers belongs to a society where his language is standardized and he never wants to give up his dominant language because he thinks that his high status lies just adapting his language and he also desires the same thing. And on the other hand, the other speaker abandons his language and follows the language of his addresser just to maintain a close relationship with that person (Fairclough, 1996).

While power behind discourse reflects the situational phenomena when one of two speakers has institutional power and uses his language within the boundary of his limitations, for instance, a policeman standing on the roads stops you and also seems ready to penalize you because you have violated driving rules. During the negotiation, the policeman asks a few questions on your crime and you can’t resist while answering his questioning.

P: Where are you going?

D: I am moving to a market, sir.

P: Your speed of the vehicle was at 100km per hour that is not allowed in this urban area, therefore you deserve a fine of 500.

D: I feel my fault and want to make sorry for this and I hope you will pardon me.

P: No, hand over your documents to me and get your ticket.

In the above dialogue, the policeman seems dominant despite the sorry and request of the driver.

Relationship Of Urdu Language with The Power

However, the primary concern of the present study is to highlight the importance of the Urdu language in Pakistan and its relationship with power. Urdu language is a national language in

Pakistan and thought as a compulsory subject around Pakistan. Therefore, mostly people of Pakistan can understand it easily. According to Nizamani et al. (2016), mother language is a language that we acquired in the natural environment. Moreover, there are many books, magazines, journals, and newspapers are being published in the Urdu language around the world to get and share knowledge and information. One of the movements was “Save Urdu Movement (تحریک بچاؤ اردو). It was a nationwide movement in Pakistan (Urdu movement, 2017). While, a movement of (Anjuman-I Taraqqi-I Urdu, 2017) was started to disseminate and promote the literature of Urdu language in Pakistan and India. In 1948, Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah declared the Urdu language as a language of the state (“Tribute to language movement,” 2014). It is a standard language in Pakistan because it is a language of capital in Pakistan. Such as Hussain, Shahzad & Sulehri (2018) argue that Urdu is a national language of Pakistan and most people can understand it easily. Furthermore, Mother language and national language play a pivotal role in the educational developments of the nations. Much importance is being awarded for the promotion of these languages all over the world as well as in Pakistan. National languages are considered official languages in many countries. In this regard recently the Government of Pakistan and courts ruled out the implementation of Urdu as an official language (Supreme court, 2015).

So far as the Urdu language is concerned it is the national language of Pakistan and now to some extent is being used as an official language in Pakistan’s institutions after the decision of the Supreme Court of Pakistan. It has a strong effect on the thinking approach of the community because it empowers the speakers to communicate with each other impressively. In Pakistan, 20 percent of people are native Urdu speakers and they consider this language of their high status. Different regional languages such as Punjabi, Saraiki, Pashtu, Balochi, Brahvi have their significance in their domain. People, although, feel superiority in their own regional or native languages and they try to prefer these languages on different levels whether it is social level, economic level, or cultural level. But Urdu language seems to have to be preferred over all other regional languages due to its strength in its structure and charming accent style and vocabulary, and its native speakers feel the pride to use it on all levels showing superiority to others and even there seems prejudice and inferiority complex among other language speakers against Urdu. For instance, Balochi language speakers always struggle to avoid Urdu speakers on social and cultural levels and due to ethnic and language issues. In the same way, Urdu speakers think themselves superior to others and they consider them inferior to themselves.

Hence it can be said that when the language gets its standardized form it assumes power in that society and people who are unable to speak Urdu try, mostly, to accommodate themselves within the surroundings of Urdu speakers. Here is an example of how the regional Saraiki language shopkeeper wants to be accommodated in any situation where he comes to confront an Urdu speaker.

S: Kehra item pasand kareso?

C: Aik stainless steel pani wala jug chahy.

S: Sir,medi dukan pe jug ni honday...haan agar apko pani wali chahida he to sath wali dukan p chalay wanjo.

C: Agar apk pass ni he to mjhy agli dukan ka btanay ki zarurat ni h.

S: Muafi chandha hun bhai.

In the above example, it can be observed that the attitude of the Urdu speaker is deviant than a shopkeeper.

Moreover, social, cultural, and political power alters communication and language behavior. While, communication and language vice versa help to create power (Scholl, et al., 2015). Such as, the above-mentioned example shows the power of the Urdu speaking person (Standard Dialect) over the Saraiki language speaking person (non-standard Dialect).

Types of Power

There is four typer of power that people get through language.

Single-Word Power

Word power is a power that the speakers use to persuade the mind of spectacles, as well as these words, are emptional words the put psychological effects on the minds of people. Such as, Imran Khan Premier of Pakistan mostly uses in his speeches i.e. relative and possessive pronouns (**mery** Pakistanio, Hum, and app).

Communitive Power

Communicative power is a strong tool that the people especially, politicians use to impose there ideology on the mind of people. Such as PM Khan, in the UN Assembly, communicate through his strong language skills and compel the world to accept his ideology (on behalf of Pakistan) concerned with Indian Held Kashmir (Sibtan et al., 2020).

Narrative Power

Narrative power means the ability to tell the story or myth about something with impressive manners and style with the purpose to get influence on the mind of the people. Such as, **Bilawal** Bhutto Zardari mostly uses the Stories of his grandfather and mother about their services for Pakistan to influence the mind of the people.

Authoritative Power.

In authoritative power, individuals have power due to their status and position in society. Moreover, example 1 is suitable for this power (police man's power in society).

CONCLUSION

To conclude, it is stated that language is a tool that people use to attain power in society. Moreover, we could understand the power in the language in two ways, the power behind discourse and power in language. Such as, if a person has authority in any society, he could enjoy the power by using authoritative language (the power behind discourse). While, if any language is being used as a standard language then the followers of that language also show their power with that language (power in language) on people of other languages of that particular society. Moreover, in Pakistan Urdu language is a state language, and the community that uses the Urdu language considered elite class people, as well as they, show their language power over the speakers of other languages.

REFERENCES

- Aazam, F., Baig, F. Z., Baig, T., Khaliq, S., Azam, A., Shamshad, S., & Aslam, M. Z. (2019). A Critical Discourse Analysis of ‘Fire and Fury: Inside the Trump White House’ by Michael Wolff. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(4), 192-199. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n4p192>
- Akhtar, S., Baig, F. Z., Aslam, M. Z., Khan, T., Tayyaba, S., & Iqbal, Z. (2020). Code-Switching and Identity: A Sociolinguistic Study of Hanif’s Novel *Our Lady of Alice Bhatti*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(1), 363-371. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n1p364>
- Anjuma-I Taraqqi-I Urdu (2017). Retrieved July 25, 2017 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anjuman-i_Taraqqi-i_Urdu
- Baig, F. Z., Umer, S., Aslam, M. Z., Razaq, M. S., Khan, S., & Ahmad, Ahmed, T. (2020). Humor as Monotony Breaker in Funny Ads: A Multi-Modal Discourse Analysis of Ads of Pakistani Ufone & Jazz Cellular Companies. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(1), 69-80. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n1p69>
- Dijk, V. T. A. (2011). Principles of critical discourse analysis. In M. Wetherell, S.
- Dijk, V. T. A. (2014). Discourse and knowledge: A Sociocognitive approach
- Dijk, V. T. A. (2018). Sociocognitive Discourse Studies. In J. Richardson & J. Fairclough, N. (1997). *Language and Power*, Longman Group UK Limited, New York America Flowerdew (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp.
- Gallagher, S. (2012). On the possibility of naturalizing phenomenology. In D. Zahavi
- Gallagher, S., & Zahavi, D. (2012). The phenomenological mind.
- Hall, S. (1996) “Gramsci’s Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity,” in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, D. Morley and K-H. Chen, Ed. London: Routledge, 1996, pp. 411-441
- Hussain, Shahzad & Sulehri (2018). ANALYSIS OF URDU LANGUAGE COLLECTION IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES OF LAHORE, PAKISTAN, University of Nebraska - Lincoln DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska – Lincoln
- Iqbal, Z., Aslam, M. Z., Aslam, T., Ashraf, R., Kashif, M. & Nasir, H. (2020). Persuasive Power Concerning COVID-19 Employed by Premier Imran Khan: A Socio-Socio-cultural Discourse Analysis. *Register Journal*, 13(1), 208-230.

- Keller, R., Hornidge, A. K., & Schünemann, W. J. (2018). The sociology of
- Nizamani, D. L., Lohar, S. A., & Nizamani, B. (2016). Exploring secondary school teachers perceptions on mother tongue as a medium of instruction in district Tando Allahyar. *Policy Dialogue on Language*.
- Scholl, A., Ellemers, N., Sassenberg, K., & Scheepers, D. (2015). Understanding power in social context: How power relates to language and communication in line with responsibilities or opportunities. In R. Schulze & H. Pishwa (Eds.), *The exercise of power in communication. Devices, reception and reaction* (pp. 312-334). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sibtan et al., (2020). Rhetorical and Persuasive Strategies Employed by Imran Khan in his Victory Speeches; A socio-political Discourse Analysis, *International Journal of English Linguistics*, Canada.
- Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 300–317). London: Sage.
- Tribute to language movemen (2014). Retrieved July 26, 2017 from <https://defence.pk/pdf/threads/tribute-to-language-movement.301018/>
- Urdu movement (2017). Retrieved July 20, 2017 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Urdu_movement.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2015). *Critical discourse studies: History, agenda, theory*
- Zahavi, D. (2004). *Phenomenology and the project of*
- Zou, H. (2012). Language, Identity and Cultural Differences, *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity*, Vol. 2, No. 6, November 2012