

A STUDY OF DISCURSIVE AND PRAGMATIC PRACTICES USED IN LITERARY AND NON-LITERARY TEXTS IN COMTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

Khadija Khadim¹, Prof.Dr.Abdul Ghafoor Awan²

ABSTRACT-Discourse is an extensive field and it constitutes on a diversity of disciplines. Inherently the word ‘discourse’ is derived from a Latin utterance ‘discursus’ which means ‘conversation’. Discourse is divided into two type i.e. literary discourse and nonliterary discourse. The discursive practices describe the process of text interpretation, their acknowledgements and description of social effects which they produce. The objective of this study is to carry out comparison between literary and nonliterary works based upon pragmatics and discursive practices. The study is qualitative in nature and it undergoes the contextual analysis of literary and nonliterary text with regard to power, hegemony and ideology of the Pakistani writer Kamila Shamsie novel Salt and Saffron. In non-literary text Parvaiz Musharaf autobiography in the line of fire and the articles of Dawn newspaper are included. Our findings reveal that how writers have consciously and unconsciously used these techniques of discursiveness and pragmatism to indicate the things which has hidden meaning, ideas and philosophies.

Key words: Discursive practices; pragmatic practices; literary text; nonliterary text.

1. M.Phil Research Scholar,, Department of English, Institute of Southern Punjab, Multan. khadijakhadim83@gmail.com. Cell # +0923317570338.
2. Dean, Faculty of Management and Social Sciences, Institute of Southern Punjab, Multan. ghafoor70@yahoo.com. Cell # +923136015051

1. INTRODUCTION:

Discourse is an extensive field and it constitutes on a diversity of disciplines. Inherently the word ‘discourse’ is derived from a Latin utterance ‘discursus’ which means ‘conversation’. The written and oral expressions may acquire different forms of discourse, such as speech, lecture, everyday communication, formal discussions, addresses, religious or political orations and a lot more constituted under the term word. The implication of a text does not originate until it is dynamically employed in a context and circumstances of use. This process of activation of a text by relating it to a context of use is called as discourse. In other words, this contextualization of a text is actually the reader’s (and in the case of spoken text, the hearer’s) reconstruction of the writer’s (or speaker’s) intended message, that is his or her communicative act or discourse. For driving a discourse from a text investigation and exploring of two different types of meaning: one is the text’s intrinsic linguistic or formal properties (its sounds, typography, vocabulary, grammar, and so on). A reader or hearer will hunt the text for cues or signals that may facilitate to restructure the writer’s or speaker’s discourse. The inference of discourse meaning is largely a matter of conciliation between writer (speaker) and reader (hearer) in a contextualized societal communication. While second one is, extrinsic contextual factors which are taken to influence its linguistic meaning. These two interacting sites of meaning are the apprehensions of two fields of study: discursive and Pragmatics. These discourses are divided into two type i.e. literary discourse and nonliterary discourse. In this thesis we have been discussed both of these types of discourses. Literary discourse which has been discussed was in proper written form with usage of figurative literary language while the nonliterary discourse has been in form of autobiographies, newspapers, advertisement representative form. The

phrase discourses have plenty of meanings but according to Dontcheva-Navratilova (year) ‘Firstly, it is used to refer to unified, meaningful and purposive stretches of spoken and written language. Secondly it is used to refer to the language in action. Last but not least, it is used to refer to the language of particular language variety.’

1.2 Rationale of this study

The rationale of the study is to find out the ways that that how how the texts are interpreted and acknowledged and what social effects they produce. Fairclough & Wodak says that to understand how ideologies are produced, it is not enough to analyze texts; the discursive practice must also be considered. These discursive practices have been discussed both in literary and non-literary discourse, that how this discourse has produces a social control on the people by analyzing these discursive practices. Discursive is the learning of prescribed meanings as they are prearranged in the language of texts, that is autonomous of writers (speakers) and readers (hearers) set in an exacting context.

Pragmatic practices mean study of concrete and practical experiences in the text. In the literary text the linguistic components are analyzed while in non-literary text not only linguistic components but visual, audible and tactile dimensions will be considered. Pragmatics is concerned with the meaning of speech in discourse, that is, when it is used in an appropriate context to achieve particular aims. Pragmatic meanings are not and substitute to semantic meaning, but harmonizing to it, because it is indirect from the interplay of semantic meaning with context. Two kinds of contexts can be distinguished: an internal linguistic context built up by the language patterns inside the text, and an external non-linguistic context drawing us to the ideas and experiences in the world outside the text.

1.3 Statement of problem:

The study has clarified the conceptual basis of discourses of literary and non-literary texts. In order to do this, it describes and compares the notions of these discourses. This comparison will argue the most important features, pragmatics and discursive, of both literary and non-literary text. From this point of view, both concepts can be checked, compared and analyzed. Their fundamental differences and basic similarities will be fetched out with great consideration and concern. The aim this study is to bring out a comprehensive comparison between literary and non-literary works based upon pragmatics and discursive practices used in these texts under different contexts.

1.4 Significance of study:

This study has a great contribution to literature of scholars. As there are many researchers who conducted research on pragmatic and discursive practices of literary and non-literary texts separately but few has done any comparison between these different discourses, as one is of written discourse and in other not only linguistic but audible, visual and graphic elements have been discussed. So this study has opened the new horizons of research and has broadened the limits of discourses and their analysis. The study has a very significant role to explore the nature, technique and impact of messages conveyed through different genres of text at different levels of pragmatism and discursiveness.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW:

Literary texts include novels, dramas, picture book, poetry, dramatic role plays, short plays, short stories, narrative with dialogue and Science fiction and horror fiction, while nonliterary text includes newspaper articles, autobiographies, personal letters, menu, recipe, information report, formal invitation, catalogue,

photo journal, timetable, documentary film, advertisement, news report, radio film documentary and biographies.

2.1 Discursive Practices in Literary Discourse

The literature review regarding the discursive practices in literature is as follows: -

Fairclough (1993) says that a discursive event is an “instance of language use, analyzed as text, discursive practice, and social practice”. Discursive event, thus, refers to text, discursive practice (production and interpretation of the text), and social practice (including situational, institutional and societal practice). Many linguistic devices are used to compress meaning in the text like metaphor, which is conceived as in terms of theoretical mapping, amalgamation and is regarded as an inherent property of human cognition. Thus, metaphor city of verbal expressions has been productively studied by cognitive linguists. But in this study the focus is to make a case for integrating the cognitive and pragmatic orientations in discourse analysis.

Hart (2010) says that metaphor is not only a cognitive but also pragmatic phenomenon. The stability of conventions of metaphors is often central to pragmatically efficient interaction. Van Dijk terms “social cognition” (1998) describes the discursive reproduction of figurative representations facilitates the building and management of collectively shared mental models.

Halliday (1985) says, “Use of terminology derived from functional linguistics, any discursive encounter is treated as a conjunction of language options that have ideational, interpersonal and textual meta functions”

Chilton (2004), Charteris-Black (2005), van Dijk (2006), Hart (2010) stated that “For some critical discourse analysts, coercion is one of the linguistic

realizations of the meta-strategy of persuasion, particularly frequent in the case of political and mass-mediated discourse”.

Luke (2002) argues that “a linguistic and text analytic met language, no matter how comprehensive, cannot ‘do’ CDA in and of itself. It requires the overlay of a social theoretic discourse for explaining and explicating the social; contexts, concomitants, contingencies and consequences of any given text or discourse.”

Penny cook (2001) also claims that what texts ‘do’ in the world cannot be explained solely through text analysis or text analytic language. The plan of this research dissertation is to light up the epistemological and to enlighten the discursive complexities and complications of student appointments in research exercises that anticipate the essential in field of work.

2.2. Pragmatics in Literary Discourse:

Practices have an essential attention in pragmatism and the commencement of practice or ‘praxis’ is vital and is the imperative notion pragmatism do definition of itself by counting it as an approach as glowing as the inter relation of practice and assumption this has been discussed in thinking of life from its early stages in the Platonic Aristotelian traditions. The concepts of theory and practice are on chance and the Meta philosophical problem of attitude, assignment and utility of philosophy. This is included in the general objective, to present a pragmatic consideration of viewpoint on the setting of a fundamental perceptive of practices. It was particularly Dewey who had persuaded that the Platonic Aristotelian institution is an incomplete philosophy to a simple meditative attempt. Aristoteles recognized the difference of praxis which means contact of human being which establishes the monarchy of ethical political practices, theory which means that the investigation into the essential grounds and causes and last poises which means the manufacture

of belongings. From Dewey's perspective this peculiarity outcome is in a challenging ladder theory is understood as a finish in itself, and the hypothetical manner of existence occupies the human being impending its greatest effort. The ethical practical life ensures the achievement of human strength and also to a definite area. Theory adds details to praxis and it inherits the contingency of authenticity; it keeps the individual into a self-governing location and is as a result the sublime and noble of conducts of existence according to Aristoteles. Poiesis is lowest in the Ladder, and doings that is vault to the model of earnings and trimmings and consequently evaluated as reliant and coerced by the contingencies of scenery and fortune. Dewey widened notion of the praxis to practices, which are also include the poiesis. 1960s veteran a very successful foundation of an additional new interdisciplinary named as pragmatics. Based upon efforts of Austin (1962) on "How to Do Things with Words", which is particularly study of John Searle (1969) on talking acts and an outstanding essay of H. P. Grice (1975) on informal maxims which will lightened a gush of studies on the language use extending the customary focal point on sentence structure and semantics with a hardnosed constituent, secretarial for the illocutive properties of language in terms of vocalizations acts, implicatures and supplementary prospects of contextually based language use.

Brown & Levinson, (1987). Pragmatics became the regulation that houses many of the studies of language use away from grammar, such as the significant vocation on graciousness.

2.3 Discursive Practices in Non-Literary Discourse:

Freedom of the press should, therefore, also be understood as power of the press. Graber (1984); Gunter (1987); Harris (1989); van Dijk (1988) says, "A socially oriented cognitive science provides insight into these structures and

strategies of cognition, and hence offers a foundation for a new understanding of the persuasive power of the media.” Verschueren (2001) says by using acronyms, such as CDA, researchers themselves are trapped in the discursive strategy of reification, since these fields tend to be so diverse that no general claims can be made.

According to Blommaert (2005), Carvalho(2008), Richardson(2008), Philo(2007) and NewsTalk & Text (2009) that in recent literature about language and media it is argued that the emphasis in CDA has been too much on the textual product rather than the journalistic processes . Jones & Collins, (2006) says that by the same token and despite the ‘linguistic turn’ in Communication Science, studies employing CDA methods have been criticized within the fields of Communication and Political Sciences for assigning a primary role to language as a medium of social control and power and supplying political and ideological insights in communicative processes. Michel Foucault that says several lines it is more better to do but it is a matter of concern and here is not to defuse communication, to make it the signal of incredible to boot, and to perforate throughout its compactness in the categorize to arrive at what relics noiselessly frontal to it, but on the opposing to uphold it in its steadiness, to create it appear in its own intricacy and it would like to demonstrate with accurate examples that in detrimental discourses themselves, one sees the loosen of the clinch, it seems that so tense, of lexis and belongings, and appearance of a cluster of system correct to discursive perform. Commissions that consists of shorter treating discourses as groups of cryptogram and symptomatic of rudiments refer to stuffing of representations but as practices that thoroughly form the matter of which they verbalize.

2.4 Pragmatic Practices in Nonliterary Discourse

White (1997) claimed that, by ‘severely’ circumscribing subjective interpersonal features in hard news reports, journalists can, through ‘objective’ language; purport to be neutral, essentially where formal language provides the veneer of neutrality. White suggests that the use of such an impersonal register is but ‘a rhetorical stratagem to aid the obfuscation of a reporter’s subjectivity’.

It has been focused that discourse studies intermingle with its sister subtype disciplines of semiotics by which idyllically it would join in the prospect being drawn in the learning of forthcoming proceedings.

Leeuwen (2005) says that the learning of discourse in a more conventional sagacity, researcher needs to comprehend that such discourse has many non-verbal magnitude, such as cadence, notions, ovation, harmony and various aspects of spoken presentation, as lay out, printing kinds, color, pictures, drawings and film for printed discourse. By the alteration of a hypothetical into a sensible gaining of acquaintance and understanding.

2.5 Research Gap:

There are researches in which discursive and pragmatic elements have been fetched out through scholars separately in literary and nonliterary text. The gap in this study is to do comparative and differentiate discursive and pragmatic analysis of both literary and non-literary text simultaneously in a single piece of research.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The methodology of this study is qualitative. Qualitative research is primarily exploratory research. It is used to gain an understanding of underlying reasons, opinions and motivations. It provides an insight into the problem or helps to develop ideas or hypothesis for potential qualitative research. Qualitative

methodology is also used to uncover trends in thought and opinions, and diver deeper into the problem.

This research approach of this study is deductive, it is concerned that reasoning from the particular to the general. If a causal relationship or link seems to be implied by a particular theory or case example, a deductive design might test to see the relationship or link did obtain more general circumstances. Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) say that the deductive researcher “works from the ‘top down’, from a theory to hypotheses to data to add to or contradict the theory”. Deductive research explores an already given theory or phenomenon and it follows the path of logic and deduce result. After deduction of result the process of generalization arrives in which result is generalized on all the population. This study probes in literary and non-literary text and finds out the differences and similarities between pragmatic and discursive elements in both types of texts by using qualitative exploratory research methodology and design.

4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

First finding of this research study is the usage of language as a social practice in literary and non-literary text to represent different ideologies. In literary text language is used as a social practice to represent different ideologies of different people. Language is considered as a tool of communication between different group of people. In literary text representation of ideology is given in a hidden and lenient way. While in non-literary texts language is used in a non-directional and biased way in representation of ideology. Sometimes in non-literary text certain group of people uses language in a harsh and sensational way in representation of their hidden motives and ideologies without considering the image of state and nation due to their harsh use of language. This sensationalism brings

haters, terror and disturbance in the lives of people. So language is taken as a tool in representation of ideology. Literary text uses this tool in a respectful way while nonliterary text uses this tool for some hidden motive.

Second finding of this research study is the usage of choice of lexical items in construction of the particular ideology. In literary text lexical items are mostly figurative, flowery language and sentence structure of literary text is usually complex due to which ideological representation is fetched out with little effort while in non-literary text choice of lexical items are simple and easy due to which ideology construction and understanding of ideology is easy. Due to easiness in lexical items selection some time these easy lexical items can be used in an erroneous way for producing terror and fear in environment. Due to this element of fear and terror sensationalism can arise in readers' mind. So it can be concluded that literary text has a sublime choice of lexical items while non-literary text has a simple choice of lexical items which can be proved as harmful in production of ideology.

Third findings of this research study are the impact of discursive and pragmatic practices in representation of society in both literary and non-literary text. Discursive practices are common in both literary and non-literary texts. These practices impact on the social, cultural, ethical, moral, religious, and environmental representation in both literary and non-literary text. Through analysis it is fetched non-literary text are more abundant in discursive practices than literary texts. Literary text has also discursive practices but due to choice of difficult lexical items these practices can't do well. While non-literary text has easy choice of lexical items so these practices have a great impact in societal, cultural, moral ethical,

environmental and political representation in non-literary text as compared to literary texts.

Fourth finding is the similarities and differences in literary and non-literary text. Literary and non-literary text has a similarity in discursive practices while in pragmatic practices non-literary text lack certain items of pragmatics as lexical items selection is easy and simple so practical implication of certain pragmatic practices are absent in non-literary texts. So both pragmatic and discursive practices have impacts on literary and non-literary text in representation of ideology.

Fifth finding is importance of both texts in representation of ideologies and viewpoints. Text is considered as a tool in representation of ideology. In literary texts the text is acting as a tool in representation of ideology and viewpoints of the author. The use of figures of language and choice of lexical items make it difficult to pin point the ideology but when ideology is fetched out it is easy to comprehend while in non-literary text the text and choice of lexical item is easy and comprehensible but these text may contain element of sensationalism and sectarianism which can bring disturbance, fight and disaster in the society. The easier the language the easier it is to understand the propaganda formation and sensationalism so sometimes non-literary text can be used in production of terror in the surroundings.

5. CONCLUSION:

This research study pin points the usage of language as a social practice in literary and non-literary text to represent different ideologies. In literary text language is used as a social practice to represent different ideologies of different people. Language is considered as a tool of communication between different groups of people. In literary text representation of ideology is given in a hidden and

lenient way. While in non-literary texts language is used in a non-directional and biased way in representation of ideology. Sometimes in non-literary text certain group of people uses language in a harsh and sensational way in representation of their hidden motives and ideologies without considering the image of state and nation due to their harsh use of language. This sensationalism brings hates, terror and disturbance in the lives of people. So language is taken as a tool in representation of ideology. Literary text uses this tool in a respectful way while non-literary text uses this tool for some hidden motive. In literary text lexical items are mostly figurative, flowery language and sentence structure of literary text is usually complex due to which ideological representation is fetched out with little effort while in non-literary text choice of lexical items are simple and easy due to which ideology construction and understanding of ideology is easy. Due to easiness in lexical items selection some time these easy lexical items can be used in an erroneous way for producing terror and fear in environment. Due to this element of fear and terror sensationalism can arise in readers' mind. So it can be concluded that literary text has a sublime choice of lexical items while non-literary text has a simple choice of lexical items which can be proved as harmful in production of ideology. Discursive practices are common in both literary and non-literary texts. These practices impact on the social, cultural, ethical, moral, religious, and environmental representation in both literary and non-literary text. Through analysis it is fetched non-literary text are more abundant in discursive practices than literary texts. Literary text has also discursive practices but due to choice of difficult lexical items these practices can't do well. While non-literary text has easy choice of lexical items so these practices have a great impact in societal, cultural, moral

ethical, environmental and political representation in non-literary text as compared to literary texts.

REFERENCES:

Allen, Graham (2000). "Intertextuality: New Critical Idiom Series." London: *Routledge*.

Alvesson, & Kärreman, D. (2000). Varieties of discourse: on the study of organizations through discourse analysis.

Ashcroft, Bill, Griffiths, Gareth, Tiffin and Helen (1989). *The Empire Writes Back.* London: *Routledge*.

Austin, J. L. (1962). "How to Do Things with Words." *Cambridge:* Harvard University Press.

Awan, Abdul Ghafoor, Muhammad Yahya (2016). "Critical Discourse Analysis of Ahmad Ali's Novel "Twilight in Delhi" *Science International*, Vol.28(2).

Awan, Abdul Ghafoor, Yasmin Khalida (2015). "New Trends in Modern Poetry" *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, Vol 13:63-72.

Awan, Abdul Ghafoor, Shahida Perveen (2015). "Comparison of Sylvia Path and Parveen Shaker with special references to their selected poems in Feminist perspective" *Journal of Culture, Society and Development*, Vol.13:11-19.

Awan, Abdul Ghafoor; Shahida Perveen (2018). "The Effects of Marxism on The Characters in Mohsin Hamid's Novel: "Moth Smoke" and Zulfiqar Ghous's Novel: "Murder of Aziz Khan" – *Global Journal of Management, Social*

Sciences, Vol.3 (4):749-772.

- Awan, Abdul Ghafoor, Syed Ahmad Raza (2016). "The Effects of Totalitarianism & Marxism towards dystopian society in George Orwell's selected Fictions" *Global Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2 (4):21-37.
- Awan, Abdul Ghafoor (1987) "Comparative study of English and Urdu Medium Institutions in Islamabad." *National Language Authority*, Islamabad.
- Awan, Abdul Ghafoor;Mavera Sultan (2017) "Comparative Analysis of "Ice Candy-Man", "Train to Pakistan" and "Alakh Nagri" in Perspective of Creation of Pakistan." *Global Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities*, Vol.3 (2):21
- Balogun, J., Jacobs, C., Jarzabkowski, P., Mantere, S., & Vaara, E. (2009). "Strategy as discourse: Its significance, challenges and future directions." Brasilia: UnB.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). "Analyzing discourse: textual analysis for social research", *London*
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). "Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage." *Cambridge University Press*.
- Blommaert, J. (2005) "Discourse: a critical introduction", Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press*
- Chilton, Paul (2004) "Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice." London: *Routledge*.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). "Discourse in late modernity. Rethinking critical discourse analysis." *Edinburg*, University Press.
- Doolin, B. (2002). "Enterprise discourse, professional identity and the

organizational control of hospital clinicians.”

Ducrot, O. (1972). “Dire ET ne pas dire: Principes de sémantique linguistique.”

Paris. *Hermann*.

Dressler, W. (ed.) (1977). “Current trends in text linguistics.”

De Gruyter. Enkvist, N.-E (1977). *Stylistics and text linguistics*.

Ducrot, O. (1984). “Le dire ET le dit. Paris: Minuit.” Duranti, A. (Ed.) (2001).

Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader. Malden, MA: *Blackwell*.

Fairclough, N. (2003). “Analyzing discourse.” New York: *Routledge*.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). “Critical discourse analysis.” In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Vol. 2 (pp. 258–284). London: *Sage*.

Fink. Gunter, R. (1963). “Elliptical sentences in American English.” *Lingua* 12: 137–150.

Grice, H. (1975). “Logic and Conversation”. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3 New York: Academic Press.

Graber, Doris A. 1984. “Processing the News.” New York: *Longman*.

Gitlin, T. (1980). “The whole world is watching.” Berkeley: *University of California Press*.

Halliday, Michael A.K. (1985) “An Introduction to Functional Grammar.” London: *Edward Arnold*.

Hardy, C., & Thomas, R. (2012). “Strategy, discourse and practice: the intensification of power.” *Journal of Management Studies*.

Hart, Christopher (2010) “Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse.” Basingstoke: *Palgrave*.

Hall, S. (1977). “Culture, the media and the ideological effect”. In *J. Curran, M.*

- Ishtiaq, A. (2007) "A profile of general parvaiz Musharaf", *institute of south Asia journal*.
- Jones, P.E., Collins, C. (2006), "Political analysis versus Critical Discourse Analysis in the treatment of ideology: some implications for the study of communication"
- John Dewey (1988), "Experience and Nature," *Later Works*, Vol. 1, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Kristevia, Julia (1980). "Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art." New York: *Columbia University Press*.
- Long acre, R. (1990). "Storyline concerns and word order typology in East and West Africa." *UCLA Dept. of Linguistics*.
- Maingueneau, Dominique. (1999). "Analyzing self-constituting discourses." *Discourse studies*, vol.1, 2, 175-200.
- Petofi, J. (1978). "A formal semiotic text theory as an integrated theory of natural language."
- Palm, G. (2002). I nationens och marknadens intresse. *Journalister, nyhetskällor och EU-journalistik*. Göteborg: JMK, Göteborgs universitet
- Ramalho, V., & Resende, V. M. (2011). "Análise de discurso (para a) crítica: o texto Como material de pesquisa. *Campinas*. Ed. Pontes.
- Resende, V. M., & Ramalho, V. (2013). "Análise de discurso crítica. Ed. Contexto" (2nd Ed.). São Paulo.
- Stubbs, M. (1993). "British traditions in text analysis."
- Tuchman, G. (1978). "Making news." New York: *The Free Press*.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2005). "Introducing Social Semiotics." New York: *Routledge*.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1998) "Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach." London:

SAGA..

Van Dijk, Teun A. (2006) “Discourse and Manipulation”” *Discourse and Society*.

Vaara, E., & Tienari, J. (2002). “Justification, legitimization and naturalization of mergers and acquisitions: A critical discourse analysis of media texts”.

Organization. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1350508402009002912>

Widdowson, H. (1995), “Discourse analysis: a critical view”, *Language and Literature*.

Widdowson, H. (2007). “Discourse analysis.” Oxford: *Oxford University Press*

Whittington, R. (2009). “Completing the Strategy Research.” *Organization Studies*.

Wodak, R. (2001). “What CDA is about – a Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Developments.” In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: *Sage*.

Wodak, R. (2010). “The globalization of politics in television: Fiction or reality?” “*European Journal of Cultural Studies*.

CONTRIBUTION OF AUTHORS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

This research work was carried out in collaboration between two authors.

Author 1: Khadija Khadim is an M.Phil scholar at Department of English, Institute of Southern Punjab. She designed the study, collected and analyzed data. She wrote first draft of the manuscript under the supervision of first author.

Author 2: Prof. Dr. Abdul Ghafoor Awan is Ph.Ds in Economics from Islamia University of Bahawalpur-Pakistan and Business Administration from University of Sunderland, U.K.He done his Master in English Literature from Islamia University of Bahawalpur. He served as Editor, Daily The Nation, a leading English Daily of Pakistan. He contributed in this research paper by way of formatting, editing and giving final shape to the manuscript.

Both authors read the manuscript carefully and declared no conflict of interest with any person or institution.
