Language, Power, and Respect: A Study of Communicative Practices in Social Hierarchies

Name (Author): Nidhi Simon

Designation: Research Scholar

Author (2): Dr.Uma Mishra

Designation: Associate professor

University: Shri Venkateswara University Gajraula Uttar Pradesh

Abstract:

This exploratory and critical review paper examines the intricate relationship between language, power, and respect within the framework of social hierarchies. Drawing exclusively on secondary data, the study navigates through theoretical perspectives and empirical observations in sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and social theory to understand how communicative practices construct, reinforce, and occasionally challenge power relations. Language is not merely a neutral medium of expression; it is a potent social instrument that reflects and perpetuates structures of dominance and subordination. The paper engages with Pierre Bourdieu's concept of linguistic capital, Michel Foucault's theory of discourse and power, and Judith Butler's notion of performativity to conceptualize language as a dynamic force in the negotiation of respect and authority.

The literature reviewed reveals that social markers such as caste, class, gender, and institutional position significantly shape communicative codes. Forms of address, politeness strategies, code-switching, and honorifics often embody implicit power differentials, while deviations from these norms may be interpreted as either resistance or disrespect. The paper also highlights how marginalized groups reclaim linguistic space through subversive discourse and alternative narratives.

Through a critical synthesis of diverse academic works, this study brings attention to the ethical and political implications of communicative hierarchies, questioning the extent to which language can be democratized in everyday social interactions. Ultimately, the paper underscores the need to understand language not just as a communicative tool, but as a central arena where power and respect are continually enacted, negotiated, and contested.

1. Introduction

Language has always been more than a medium of communication—it is a mechanism of social organization, a tool of control, and a symbol of identity. From royal courts to modern bureaucracies, language has historically mediated relationships of dominance and deference. In both oral and written traditions, it has served to maintain boundaries between classes, castes, genders, and ethnicities. Contemporary societies, despite being shaped by democratic and egalitarian ideals, continue to reflect deeply entrenched linguistic hierarchies. The way individuals speak, address others, or remain silent often carries significant implications for power and respect. The interconnectedness of language, power, and respect is evident across various spheres—be it in the workplace, the family, classrooms, or public institutions—where communicative practices both mirror and mold hierarchical social relations (Tannen, 2020; Bourdieu, 1991).

In recent decades, scholars in sociolinguistics and discourse studies have drawn attention to how language perpetuates structural inequalities. Communication is not neutral; rather, it is shaped by the positionality of the speaker and listener. Honorifics, speech registers, and code-switching, for example, often reinforce existing social stratification, particularly in societies where caste, class, race, and gender are deeply embedded (Holmes & Marra, 2022). At the same time, language offers possibilities for resistance. Marginalized groups have used satire, parody, and vernacular speech as subversive strategies to question and dismantle power structures (Flores & Rosa, 2019).

The **central research problem** addressed in this paper is the extent to which communicative practices reproduce, reinforce, or resist social hierarchies. By exploring speech patterns, discursive forms, and communicative norms, this study aims to understand how respect is negotiated and power is performed through language. Respect in communication, often seen in forms of politeness, deference, or strategic silence, is deeply context-dependent and varies across cultures and power configurations. For example, linguistic practices in hierarchical collectivist societies like India or Japan differ significantly from those in more individualistic societies like the United States (Matsumoto, 2021; Kumar, 2023).

The **objectives** of this paper are twofold:

(i) To explore how language functions as a tool of power in hierarchical social structures.

(ii) To critically examine how respect is communicated, demanded, or denied across different social and institutional contexts.

This study adopts an **exploratory and critical review methodology**, relying exclusively on **secondary data**—academic books, peer-reviewed journal articles, theoretical frameworks, and policy documents. The review encompasses foundational theories as well as recent contributions from linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and discourse studies. The analytical approach is interdisciplinary, drawing particularly from critical discourse analysis and sociolinguistic theory.

The **scope** of this paper is limited to theoretical and literature-based analysis, without any primary data collection. While it incorporates global perspectives, it places special emphasis on South Asian and postcolonial contexts,

where linguistic practices remain deeply tied to social hierarchies. The **limitations** include the lack of empirical fieldwork and the exclusion of statistical analyses, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings.

By examining language not merely as a communicative system but as a site of power struggle and negotiation of respect, this paper contributes to a deeper understanding of social hierarchies and their reproduction through everyday discourse.

2. Theoretical Framework

To critically investigate how language mediates power and respect within social hierarchies, this study employs an interdisciplinary theoretical framework grounded in sociology, philosophy, and discourse studies. Four core theoretical perspectives are synthesized to provide conceptual clarity: Bourdieu's theory of linguistic capital, Foucault's analysis of discourse and power, Judith Butler's performativity theory, and the principles of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as developed by Fairclough and van Dijk.

Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Linguistic Capital conceptualizes language not merely as a tool for communication but as a form of symbolic power embedded in social structures. According to Bourdieu (1991), linguistic exchanges are not neutral acts; they are part of a social field where power relations are enacted. Linguistic capital refers to the value ascribed to certain ways of speaking in specific social contexts, often privileging dominant dialects, accents, or registers over marginalized ones. This operates through the mechanism of *habitus*—the internalized dispositions shaped by one's social background—and *field*, the structured social space where individuals compete for resources, including symbolic ones like language. For instance, Standard English may carry more linguistic capital in formal institutions than regional vernaculars, which can lead to systemic marginalization (Thompson, 2020).

Michel Foucault's notion of Discourse and Power shifts focus to how language constitutes subjectivity and institutional authority. For Foucault (1980), discourse is not simply about speech but encompasses the rules, norms, and practices that govern what can be said and who can say it. Power, in this framework, is not merely repressive but productive—it creates knowledge, norms, and identities. Language thus becomes a mechanism of control, shaping individuals into subjects through repeated discursive practices. Institutions like schools, courts, and hospitals use regulated speech patterns that simultaneously produce authority and demand compliance (Olssen, 2022).

Judith Butler's Theory of Performativity offers another dimension by focusing on how identities and social positions are enacted through repeated speech acts. Building on Austin's theory of performative utterances, Butler (1997) argues that language does not just describe reality—it creates it. When someone uses honorifics or deferential tones, they are not only showing respect but also re-enacting the power structure that necessitates such respect. In this sense, respect and subordination are performative: they do not exist independently but are continually brought into being through communicative repetition. The gendered nature of these performances is also crucial, as Butler shows how speech can enforce or subvert patriarchal hierarchies (Ahmed, 2021).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), particularly through the works of Norman Fairclough and Teun A. van Dijk, adds an explicitly ideological lens. CDA views language as a site of social struggle where dominant ideologies are

naturalized through everyday speech (Fairclough, 2013; van Dijk, 2015). CDA examines texts, conversations, and institutional discourses to uncover implicit power relations and ideological assumptions. For instance, the recurrent depiction of working-class speech as "improper" or "unrefined" in media and education reflects broader processes of social exclusion and class reproduction.

Together, these theories illuminate how language is a critical medium through which social hierarchies are produced, maintained, and occasionally contested. The study leverages these perspectives to map the complex terrain where communicative practices reflect both overt and subtle dynamics of power and respect.

3. Literature Review

This literature review is organized thematically to examine the intersection of language, power, and respect through the lens of sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and cultural theory. It draws on secondary sources to explore how communicative practices reflect and reinforce social hierarchies, while also serving as tools of resistance and identity formation.

3.1 Language and Power

Language functions as a crucial medium for the exercise and legitimization of power. Colonial histories provide compelling evidence of how dominant powers imposed their languages to subjugate and control indigenous populations. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) famously critiqued linguistic imperialism in Africa, arguing that the imposition of colonial languages like English and French disrupted native epistemologies and served as a tool of domination. Postcolonial scholars like Alastair Pennycook (1994) further emphasized that language was never a neutral vehicle in colonial contexts but deeply entangled with the politics of identity and control.

In modern bureaucratic and institutional settings, language continues to function as a gatekeeping mechanism. The use of professional jargon and "prestige dialects"—varieties associated with higher socioeconomic classes—limits access to certain jobs, services, and networks. Bourdieu (1991) identified this phenomenon as the use of linguistic capital, wherein those fluent in institutionalized linguistic norms enjoy material and symbolic advantages. For example, access to elite educational institutions often presumes fluency in Standard English, thereby excluding speakers of non-standard or regional dialects (Lippi-Green, 2012).

3.2 Language and Social Hierarchies

Language not only reflects but actively structures social hierarchies. Hierarchical speech patterns are embedded in linguistic practices like honorifics, code-switching, and diglossia. In languages such as Japanese, Korean, or Hindi, the use of honorifics indexes one's social position relative to the interlocutor, thus institutionalizing deference and hierarchy in everyday speech (Ide, 2006).

Code-switching—the strategic shift between languages or dialects depending on context—further demonstrates how speakers navigate social hierarchies. In many multilingual societies, the choice to switch between vernacular and official languages often signals shifts in formality, authority, or identity (Gumperz, 1982). Diglossia, a related phenomenon, refers to situations where two dialects or languages are used under different conditions within a community, typically a "high" (formal) and a "low" (informal) variety (Ferguson, 1959). This division perpetuates

linguistic inequality, privileging the "high" language in education and administration while marginalizing the "low" variants.

Gender also plays a critical role in linguistic hierarchies. Feminist linguists such as Deborah Tannen (1990) and Robin Lakoff (1975) have shown how women are socialized to use more polite, deferential, and emotionally supportive language, which reinforces patriarchal norms. In institutional settings like workplaces or courts, masculine-coded speech often correlates with authority, while feminine-coded language is perceived as subordinate or less rational (Cameron, 2005). Similarly, linguistic class stratification manifests in the way working-class dialects are stigmatized, and middle or upper-class accents are valorized, thereby perpetuating broader structures of economic inequality (Labov, 2006).

3.3 Language and Respect

The negotiation of respect through language has been extensively studied through frameworks like Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory. They distinguish between *positive politeness* (strategies to express solidarity) and *negative politeness* (strategies to show deference). These linguistic choices are not arbitrary but shaped by social variables such as age, gender, class, and cultural norms.

In formal institutions, respect is often ritualized through specific codes of speech. Courtroom interactions, military instructions, or religious rituals involve language forms that demand strict adherence, reinforcing hierarchical structures. For example, the use of "Your Honour" or "Sir/Ma'am" does not merely indicate politeness but signifies institutional power and authority (Goffman, 1967).

Moreover, generational and regional factors affect how respect is expressed. In Indian society, younger individuals may use pronouns like "aap" rather than "tum" to elders, reflecting both cultural and linguistic markers of respect. In African-American Vernacular English (AAVE), expressions like "yes, ma'am" or "no, sir" function both as respect and as a legacy of sociohistorical stratification, especially in the American South (Smitherman, 2000).

3.4 Resistance through Language

Despite its role in reproducing hierarchies, language can also be a site of resistance and empowerment. Subversive speech acts—such as satire, parody, or slang—challenge dominant ideologies and expose power imbalances. Bakhtin's (1981) concept of the "carnivalesque" highlights how alternative, often humorous, linguistic registers undermine official discourses.

Social movements have harnessed language to challenge systemic oppression. Feminist linguistics has reclaimed derogatory terms to undermine misogyny, while Dalit writers and activists in India use Ambedkarite language to assert dignity and resistance against caste-based oppression (Paik, 2014). These examples illustrate how marginalized communities can appropriate language to construct counter-narratives and challenge dominant discourse.

Furthermore, new digital spaces allow for the circulation of resistant language. Hashtags, memes, and activist slogans on platforms like Twitter and Instagram function as linguistic performances of resistance, creating new public spheres where power can be contested (Papacharissi, 2015).

4. Methodological Considerations

The present study adopts an exploratory, conceptual, and critical approach to understand the intersections of language, power, and respect within sociocultural and institutional contexts. Given its theoretical orientation, the research relies on qualitative data sourced from a wide range of secondary materials, including academic journal articles, scholarly books, discourse transcripts, historical documents, and relevant policy papers. These sources provide a rich repository for tracing linguistic patterns and power dynamics across different social fields.

A systematic literature review forms the backbone of data collection. Searches were conducted using scholarly databases such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and Scopus, employing keywords like "linguistic capital," "discourse and power," "politeness theory," "language and social hierarchy," and "language as resistance." The review strategy was guided by inclusion criteria prioritizing peer-reviewed publications, thematic relevance, and a temporal focus on literature post-1990s to ensure contemporary analytical depth. Exclusion criteria eliminated non-scholarly or overly anecdotal sources lacking theoretical grounding.

The analytical lens combines Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and sociolinguistic contextualization. CDA, particularly drawing from Norman Fairclough and Teun A. van Dijk, enables the unpacking of ideological undercurrents in language use, while sociolinguistic methods help situate discourse within its cultural, institutional, and historical frameworks.

5. Analysis and Discussion

Language operates as more than a tool for information exchange; it is a powerful medium that constructs, legitimizes, and sometimes challenges social hierarchies. A critical synthesis of the reviewed literature highlights the complex ways in which linguistic practices function to maintain power dynamics, express social respect, and provide avenues for both conformity and resistance.

At the core of social stratification lies the strategic deployment of language by dominant groups to reinforce their privileged positions. Scholars such as Bourdieu have demonstrated how the valorization of certain language forms—particularly those used by elites—translates into symbolic power. These legitimized speech codes, often institutionalized through education, media, and administration, systematically exclude individuals from marginalized linguistic backgrounds. In postcolonial contexts, the dominance of colonial languages like English has continued to shape access to social mobility and prestige, marginalizing speakers of indigenous or vernacular tongues. Additionally, the professional use of jargon and specialized registers further alienates those not trained in the linguistic culture of institutions, effectively gatekeeping participation in decision-making processes.

Language also plays a vital role in the performance and negotiation of respect. Drawing on Judith Butler's notion of performativity and Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, it becomes clear that respect is enacted through language, not merely felt. Individuals demonstrate or demand respect through culturally specific linguistic strategies, such as honorifics, deferential speech levels, and indirect expressions. These conventions are deeply embedded in societal expectations and are especially pronounced in hierarchical or collectivist cultures. A deviation

from these norms can result in social sanctions or be interpreted as disrespectful, irrespective of the speaker's intention.

Within institutional and interpersonal communication, asymmetry is often normalized. In bureaucratic and educational settings, authority figures tend to use more assertive and directive language, while subordinates are expected to use conciliatory or deferential forms of address. In domestic contexts, patriarchal expectations shape conversational roles, often limiting women and children's voices. Such vertical communicative patterns not only reflect but perpetuate existing power relations.

However, language is not solely a medium of dominance; it also serves as a site of contestation. Subaltern groups frequently engage in linguistic subversion through the use of satire, slang, and hybrid dialects to question or resist dominant norms. Movements such as feminist, Dalit, and queer linguistic activism reclaim language to empower identity and destabilize oppressive narratives. Thus, communicative practices remain dynamic, allowing both reproduction and resistance of social hierarchies.

6. Case Illustrations from Literature

Case illustrations from scholarly literature provide concrete examples of how language operates within and against social hierarchies, offering deeper insight into the lived realities of communicative power. These cases, drawn from diverse socio-cultural contexts, underscore the centrality of language in reinforcing, negotiating, or resisting power structures related to caste, gender, colonial legacies, and honorific systems.

In the Indian caste context, language serves both as a tool of oppression and resistance. Dalit literature, particularly since the late 20th century, has emerged as a powerful form of linguistic assertion against Brahminical hegemony. Writers such as Omprakash Valmiki and Bama employ vernacular language, non-Sanskritized vocabulary, and local idioms to reject dominant norms of literary purity and high-caste aesthetics. Paik (2014) argues that such texts challenge the "linguistic untouchability" enforced by Brahminical control over Sanskrit and formalized registers. The very act of writing in a stigmatized dialect becomes a counter-hegemonic practice, disrupting established hierarchies and reasserting marginalized identity.

Gendered communication in the workplace illustrates how power asymmetries are reproduced through speech. Numerous sociolinguistic studies have revealed that women's language is often dismissed, interrupted, or judged more harshly than men's. Tannen (1994) highlights how women are socialized into using more polite, indirect, and collaborative speech patterns, which are frequently perceived as weak or unassertive in male-dominated professional settings. Holmes and Marra (2002) further show that even when women exhibit assertiveness, they are penalized more severely than their male counterparts, reinforcing gendered expectations through communicative norms. Thus, workplace discourse often polices femininity and reinforces patriarchal authority through seemingly neutral linguistic interactions.

The legacy of colonialism continues to shape language politics in postcolonial nations. In South Asia and Africa, English persists as a language of governance, education, and upward mobility. Scholars like Pennycook (1998) and Canagarajah (1999) argue that English functions as a form of linguistic capital that privileges elite classes and

marginalizes vernacular speakers. In India, for example, fluency in English is strongly associated with social prestige, urbanity, and professional success, often to the detriment of speakers of regional languages or dialects. This stratification mirrors and sustains existing class and caste inequalities, with English proficiency becoming both a marker and a mechanism of exclusion.

Honorific systems in languages further institutionalize social hierarchy. In Japanese, for instance, the use of *keigo* (honorific speech) encodes social status, age, and group membership, requiring speakers to constantly adjust their language based on relational positioning (Ide, 2006). Similarly, in Hindi, pronouns such as 'aap,' 'tum,' and 'tu' reflect degrees of respect, familiarity, or inferiority. Misuse or misalignment of these forms can lead to perceived social impropriety. The presence of such hierarchical markers in everyday language reinforces social boundaries and expected behavior, subtly guiding interpersonal dynamics along stratified lines.

Together, these cases reveal that language is not simply a neutral medium but a socially loaded practice deeply intertwined with power, identity, and resistance. Through such illustrations, we see how linguistic choices both reflect and shape broader structures of domination and social negotiation.

7. Critical Reflections

Critical engagement with the literature on language, power, and respect reveals several underlying ethical, normative, and epistemological concerns. Language, often perceived as a vehicle for social cohesion and civility, can also encode and perpetuate systems of domination. The ethical implications of this dual role become evident when expressions of respect, embedded within linguistic norms, function more as instruments of subjugation than mutual recognition. As Bourdieu (1991) notes, linguistic exchanges are rarely neutral; they often operate within power-laden "fields" where the recognition of authority is misrecognized as voluntary respect. For instance, the consistent use of deferential speech by subordinates in hierarchical institutions may appear respectful but actually reflect entrenched coercive norms rather than genuine regard.

This leads to pressing normative questions. Can language be de-hierarchized? And should it be? Scholars like Cameron (1995) argue that while linguistic reform (e.g., gender-neutral or anti-caste language) is symbolically powerful, it is limited by the social structures in which language is embedded. The performative nature of language (Butler, 1997) means that merely altering words does not necessarily dismantle the underlying relations of power. At the same time, linguists and critical theorists emphasize that awareness and deliberate re-structuring of linguistic practices can help mitigate symbolic violence and promote inclusivity.

A significant gap in existing scholarship is the lack of an intersectional approach that captures the multiplicity of identities shaping communicative behavior. While studies have independently explored caste (Paik, 2014), gender (Holmes & Marra, 2002), or age-related speech patterns (Coupland, 2009), there is limited integrative research examining how these social axes intersect to influence language use and reception. For example, how does a Dalit woman's speech act in a senior position in a patriarchal and casteist context differ from that of her male or upper-caste counterparts? Such questions remain underexplored, limiting a holistic understanding of linguistic power.

Moreover, the majority of studies on honorifics, politeness, and communicative deference tend to treat categories like gender, caste, or class in isolation, failing to account for the compounded effects of multiple identities. Crenshaw's (1991) framework of intersectionality offers a potent tool for future linguistic studies, urging scholars to move beyond single-axis analysis and recognize the complex, overlapping structures of marginalization reproduced through language.

In sum, critical reflection necessitates not only evaluating language as a mirror of social hierarchy but also questioning its ethical deployment and the adequacy of current theoretical models to address its layered realities. This opens fertile ground for further interdisciplinary and intersectional inquiry.

8. Conclusion

The study of language, power, and respect reveals a complex and dynamic interplay where linguistic practices not only mirror existing social hierarchies but also actively contribute to their construction and perpetuation. Through critical review and analysis, it becomes evident that language functions as a potent medium of symbolic power, capable of reinforcing dominance and negotiating respect in multifaceted ways. Whether through the use of honorifics, professional jargon, or normative politeness strategies, communicative acts serve as sites where power relations are continuously enacted, contested, and sometimes subverted. The reviewed literature underscores that respect, often embedded in linguistic conventions, can simultaneously foster social cohesion and mask deeper inequalities, highlighting the ambivalence inherent in language as both a tool of civility and control.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings emphasize the necessity of an interdisciplinary approach to understanding the socio-political dimensions of language. While sociolinguistics offers invaluable insights into how language varies and functions within social groups, discourse theory provides a robust framework for analyzing how power relations are discursively produced and maintained. Additionally, integrating perspectives from social psychology can deepen understanding of individual agency, identity performance, and the cognitive underpinnings of respect and subordination in communication. The contributions of scholars such as Bourdieu, Foucault, and Butler reveal that language cannot be disentangled from broader social structures and power fields, necessitating theories that account for both macro-level social forces and micro-level interactional dynamics.

Looking forward, there is a clear imperative for future research to expand beyond conceptual and secondary analyses by incorporating empirical investigations that examine how language, power, and respect manifest in diverse real-world contexts. Cross-cultural comparative studies are particularly needed to understand how different societies encode and negotiate hierarchical relationships linguistically, given the cultural specificity of honorifics, politeness norms, and communicative strategies. Moreover, policy-level discourse analysis could shed light on how institutional language practices shape access to power and resources, for instance in education, governance, and the legal system. Such research would contribute to identifying linguistic barriers and opportunities for fostering more equitable communication practices.

In conclusion, the intricate relationship between language, power, and respect is fundamental to the organization and experience of social hierarchies. Language serves not only as a reflection of these hierarchies but also as a

performative space where respect is demanded, negotiated, and sometimes resisted. The interdisciplinary theoretical lens advocated in this study provides a comprehensive platform for future inquiries, which must be empirically grounded and culturally sensitive to fully grasp the nuanced ways in which communicative practices reproduce or challenge social inequality. This ongoing scholarly endeavor holds significant implications for fostering social justice by illuminating the ethical dimensions of linguistic respect and the potential for transformative change through critical awareness and policy interventions.

References:

1. Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.

2. Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2019). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 89(2), 149–172.

3. Holmes, J., & Marra, M. (2022). *Power and Politeness in the Workplace: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Talk at Work*. Routledge.

4. Kumar, S. (2023). Language and Power in Postcolonial India: Revisiting the Linguistic Hierarchies. *South Asian Linguistics Review*, 8(1), 23–40.

5. Matsumoto, Y. (2021). Language, honorifics, and respect: A comparative sociolinguistic study. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 30(4), 413–432.

6. Tannen, D. (2020). *That's Not What I Meant!: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships*. Ballantine Books.

7. Ahmed, S. (2021). *Complaint!*. Duke University Press.

8. Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.

9. Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. Routledge.

10. Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Routledge.

11. Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. Pantheon.

12. Olssen, M. (2022). Foucault and education: Disciplines and knowledge revisited. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 54(3), 289–304.

13. Thompson, J. B. (2020). *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Polity Press.

14. van Dijk, T. A. (2015). *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge University Press.

15. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. University of Texas Press.

16. Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.

17. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.

18. Cameron, D. (2005). *Language, Gender, and Sexuality: Current Issues and New Directions*. Applied Linguisics, 26(4), 482–502.

19. Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, 15(2), 325–340.

20. Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Anchor Books.

21. Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press.

22. Ide, S. (2006). Honorifics and Politeness. In *Handbook of Pragmatics*.

23. Labov, W. (2006). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Cambridge University Press.

24. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. Harper & Row.

25. Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. Routledge.

26. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. James Currey.

27. Paik, S. (2014). *Dalit Women's Education in Modern India*. Routledge.

28. Papacharissi, Z. (2015). *Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics*. Oxford University Press.

29. Pennycook, A. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Longman.

30. Smitherman, G. (2000). *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. Wayne State University Press.

31. Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. Ballantine

32. Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.

33. Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. Routledge.

34. Cameron, D. (1995). *Verbal Hygiene*. Routledge.

35. Coupland, N. (2009). *The Handbook of Language and Age*. Wiley-Blackwell.

36. Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299.

37. Holmes, J., & Marra, M. (2002). *Women, Men and Politeness*. Longman.

38. Ide, S. (2006). *Honorifics and Politeness*. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 127–133). Elsevier.

39. Paik, N. (2014). *Dalit Literatures in India*. Routledge.