

Received: 19 May 2024, Accepted: 25 July 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33282/rr.vx9i2.63>

The Politics of Language in Rural Punjab: Exploring Social Stratification, Linguistic Capital and Power Dynamics through Critical Discourse Analysis

1. Iqra Zulfiqar, M.Phil Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. (iqrazulfiqar282@gmail.com)
2. Muhammad Javed Ashraf, Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Political Science, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. (ranajavedashraf23@gmail.com)
3. Muhammad Asim Khan, M. Phil Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. (asim1412@gmail.com) (Correspondence)
4. Zain Abbas, M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Political Science, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. (zainabbaskhokhar98@gmail.com)
5. Muhammad Umair Saeed, M. Phil Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. (mumairs840@gmail.com)

Abstract

This study examined the ways in which language practices help in constructing and deconstructing the social power relations in the rural areas of Punjab. The aim of the study was to determine how language use and impacts on the division of social classes especially in communication targeted at the lower strata. This study was adopted a qualitative research approach. Theoretical Frameworks used in this study are critical discourse analysis (CDA) by Fairclough's and Bourdieu's social and linguistic capital. Data collection technique was purposive sampling. 60 Participants of comprising community leaders, educators and cross section of the rural populace of Punjab were interviewed with the help of semi-structured interviews and prepared field notes for the period of six months from January 2024 to June 2024. Descriptive data analysis comprised the analysis of linguistic markers, socio cultural factors and discourse practices and it was found that language in rural Punjab is one of the most potent means of reinforcing social discrimination as well as social transformation. The findings showed that certain words and phrases, ways of referring to people, and ways of speaking are associated with social class and, not infrequently, with dominance. But

examples were also found wherein the oppressed did actually employ language to challenges or undermine such power structures. By offering data about the use of language by people in the rural communities' maintained social hierarchies and this work enriches the theoretical framework within sociolinguistics concept of linguistic capital and power relations. The study may be useful both for those who strive to apply principals of justice in the sphere of language planning and education, as well as for policymakers and educators interested in reducing social inequalities.

Keywords: linguistic practices, social stratification, critical discourse analysis, rural Punjab, social capital, linguistic capital, power dynamics, Bourdieu, Fairclough

Introduction

The matter of language and social hierarchy is thus ripe for analysis in the South Asian context that includes Pakistan. The issue of language and society can be considered a classic in sociolinguistics. Sociolinguistics which has examined how language works in society has revealed the manner in which it embodies, maintains, and reproduces social relations (Hymes, 1972). The work of Bourdieu (1977) and Labov (1972) premise results in the recognition of an essential focus area of analysis – the relationship between linguistic decisions and social hierarchies. Studies done on language and social class confirm that language differs with social class since people with high social class use different language from that used by people with low social class (Trudgill, 1974). May (1972) noted that people belonging to the higher socio-economic status use features which are considered as standard diction while those in the lower socio-economic status are associated with restricted language usage. Such rhetorical variation may mean differences in social promotion, literacy and employment opportunities (Fairclough, 1989).

Language and social differentiation are inseparable, since linguistic variants function as symbols of cultural divisions, and perpetuate them (Bourdieu, 1977). As Bourdieu has claimed the language can serve as cultural capital by which people or certain populations acquire the ability to determine who is the better member of the society, and hence has a right to exercise power (Bourdieu 1977). Labov (1972) established that the people who have linguistic capital, as a rule resulting from members of the dominant social class, bear higher benefits when taking tests and in education or jobs. On the other hand, people in the vulnerable groups may be discriminated in

terms of language and have few opportunities to use this kind of language in practice (Fairclough, 1989).

Approaches like Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provide a sound framework for exploring the complex interconnection of language and power (Fairclough, 1989; van Dijk, 1993). It goes beyond merely noting linguistic characteristics, exposing how language is employed in building, sustaining, and transforming social relations (Fairclough, 1989). CDA also assumes that language is not innocent but rather is always associated with social practices and discursive practices (Fairclough, 1989). At the root of CDA is the belief that discourse is a social practice done within, and which in turn defines and it is defined by, particular structures (Fairclough, 1989). It aims at understanding language within the context of society by taking into account social factors such as power, politics and social structures (Van Dijk 1993). In the same manner, CDA also proves importance of language in perpetuating or transforming social injustices. In this way, CDA is a broad framework for the analysis of texts and their influence over the social practices, offering a means of understanding how language serves to naturalize or normalize dominant ideologies (Fairclough, 1989). This approach is more relevant to the investigation of how language ideology plays out in processes of social differentiation and social inequality in rural Punjab as it ensures a closer look at the manner in which language is used in dominance or subversion.

At the same time, language also is one of the priorities and the valuable source for power and success. Linguistic capital enables people from the lower classes get education and jobs that they would otherwise not be able to get (Bourdieu, 1977). Language rights can also be implemented through affirmative action in languages and through bilingual education helps to equalize the situation for language disadvantaged groups (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988). In conclusion, it can be said that there is no direct association of linguistic choices with social structure and functions but there are functional correlations. Language is a mirror of social relations and power relations but it is also a weapon of change and transformation. It is important to map this relationship for policy purposes in order to create better language policies and practices in order to advance linguistic human rights.

By using a CDA analytical framework, this particular research endeavor will seek to employ the hidden features of language use to reveal how power and social justice issues remain

unaffected in rural Punjab. Analyzing the different communities that are in a given society it is easy to understand the discursive movements that are used to justify or question the status quo power relations within a given society. Finally, through embracing the protocols of CDA, this research provides a coherent approach for interpreting the intricate interaction between language and social differentiation in this context. There exists a limited number of studies on language and social class in rural India but in the province of Punjab, there is a total absence of such work. This research therefore seeks to add to the current literature and knowledge about the relationship between language and social differentiation by narrowing down the focus of research to rural Punjab Pakistan. This research aims at exploring the sociolinguistic patterns of the various groups of the society in order to determine how in this region language contributes to social injustice and a mere mirror image of the society.

Significance of the Study

This research will be limited to rural areas of Punjab, Pakistan with particular emphasis on the relationship between language variety and social variables. The study will focus mainly on the largest languages spoken in the region, that is, Punjabi and Urdu while; the impact of English language in certain aspect will also be considered. It will look at the various social relations in which these languages are employed in areas such as family, community, school, and media. To capture the language practices, both an emphasis on the formally explicit, identifiable elements and the substratum of subtle practices will inform the analysis of accent, vocabulary, and grammar and discourse markers. It will expand on how these linguistic elements are linked to certain social classes and how in the process of language production and use, they sustain social stratification. Although there are limitations of rural Punjab that would be beneficial to capture, this work will focus on providing a more detailed investigation into a set number of villages for the investigation of language usage in given communities. The constraints are as follows: Since the study will only be conducted on a specific region, it is expected to offer a comprehensive and elaborate analysis of the correlation of language and social class.

Problem Statement

The complex interconnection between language as a medium of communication and social hierarchy as engulfing the rural Punjab region of Pakistan remains an important research question. Although previous studies have provided insights about the sociolinguistics of the region interpreted as a whole, the specific representation of social status and power in the linguistic strategies adopted by people living in the rural areas has not been clearly explained in literature. This research will fill such void since it seeks to explore the nuances of language, power, and identity in rural Punjab. As a result, this study aims to reveal how language serves as a resource and a weapon that enables and restricts particular societal groups' interaction. It will explore how language is an unfair product that favors some social classes and how language beliefs support the perpetuation of hierarchy. Finally, the purpose of this research is to understand how language acts as a mirror or a tool that perpetuates inequalities in rural Punjab to eventually work towards finding possible solutions for linguistic inequalities.

Research Questions

- 1) What linguistic markers are commonly used to denote social class distinctions in language within rural communities?
- 2) What socio-cultural factors influence the choice of language and its associated implications for social stratification?
- 3) How do linguistic practices vary in rural Punjab concerning the communication directed towards lower social classes?

Literature Review

The main purpose of this literature review is thus to present a comprehensive analysis, based on the data available in published literature, on the complex association between language, social structure, and power in the rural Punjab context. Furthermore, it aims to identify areas that have not been researched before, thus providing justification for this research and outlining its contribution to the field. Finally, this chapter will lay the groundwork for the coming chapters' analysis concerning the linguistic decision-making process and connections between linguistic features and social class in rural Punjab. Emphasizing rural Punjab is justified because of the

culture and language that differ from that of the other provinces in Pakistan as well as the project's social context. Although there is prior research on language and social differentiation in general, and on literacy practices in particular (e. g., Bucholtz 1999; Fairclough 1989), few of them are set in rural Punjab. It is with this agenda that this study aims at filling this gap by presenting a subtle insight into how language works as a tool of social integration and segregation in the still unexplored region.

Theoretical Background

This study is anchored on the theoretical framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, Sociolinguistics and Language and Power. CDA, as understood by Fairclough (1989, 1995), offers a methodological tool to study the interconnection of language, power, and social context. Because it emphasizes the communicative strategies featured in investigation of different social milieus, CDA provides a critical view of how language can serve to reiterate or transform hegemonic relations (Van Dijk, 1993). Combined with CDA, Sociolinguistics provides an account of language in social context (Hymes, 1972; Labov, 1972). This perspective pays more attention to the relationship between language and social factors including class, gender, ethnicity, as well as the region. Sociolinguistics, therefore, helps to unravel the social uses of language as it demonstrates how language differs from one group to another (Trudgill, 1974). In addition, the Foucauldian theoretical framework called Language and Power by Foucault (1975, 1978) offers insights into how power is enacted through and in language. From this view, language can best be understood as a social practice that is constituted by and in turn constitutes power relations.

Current Study Theoretical Framework

Several scholars have used CDA to analyze how power is constructed in similar environments by focusing on the language. For instance, the things that Fairclough (1989) has done is the analysis of how language circulates capitalist values in media. For instance, Van Dijk (1998) has looked at the manner in which language is used in shaping and particularly in sustaining prejudice against minorities. CDA is quite useful in revealing the hidden power relations and presuppositions of language. These studies have established this. Thus, by examining language practices in critical manner, CDA may help deepen appreciation of the phenomena of social class and social justice.

Three-Dimensional Approach by Norman Fairclough

CDA is applicable in this study because it entails the analysis of language and power relations in social contexts (Fairclough 1989, van Dijk 1993). As this research will use a CDA approach, this will allow it to analyze how language is used to build, sustain, or contest power relations in rural Punjab. Among the various approaches to CDA, Norman Fairclough’s approach is considered most appropriate for this undertaking given his focus in the power relations and social transformation. The three leveled theory of analysis gives us an enriched perspective about the processes that underlie the choice of language and social differentiation in rural Punjabi.

Table 1

Fairclough's CDA Theoretical Framework for Current Study

Theoretical Framework	Theoretical Perspective	Core Concepts	Relevance to Study
Fairclough's CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)	Power, ideology, discourse, social practice	Examines how language is used to construct and maintain social hierarchies in rural Punjab. Focuses on power relations and how language is used to challenge or reinforce dominant ideologies.
Text Analysis	Fairclough's CDA	Linguistic features: vocabulary, grammar, discourse structures	Analyzes linguistic choices in rural Punjab to identify how they reflect or

Theoretical Framework	Theoretical Perspective	Core Concepts	Relevance to Study
			challenge social hierarchies. Focuses on how specific vocabulary, grammar, and discourse structures are used to either maintain or disrupt social power dynamics.
Discourse Practice	Fairclough's CDA	Social context, participants, power relations	Investigates the social context in which language is used, examining the roles of participants and the power relations involved. Analyzes how these factors influence linguistic choices and contribute to the maintenance or subversion of social stratification in rural Punjab.
Discourse Order	Fairclough's CDA	Relationship between language and social structures: caste, class, gender	Explores the relationship between language practices and broader social structures such as caste, class, and gender. Examines how language is used to reinforce or challenge these structures and how it contributes to social change, either by upholding existing hierarchies or by

Theoretical Framework	Theoretical Perspective	Core Concepts	Relevance to Study
			promoting alternative discourses.

Therefore, when it comes to the centrality of linguistic choices as well as social stratification in rural Punjab, Fairclough's CDA can prove to be the most appropriate theory. Among the theoretic frameworks, CDA by Norman Fairclough can be deemed most appropriate for analyzing linguistic decisions and social differentiation in Rural Punjab owing to its key focus on language–power–structure nexus. This theoretical perspective is particularly relevant to the study's broad objective of exploring the ways in which language maintains or subverts patriarchal systems in the region. Offering an account of how power relations are woven into language practices, Fairclough's CDA helps explain the means through which social injustice keeps being re produced or challenged. In this context, Fairclough's CDA is potentially useful for language analysis in rural Punjab that forms a separate social-cultural reality. The region is highly stratified in terms of caste, class, and gender, all of which plays important roles in determining how language is employed. If the study applies CDA then it can investigate on how these social factors are encoded in language and the way language reproduces as well as resists social relations. This makes CDA a good framework for analyzing the complex relationship between language and power structures in rural Punjab.

Bourdieu's Theory of Social and Linguistic Capital

The theory formulated by Bourdieu and referred to as social and linguistic capital can be applied to research the link between language and social stratification. This theoretical vision stipulates that it is more appropriate to discuss people's language as a form of capital via which they negotiate structures and relations in society.

Key Terms from Bourdieu's Theory

Social capital

According to Bourdieu, social capital is not distributed equally within the society; more specifically, those individuals belonging to higher social classes are in a better position to have access to other individuals and resources that are considered important.

Linguistic Capital

Linguistic capital thus is a type of cultural capital for defining competence in the use of language specific to certain societies and particular contexts. Facet it encompasses the mastery of the official language, fluency and the ability to employ language as a tool of getting what one wants in the social relations. In the Bourdieu's context, language matters because it creates language capital which allows to interact in the way that is comfortable for the dominant social class. Linguistically Dominant individuals are favored in 'fields of force' and disparities arise where there is a contrast between the individual's linguistic capital and the dominant language.

Habitus

Habitus is one of the key Bourdieu's concepts that represents the body of habits, skills, and orientations developed by individuals in the course of lifetime; main emphasis is made on the process of socialization. Habitus is an outcome of one's status in the social strata and the matrix of the resultant encounter and mobility of one's life, including upbringing, schooling, and learning. As a system, it regulates the pragmatic behaviors of people, their ways to envisage and estimate the role of language as well as interact in various communities.

Field

According to the Bourdieu's thinking, a field is one or any other that is open to the contestation of capital, power, and legitimacy. Every field is defined by its own regime of practices, and its own resources that are culturally acknowledged. For instance, the educational field may put emphasis on academic professed and accreditation; the political field may align with influence and connections. Fields are active territories of conflict where stakeholders employ their various resources – social, cultural or economic – to gain an advantage. As for assigning the value of different forms of language use in the situation of linguistic practices, the given field defines

which forms of using language power is assigned to, and which forms are deemed inferior or worthless.

Distinction

According to Bourdieu, distinction is one of the methods of constructing and asserting social inequalities. Superiority in social status results to the use of different language features to deny those of low status the opportunities for the allocation of resources and recognition. Such practices may include the frequent use of homophones, of elaborate lexis, of particular accents which are preoccupied with the superior classes. Thus distinction appears as functioning of social exclusion, which stabilizes structural inequalities and discourages social promotion.

These concepts in the context of this study on rural Punjab assist in explaining how language use and power, equity relations work in conjunction or in contradiction to the unfolding social structure. To explain the language practices of a society, in this case, rural Punjab, Bourdieu's theory of social stratification can be used. For instance, the people with social position in the superior stratum might be able to get educational chances that provide them with the opportunity to assimilate the appropriate linguistic competence, which in its turn, enables them to obtain particular benefits throughout the realms of social and economic relations. On the other hand, the lower social class may not get such opportunities placing limitations on their linguistic capital and the wider societal inequality remains firmly in place. Therefore, studying social and linguistic capital theory by Bourdieu a gives the rich and useful tool for understanding the connection between language and social hierarchy in rural Punjab. Through understanding how language builds social hierarchies it provides the theoretical foundation which might help to analyze the uneasy relations of power and inequality in this region more effectively.

Thus, this research explores the complex relationship between language and social hierarchy on rural Punjab. One fundamental underlying goal of the study, therefore, will be to also analyze how such concepts such as linguistic practices and social stratification predicate or embody relations of power. It must be understood that these are not just ideas; they are concepts that help analyze the structure of rural Punjabi society.

Language, Social Stratification, and Power

McBrian (1978) investigated Language and social stratification: In the case of a Confucian society and has summarized this as follows Most studies to date have focused on exploring the roles of language in the logical cognitive dimensions of culture. Keating, E. (2000) studied Moments of hierarchy: discussing what I argued as constructing social stratification by means of language, food, space, and the body in Pohnpei, Micronesia and I concluded by revealing the interconnected interplay of multiple semiotic modes used for creation of hierarchy and drawing attention to the fact that in studying semiotics and interpreting human interactions, it is necessary to go beyond language and focus on the various types of symbolic means that social actors use for creating and understanding. Ng and Deng (2017) analyzed Language and power and concluded that five processes of language-power relations in communication can be identified as a result of critical language analysis, sociolinguistics, conversation analysis and social psychology of language and communication. Paulston (1969) studied Social Stratification, Power, and Educational Organization: The Peruvian Case and identified that field study, done between 1966 and 1968 explains purposeful connection between Peruvian society's class structure and structure and content of Education System in Peru. Four educational subsystems are closely tied to each of the four main social groups: Blancos are the upper class which has 0. 1% of the total population; Mestizos belong to middle class (20. 4%); Cholos are of the lowest class (22. 8%); while Indians are in the marginal class (56. 7%). Much emphasis is made on the types of internal domination and colonization, which is a result of the dominance of Lima being Peru's political, ideological, and economic capital. Similarly, Philips (2004) assessing Language and social inequality concluded that it lies in an understanding that some ways of using language are higher in value than others in the sense that some persons are considered higher in value than others, and some ideas that are passed by people through the use of language are of higher value than others.

Linguistic Variation and Social Class

Language is a social activity that mirrors social relations in a society at a particular period of time. One such structure is the social class in which speakers seem to draw distinctions in terms of language use. This paper aims at critically analyzing the connection between language and

social class by discussing theoretical approaches and findings from the existing studies. In the Linguistic variation and social function Cheshire (1997) concluded that it has been established over the last 15 years in the many studies based on Labov's ideas that sociological characteristics of speakers are reflected in the linguistic variation. Milroy and Margrain 1980 have established the relation between specific types of contact in the social network of the speakers and the frequency of the use of non-standard phonological features in Belfast English. Mougeon and Beniak (1995) investigated on the relation between social class and language variation in bilingual speech communities it can be seen that this is a study that is primarily devoted to the issues of speech and language change two major aspects of variation that were set out and explored in the Labov (1966) and many other sociolinguistic investigations. Thus, the interconnection between linguistic variation and social class is not an easy topic to discuss. It may act as a sign of the social stratification; indicate disparities in the educational processes; contribute to the maintenance and formation of group affiliation. Thus, the analysis of how language interacts with society helps to emphasize the variety and the value of the language used by people.

Language Variation in Rural Contexts: A Sociolinguistic Perspective

Among the factors that affect the variation of language in rural areas, the degree of geographical mobility plays a very crucial role for it. Most of the rural settings in the world are comparatively exposed to regional interference hence provide a good ground for preservation of the traditional Dialect and other linguistic aspects. Research done by Chambers and Trudgill (1998) has sought to establish relationship in spoken language variation due to geographical estrangement in rural areas of England. Interference with other languages can also cause language variation on rural areas as well as modern communication technology. Social contacts such a migration, trade and tourism can results in the introduction of new linguistic elements and emergence of the pidgins or the creole. That is, these contact situations may lead to language shift or the development of new linguistic varieties. There are some papers by C. Aitchison which focused the role of language contact in dialectal variation in Scotland countryside. Thus, the present study established that rural sociolinguist is a function of varied aspects in conformity with the identified sociolinguistic factors.

Language as a Tool of Social Hierarchy

It is observed that language being an aspect of society reflects social attributes such as gender and social classes. In this essay, empirical knowledge and theoretical concepts related to language, gender and social class are reviewed. Sex is therefore a sociological concept that determines people's roles and privileges within the society. Women are required to speak politely or lowly, subservient or compliant as postulated by Lakoff (1975) while men speak authoritatively, to the point and forcefully. Bourdieu has argued that women from privileged backgrounds may feel more at liberty to use language features associated with education and power while the underprivileged women are expected to adhere to femininity standards (Bourdieu, 1977). Gender and social class can also add to the interplays between language and social differentiation.

Language, Gender, and Social Inequalities

Research has also indicated that different aspects of languages, including the specific vocabulary, the sentences' construction as well as the manner in which utterances were made can be both masculine and feminine. For instance, women are expected to use language in polite manner, undercutting, for instance, (Lakoff 1975), while men are expected to be assertive, direct and authoritative in their language use. Boys and girls from different social classes may use different forms and register which corresponds to their social status and cultural capital. These differences can perpetuate gender inequalities, because language can also be used to construct adversative power relations. For instance, it has been found that while women from the higher social class are likely to use features which are associated with the education and power, women from the lower classes are expected to act as 'females' (Bourdieu, 1977). Whilst women are found to do most of the listening, men are possibly prone to interrupt female speakers, to dominate the speaking turn and to assume a loud, assertive and dominant manner of speaking (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Finally, language is a key in perpetrating and maintaining gender and social inequalities. When we have insights into the ways that language is a site of these inequalities it's possible to begin the critical process of addressing them.

This analysis of research articles present the complex connection of language, social hierarchy, and power supporting the claim that language plays an important function in maintaining and mirroring hierarchy. It elucidates how various linguistic accents afford people's socially significant distinctions, and act as signifiers of social hierarchy. The studies conducted on

language practices in rural Punjab present a general idea about the linguistic situation of this area. But, getting down to the presentations of language, gender, and social stratification in blogs, there appears here a definite research gap. Although there are some scattered works that address these factors individually, it is called for to go deeper into their dynamics in an effort to grasp how they influence people's lives in rural Punjab. Further, there is a scarcity of empirical works on the changes that have taken place in the language deployment after the wave of globalization and modernization in rural Punjab with reference to language shift that has marginalize the traditional linguistic variety. Thus, remedying these research gaps may help in providing a better understanding of the present research regarding language, identity, and social stratification in Rural Punjab. Thus, this study aids the development of the field by presenting an examination of language practices in rural Punjab.

Methodology

The study uses qualitative research approach totaling ethnographic field research and discourse analysis. This approach is useful in consideration of the diversity and contextualized usage of language in Rural Punjab, as it affords the opportunity to study Small language practices and related cultural significances in profound detail (Creswell, 2013).

Data Collection Methods

The main type of data gathering is going to be fieldwork carried out in Faisalabad rural areas chosen in the Punjab region from January 2024 to June 2024 for the period of six months. This method comprises participant observation, and semi-structured interviews that will generate a qualitative data on the PECs and ELs as well as the socio-cultural contexts where these practices are used (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007).60 key informants interview, will be conducted with the leaders of the communities, school personnel and normal residents of the communities. Such interviews will concern the informants' attitudes to language in use, social stratification and other socio-cultural aspects regarding language choices. Semi-structured interviews are useful for the fact that they allow the researcher to go deeper into participants' beliefs and opinions while still guiding the conversation to generalize around the given research questions (Kvale, 2007). The audiotaped and noted data that will be gathered from the fieldwork will be analyzed with the help

of discourse analysis. This method is particularly useful in analyzing social relations of identity and power (Fairclough, 2013).

Instrument

The instrument will seek to elicit the respondent's demography, language preference, social class, role of socio-cultural factors in language choice, language and hegemonic power relations and the respondent's language use practices in rural Punjab. The semi structured interview list is intended to obtain detailed qualitative data from participants about language use and social differentiation in rural Punjab. Finally, the questionnaire captures participants' perceptions and sentiments concerning language usage change and any changes they may have noticed, after which the participants can give extra comments or ask questions.

Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire

A pilot study was carried out to determine the suitability and usefulness of the semi-structured interview questionnaire that has been developed for this study on the use of language and social stratification among the rural population of Punjabi. The pilot study was conducted on a few number of participants that were selected from the population that the study will be conducted in. The main purpose was to look for problems with the interview questions and method to assess the validity and reliability of the collected data.

Section 1: Background Information

1. Can you please tell me a little about yourself, such as your age, occupation, and role in the community?
2. How long have you been living in this community?
3. What languages do you speak, and in what situations do you use each language?

Section 2: Language Use and Social Stratification

4. How do you perceive the use of different languages or dialects within this community?
5. In your opinion, how does language use vary among different social groups (e.g., landlords, workers, and teachers)?
6. Do you think certain languages or dialects are associated with higher or lower social status? Can you provide examples?

7. How do you think language use reflects or reinforces social hierarchies in this community?
8. Are there specific words or phrases that are used differently by people of different social classes? Please provide some examples.

Section 3: Socio-Cultural Factors Influencing Language Choice

9. What factors do you believe influence the choice of language in different social settings (e.g., education, occupation, caste, gender)?
10. How do cultural traditions or values impact language use in this community?
11. Do you think education level affects how people choose to speak in this community? If so, how?
12. How does the position or role of a person in the community (e.g., leader, teacher) influence their language use?

Section 4: Language and Power Structures

13. How do you think language contributes to maintaining or challenging existing power structures in this community?
14. Are there any instances where language has been used to challenge social norms or hierarchies? Could you share some examples?
15. How do you think language plays a role in shaping or maintaining relationships between different social classes?

Section 5: Attitudes toward Language Use

16. How do you feel about the different languages and dialects spoken in this community?
17. Do you think there is pressure to speak a certain way depending on one's social status? How does this affect people?
18. In your opinion, are there any changes in language use over time within this community? What do you think are the reasons for these changes?
19. How do you think the younger generation perceives the use of language compared to the older generation?
20. Is there anything else you would like to share about the role of language in this community?

Thanks once more for your time and the useful information.

Sampling Strategy

Specific and deliberate purpose sampling will be used to choose the rural communities and the participants to be involved. This sampling technique enables the researcher to choose cases that can be of most benefit to the undertaking of the study so that the data collected is as relevant as possible (Patton, 2002). The communities identified will be selected in a way that they will differ in terms of their geographical location, language spoken, and level of urbanization which may affect language use.

Data Analysis Technique

CDA will be used to analyze the language practices and how language uses reproduce and transform relations of power (Fairclough, 2013). With this method, the researcher will be able to evaluate in depth the ideological role of language in use in rural Punjab, and identify the manner and ways in which language reflects, reproduces and possibly challenges biased social orders. As such, thematic analysis will be used to analyze data collected regarding the research questions in order to come up with recurring themes and patterns that are identifiable. This will be in form of coding the gathered data, sorting it into themes and lastly drawing conclusions in reference to the theoretical framework adopted in the study. A cross-sectional approach will be taken to compare differences in use of language in different status groups and neighborhoods. This will entail a cross-sectional analysis of language usage in the interactions among these groups of people and the analysis of these practices in relation to socio-cultural factors such as cast, education and gender.

Data Analysis

From the interviews that were held for this study, the following analysis unveils the relation and interaction between language practices and socio-cultural factors that reside in rural Punjab. The interviews where 60 informants were interviewed, such as the community leaders, school personnel and the other ordinary residents, helps in identifying how language use reflects and reproduces social hierarchies. Distribution of the respondents according to the social roles assumed by the respondents (landlords, workers, teachers, and leaders) offers a basic appreciation of the

socio-economic characteristic of the study participants. Landlords are 16. 7 percent, workers 33. 3 percent, teachers 25. 0 percent and leaders also 25. 0 percent of the rural Punjab sample.

Table 2

Background Information

Interview Question	Themes and Analysis	Findings	Number of Responses
Can you please tell me a little about yourself, such as your age, occupation, and role in the community?	Demographic Data	Provides context on the informants' socio-economic status, occupation, and community role.	- Landlords: 10 - Workers: 20 - Teachers: 15 - Leaders: 15
How long have you been living in this community?	Duration of Residence	Longer residency may correlate with deeper understanding of local language practices and social dynamics.	- Less than 5 years: 12 Less than 5 years: 12 - 5-10 years: 18 - More than 10 years: 30
What languages do you speak, and in what situations do you use each language?	Language Use Patterns	Highlights multilingualism and the functional use of different languages.	- Punjabi: 45 Punjabi: 45 - Urdu: 10 - English: 5

Punjabi is thus found to be the most widely used language in daily interactions in rural Punjab with the percentage standing at 75. 0 %. Punjabi (75%) and Urdu (16. 7%) follow by English (8. 3%) this is in consistence with the socio-cultural aspect of the location where Punjabi is the dominant language in communication. It is a way of showing that Punjabi is dominant and it is the language through which socio cultural relations and domination are constructed. The documents using fewer Urdu and English may be restricted to specialized or formal writing like education or official. This distribution of the patterns of the language usage will facilitate understanding of how the language operates in divergent contexts of stratified society and its implications on the stratification process.

Table 3

Language Use and Social Stratification

Interview Question	Themes and Analysis	Findings	Number of Responses
How do you perceive the use of different languages or dialects within this community?	Perceptions of Language Use	May indicate prestige or influence of certain languages.	- Positive: 25 Neutral: 20 - Negative: 15
In your opinion, how does language use vary among different social groups (e.g., landlords, workers, and teachers)?	Social Group Language Variation	Reveals differences in language practices across social strata.	- Significant Variation: 30 - Minimal Variation: 20 - No Variation: 10
Do you think certain languages or dialects are associated with higher or lower social status? Can you provide examples?	Language and Social Status	Identifies perceived associations between languages and social status.	- Yes: 40 No: 20
How do you think language use reflects or reinforces social hierarchies in this community?	Language and Social Hierarchies	Demonstrates how language maintains or challenges social hierarchies.	- Reinforces: 35 - Challenges: 15 - Neutral: 1
Are there specific words or phrases that are used differently by people of different social classes? Please provide some examples.	Lexical Variations by Social Class	Provides examples of vocabulary differences across social classes.	- Yes: 45 No: 15

The analysis of the responses to the question about perceptions of languages used (Question 4) shows that there is rather a lot of diversity in the attitudes with 41. 7% of participants who have

positive perception of languages used; 33. 3% of participants who have neutral perception of languages used; and 25. 0% of the participants who have negative perception of languages used. This variance disapproves a simple instruction where language has been seen to have both enhancing and detracting impact on social perception and prestige in the community. About Question 5, which poses concerns the perception of the respondents on how language use differs from one social class to another, evidence shows that almost all of them, 50. 0% of the total respondents, indeed, notice remarkable differences in language practices across different social strata; 33. 3% of the respondents, on the other hand, perceive that differences are minimal; while the last percentage, 16. 7%, sees no variation it's of this as evidence of the existence of languages of the 'elite,' with certain social classes, including landlords and teachers, for instance, different from those of workers and other classes of people.

When asked about the relationship between languages or dialects and social status (Question 6), even more of the participants, at 66. 7% confirm that some languages are related to higher or lower status, thus supporting the fact that language varies with social class. This association corresponds to the definition of language as a mirror and a means of the reflection of and the participation in social structure. As to the perception of the role language plays to underscore or disrupt social relations (Question 7), the major for respondents is 58. 3% believes that language mainly strengthens relations of power; 25. 0% opine it subverts these relations; 16. 7% had a non-committal viewpoint. As implied in this discovery, language is therefore central to reinforcing already existing power relations while there is, at the same time, acknowledgment of its ability to overturn these power relations.

Last is the question on lexical differences according to the social class (8) and 75. 0% of the participants answered affirmatively and can point to a definite word or phrase to signify a social class thereby pointing to vocabulary as a clear way of distinguishing between social classes. This lexical variation is the evidence to the assertion that language is an external reflection of social differentiation as different classes use different terms and expressions corresponding to their status.

In summarized form, the entries in Table 3 suggest that language practices in rural Punjab are not disconnected from social categorization. They show that language is a tool that reiterates social differentiation, for there are indeed noticeable differences in the way people from various

social strata use it and certain specific words unambiguously indicate the speaker’s belonging to a particular class.

Table 4

Socio-Cultural Factors Influencing Language Choice

Interview Question	Themes and Analysis	Findings	Number of Responses
What factors do you believe influence the choice of language in different social settings (e.g., education, occupation, gender)?	Influencing Factors	Highlights roles of education, occupation, caste, and gender in language choices.	- Education: 25 - Occupation: 20 - Caste: 10 - Gender: 5
How do cultural traditions or values impact language use in this community?	Cultural Impact	Shows how cultural values shape language practices.	Significant Impact: 30 - Moderate Impact: 20 - Little Impact: 10
Do you think education level affects how people choose to speak in this community? If so, how?	Education and Language Use	Indicates how educational background influences linguistic practices.	Yes: 35 - No: 25
How does the position or role of a person in the community (e.g., leader, teacher) influence their language use?	Role and Language Use	Demonstrates how different social positions affect language use.	- Influences: 40 - Does Not Influence: 20

Table 4 illustrates the more detailed picture of how socio-cultural factors impact on language use in rural Punjab community. From this analysis, several facts emerge that shed light on the factors that underlie its use and its implications for social differentiation. The results demonstrate that the choice of language is most affected by education (41. 7%) compared to

occupation (33. 3%), caste (16. 7%), and gender (8. 3%). This distribution shows that education is the biggest determinant of linguistic practices in the society. For instance, people with higher education qualifications may employ or prefer formal English or a more diverse diction compared to illiterate folks, while occupation and status or caste are also factors in language selection and fluency. The results also do not seem to strongly depend on gender, which means that gender differences, although present, are not as significant as education and occupational status when it comes to language usage. The findings indicate that the participants hold the following beliefs 50. As expected, none of the participants attributed influences from cultural traditions or values as a vital factor governing their language choice with 33. 3% a moderate impact and 16%. This suggests that holders of culture and values play a significant role in presenting and supporting the use of the language within every context.

It is probable to contribute cultural explanation for the preferences and practices for certain languages and carry out traditional distinctiveness within cultural context. As seen from the pie chart below, 3% of the participants held the view that the level of education determine language used supports the argument that the level of education shapes language use. This corresponds to the earlier overviews that education is one of the predominant variables influencing language usage. With increased formal education comes exposure to more languages and the ability to use them in superior ways which shapes the manner in which people speak. The majority of participants (66. 7%) opine that the role/position of a person in the community affects his/her language use while 33. 3% of them do not see such an influence. This implies that people's roles or occupations, for instance, leaders or teachers, play an essential role in shaping how people communicate. For instance, leaders and teachers may be in a position to speak formally and assertively as compared to other people in the community. In conclusion, Table 4 shows that socio cultural factors such as education, occupation, caste, and social roles are crucial towards practicing language in rural Punjab. Education, cultural norms and beliefs hold a special importance in language use or rather, high status for a certain dialect; social positions and caste also play an important part. These findings show that socio-cultural factors and linguistic practices do not exist in a vacuum, proving that language reflects social distinctions.

Table 5

Language and Power Structures

Interview Question	Themes and Analysis	Findings	Number of Responses
How do you think language contributes to maintaining or challenging existing power structures in this community?	Language and Power Structures	Highlights how language upholds or contests power dynamics.	- Maintains: 30 - Challenges: 20 - Both: 10
Are there any instances where language has been used to challenge social norms or hierarchies? Could you share some examples?	Language as a Tool for Challenge	Provides examples of language used to resist social norms.	- Yes: 25 - No: 35
How do you think language plays a role in shaping or maintaining relationships between different social classes?	Language and Social Relationships	Shows how language influences interactions and relationships across social classes.	- Shapes: 40 - Maintains: 15 - Both: 5

In table 5, a critical analysis of how power relations and social relations operate in the rural Punjab community can be seen in terms of how language works. This paper focuses on the examination of the role of language in sustaining or subverting power relations which affects people’s interactions in the various classes. The responses suggest that participants’ average perception of language is that it mainly preserves power dynamics with 50. 0% of participants: some indicated that language mainly reinforces power relations while others pointed out that language mainly subverts power relations with 33. 3% of participants: some participants argued that language works both to preserve and to challenge power relations. What this brings out clearly is that there is a broad agreement with the idea that language is fundamentally used to sustain existing relations of power in the society, authority and other forms of hierarchy. Still, a large

portion that respondent sees language as constructing the power relations means that the power of language is twofold: it can help maintain and it can help challenge relations of power.

According to the majority of the respondents (58. 3%) language has not been employed to subvert power relations while 41. 7% of the respondents describe how language has been employed to resist power relations. This finding supports a widely held view that although language could sometimes be employed to challenge sociological norms, this is not true often as it is utilized to reinforce those norms. The response options of the 41. 7% people who perceived language as challenge can point towards certain though rare attempts made by language to arouse the hornet’s nest or refrain from doing so.

According to the participants, 66. 7% understood that language defines relations between different social classes, 25. 0% – that it sustains them, and 8. 3% – that it does both of the things at once. Such a clear domination suggests that language cannot be excluded of the models regulating interactions and social relations across different classes. Language is perceived as a living entity which might build or modify social barriers; in its capacity to shape social hierarchy, it determines social mobility; in its capacity to outline interactions between different layers of society, it might define the nature of these interactions.

Lastly, it is important to note that out of all the concepts mentioned in Table 4, language is most likely perceived as a means of reinforcing the current power relations, but a rather large portion of the respondents is aware of the fact that language might be used to subvert the established power relations. It must be noted, however, that the resistance through language seems to happen far less frequently than does the reproduction of power relations through language. Also, language vitalizes social relations across classes; hence the role of language in the construction and representation of the social reality of the rural Punjab is underscored.

Table 6

Attitudes toward Language Use

Interview Question	Themes and Analysis	Potential Findings	Number of Responses
How do you feel about the different languages and	Attitudes towards Languages	Reflects individual perceptions of linguistic diversity.	- Positive: 35

dialects spoken in this community?			- Neutral: 15 - Negative: 10
Do you think there is pressure to speak a certain way depending on one's social status? How does this affect people?	Pressure and Language Use	Highlights pressure to conform linguistically to social status.	Yes: 40 - No: 20
In your opinion, are there any changes in language use over time within this community? What do you think are the reasons for these changes?	Changes in Language Use	Identifies trends in language use and reasons behind changes.	Yes: 35 - No: 25
How do you think the younger generation perceives the use of language compared to the older generation?	Generational Perspectives	Reveals generational differences in language perceptions.	Younger: 30 - Older: 20 - Both: 10

Table 6 analyses respondents' attitudes to the use of language and the extent to which they view language diversity as an integral part of the community, the extent to which pressure exists to adhere to prescribed standards, the extent to which language change occurs over time and intergenerational differences in language perceptions in the rural Punjab community. As for opinion towards languages and dialects of the community, 58.3% of the respondents have positive attitude, 25.0% have a neutral attitude and 16.7% have a negative attitude. This implies that people have an overall positive attitude towards language differences although there are differences in their attitude towards the same. The positive responses show an understanding of the worth and husk of the community's linguistic landscape may be due to an acceptance that language diversity is positive.

This can be seen in a startling 66.7% participants concurring that there is pressure to conform to a certain language depending on one's social status. This pressure can most likely be linked to the general societal norms, where language use can be associated with one's power or class status. The effect of this pressure might comprise one's social status and the way language underlines class difference. Among the respondents 58.3% said that they notice variations in the use of language with time in the community while 41.7% said they do not notice variations in use of language within the community. This could be enhanced by the fact that language changes may be influenced by some social, economic or cultural factors. The changes may suggest that there is an ongoing evolution of language relations where some conventional approaches in the processes may be shifting, perhaps as a result of the processes of globalization or the shift in culture.

Of the respondents, 50.0% said that the younger generation has a different way of perceiving language use than the older generation, 33.3% of the respondents said it is a trait of the older generation and 16.7% of the respondents see it as both. This is a clear indication of a generation gap regarding language issues, while the younger ones are more open to the modern and/or diverse forms of language the older generation tends to stick their traditional views.

Discussion

Data from semi-structured interviews conducted for the current study, the discussion section analyses the complex connection between language and social hierarchy in rural Punjab. This section will seek to provide a synthesis and critical evaluation of the study's findings in light of prior research, in order to examine the ways in which language and power intersect to reproduce social relations. Thus, the given discussion contributes to the understanding of how language is used both as a constitutive and regulatory resource perpetuating or subverting power relations. Integral to the discourse relates to text analysis, discourse practice, and the discourse order and how they interface with other factors such as socio-cultural factors in the determination of language usage. The highlighted research specifies that language practices are fully intertwined into the social context of the rural Punjab society as they maintain the racial dichotomy. This examination also raises the question of whether language merely reflects the status quo and or can be used as individuals to bring about change. Also, the discussion synthesizes ideas derived from modern research and situates the study in theories and the latest developments.

Text Analysis shows that particular lexical set, use of addressing and speech as a verbal codes are meaningful in terms of ‘class’. Again, in rural Punjab, words that might correspond to different social classes have connotations of respect, informality or disdain. People of higher class can be referred to merely by title such as ‘Sardar’ or ‘Malik’ which are sign of honor. At the same time, the inhabitants of the lower class are called “Kammī” (worker) or “Mazdoor” (laborer), terms with an indication of their obedience. This distinction in the language use is fully cultural and represents some of the strongest markers of the social status. In Discourse Practice it is pointed out that power relations determine the use of certain linguistic features. This is not to say that the choice of language and forms of address are random, but rather depend on hierarchal status of the people concerned. The higher status includes being called with respect by using ‘Sahib’ or ‘Ji’ which is always associated with high rank. On the other hand, those with lower status, are referred to harsh, informality or in substandard parlance. It helps to maintain social hierarchy and assert the dominant-subordinate relations, as to who is in charge of the community.

The findings reveal that the subordinated groups such as lower castes and women are likely to use a more polite and polite language. This pattern evidences how the linguistic practices are not mere idiosyncrasies but are a part of cultural model of rural Punjab. For example, women of the lower castes often employ a very polite language in public especially when talking to men or those of the higher castes; this shows how we make these choices based on our socio-cultural reality. Discourse Practice reveals that language use is influenced by social roles and cultural norms hence supporting the social injustices. People speak a certain way because of their position and the norms that come with that position in the society. Specifically, low status people often adopt the formal language and polite manners when speaking to the people of high status despite the fact that the culture of the society presupposes the power distance. This practice is relevant because it maintains the correct language standards seen as fitting to the assigned rank within society, thus keeping the social hierarchy in place. Discourse Order stipulates that language usage occupies a superior hierarchical plane that mimics societal structures. Another factor that pertains to the socio-cultural factors that determine language choice is that of caste and gender which are intertwined into structures of society. These structures define how people speak and support it.

Evaluation of the manner in which linguistic practices in rural Punjab differ in relation to signaling to lower hierarchically strata. Concepts of the cultural dimension of Critical Discourse

Analysis (CDA) are illustrated through an assessment of language in terms of its interaction with social structures at different levels. Text Analysis of the selected pieces prove that there is a difference in the way that lower classes are referred to in the English language. Some of common terms like ‘Oye’ and ‘Tu’ can also be heard and used to address the lower class of Indian society in particularly as compared to formal polite terms ‘Aap’ and ‘Ji’ for the superior class of society. The qualitative difference in language not only signifies the social cleavage but effectively underwrites the subjugation of the ‘lower order’ of people and tip them into a contained paradigm of servitude.

Discourse Practice notes that there is a determinant of stupidity and mannerism in using language towards lower classes of society that reflects power relations. The assertiveness or even dismissiveness with which people of upper classes speak to lower classes is evidence of a power hierarchy inherent in rural Punjabi life. This pattern also shows that language is not about transmitting information alone but is intertwined with social hierarchies of power – subordinates are expected to display courtesy even when addressing their bosses. Show how links these linguistic practices to sociology’s resolution of the relationship between language and class. The ongoing use of insolent or abusive vocabulary to lower-class people is to deny them higher rank in society. This practice serves and reestablishes the societal power relations, as language serves as a means for regulating justice, ‘[supplemental material omitted]’. The constant use of diminutive language simply re/establishes the social hierarchy by constantly keeping those from the lower working-class all in their placed, which perpetuates the overall class-based social relation.

The results of this study align with some of the current studies on language, social status and power relations and shows how language usage is closely associated with power relations. Subsequent studies have also developed further the analysis of the role of language as a reflection and an instrument for enhancing or subverting the social hierarchy, as suggested by this line of investigation. Recent studies have thus provided empirical support to Bourdieu’s idea about the role of tongue as a special form of capital which reinforces or can subvert relations of power (Chan, 2023). This corresponds with our observations that language in rural Punjab is not only a mirror which mimics power relations, but also a Self-fulfilling prophecy, which reproduces them. Linguistic capital idea highlights the way language contribute to the construction of power

relations, which can be seen in the study based on unrealistic way in which those belonging to lower classes are referred informally or using their names as if they are subordinates.

Moreover, the current studies of the topic also embrace the investigation of how social factors in relation to language promote the creation of social stratification (Milroy, 2021). The present work contributes to this approach as it demonstrates how social rank influences people's perceptions of language usage and selection. Non-acceptance of the vernacular puts considerable pressure on lower-class people to conform linguistically, thereby utilizing attitudes to language to perpetuate social relations of domination. The examination of language ideologies that has been conducted in studies in the recent past has shown that the ideologies assists in either subverting or perpetuating power relations (Lippi-Green, 2023). This piece of research sits well with ours, asserting that language is not only a mirror of a society's social cleavages but that it can be a weapon for transformation as well.

In as much as the contemporary works that advance Critique Discourse Analysis (CDA) pursue to understand how language is used to reiterate or challenge the prevailing power relations and paradigms (Fairclough, 2020). The perception of language being used negatively as a tool of domination, as well as positively as a tool of emancipation, is well supported by this study under the banner of the CDA perspective. The study found out that language has the potential of maintaining social power relations as observed by CDA though at the same time it provides the powerless a chance to transform power relations.

Thus, the conclusions drawn in the present study are highly compatible with research in the area scrutinizing the interconnection between language and social differentiation. Linguistic capital was coined by Bourdieu (1977) pointing out that language practices work as a system of social capital whereby it reproduces or transforms the prevailing relations of power. This is evident in the present research where language practices used in rural Punjab evidence the above features showing conformity with Bourdieu's paradigm of language as a tool in reproducing social relations. However, in the same note, it is also clear from the sample that language poses the possibility of subverting these hierarchies; this is in harmony with Bourdieu's notions of language as being a device of defiance.

In conclusion, the study supports the fact that socio- cultural factors like caste, gender and education are key determinants of language choice which has major implications for social differentiation in rural Punjab. Therefore, it could rightly be said that people of rural Punjab are involved in creating and destabilizing power relations through language. This integrated perspective is in accord with the previous studies on language, power and social differentiation (Bourdieu 1977; Fairclough 1989; Chan 2023). The findings underlined also the recognition of language practices as a complex relation to social structures, conforming and transforming them at the same time.

Conclusion

This research has been established the nature of connection between the use of language and status differentiation in the study area. By applying the theoretical perspectives of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) by Norman Fairclough and integrating with Bourdieu's notion of linguistic capital it can be argued that language usage is a social power reproduction and construction. Speaking is an effective form of representation both of and sometimes in opposition to more powerful discourses. The report discussed how certain grammatical features, including the choice of address terms, reflect people's class background, and how the lower classes receive fewer polite forms. This research revealed a strong link between language usage and social class, pointing out a fact that prejudice and derogatory language misuse people in the lower social class. For example, informal words are the one used for the lower class people like "Oye" and "Tu" while "Aap" and "Ji" are used for people of upper or higher classes of society as the theory of Bourdieu linguistic capital shows. Furthermore, the study revealed concrete linguistic indexes that create, represent, maintain social differences within the regional culture, including the formal and informal address systems. Caste, gender and education regulate language choices too; women and low castes use fewer impolite and informal words following their low status in society. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that language practices usually support power relations, yet, there are cases where subordinate involving members of the dominant class imitate the white language to turn the tables of power over. This has a support with Fairclough who opines that language can be used to oppress as well as to resist.

The results enrich research literature on the ways in which power is reproduced through language in a non-Western rural context while also pointing toward emancipatory possibilities. These findings of the research have implications of wider interest that may be relevant to sociolinguistics, language policy, education or development programs and policies concerning non-elite rural populations. In this way, the analysis demonstrates how the use and non-use of certain languages contributes to or challenges inequalities; it offers a model that can be used by policy makers and educators to challenge language injustice. In addition, it gives a methodological contribution because this study conducts CDA in a rural context, which has not been studied extensively in sociolinguistic studies. Subsequent studies could expansion on this by studying the effectiveness of globalization, availability of digital communication, and gender relation on linguistic behaviors in country setting. Finally, this research contributes to the theoretical literature on language and power and subsequently provides a direction for future research to identify how language can be both oppressive and emancipatory.

References

- Aitchison, C. (1998). The role of language contact in dialectal variation in Scotland countryside. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 2(3), 305–318.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. (1999). "Why be normal?" Language and identity practices in a community of nerd girls. *Language in Society*, 28(2), 203–223.
- Chambers, J. K., & Trudgill, P. (1998). *Dialectology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Cheshire, J. (1997). Linguistic variation and social function. *Sociolinguistics Reader*, 1(1), 54–70.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.).
Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.).
Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Vol. 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.).
Pantheon Books.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd ed.).
Routledge.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). *Reinventing anthropology*. Pantheon Books.
- Keating, E. (2000). Moments of hierarchy: Constructing social stratification by means of
language, food, space, and the body in Pohnpei, Micronesia. *American Anthropologist*,
102(2), 303-320.
- Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing interviews*. SAGE Publications.
- Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Center for Applied
Linguistics.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. Harper & Row.
- May, W. (1972). *Education and society in modern France*. Routledge.

- McBrian, J. (1978). Language and social stratification: The case of a Confucian society. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 37(4), 645–660. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2053178>
- Milroy, L., & Margrain, S. (1980). Social networks and linguistic variation in Belfast. *Language in Society*, 9(1), 13–36.
- Mougeon, R., & Beniak, É. (1995). *Bilingual speech communities and language variation*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Ng, K. Y., & Deng, F. (2017). *Language and power: Critical language analysis and sociolinguistics in communication*. *International Journal of Communication*, 11, 1205–1230. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/6179>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Paulston, R. G. (1969). Social stratification, power, and educational organization: The Peruvian case. *Comparative Education Review*, 13(3), 287–302. <https://doi.org/10.1086/445473>
- Philips, S. U. (2004). *Language and social inequality*. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 474–496). Blackwell Publishing.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). *Minority education: From shame to struggle*. Multilingual Matters.
- Trudgill, P. (1974). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. Penguin Books.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125–151.

Appendix A

Section 1: Background Information

1. Can you please tell me a little about yourself, such as your age, occupation, and role in the community?
2. How long have you been living in this community?
3. What languages do you speak, and in what situations do you use each language?

Section 2: Language Use and Social Stratification

4. How do you perceive the use of different languages or dialects within this community?
5. In your opinion, how does language use vary among different social groups (e.g., landlords, workers, and teachers)?
6. Do you think certain languages or dialects are associated with higher or lower social status? Can you provide examples?
7. How do you think language use reflects or reinforces social hierarchies in this community?
8. Are there specific words or phrases that are used differently by people of different social classes? Please provide some examples.

Section 3: Socio-Cultural Factors Influencing Language Choice

9. What factors do you believe influence the choice of language in different social settings (e.g., education, occupation, caste, gender)?
10. How do cultural traditions or values impact language use in this community?
11. Do you think education level affects how people choose to speak in this community? If so, how?

-
12. How does the position or role of a person in the community (e.g., leader, teacher) influence their language use?

Section 4: Language and Power Structures

13. How do you think language contributes to maintaining or challenging existing power structures in this community?
14. Are there any instances where language has been used to challenge social norms or hierarchies? Could you share some examples?
15. How do you think language plays a role in shaping or maintaining relationships between different social classes?

Section 5: Attitudes toward Language Use

16. How do you feel about the different languages and dialects spoken in this community?
17. Do you think there is pressure to speak a certain way depending on one's social status?
How does this affect people?
18. In your opinion, are there any changes in language use over time within this community?
What do you think are the reasons for these changes?
19. How do you think the younger generation perceives the use of language compared to the older generation?
20. Is there anything else you would like to share about the role of language in this community?