Power Dynamics in Education Language Policy: A Discourse-Historical Analysis of the Impact of Pakistani Education Language Policy on the Marginalization of Regional Languages

Anfal Hassan1, Dr. Syed Kazim Shah2, Zahra Batool3
1MPhil Scholar
Department of Applied Linguistics
Govt. College University Faisalabad

2. Assistant Professor,
Department of Applied Linguistics
 Government College University, Faisalabad.

3Lecturer,
Department of Languages and Cultural Studies,
 University of BaltistanSkardu

Abstract

Language planning and policy is the deliberate effort of the governments to regulate and manage language use, development, and maintenance within a society. This study aims to identify the power relations and hidden linguistics ideologies in the National Education Policy (NEP) 2018. The Discourse Historical Approach by Wodak (2015) was used to analyze the NEP (2018) documents. A comprehensive framework was developed containing four major elements i.e. discursive strategies, historical context, power relations, ideology, and hegemony. It was found that English is the most dominant educational language in Pakistan followed by Urdu. It is because English is coined with social prestige and economic growth, and termed as the language of power. The NEP (2018) significantly marginalizes the regional languages (i.e. Punjabi, Sindhi, Pashto, Balochi, etc.) which in the long run leads to their decline and loss of culture and identity among vast cultural and linguistic groups in Pakistan.

Introduction

Language policy and planning is concerned with planning language, its implementation in society, and its outcomes. Language policies are usually developed by the government to integrate diverse linguistic groups and offer them a common code of communication for national harmony. The most common approach of language policy is top-down but it can also be bottom-up. In a top-down approach, governments or institutions impose policies, whereas a bottom-up approach allows communities to contribute to shaping the language policies that directly impact them. Both approaches have their strengths and weaknesses, depending on the socio-political and cultural context in which they are implemented.

Pakistan's language policy is fully mentioned in the 1973 constitution states that Urdu is the national language of Pakistan while English is used for official purposes. The constitution urged the replacement of English with Urdu which was never implemented due to power dynamics coined with the English language. Despite constitutional commands, English continues to dominate main sectors such as education, governance, media, and business, highlighting the socio-economic divide it creates within society.The latest National Education Policy NEP (2018) also highlights the importance of the English language, the language of power and prestige. Urdu and other regional languages attain a lower status, especially in the educational context. This disparity reflects how language policy is intertwined with societal inequalities, where access to quality education and opportunities often hinges on proficiency in English rather than native languages.

In this study, Wodak's (2015) Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) is employed as a main tool for investigating power relations and hidden ideologies regarding languages in NEP (2018). The study aims to identify the hidden power relations and language ideologies that lead to the dominance of a few languages while marginalizing others. By examining the language used in the NEP (2018), this research aims to shed light on how policies can promote inequalities and contribute to linguistic hierarchies.This study also aims to identify how Pakistan NEP (2018) creates linguistics hegemony i.e. dominating few languages while marginalizing others. The findings aim to inform future language policy development in Pakistan, ensuring a more inclusive and equitable linguistic landscape.

Literature Review

Introduction to Language Policy and Planning (LPP):

LPP deals with explicit and implicit policies that impact the use of languages. It is concerned with who speaks which language when they speak it and how. It investigates three basic phenomena i.e. policy development, its implementation, and its impact at various levels. It considers social, political, and cultural factors of the society by using various sub-disciplines like discourse analysis, corpus analysis, and media studies. (Stemper & King, 2017) LPP involves decisions made about language at various societal levels i.e. macro level, meso level, and micro level. Traditionally, LPP had a top-down approach in which the state makes efforts to change the structure and function of languages. However, in the current scenario bottom-up approach of LPP is also common in which the structure and function of languages emerge from the grassroots level. Thus, in the modern era, it is believed that LPP can either be explicit or implicit and can emerge from the authoritative level as well as the grassroots level. (Romaine, 2021)

Historical Development of LPP:

Language policy and planning (LPP) is an interdisciplinary field that was introduced by Haugen in 1959 originally to solve the problems of newly-developed nations in the post-colonial context. He described language planning as an activity of preparing normative orthography, grammar, and dictionaries for the counseling of writers and speaking of a diverse speech community. The field of LPP developed in three stages; in the first stage (1950s-1960s) the main focus was the development of grammars, writing systems, and dictionaries for indigenous

languages, emphasizing corpus planning while neglecting sociopolitical context; in the second stage (1970s-1980s) the structuralist approach was challenged and pragmatic approach of LPP was promoted to solve immediate language problems that often lead to the promotion of ex-colonial languages (mostly English and French) however, socio-cultural contexts in language planning were emphasized; the last stage (1990s-present) is more inclusive as it not only considers the state-directions but also the broader societal perspectives, thus it emphasizes the roles of local actors and the sociopolitical and ideological dimensions of language planning. (Goundar, 2017)

Difference Between Language Policy and Language Planning:

An important aspect that should be considered in dealing with LPP is that language policy and language planning are two different but interlinked phenomena. Language policy refers to the goals of language planning, while language planning involves the actual measures taken to achieve these goals. (Romaine, 2021) Language policy includes the general goals set by authorities regarding the use and management of languages within a society. Whereas, language planning involves specific measures taken to realize these goals, often through status planning and corpus planning. (Coulmas, 2013) Thus, language policy and planning cannot be separated because one defines the goals and the other provides the method to achieve those goals.

Evaluation of LPP in International Context:

LPP emerged as a field to help nations plan and develop an appropriate system of communication where diverse linguistic landscapes can cause serious disputes among various linguistic groups. Different nations around the globe have planned their language policy mainly to overcome societal disharmony but they end up marginalizing the indigenous languages.

A critical study of Lesotho's language policy using Ideological Grammatical Metaphors (IGM) and Fairclough's 3D models found the explicit exercise of power. Various linguistic elements were found in Lesotho's language policy including mode, performativity which embodies interpellation and censorship, modality, coordination, and nominalization. The findings of the study suggest that Lesotho's language policy emphasizes Sesotho and English as official languages while marginalizing the minority languages. This language policy suggests that those who are frequent in Sesotho and English will possess power while others who can't use these languages will be powerless with a lower status. (Mpholle, 2024)

Another study critically comparing the research articles about the LPP of Malaysia and Cambodia using Fairclough's 3D model revealed that the LPPs of both nations are influenced by political factors, historical context, and the development of national identity. Considering the post-colonial contexts of Cambodia and Malaysia, they underwent challenges in standardization i.e. Cambodia faced challenges in the romanization of Khmer while Malaysia faced challenges due to the multi-racial population while making Malay Bahasa the national language and compulsory subject at schools. The main finding of the study suggests that both nations' LPPs are influenced by their respective political landscapes. (Azmi et al., 2013) However, the data used for analysis were research articles on LPP rather than the original policy documents, which makes the research results rather skeptical.

https://remittancesreview.com

The USA's educational language policy emphasizes the English language and necessitates all students to be at a certain level of English with annual assessments for English learners (ELs). Giles et.al (2020) critically evaluated the federal, state, and district policy documents using Tollefson's critical language policy (2006) and Fairclough's (1995) critical discourse analysis. Seven states were selected from the ELPA-21 consortium and seven school districts with the most number of ELs were chosen to study the power relations. The top-down directive is found with federal directives influencing the implementation and operationalization of state and district policy documents in the ELPA-21 consortium. It is also found that some districts strictly aligned with the federal and state definitions while others made more inclusive policies supporting the bilingualism or multilingualism of ELs.

Another study analyzed China's English language education policy using Fairclough's 3D model. The national and regional ELEP documents were collected from October to February 2012 and analyzed using the CDA model mainly focusing on intertextuality to determine power relations. Then the ethnographic data, including observation field notes, interviews, classroom observations, and questionnaires, was collected from three schools in Yulin to determine policy implementation in the society. After critical discourse and ethnographical analyses, a significant tension is found between policy and practice. The policy was not implemented in society because educators and other individuals hindered its implementation. It was observed that ignoring the ELEP would increase the social gap between rich and poor because rich individuals possessing proper English knowledge would benefit while poor individuals would face challenges to move up in society. (Shi, 2016)

South Korean language testing policies were examined using a discourse analytical approach (DA) mainly focusing on NEAT, TOEIC, and TOPIK exams. The policy documents and the media discourses from three Korean newspapers were analyzed using the DA to examine the meaning-making processes in ideologies, practices, and social contexts related to LTP. The discursive practices, power dynamics, and ideological constructs within the texts were identified and interpreted. The study found that NEAT policies were influenced by bureaucratic and economic discourses leading to their elimination, TOEIC graduation requirements emphasized English proficiency for global competitiveness, and TOPIK immigration policies focused on Korean proficiency for integration. The main result is that language testing policies reflect and influence sociopolitical interests and power relations, highlighting the need for a discursive approach to understand their broader implications in language planning and policy. (Shin et al., 2023)

Another corpus-based critical study was conducted to examine the contentious debate over the Tamazight language in Moroccan news media, focusing on how language ideologies shape language policy discussions. A text corpus of 658 newspaper articles totaling 803,444 tokens was developed and analyzed using corpus linguistics (CL) and discourse historical approach (DHA), performing both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The quantitative analysis of the corpus included absolute frequency and collocate analysis, and the qualitative analysis included the examination of discursive strategies and argumentation schemes. It is found that media discourses significantly influenced perceptions and debates surrounding Tamazight by shaping language ideologies and framing its societal importance and integration within Morocco

through narratives of historicity, homogeneity, modernity, 'scientificity,' and victimhood, influencing public opinion and policy discussions about the language. (Khalid & Said, 2023)

Table 1

LPP in the International Context

Author	Theory for Analysis	Main Findings
Mpholle (2024)	Ideological Grammatical Metaphors (IGM) and Fairclough's 3D models	Lesotho's language policy emphasizes Sesotho and English as official languages, marginalizing minority languages, and reinforcing power dynamics.
Azmi et al. (2013)	Fairclough's 3D model	Malaysia and Cambodia's language policy and planning (LPP) are influenced by political factors, historical context, and national identity.
Giles et al. (2020)	Tollefson's critical language policy and Fairclough's critical discourse analysis	US educational language policy shows top-down influence with varying degrees of alignment and inclusivity across states and districts.
Shi (2016)	Fairclough's 3D model and ethnography theoy	China's English language education policy faces challenges in implementation, impacting social mobility and reinforcing socioeconomic gaps.
Shin et al. (2023)	Discourse analytical approach (DA)	South Korean language testing policies reflect sociopolitical interests and power dynamics, influencing language planning and policy.
Khalid & Said	Corpus linguistics (CL) and discourse historical approach	Moroccan news media shapes language ideologies and policy

(2023)	(DHA)	discussions about Tamazight, influencing public opinion and societal integration.

LPP in Pakistan:

Pakistan is an ethnically, linguistically, and culturally diverse nation with about 78 different languages and dialects (Umer, 2023). Due to the vast linguistic landscape, Urdu is considered the national language of Pakistan while English is the official language. Since the independence of Pakistan, Urdu and English have been the major languages that dominated the language policy. Both of these languages are used in educational settings as mediums of instruction while the regional languages are marginalized. (Sikandar, 2017)

The language policy (LP) of Pakistan is not explicitly documented but it has changed over the years. The change in LP of Pakistan is as follows; in the first period of LP (1940s-1950) the Urdu language was given the status of national language which gave rise to the Bengali language moment. Moreover, it was considered by the Karachi Committee that the English language is compulsory for advanced scientific knowledge; in the second period of LP (1950s-1970s) English gained and lost its status and it was advised to be replaced by Urdu. A major shift toward the Urdu language was seen in education however; private elite schools enjoyed the privilege of using English as a medium of instruction; in the third stage of LP (1990s-2000s), the schools were given the freedom to choose English as medium of instruction in addition to Urdu because of the economic benefits that were coined with this language. Especially, in 2009 the importance of English as an international language and Urdu as a common language of communication was highlighted. So, over the years, the LP of Pakistan has been dominated by Urdu and English while regional languages were marginalized. (Hassan et al., 2015)

The language policies of Pakistan have excessively promoted the Urdu language over the years which has obstructed the development of indigenous languages (i.e. Punjabi, Pashto, Sindhi, Balochi, Siraiki). This bias between languages has led to ethnic resistance due to a strong sense of ethnic identity linked with their mother languages which resulted in the formation of various ethnolinguistic communities. The imposition of Urdu thus promoted ethnic antagonism, and strong ethnic identities, and threatened the country's linguistic and cultural diversity. These ethnolinguistic communities seek recognition and rights for their languages and cultural heritage. (Abbas & Bidin, 2022) These language problems are arising due to the improper LPP in Pakistan. The proper planning and implementation were not done due to consistent political instability in the nation. The unstable governments were unable to properly design and implement the language policy in Pakistan. (Abbas & Bidin, 2022; Hassan et al., 2015; Sikandar, 2017)

In the face of the LPP problems in Pakistan, various scholars are proving suggestions which are discussed as follows; the development of a more comprehensive language policy in

which Urdu, English, and regional languages are given equal rights (Mesti, 2020); a trilingual formula should be adopted in LPP of Pakistan for the development of English as international language, Urdu as communicative language, and regional languages as languages of various ethnolinguistic communities (Hassan et al., 2015); and lastly, all these languages should be given institutional promotion well as legal protection in the language policy documents (Abbas & Bidin, 2022).

Table 2

Main Concepts of LPP in Pakistan

Author	Main Idea
Umer (2023)	Pakistan's linguistic diversity is dominated by Urdu as the national language and English as the official language, marginalizing regional languages.
Sikandar (2017)	Urdu and English dominate educational settings in Pakistan, marginalizing regional languages.
Hassan et al. (2015)	Pakistan's language policies heavily promote Urdu and English, marginalizing indigenous languages and contributing to ethnic resistance.
Abbas & Bidin (2022)	Political instability in Pakistan has hindered the proper planning and implementation of language policies.
Mesti (2020)	Advocates for a trilingual language policy in Pakistan: English for international communication, Urdu for national communication, and regional languages for ethnolinguistic communities.

The education policy of Pakistan is the only document that contains some information about the languages used in Pakistan as a medium of instruction aside from the 1973 constitution that states Urdu as the national language and English as the official language. The national education policy (NEP)(2017) of Pakistan was investigated at the macro-level using the framework for policy analysis given by Hassan and Shah (2022) and Anjum and Shah (2022)

based on the policy framework established by Haddad and Demsky (1995). It was found that the NEP (2017) on educational language in Pakistan aligned with the specific qualities described by theorists and approved by UNESCO. (Dilawar et al., 2022) However, the study has a limitation in that it didn't investigate the NEP (2017) at the micro-level.

A corpus-based critical study of NEP (2017) and an intermediate Urdu textbook was conducted to identify the hidden power relations. The corpus was developed and a Multi-Layered Model (Ricento & Hornberger 1996) was developed for comprehensive analysis which was subcategorized into three layers; Macro-level analysis (Haddad & Demsky, 1995); Meso-level analysis (Stabback, 2007); and Micro-level analysis in which two theories are used i.e. 3D model (Fairclough, 1995) and modality theory. The main finding of this study suggests that the NEP (2017) is according to both UNESCO and NCF standards. It also suggests that the content of Urdu textbooks represents power through modality expressions. (Hassan & Shah, 2022)

A similar corpus-based critical study of NEP (2017) and an intermediate English textbook was conducted to identify hidden power relations. The corpus of the policy document (2017) and the English textbook was built which was analyzed using a Multi-Layered Model (Ricento & Hornberger 1996) was developed for comprehensive analysis which was subcategorized into three layers; Macro-level analysis (Haddad & Demsky, 1995); Meso-level analysis (Stabback, 2007); and Micro-level analysis in which two theories are used i.e. 3D model (Fairclough, 1995) and modality theory. The study found that the policy implemented is according to the UNESCO set standard. Power is also represented in the English textbook through modality. (Anjum & Shah, 2022) However, more research should be conducted on English textbooks using different sets of linguistics features to further explore the power representation.

A critical discourse analysis of Pakistan's language policies in the 21st century was conducted to investigate power dynamics influencing Pakistan's language policies and their impact on the country's linguistically diverse population. The data for critical analysis was taken from public discourse, instructional materials, and official policy papers related to language in Pakistan. Three CDA models presented by Fairclough (2010), Dijk (1993), and Foucault (1972) were used for the data analysis. The study revealed a dominant narrative favors Urdu as a symbol of national unity while English as a mean of global communication, marginalizing regional languages in official and educational settings. However, language activists are against this language policy and advocate for a more inclusive policy that supports regional languages. (Khan et al., 2023)

Another corpus-based longitudinal analysis of Pakistan's educational policy from 2000-2020 was conducted using CDA to determine language ideologies. A corpus of 1.28 million words was developed using 32 official policy documents retrieved from UNESCO and Pakistan's Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training. Corpus Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis (CACDA) techniques and Discourse Historical Analysis (DHA) were mainly used for analysis. The main findings of this study also suggested that English and Urdu dominate the ideological space in education policies, marginalizing indigenous languages. The study revealed that the Pakistani education policy underscores a monoglossic ideology that marginalized

regional languages. Thus, there is a need for the development of a more inclusive educational language policy that assists in the promotion the regional languages. (Khan & Zaki, 2022)

Table 3

Critical Evaluation of Pakistan's LPP

Author	Theory for Analysis	Main Findings
Hassan et al. (2015)	Framework for policy analysis (Haddad & Demsky, 1995)	NEP (2017) in Pakistan aligns with UNESCO standards but lacks micro-level investigation.
Hassan & Shah (2022)	Multi-Layered Model (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996): Macro-level (Haddad &Demsky, 1995), Meso-level (Stabback, 2007), and Micro-level (Fairclough's 3D model and Modality theory)	NEP (2017) represents power dynamics through Urdu textbooks, aligned with UNESCO standards.
Anjum & Shah (2022)	Multi-Layered Model (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996): Macro-level (Haddad & Demsky, 1995), Meso-level (Stabback, 2007), and Micro-level (Fairclough's 3D model and Modality theory)	Power dynamics in English textbooks of NEP (2017) reflect policy implementation standards.
Khan et al. (2023)	Fairclough (2010); van Dijk (1993); Foucault (1972)	Pakistani language policies favor Urdu and English, marginalizing regional languages, prompting calls for more inclusive policies.
Khan & Zaki (2022)	Corpus Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis	Pakistan's education policy marginalizes regional

	(CACDA); Discourse Historical Analysis (DHA)	languages, advocating for a more inclusive policy to promote them.

Research Gap

After conducting extensive research on LPP and reviewing both international and national researches, a large gap is identified in the research. Firstly, most of the researches conducted at the national level are limited to NEP (2017) and there is no significant study found on the National Education Policy 2018. Secondly, Fairclough's 3D model is widely used by researchers in the Pakistani context to unveil the power relations, dismissing other CDA models, especially the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA). So, in this research, I will perform the CDA analysis of National Education Policy 2018 using Wodak's DHA.

Research questions

1. What power dynamics are present in the National Education Policy (2018)?

2. Which languages are promoted by the National Education Policy (2018)?

3. How does the National Education Policy (2018) in Pakistan affect the status of regional languages?

Methodology

Research Design:

This research follows a qualitative approach in which policy documents are analyzed using a framework designed using Wodak's discourse historical approach (DHA).

Data Collection:

The data for analysis is the National Education Policy Framework 2018 (NEP 2018) which was searched on Google and a PDF file of the policy document was downloaded from the official website of the Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training.

Analytical Framework:

Wodak's (2015) Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) is the main analytical framework used for analyzing the NEP 2018 document. This is a problem-oriented approach that focuses on the historical context of the discourse to identify underling ideologies and power relations. A DHA framework is designed using concepts from Wodak's DHA to evaluate the LP in education. The Discourse-Historical Analysis Framework for Language Policy in Education is presented in the given table 4:

Table 4:

Discourse-Historical Analysis Framework for Language Policy in Education

Discursive strategies	Which lexical choices showcase hidden power or ideology?
Historical Context	Which languages are dominated and which languages are marginalized by education policies in the historical context?
Power Relations	Which languages are highlighted in the NEP 2018 document and which languages are marginalized?
Ideology and Hegemony	What is the dominant language ideology and how it is producing inequality among languages?

Data Analysis:

The NEP (2018) document was analyzed using the DHA framework developed by using Wodak (2015) concepts. The analysis was done in four steps following the developed framework which is presented below:

Discursive Strategies

Which lexical choices showcase hidden power or ideology?

In the challenge section of the NEP (2018), the lexical choices used suggest that English and Urdu both are used as mediums of instruction, where English is mainly utilized in the private

sector, and Urdu in the public sector. "Private schools predominantly use English as medium of instruction" vs. "public sector schools mostly use Urdu and the regional mother tongue as a language". Here the English language is given a hegemonic stance as the text explicitly states that English can help achieve "Glorified status in society". Moreover, statements like "Low capacity of teachers" and "unable to achieve even basic competency levels" criticize the public sector's capability, reinforcing the superiority of private education. It is also highlighted that individuals with better English are more likely to achieve success and build stronger careers than those who don't, "students in high-cost private schools are more advantaged than children studying in public sector schools, low-cost private schools and madrassas". All these statements showcase the underlying ideology that English is a superior language, the language of power and success while Urdu and other regional languages have a lower status.

To cope with this issue, it was proposed to develop a single national curriculum for public and private schools, and madrassas. The priority section emphasized future reforms, including the "Uniform Education System" and "Equitable quality education," aiming to provide equal education opportunities to all children. Additionally, a clause stated the attainment of a "Multi-lingual policy, with English to be taught as a second language" suggesting that multilingualism will be promoted but the English will not lose its high status as it will still be taught as a second language.

Historical Context

Which languages are dominated and which languages are marginalized by education policies in the historical context?

English and Urdu have been historically dominant languages in Pakistan. English is the official language used in education, media, and governance while Urdu is the national language used for communication between linguistically diverse populations. English, in particular, is associated with higher status and economic opportunities. The 1973 constitution of Pakistan ordered the replacement of English with Urdu within 15 years but the amendments had never been made to replace English with Urdu. It is because English is the language of elite groups and bureaucracy in Pakistan and replacing it with other Urdu means losing the power over recessive groups. On the other hand, regional mother languages (i.e. Punjabi, Pasto, Sindhi, Balochi, etc.) have been marginalized in formal education settings as most books and instructions either in English or Urdu. The policy's historical context shows a long-standing preference for English and Urdu, with regional languages being sidelined.

Power Relations

Which languages are highlighted in the NEP 2018 document and which languages are marginalized?

The English language is highlighted in the NEP 2018 document as it is termed as "glorified" because of its connection with economic growth. It is also stated that "Children with better English language skills tend to have more opportunities". This showcases that English is

the language of power in Pakistan. On the other hand, Urdu and regional mother tongues are marginalized in the policy document. Although Urdu is used in public sector schools, it is presented as less effective compared to English when it comes to social, political, and economic growth. The involvement of regional language as the medium of instruction has been vaguely mentioned which suggests their marginalization.

Ideology and Hegemony

What is the dominant language ideology and how is it producing inequality among languages?

The policy promotes a multilingual approach inclusive of regional languages but places significant emphasis on English. The underlying dominant ideology is that English is crucial for socioeconomic growth and success, reinforcing its hegemonic status. Children proficient in English have more job opportunities, creating a divide between those who can access quality private education and those reliant on public education. This suggests that private schools (using English) provide better education and opportunities, marginalizing those who attend public or madrassa schools. The glorification of English even within the policy document creates hegemony, devaluing local languages.

Table 5

Summary of Data Analysis:

Framework	Analysis
Discursive Strategies	- Lexical choices favor English as superior for economic and social status. - Criticism of public sector education reinforces the superiority of English-medium education. - English is associated with societal glorification and career success.
Historical Context	- English and Urdu are historically dominant; regional languages are marginalized. 1973 constitution aimed to replace English with Urdu, but English retained its elite status.
Power Relations	- English is highlighted for economic opportunities; Urdu and regional languages are marginalized. - Policy vagueness on regional languages suggests marginalization.
Ideology and Hegemony	- Emphasis on English as crucial for socioeconomic growth reinforces its hegemonic status. - English glorification in policy perpetuates inequality

	among languages.

Results

The study aims to analyze the power dynamic in NEP (2018), highlighting the languages dominated and marginalized by the policy and its effect on the regional languages. The analysis revealed that significant power dynamics are found within the NEP (2018), highlighting the dominance of English over other languages. The NEP 2018 promotes English as a second language, highlighting its importance for providing better job opportunities and economic advancement. However, the future implication section suggested the development of a more inclusive multilingual policy where English will still be taught as a second language. The development of a multilingual policy may help in raising the status of regional languages.

Discussion

The critical evaluation of the NEP (2018) found hidden ideologies and power relations among languages with English representing the hegemonic stance in the educational context. The detailed interpretation of the analysis using Wodak's DHA is provided below:

Discursive Strategies:

To identify the discursive strategies, lexical choices were analyzed which revealed the hidden ideologies and power dynamics. The phrase "glorified status in society" is used to highlight the powerful status of English in Pakistani society and the hidden ideology is revealed that it helps individuals gain high socioeconomic status through better career opportunities. Another significant point is highlighted that private schools "predominantly use English as medium of instruction" while public schools and madrassa "mostly use Urdu and the regional mother tongue". This unveils the hidden ideology that children with high SES who can afford to attend private school will stay in the elite class while the children with low SES who can't afford to attend private school with face challenges in the long run due to the inability to navigate in English language.

Historical Context:

In the historical context, English and Urdu are the dominant languages in Pakistan. English served as an official language while Urdu was a national language. The 1973 constitution of Pakistan urged to replace English with Urdu but it was never implemented which underscores the power of the English language in Pakistan. This historical trend is also continued in the NEP (2018) where English is given a high status and it is coined with social stability. The Urdu language is also emphasized in the policy document but regional languages are not explicitly mentioned. The future development of multilingual policy is suggested but it is vague whether the regional language would be included in it or not which implies their further marginalization in the educational context.

Power Relations:

The NEP (2018) highlights English as the language of power, significantly promoting it through various educational reforms and standardized curriculums. English is the language of socioeconomic growth and career development. English is the main medium of instruction in the private sector which indicates that children with high SES will attain better knowledge of English and be successful in the long run while the children studying in the public sector with low SES status will have to encounter challenges in the long run. The NEP (2018) glorifies the English language representing its power within Pakistani society, economy and governance. Urdu language is also highlighted but to a lesser extent. However, regional languages are explicitly marginalized getting no emphasis in the policy document.

Ideology and Hegemony:

The NEP (2018) highlights the hegemonic status of English and coins it with socioeconomic growth and stability. The policy implicitly talks about the development of multilingual policy but teaching English as a second language shows that English will retain its elite status in Pakistan's educational context. The underlying ideology here is that English is a significant language for social growth and economic stability, the language of power. This ideology creates inequality in society by giving students with proficiency in English better opportunities than those who are not proficient. The policy further marginalizes the regional language and improves the status of the English language as no explicit remark is made about regional language development.

The NEP (2018) thus promotes the English language in the educational context while further marginalizing the regional languages. The status of Urdu in the educational policy is lower than English but it is not marginalized as it is the major communicative language in Pakistan.

Conclusion

In short, the main aim of this study was to identify the power relations and hidden ideologies in the National Educational Policy NEP (2018). Wodak's Discourse Historical Approach is used to analyze the policy document. After analyzing the discursive strategies, historical context, power relations, ideology, and hegemony, it was revealed that English is the most dominant educational language in Pakistan. It is the language of glory, prestige, and socioeconomic stability. It is the most powerful language in Pakistan as it helps in attaining better opportunities. Urdu is also a significant language but it is not as powerful as English in educational context. The NEP (2018) just like previous Educational language policies marginalizes the regional languages in the educational context. Although the development of multilingual policy is emphasized it doesn't mention the development of the regional languages which indicates their sidelining in the policy document.

Suggestions:

Pakistan doesn't have any explicit language policy, there is a need to develop a comprehensive language policy that would ensure the development and maintenance of English as the international language, Urdu as a national language, and regional languages as the cultural

representative of diverse groups living in Pakistan. Moreover, the educational language policy of Pakistan is also not regularly updated which results in inconsistency and a lack of alignment with the ever evolving linguistic and educational needs of the country. Regular updates are essential to ensure that the policy addresses modern challenges, promotes inclusivity, and balances the roles of English, Urdu, and regional languages effectively.

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*, 85-96. http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.911521

Anjum, R., & Shah, K. (2022). INVESTIGATING POWER IN ENGLISH EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS. *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq*, *5*(1), 79-107. https://jahan-e-tahqeeq.com/index.php/jahan-e-tahqeeq/article/view/439

Azmi, M. N. L., Samsuddin,, N. W., & Rahman, M. A. (2013). Fairclough's Concepts of Language Policy and Language Planning: A Comparative Study between Malaysia and Cambodia. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *1*(9), 375-379. 10.12691/education-1-9-5

Coulmas, F. (2013). Language planning: communication demands, public choice, utility. In *Sociolinguistics The Study of Speakers' Choices* (pp. 203 - 224). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139794732.014

Dilawar, K., Haider, R., & Hassan, M. a. (2022, March 30). Investigation of Educational Language Policy of Pakistan: An Evaluative Study. *Linguistic Forum*, *4*(1), 12-20. http://doi.org/10.53057/linfo/2022.4.1.4

Giles,, A., Yazan, B., & Keles, U. (2020, April). Educational language policies in the United States: a critical discourse analysis of ELPA21. *European Journal of Language Policy*, *12*(1), 5-27. https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2020.2

Goundar, P. R. (2017). The Characteristics of Language Policy and Planning Research: An Overview. In *Sociolinguistics - Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 81-83). IntechOpen. 10.5772/65156

Hassan, A., Dilpul, N., Gill, M., Syed Aziz, S. A., Kausar, S., & Akbar, S. (2015). Language Planning and Language Policy Dilemma in Pakistan. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *2*(4).

Hassan, M. D., & Shah, K. (2022). POWER REPRESENTATION IN EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING OF URDU: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS. *Harf-o-Sukhan*, *6*(1), 143-169. https://harf-o-sukhan.com/index.php/Harf-o-sukhan/article/view/302

Khalid, L., & Said, F. (2023, September 27). anguage policy debate and the discursive construction of Tamazight in Moroccan news media: a corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis. *SpringerLink*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-023-00725-4

Khan, H., Kamran, M., Sarwar, T., Kanwal, H., & Anjum, Q. (2023). A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE POLICIES IN SOUTH ASIA IN THE 21ST CENTURY: A CASE STUDY OF PAKISTAN. *Russian Law Journal*, *11*(3), 2091-2106.

Khan, M. A., & Zaki, S. (2022). Corpus Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis of Pakistan's Language Education Policy Documents: What are the Existing Language Ideologies? *Sage open*, *12*(2), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244022112180

Mesti, S. (2020). Language Policy and the Use of English as the Medium of Instruction in Pakistan. *Arab World English Journal*, 229-237. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/MEC2.16

Mpholle, M. M. (2024, February 2). The Critical Analysis of the Lesotho Language Planning and Policy and Its Implications on Education. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATION*, *3*(2), 209 - 215. https://doi.org/10.58806/ijirme.2024.v3i2n11

Romaine, S. (2021). Language Policy and Planning. *Oxford Bibliographies*.

Shin, D., Park, S., & Cho, E. (2023, October 8). A review study on discourse-analytical approaches to language testing policy in the South Korean context. *Language Testing in Asia*, *13*(44). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00257-x

Shi. J. (2016). *English language education policy in China: A CDA and ethnographic study* [Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University].

Sikandar, A. (2017). Language Policy Planning in Pakistan: A Review. *Researchgate*, 1-6.

Stemper, K. D., & King, K. A. (2017). Language Planning and Policy. In *The Handbook of Linguistics* (Second ed., pp. 655-673). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 10.1002/9781119072256.

Umer, I. (2023, May 7). Dying languages. *Pakistan Today*. https://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2023/05/07/dying-languages/

Ruth, Wodak. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse-Historical Approach. 1-14. doi: 10.1002/9781118611463.WBIELSI116