

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING: ATTRIBUTING URDU FOR SOLIDARITY AND CULTURAL FUSION

Javeria Amjad¹, Dr. Tazanfai Tehseem², Shoaib Mehmood³, Maria Sundas⁴

¹PhD Scholar Department of English University of Sargodha - Pakistan

²Assistant Professor Department of English University of Sargodha - Pakistan

³Lecturer English, Higher Education Department, Punjab.

⁴Lecturer in English at University of Lahore, Sargodha campus

Javeria Amjad, Dr. Tazanfai Tehseem, Shoaib Mehmood, Maria Sundas. Language Policy And Planning: Attributing Urdu For Solidarity And Cultural Fusion--Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 20(2), 1053-1069. ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Language Policy, Cultural Solidarity, Urdu Vs Pakistani, Language Policy Goals And Motivations

ABSTRACT

The present research presents the researchers' point of view based on a wider perspective on Pakistan's language policy to attribute Urdu as Pakistani and its role in bringing cultural solidarity across the country. It also sheds light on the language policy goals and motivations that can manoeuvre Pakistan's language policy to create a uniting language that can be accepted by the indigenous cultures. So far, the language policy says that Urdu is a national tongue so it is still not accepted by the indigenous cultures, where rifts due to languages are common. The researchers are of the view that if Pakistan's language policy declares the name of Urdu as 'Pakistani', many cultural disputes regarding language can be resolved, as Mahboob (2015) supports the idea that 'Pakistani' is the solution to bring cultural unity. The research is quantitative in nature and uses 11 goals of language planning by Nahir(1984) and motivations for interdependence of language by Fishman(2000) to support researchers' view. The data is collected using questionnaire and the research tool is based on the prior mentioned goals and motivations.

INTRODUCTION

Pakistan has a wide variety of languages. Just 7.08 percent population states Urdu as their L1, despite the fact that it is extensively spoken throughout the country's urban centers. Like the time British ruled the subcontinent, English is still the certified language for official documentation. The nation also possesses the following major indigenous language

Pakistani Languages	
Languages	Percentage of speakers
Punjabi	38.78
Pashto	18.24
Sindhi	14.57
Siraiki	12.19
Urdu	7.08
Balochi	3.02
Hindko	2.24
Brahui	1.24
Others	2.65
Source: Census 2017	

The Ethnologue also lists 57 other languages, some of which are close to extinction (Grimes 2000). Several of these languages are extinct, and the source does not mention Kundal Shahi, a recent language.

In order to understand how Pakistan's language policy favors some languages over others and what impact it has on politics, society, education, and the economy, this article not only examines Pakistan's language policy but also tends to shed light on the fact that why Urdu inspite of being national language is only spoken by the 7 percent of population. It also highlights the fact that Pakistan's policy of language has not been successful in bringing cultural solidarity. It makes the case that many of Pakistan's languages, especially important ones, are being neglected since they are neither taught nor utilized in employment. The official status of Urdu is shown in the clause of 1973 constitution, it is ironical that after so many years of independence language policy is still the part of single clause of constitution.

Pakistan's Language Policy (Article 251 of the Constitution of 1973)

The Parliament in 1973, solidly approved a novel constitutional structure by an elected Parliament. After numerous modifications the very constitution is still applied in Pakistan, this constitution has the these chunks about language that should be used in Pakistan:

1. Urdu is the national language of the country, and provisions shall be prepared for its usage for official purposes in the whole country within 15 years from starting day.
2. English might be used in official needs unless preparations are prepared for the replacement of English by Urdu.
3. Without partiality to the prestige of the national tongue, a regional assembly might via law propose processes for the coaching, advancement and usage of provincial tongue along with the nationally official language.

The research is derived from secondary sources as, such as printed materials

or conversations with researchers and primary source is the data collected by a survey questionnaire.

The Policy about Urdu

Pakistan's official language is Urdu. Together to Islam, it served as a sign of Muslim separation of subcontinent, and the Muslim League utilized it to galvanize Muslims against what they saw as Hindu dominance in the fight for Pakistan. In order to combat fissiparous (ethnic nationalist) tendencies, the governing class of the nation, that was predominated by West Pakistanis; Punjabi and Mohajir military and bureaucracy respectively during the initial years of the newly established state, maintained to give Urdu priority over local languages.

Ethnic opposition to Urdu has been the main result of its elevation. As previously indicated, most Pakistanis speak Urdu as their second language, as shown by census data.

Yet, it is true that Urdu is the language that is most commonly understood in the nation and may be the main form of communication there. Even ethnic activists concur that it would be helpful to use this language as a bridge between various ethnic groupings. But, it has encountered opposition since the ruling class of the centre has patronised it, frequently in insensitive ways.

When Urdu was first given priority, there was a feeling of cultural hegemony since Mohajirs, a highly prominent group in the bureaucracy, spoke it as their mother tongue. The elite of Mohajirs the location—expressed—that Mohajirs were better civilized than Pakistan's native language speakers. As a result, that was only fitting Urdu is used instead of the "lesser" tongues. In fact, it can be claimed that this attitude, that are acquainted with thanks to the works of language experts who criticize the haughtiness of monolingual users of English, instilled the component of individual reaction or enmity for Urdu speakers in the first twenty years of Pakistan's existence.

Urdu was rejected in the provinces because it was seen as a symbol of the Punjabi ruling elite. Pakistanis are switching to Urdu and English out of necessity, even though they may prefer their native tongues. This phenomenon is not actually voluntary, as demonstrated by the example of the original Hawaiians. According to sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, a language can become deficient in "cultural capital" if it is not seen as valuable in the market. This can prevent people from advancing in society, leading them to feel ashamed of their native tongues. Even if people are not ashamed of their native tongues, they may not want to teach them to their children because it would be too much work. For example, Pashtuns preferred Urdu to Pashto as the language of instruction for their children in 1932. Even today, the MMA government has decided to use Urdu rather than Pashto as the official language of the N.W.F.P.

Baluchistan has also observed a similar phenomenon. In 1990, the government schools in the region were required to teach in Balochi, Brahvi, and Pashto

languages (LAD-B 21 June and 15 April 1990). Language advocates enthusiastically developed educational materials for these languages. However, on November 8, 1992, these languages were made optional, and parents reverted to using Urdu as the medium of instruction (Rahman 1996: 169). This choice instilled the fear of "Urdu imperialism" in Pakistan, contributing to the resistance towards accepting Urdu by indigenous cultures.

The state's consistent adoption of Urdu has had two significant effects. Firstly, it has positioned Urdu as a force that ethnic communities must actively oppose. Consequently, these communities have strived to strengthen their own languages through acquisition planning and corpus planning, which involves creating language resources such as books, dictionaries, and grammars, as well as pressurizing the state to promote the teaching and use of their languages in the media. Secondly, the widespread influence of Urdu through education, media, and urbanization poses a threat to the concept of additive multilingualism endorsed by UNESCO and supported by linguists and educationalists alike (Edwards 1994). As Urdu continues to expand, it exerts pragmatic pressures that marginalize other Pakistani languages. Paradoxically, prioritizing Urdu inadvertently promotes ethnic divisions while endangering the linguistic and cultural diversity of the nation. Resolving this cultural divide and fostering national unity can be achieved by labeling Urdu as a Pakistani language.

SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH

The article is valuable since it explores the dimension that how can Urdu be culturally accepted and can be a uniting language for divided people. Classifying Urdu as **Pakistani** is possible to what extent and how it can play a uniting part in the language community. Pakistan's language laws are designed to make the nation stronger. This is interpreted to suggest that there needs to be a national tongue that represents the nation-state. This is the Urdu language and it can be named 'Pakistani' to bring cultural solidarity. The policy asserts that Urdu will modernize the nation so can be the function of Pakistani.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To analyze the role of language policy in bringing cultural solidarity
- To retrospect language policy goals by Nahir in order to classify Urdu as Pakistani
- To explore the motivational factors in language planning by Fishman that can make Pakistani a uniting language for culturally divided people

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- In what ways language policy of Pakistan effects the solidarity of people?
- What language policy goals should be kept under consideration in order to label Urdu as Pakistani?

- What are the motivational factors in language planning by Fishman that can make Pakistani a uniting language for culturally divided people?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pakistan's literacy rate is barely 58% (Economic Survey Pakistan, 2012–2013), and only 5% of the population attends higher education (Economic Survey Pakistan, 2011). Although Urdu was designated as the nation's official language, English has continued to be used in Pakistan since the country's independence from the British in 1947. English remains the language of prestige in Pakistan, predominantly used by the elite, bureaucracy, military, higher courts, higher education institutions, and in all significant official communication, despite the constitutional commitment to Urdu (Constitution, 1973, Article 125). Regional languages receive limited attention from national language policies and are situated at the bottom of the linguistic hierarchy. The issue of languages has been a contentious subject among Pakistani educators and politicians, even reflected in the recent National Education Policy of 2009. Different arguments have been put forth, highlighting the importance of native languages for conceptual learning, promoting Urdu for national identity and unity, and advocating for English due to its global significance. However, the core of the debate revolves around whether English or Urdu should be the medium of instruction.

The majority of private schools in urban areas already offer English as the language of instruction, alongside Sindhi, Urdu, and English (only for specific schools preparing students for provincial matriculation examinations in Sindh). Some schools market themselves as "English-medium" to attract parents in such cases (Tamim, 2010). Notably, the pricing structures of these schools often reflect the quality of language instruction, with higher-priced schools typically offering more extensive English education. Consequently, English instruction varies among different classes (Rahman, 2006). In mainstream government schools, regional languages hold little significance beyond the primary level, where education is primarily conducted in Urdu. Sindh province is an exception, with some government schools offering secondary education in Sindhi. The recent National Education Policy of 2009 reaffirms the provinces' right to promote their languages and determine the languages used in education, but it only allows their use up to grade V. After that, English becomes the primary language of instruction for science and mathematics (p. 28). Despite the teachers' inadequate English language skills, the decision was made to meet the increasing demand for English-medium education in the country. A government policy paper acknowledges the growing demand for English as a medium of instruction in government schools but notes the lack of institutional capacity to offer education in English (National Report of Pakistan, 2008–09, p. 11). Currently, the government is initiating an English language teacher training program with assistance from the British Council. However, addressing the issues goes beyond teacher training. Another crucial problem that has been largely overlooked in the commoditized distribution of English is the fact that the majority of underprivileged students in these government institutions consider English as their second language. It is not difficult to imagine the conceptual difficulties these students face in their education.

Considering these challenges, the Punjab government recently reversed its decision to transition from Urdu to English as the medium of instruction and instead delegated the choice to individual schools. However, some provinces like Khyber Pakhtoon Khawa (KPK) continue with English-medium education despite the issues faced in Punjab. Therefore, the debate regarding the preferred instructional method remains unsettled, with minimal research and informed decision-making.

According to Ethnologue (2016), there are 73 distinct languages listed. However, if we exclude different spellings of the same language, the total number of languages amounts to 66 (Lewis et al., 2016).

Linguistic and Social Goals for language planning

Nahir (1984) listed 11 objectives for language planning.

1. Language purification involves establishing and maintaining the standards and consistency of a language, often achieved through prescriptive grammars and dictionaries.
2. Language restoration, also referred to as language revival or revitalization, aims to revive a language that has declined or lost its prominence.
3. Language reform, which entails altering a language's grammar, lexicon, orthography in order to make it easier for speakers to communicate.
4. Linguistic standardization is crucial for effective communication and is typically accomplished through the development of pedagogical grammars and dictionaries.
5. Linguistic spread, the process of trying to get more people to speak a certain language, usually by getting others to switch to a different language.
6. Lexical modernization, which enlarges a language's ability to deal with novel ideas and technological advancements.
7. Terminological unification, often referred to as term planning, is the process of creating terminology that is equal across geographic boundaries, particularly when it comes to terms related to technology, science, business, aviation, and maritime navigation.
8. Stylistic simplification aims to reduce lexical and syntactic complexity and increase readability.
9. Interlanguage communication to help people from many linguistic cultures communicate.
10. Language maintenance, the process of keeping a language alive.

11. Standardization of auxiliary codes encompasses various aspects, such as creating signs for the deaf, establishing consistent place names, and formulating rules for transliteration and transcription, as highlighted by Nahir (1984).

Motivations for language planning

Independence versus Interdependence

All language planning efforts, according to Fishman (2000, 2006), come down to the super-factor of independence vs interdependence. Fishman uses the term "independence" to refer to whether a social group wishes to be seen as independent and self-sufficient. Interdependence is the desire to belong to a different social group. He creates a motivating theory that divides these two super-factors into categories for language policy.

Policy on Language for Independence

Fishman asserts that language policy for independence is implemented through the following four processes: ausbau, uniqueness, purification, and classicization. The cases that follow are divided into those from Fishman (2006) and those from other sources, particularly Garca and Fishman (2012).

Baluchistan has also observed a similar phenomenon. In 1990, the government schools in the region were required to teach in Balochi, Brahvi, and Pashto languages (LAD-B 21 June and 15 April 1990). Language advocates enthusiastically developed educational materials for these languages. However, on November 8, 1992, these languages were made optional, and parents reverted to using Urdu as the medium of instruction (Rahman 1996: 169). This choice instilled the fear of "Urdu imperialism" in Pakistan, contributing to the resistance towards accepting Urdu by indigenous cultures.

The state's consistent adoption of Urdu has had two significant effects. Firstly, it has positioned Urdu as a force that ethnic communities must actively oppose. Consequently, these communities have strived to strengthen their own languages through acquisition planning and corpus planning, which involves creating language resources such as books, dictionaries, and grammars, as well as pressurizing the state to promote the teaching and use of their languages in the media. Secondly, the widespread influence of Urdu through education, media, and urbanization poses a threat to the concept of additive multilingualism endorsed by UNESCO and supported by linguists and educationalists alike (Edwards 1994). As Urdu continues to expand, it exerts pragmatic pressures that marginalize other Pakistani languages. Paradoxically, prioritizing Urdu inadvertently promotes ethnic divisions while endangering the linguistic and cultural diversity of the nation. Resolving this cultural divide and fostering national unity can be achieved by labeling Urdu as a Pakistani language.

Language Policy for Interdependence

Instead of the four processes discussed earlier, language policy for interdependence employs four different strategies: einbau, internationalization, regionalization, and vernacularization. These strategies aim to bring languages closer together, align them with global standards, unite people from specific regions, and promote the use of popular vernaculars. Examples drawn from Fishman (2006) and Garca and Fishman (2012) illustrate these strategies in action.

1. Einbau: In contrast to ausbau, einbau is a language policy approach that aims to bring languages closer together instead of separating them. Examples of this process include the diminishing distinctions between Moldovan and Romanian in the Republic of Moldova, where linguistic identity is recognized and similarities between the languages are acknowledged. Similarly, Chinese officials consider the various languages spoken by Han Chinese as "dialects" of Chinese, despite their mutual incomprehensibility and potential classification as independent languages.

2. Internationalization: Language regulations focused on internationalization seek to align languages with global standards or enhance their appeal to the international community. Examples include the westernization of Turkish under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's leadership, which involved adopting the Latin script and incorporating French influences. Azerbaijani, Turkmen, and Uzbek are also written in the Latin script, indicating their growing international presence, while Kazakh, Kyrgyz, and Tajik continue to use the Cyrillic script. Oromo in Ethiopia has embraced the Latin script, distinguishing it from the Ge'ez script used for Amharic and Tigrinya. Additionally, the US government and the British Council promote the increased use of English in international communication, while the Goethe Institute, the Japanese Foundation, and the Instituto Cervantes support the respective languages of German, Japanese, and Spanish.

3. Regionalization: Language policies aimed at regionalization seek to bring together people from geographically related areas. Despite their differences, Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia borrow extensively from Bahasa Melayu (Malay), from which they are derived.

4. Vernacularization: Language planning focused on popular usage and vernacularization can lead to the convergence of different languages. It is important to note that language planning decisions are not always limited to the choice between independence and reliance. Beyond Fishman's paradigm, motivations for language planning can be traced back to three additional overarching factors: exclusion, inclusion, and cultural autonomy.

METHODOLOGY

The present research is quantitative in nature and the data is collected through questionnaire based on the language policy goals of Nahir(1984) and motivations for interdependence of language by Fishman(2000). Data is collected through random sampling and 30 teachers from University of

Sargodha are taken as the sample of research and 30 teachers are taken from Government Degree College for Women, Sargodha. Total 60 teachers are selected randomly with the equal strength on gender basis from the department of English of both the government institutions. Also the variable like social background, demography and the terminal qualifications were given weightage while doing sampling. However, this is a small scale research so may not have the potential to be generalized but the perspective raised is highly significant which can be further taken on board before undergoing any future language policy. The questionnaire is designed on the Likert scale to get the optimum feedback from the teachers. Considering the available space of the paper only 20 responses have been reported here, 10 from each institution respectively but the analysis is based on the percentage of data collected from 60 teachers.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

- Nahir(1984) 11 goals of Language planning
- Fishman(2000, 2006) motivations relating interdependence of language in language planning

COLLECTED DATA

There are 5 possible answers of each question and there are 10 questions in each questionnaire.

Scale

- A= Strongly Agree
 B= Agree
 C= Neutral
 D= Disagree
 E= Strongly Disagree

Responses from the department of English, University of Sargodha

No. of teachers	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
1	B	C	C	B	C	C	D	D	D	D
2	D	D	D	B	B	B	B	D	C	D
3	B	D	B	A	B	B	B	A	B	B
4	B	D	B	A	C	B	B	C	D	B
5	C	C	C	B	C	C	D	D	B	C
6	D	C	D	D	B	B	C	B	B	C

7	D	D	C	C	C	B	B	D	C	D
8	B	B	B	C	D	D	C	D	B	D
9	B	D	B	B	C	B	C	C	C	D
10	B	D	B	A	D	B	D	B	B	C

Responses from the department of English, Government Degree College for Women

No. of teachers	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
11	B	D	C	A	B	B	B	D	B	B
12	B	D	B	A	C	C	C	A	C	D
13	B	C	B	B	C	B	B	D	D	C
14	D	C	B	B	B	B	C	C	B	D
15	C	D	D	C	C	C	B	D	B	C
16	D	D	C	B	C	B	C	D	C	B
17	D	D	D	C	D	B	B	D	B	D
18	B	B	B	A	B	B	D	B	B	D
19	B	C	B	B	C	B	D	B	D	D
20	B	D	C	D	D	D	D	C	C	C

ANALYSIS:

Percentage of responses

Q1: Do you agree that labeling ‘Urdu’ as ‘Pakistani’ can bring cultural solidarity?

There are mixed responses as 60% of the teachers said B, 30% said D and 10% said C. It indicates that 60 percent agree with the notion that labeling Urdu as Pakistani can bring cultural solidarity, 30 percent disagree with it and only 10 percent of the response was neutral. This question is based on one of the motivations on language policy by Fishman, naming Einbau which talks about the interdependence of language to show cultural fusion. Where Urdu has not been successful enough to resolve ethnic issues and people of Pakistan has yet not seen Urdu as bringing about the interdependence of language. This interdependence can be achieved by labeling Urdu as Pakistani. The higher

percentage of the responses is in favor of the view that this transformation of name can bring about a wave of change at least at psychological level. Where people can relate Pakistani as a language directly coined from Pakistan. Although 30 percent of the responses show that not all the people will agree on the notion to change the name of Urdu and it will bring no change either at mental or emotional level.

Q2: Do you agree that Pakistan's language policy is playing a significant role in making Urdu as the language bringing cultural unity?

The responses were 60% D, 30% C and 10% B. This percentage clearly shows that 60 percent of the teachers said D which manifests that they disagree with the fact that language policy of Pakistan is playing any significant role in bringing cultural unity. 30 percent of the responses were neutral in this regard and 10 percent favor the notion that language policy of Pakistan is designed to bring cultural fusion. The language policy of Pakistan has not been revised since 1973 and is only based on the single article of the constitution where merely three points have been discussed. Urdu is announced as the official language and it was said that English is an official language till the Linguistic spread of Urdu. It was said that measures should be taken to make Urdu as the official language in the coming 15 years but it is unfortunate that due to political instability in Pakistan, English is still the official language and Urdu is only spoken by the 7% of Pakistan's population. When the government is not playing a significant part in revising the language policy and making Urdu as the language to bring cultural fusion, this issue will continue to prevail in society which can be seen from the majority of responses.

Q3: Do you agree that 'Pakistani' (Urdu) as an official language can bring compliance with international community?

The percentage of the responses were 50% B, 30% C and 20% D which indicate agree, neutral and disagree respectively. 50% teachers believe that by labeling Urdu as Pakistani as a national and official language, a compliance can be made with the international community. Globalization is the part of motivations of language planning by Fishman. Several countries have made changes in their language policies in order to bring compliance with international community, where Fishman has given the example of Turkish which went through westernization by adding the scripts from different languages. Similarly, Urdu can be classified as Pakistani to make compliance with international community and to win the hearts of people of Pakistan to bring cultural solidarity.

Q4: Do you agree that 'Pakistani' (Urdu) can bring the people of different regions and languages in Pakistan closer?

The responses of this question were 40% B, 30% A, 20% C and 10% D. It shows that 40 percent of the teachers agree with the view that Pakistani can be the language that can bring the people of different regions and languages together. Urdu which the researcher is of the view can be labelled as Pakistani is a mutually intelligible language of Pakistan, where the people speaking

Punjabi can easily understand Urdu and even many of the words of the other major provincial languages can be comprehended by comparing them with Urdu like that of cognates. 30% of the responses strongly favored that the name Pakistani can be a thread to weave the regions together. 20% of the responses were neutral, whereas 10% disagree that Pakistani as the national language can bring the regions together. This question is also based on the language policy of Interdependence by Fishman.

Q5: Do you think that ‘Pakistani’ (Urdu) can play a role in language purification and consistency of language?

This question is based on Nahir’s goal of language planning where language policy should be formulated to work continuously for language purification and consistency of language. Labeling Urdu as Pakistani can also bring about the lexical changes where Urdu dictionary can be revised for language purification and also the prescriptive rules of the language could be implemented through language spread to make sure about the consistency of language use, as Urdu is only spoken by the 7% of Pakistan’s population. Pakistani as the national language can bring uniformity as it can bring the psychological change in people to adopt the use of national language. 50% of the teachers said C, 30% said B and 20% D. This indicates the most responses as neutral, they didn’t link the role of Pakistani in language purification, 30% agree with the notion that Pakistani can be a cause of language purification and 20% disagree with it.

Q6: Do you agree that language spread of ‘Pakistani’ can be attained by making it language of educational sectors and official institutions?

70% B, 20% C and 10% D were the percentage responses of the teachers towards this question. Most of the teachers agreed with the fact that language spread is actually possible when a language is institutionalized and made the language of educational sectors. For this purpose, the recent advancements have been made in designing a curriculum where Urdu must be prioritized as the national language. Again if Urdu will be attributed as Pakistani, this process of change and acceptance for that change will be of greater intensity than it is going to be with Urdu. 20% of the responses were neutral in this regard and 10% negated the idea that Pakistani can make any difference being a national language. The phenomenon of language spread is also part of the language planning goals by Nahir (1984). Language spread by institutionalization is a serious step towards one of the clause of 1973 constitution where it has been stated that serious measures should be taken to make Urdu as the official language within 15 years of that announcement. So far Urdu has not brought about that change as expected.

Q7: Do you agree that ‘Pakistani’ can help in lexical modernization, a capacity to deal with new concepts?

Impact of innovations cannot be negated, especially when it is a national innovation. Lexical modernization is a worldwide process of language development where new advancements and novel ideas are accepted according

to the trends of a particular age. It makes the language flexible to absorb the changes regarding cultural shock. Lexical modernization is mentioned in the language planning goals of Nahir and also Fishman has mentioned the example of Turkey where Turkish was modernized on the patterns of western culture. The percentage of responses towards lexical modernization and role of Pakistani in it were 40% B, 30% D and 30% C. 40 percent of the teachers agreed upon the role of Pakistani as a national language to bring about the lexical modernization. They claimed the fact that attributing Urdu as Pakistani is also a form of lexical modernization and will reap a positive impact in future. 30 percent of the responses were against the role of Pakistani in lexical modernization and 30 percent were neutral.

Q8: Do you agree that stylistic simplification should be made in ‘Pakistani’ to make it easy to comprehend for the users of indigenous languages?

Stylistic simplification is the part of language change where language is simplified to reduce syntactic complexity and increase readability. Urdu as Pakistani can undergo the process of stylistic simplification, so that the people of indigenous cultures of Pakistan can easily read and adopt the maximum use of language. It can increase the comprehensibility, thus ending in the increased readership of the national language. The responses towards this question were 50% D, 20% B, 20% C and 10% A. It manifests that majority of the teachers were against the stylistic simplification, according to them this process of syntactic change can cause a detriment to the beauty of the language. Moreover, they were not able to realize the fact that attributing Urdu as Pakistani itself is a change which can be the precursor of many potential changes in the language. Only 20 percent of the responses were in the favor of stylistic simplification and 10 percent strongly agree with this notion. 20 percent of the responses were neutral where the teachers argued that there is not any link between the stylistic simplification of language and the increase in the number of language users.

Q9: Do you agree with the notion that Pakistan’s language policy must be revised in order to change the name of Urdu as ‘Pakistani’?

50% B, 30% C and 20% D are the percentage responses of the teachers regarding this question. 50 percent agreed with the fact that the role of national language is undeniable in the upbringing of the nation. They further asserted that Pakistani can bring cultural solidarity which Urdu was still not able to bring after being the national language for so many years. 30 percent of the responses were neutral as they were neither in favor, nor against the notion. 20 percent of the teachers disagree with the fact that language policy should be revised to change the name of national language from Urdu to Pakistani. Most of the teachers who were against this notion argued that what difference it will make after changing merely the name of the language.

Q10: Do you think that a new language ‘Pakistani’ should be created instead of labeling Urdu as ‘Pakistani’?

This question is based on the idea Mehboob gave in 2015. He is of the opinion that a new language Pakistani should be created in order to unite the nation. This according to him is a cultural remedy for the rifts that shake the nation, in the name of indigenous languages. Pakistani can be the platform to unite the divided cultures of Pakistan where the race of superiority creates cultural clashes. The percentage of responses in this respect were 50% D, 30 % C and 20% B. The researcher's point of view here is not to create a new language but to attribute the previously existing national language Urdu which is favored in the responses. 50 percent of the teachers said that creating a new language altogether is a long and patient process which might take decades to be implemented so they were against creating a new language Pakistani altogether. 30 percent of the responses were neutral and only 20 percent favored that a new language Pakistani should be made in order to resolve the cultural disputes and bring cultural autonomy.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The examination of the data based on language policy goals and motivations shows a clear picture that the educated people of Pakistan are not offended if Urdu is attributed as Pakistani for the sake of cultural fusion. There is a group of people who at the very first stage contemplate that what is the need of changing the name of Urdu and what difference will be created by it. For the sake of providing deeper insight into the matter of interdependence, the researcher-administered survey was conducted using a questionnaire.

The results showed that 60% of the people agree to the notion that the name of Urdu can be attributed as Pakistani and it will bring a wave of psychological change towards the approach of ownership of their national language. As, the nation is divided into religious, cultural and political rifts, Pakistani can be a prototype of national conformity.

60% of the teachers said that Pakistan's language policy is not playing any substantial role in the promotion of national language and integration of nation. The clause regarding the language policy in the constitution of 1973 is insufficient to be called as the language policy of Pakistan. It has not been revised and no significant role was played after announcement of Urdu as the national tongue, to check the implementation of the rules. English is yet considered as an official language in Pakistan which has caused the deterioration of Urdu. Students graduating from private institutions are not even able to speak and write Urdu properly. Therefore, the current language policy of Pakistan is effecting the nation in the negative manner where the number of people using Urdu is decreasing and people of urban areas are switching towards English. Solution is nothing but to revise the language policy and to attribute Urdu as Pakistani.

The motivations for interdependence from Joshua Fishman seek the role of language planning in globalization and internationalization. The answers of 50% of the teachers were in the favor of Pakistani to be the language of Pakistan creating compliance with international community. They were of the view that a language playing part in cultural autonomy can perform a dynamic role in bringing compliance with the other nations. Pakistani gives the sense of

ownership to the people of Pakistan and they will strive more for the acknowledgement of language worldwide.

Another motivation from the model of Fishman implies the role of regionalization of language for interdependence which the researchers have mingled with the attribution of Urdu as Pakistani. It states that Pakistani can bring the people of different regions and cultures closer and the suggestion is favored by 40% and is strongly favored by 30% of the teachers.

Language policy goals by Nahir talk about consistency and purification of language and here the responses were mixed when it was asked that Pakistani can play any role regarding this. Only 30% teachers were of the view that Pakistani as the national language can play a constructive role in language purification and consistency of language. 50% of the teachers were neutral in this regard which shows that this language policy goal couldn't be applied as it may create ambiguity to be implemented in language policy. Language spread by means of institutionalization is another goal of language planning and policy that can be implemented in the language policy of Pakistan as 70% of the teachers were in favor of language spread of Urdu as Pakistani. There is already a clause in the language policy of 1973 that states that Urdu should be institutionalized as the national language, similarly can be Pakistani as it is only the attribute of Urdu being changed and not the language itself.

40% of the teachers generated surveys said that Pakistani can be modernized as the national language and can hold the attention of international community as a name representing Pakistan. Furthermore, lexical modernization can make the language align with the wave of modernization to make language accessible to learn even for the people who are interested in learning of Urdu as a second language. The notion of lexical modernization was appreciated whereas, when it came to stylistic simplification for the sake of indigenous cultures, the responses were different. 50% of the responses were against stylistic simplification of language.

The results of the research manifested that 50% of the teachers agreed upon the idea of attributing Urdu as Pakistani. Moreover, the same percentage of responses said that Urdu can be labelled as Pakistani, instead of creating a new language Pakistani which is a long process and it would be really difficult first to coin a new language, then making it the national language of Pakistan and also expecting people to be welcoming towards a new language altogether.

In crux, the prevailing language policy has not played a constructive role in bringing the cultural fusion. It needs to be revised, in order to meet the challenges of 21st century. The researchers have laid a foundation of the thought that is in favor of Pakistan and its people to bring cultural solidarity and by giving concrete evidence using the motivational features for interdependence of language and language policy goals by Nahir(1984).

REFERENCES

- Abbas, F., & Bidin, S. J. (2022). A Critical Analysis of the Language Planning and Policy (LPP) in Pakistan and its Impact on Indigenous Languages of Pakistan. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 85-96.
- AMMAR, A., Naveen, A. L. I., FAWAD, A., & QASIM, K. (2015). Language policy and medium of instruction issue in Pakistan. *Acta Linguistica Asiatica*, 5(1), 111-124.
- Ayres, A. (2009). *Speaking like a state: Language and nationalism in Pakistan*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bhatt, R. M., & Mahboob, A. (2008). Minority languages and their status. *Language in South Asia*, 132-152.
- Blommaert, J. (2006). Language policy and national identity. An introduction to language policy: Theory and method, 238-254.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Djenar, D. N., Mahboob, A., & Cruickshank, K. (Eds.). (2015). *Language and identity across modes of communication (Vol. 6)*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- Fishman, J. A. (1974). Language planning and language planning research: The state of the art.
- Fishman, J. A. (2006). Language policy and language shift. An introduction to language policy: Theory and method, 311-328.
- Gooskens, C., & Schneider, C. (2019). Linguistic and non-linguistic factors affecting intelligibility across closely related varieties in Pentecost Island, Vanuatu. *Dialectologia: revista electrònica*, 61-85.
- Holmes, J., & Hazen, K. (Eds.). (2013). *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Jayasundara, N. S. (2021). Language Policy of a Nation: Literature review in Language Planning Models and Strategies: A Brief Overview. *Scientific Research Journal (SCIRJ)*, 9(II).
- Khan, T., Khan, I., & Ahmad, A. (2019). A Proposed Language Policy for Education in Pakistan. *Review of Economics and Development Studies*, 5(4), 809-816.
- Mansoor, S. (2004). The status and role of regional languages in higher education in Pakistan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(4), 333-353.
- Mahboob, A., & Tilakaratna, N. (2012). *A principles-based approach for English language teaching policies and practices*. Mountain View, CA: TESOL International Association.
- Nahir, M. (1977). The five aspects of language planning-a classification. *Language problems and language planning*, 1(2), 107-123.
- Nahir, M. (1984). Language planning goals: A classification. *Language problems and language planning*, 8(3), 294-327.
- Oldenburg, P. (1985). "A place insufficiently imagined": language, belief, and the Pakistan crisis of 1971. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 44(4), 711-733.
- Rahman, T. (2008). Language policy and education in Pakistan. *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 1, 383-392.

- Ricento, T. (Ed.). (2005). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge university press.
- Spolsky, B. (Ed.). (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (p. 3). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiley, T. G. (1996). Language planning and policy. *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*, 103-147.
- Wiley, T. G., & García, O. (2016). Language policy and planning in language education: Legacies, consequences, and possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 48-63.