

CDA as an Approach to Analyze Language Ideologies in Supervisory Meetings

1. Faiza Panhwar

MS scholar at Center of English literature and linguistics(CELL), Mehran university of engineering and technology, Jamshoro, Pakistan
Email: faizapanhwar66@gmail.com

2. Shazia khokhar

Lecturer Centre of English language and linguistics (CELL) Mehran University of Engineering and technology, Jamshoro, Pakistan
shazia.muheodin@faculty.muett.edu.pk

3. Jam Khan Muhammad sahito

Lecturer Centre of English language and linguistics (CELL) Mehran University of Engineering and technology Jamshoro, Pakistan
Email: jam.khan faculty.muett.edu.pk

4. Dr Sanaullah Ansari

Associate Professor Institute of English Language and Literature(IELL), University of Sindh, Pakistan
Email: sanaullah@usindh.edu.pk

Abstract

This qualitative case study research set out to look at the concepts of hegemony and power in supervisory meetings centered on the idea of linguistic ideologies. Two BS (English) study supervisees and their supervisors were chosen for the study as two case studies their supervisory meetings were recorded and later transcribed for analysis purpose. The study adopted Halliday's Systematic Functional Linguistics (SFL) for data collection and Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) analytical methodology for the empirical investigation of the concepts of power as well as hegemony in supervision procedures (1989; 2003). The study's findings show how language contributed to the development of power relationships among the study's participants. In research supervisory meetings, language was a significant issue along with educational experience and knowledge that contributed to the development of unequal power relations among the participants. In terms of methodology and supervisory style, case B was slightly different from case A, due to its flexibility. This study suggests a fair and democratic style of supervision that can be beneficial and flexible for participants involved in research supervision regardless of their educational background.

Keywords: Critical discourse analysis (CDA), SFL, Power, Research supervision, Hegemony, Language ideologies.

DOI: 10.7176/JEP/13-33-13

Publication date: November 30th 2022

Introduction

This section introduces the background and generic scenario of the research topic.

Background of the Study

This research examines how language ideology is shaped in language and how entrenched notions of power and hegemony influence and disband research supervisory meetings. It is a cyclical process that explores the language ideologies, analyzes their meaning, and makes useful suggestions to policy makers to overcome these language ideologies emerging at the Higher Education research meetings. To better understand the deep-seated power and hegemony in Research supervision, it is vital to understand the concept of supervision.

Definition of Supervision:

The Macquarie Dictionary, considered an authoritative source, defines supervision as the process of inspecting work, processes, workers, etc. when a specific task is being performed. By its definition, therefore, "supervision" suggests an unprecedented balance of power between supervisors and supervisees. Previous research on supervision suggests that misunderstandings exist between supervisor and supervisee due to the nature and beliefs of feedback and the difficulty in communicating problems and perceptions. A study by Crughen and

Connell (2012) shows that there are frequent disputes over power and supremacy among participants in supervisory meetings. Many researchers also consider how meaning-making processes are negotiated differently between supervisor and student in educational institutions, given interpretation of writing work and dialogic approach in research meetings. The element of power is always on the side of supervisor's practices of supervising. (Lea & Street, 1998; Lillis, 2001).

First, the supervisor has advanced knowledge and experience in the field, which can overwhelm the supervisor at higher education institutes. However, this one-sided power relationship is not simple. In a research supervision process where all authority is vested in the supervisor, other participants tend to be overwhelmed and their efforts are not recognized. In fact, the actual process is designed to promote supervisors from lower to higher positions.

The field of Language Ideology

Language ideology is an umbrella term with branches in many areas of study. However, the focus here is only on discourse analysis. This study is about how language is used in society. Linguistic ideologies emerging in the twentieth century meet linguistic ethnography and social science research on ideology. Language is composed under many influences, including sociocultural, political and historical phenomena. Its very existence is an ideological possessing unparalleled power, hegemony and authority.

Language ideology can be defined as existing beliefs, thoughts, assumptions, and perceptions about the nature, purpose, utility, and accessibility of language. (Woolard, 1992). So far, language ideology has held a categorical place in the ethnographic tradition. For this reason, major scholarships in education, gender studies and media are associated with ideology. Of these, it is mainly related to power and hegemony, inequality. As is known from research, hierarchies are constructed both in the classroom in relation to language and within language (De Costa, 2010; Carreira, 2011), student diversity due to privileged and non-privileged backgrounds.

Rationale of Study

The basis of this study is an ideologically critical stance. There are struggles for social, political, and economic power. The critical nature of ideology is that there is a conducive environment for both participants and is intended to improve the quality of social inequality lies deep-rooted reasons why some languages are seen as the norm and others are labeled as inferior. Explore how different modifiers are associated with different languages and dialects. For example, one language is classified as good another as bad and, another as worst. Who defines them so and how are they labeled as this.

In ideological design of language ideologies, a language that doesn't correspond to ideology, society's set norms is denigrated as a complete failure in all areas of life. In English, Standard English is just a variant adopted as a standard by users in power. Globalization and hegemonic rule by the western colonies have made English widely used in all walks of life. It enjoys privileged position all across.

Scope of the Study

the proposed study investigates the Language Ideologies in supervisory meetings using CDA model. This is a case study of BS English final year students of IELL of University of Sindh, Jamshoro.

Literature review

The following literature, well-studied by eminent scholars, was selected to support the current research study. This literature review delves into the concepts of power and hegemony in supervisory meetings. This study will focus on the realm of language ideologies and their impact on the discourses generated in supervisory meetings. This section also includes literature on methodological frameworks applied in current study, which are Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Systematic Functional Linguistics (SFL).

Power and Hegemony in Supervision

Research supervision is less explored topic to this day, available studies suggest that there is a stark disparate relation between the supervisor and supervisee. According to Heath, 1983 the research thesis of supervisees can be impacted by any technique by the supervisor. Another relevant study is of theme of relationship between supervisee and supervisor on the type of feedback. The subject of student identities is also worth mentioning. Above insightful perceptions prove remarkable for the writers when it comes to comprehend supervision as a

social practice. Contrary, controlling behaviors and attitudes of supervisors which emerge from power and control in research supervisory meetings change the thinking of students in a specific way all together. (Reeve, 2009; Vansteenkiste et al., 2010).

Another study by Reeve(2009) states that when the perceptions of supervisors become students priority then there emerges the controlling behavior of supervisor which kills student's personal ideas and thoughts. Trust is also mandatory between supervisee and supervisor. Trust has always positive outcomes; mutual trust can benefit them equally.

The Scope of Language Ideologies

Having a broad scope, Language ideologies explore the connection between language and society in connection to culture. (Calvet, 1974; Errington, 2001). It could be traced back to Marxist theory that says it is collaboration between material and ideational sides of reality. In words of Karl Marx, the existing ideology in any society is the controlling bloc that controls thinking, religion, education and communication. By accepting prevailing ideology the marginalized class create 'false consciousness', which again controls the marginalized from seeing the actual reality.

Althusser (1971) rejected the Marxist notion of false consciousness and gave another definition of ideology. According to him ideology is a set of cultural practices; it is practiced and strengthened in institutions like family, law, religion educational, cultural and political. However, segmentation of individuals into groups is made to give treat them differently in systematic way.

The impact of language ideologies

In different definitions of language ideology the only similarity is that language ideology can be found in every aspect of communication. Therefore it can be said language ideologies are blamed for the stratification among the society. It also affects the various forms and functions of language. It also modifies the behavioral setting. According to Tollefson (1999), language ideologies have a grave impact on human thinking it unknowingly modifies the way people interpret different things in society. Aliya sikandar in her study Power and Hegemony: a critical discourse analysis in Research supervision(2018) analyzed that language is used as a manipulative tool by the powerful agents in literary practices that becomes a source of hegemonic control in academia, the discourses of the participants get largely affected by the institutional structure and control, which influenced the supervision practices and give them a highly structured form. In supervisory meetings, Language is a major concern, which becomes a source for establishing asymmetrical power relations between the participants.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

The area of CDA is not limited to language only but it also unveils the asymmetrical power patterns mechanisms. The text never neither happens alone nor can be separated nor its context what Fairclough defines Intertextuality. There is always hidden agenda of power deep in discourses. CDA provides a framework that unveils the things which are unsaid and hidden meanings in discourses are opened through CDA(Fairclough, 1989). Discourses, appropriate in a given particular setting positions power to a certain group of people. The discourse gives special treatment to its selected people who are in position of accessibility. Not all the users of same language enjoy this privilege but a certain number because discourse is not accessed by everyone. Likewise, there begins struggle between accessing power and resisting power. From qualitative research point of view, this study falls into paradigm of critical research.

How power play in research supervision is carried, CDA suggests keen observations by the researcher. Studies suggest how misunderstandings are born between supervisor and supervisee owing to asymmetrical relationship. They both are aware of this power imbalance so there rise a problem like nature of feedback from both participants. CDA helps us to explore these power relations and practices at local and wider societal level(Street, 2000). Thus, such asymmetrical power relations can bring forth poor results as well.

Research supervision, in Pakistan, is quite an independent area. In academia various style of supervision is carried out. CDA by analyzing the discursive power relations comes up with valuable suggestions in terms and approach to study. It unveils the latent patterns of power and hegemony, making it visible and structures a pattern to eliminate the asymmetrical power accumulation in research supervision.

SYSTEMATIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS (SFL) BY HALLIDAY:

Language has direct relationship with the social atmosphere in which it is used. Different functions of language in given atmosphere are studied in SFL. A model given by Micheal Halliday, also known as Hallidayan linguistics. Language in any form inscribed or uttered; is an instrument used in expressing ones thoughts and opinions to others in the society. It is an important tool of communication. It plays important role in one's participation with others. Furthermore, for the clarity and transferability of thoughts conveniently one needs to arrange ones speech in order to attract others attention, for this, one needs language to transfer thoughts in more expressive and clear meaning manner.

Halliday (1978:14) argues that it is only by the language that humans become interactive and make a group of their own. Without through language there has been no communication amongst people.

Meta Functions of Language:

In SFL, Halliday(1978) opines that primarily language has three meta functions. Which he categorized as:

Ideational Function:

The first meta function mainly explores the human experience of world. Be it inner or outer. This shows the human's experience of internal and external world through language. It is through language that human express their cultural identity and experience (Halliday, 1978: 112).

Interpersonal function:

Interpersonal function focuses on the relationship of participants who are involved in conversation, in which the speaker uses language to make known his thoughts to the next person; the hearer. And tries to influence the next person through his words and attitudes. (Halliday, 1978: 112).

Textual function:

Textual function deals with the formation of communication (text and the flow of information) by which language relates to the verbal and non-verbal environment. In a nutshell, Halliday's point is that any piece of language simultaneously uses all the three metafunctions.

In order to analyze the discourse the researcher made a chart of Halliday's framework and categorized it into different items where the data was broken in sentences and sentences into words and words were categorized in different categories and then analysis was made according to their usage.

Research Design and Methodology

This chapter includes the research Methodology overview and research question, aims and objectives along with samples, frameworks and limitations of the study.

Overview

The present research adopts qualitative research methodology. Qualitative method of research helps to comprehend which is little (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). It interprets the meaning of the actions, opinions, experiences and beliefs. It collects non-numeric data through open-ended and conversational communication. Hence, Qualitative methodology is suitable for this study. The case study selected two BS students', two supervisors' who were at early stage of writing their thesis, as purposive samples. This research designs its methodological framework based on Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (1989; 2003) of three levels of analysis, that are: Text analysis (description), processing analysis (interpretation), and social analysis (explanation). However, this study only focuses on two levels that are Text analysis (description), processing analysis (interpretation).

Research Question

What languages ideologies are established in supervisory discourses?

Study Aim

This study defines what language ideologies are constructed in supervisory meetings.

Study Objectives

Main objective of the study is investigation of how languages ideologies are established in the 'supervisees and

their supervisors' discourses in research supervision meetings.

Sampling

Purposive sampling technique adopted for conducting this study, which selected Two BS (English Linguistics) students and their supervisors were selected within their contexts (university of Sindh). Case A includes both male supervisee with a supervisor; case B includes female supervisee with a male supervisor. These cases are selected as purposive sampling to examine their discourses on way to formation of thesis development when the participants were at early stage of writing their thesis, meanwhile, no attempt to extend the cases was made because they cases were rich in required data. No attempt at generalization for larger audience and organizational studies is made.

Sample Size and Selection of Sample

The sample size is given in this table:

S.	Category	Number of Participants
1	Faculty Assistant Professor or Lecturer	02
2	Student BS English (Final Year)	02
	Total	04

Data Collection

For data collection the transcriptions of research meetings were made, researcher herself attended and recorded the meeting along with supervisor and supervisee later those transcriptions were categorized according to SFL and for analysis CDA model was followed. As it is known in CDA there is no any fixed pattern of collecting data, so the researcher used SFL model. Besides, the process of analyzing started as soon as the data collected. It is worth mentioning here that the privacy of the participants was high responsibility of the researcher. There is complete confidentiality their names will never be mentioned anywhere. However, a verbal and written consent was taken from the both parties. Lastly the data was transcribed in isolation and was kept away from others knowledge.

Following tools will be used for the data collection of the study:

- i. Literature review
- ii. Transcriptions of research supervisory meetings

Data Analysis Framework

This research study explores the notions of power and hegemony which are built by language ideologies in supervisory meetings in higher education. The founding block of this study is the framework known as Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). CDA opens the latent language ideologies, argued power and hegemony relations, and issues like inequality and oppression prevailing in society. CDA views discourse, as a means to provide a just democratic society by delivering justice to social problems, pointing out the power and hegemonic relations as discursive.

Fairclough's CDA is composed of three inter-related processes of analysis tied to three inter-related dimensions of discourse. These three dimensions are:

1. The subject of analysis (which is language ideologies in this study)
2. The process in which the subject is formed (the supervisory meetings in which language ideologies are formed)
3. The conditions which control the process of subject formation (background, relationship ,knowledge)

Above dimensions require a separate type of analysis, which is:

1. The text of study is thoroughly described: description
2. The process of subject formation is interpreted: processing analysis
3. The background of the process of formation of subject is explained: social analysis

However, study focused on the two levels of analysis that are description and interpretation. At these levels of analysis, the focus of CDA is on describing the linguistic characteristics of transcripts of discourse, which include use of grammar, selection of words, text cohesion, etc. As it has been cleared that CDA doesn't follow a fixed course so one can assume by looking at language that what could be the possible background and ideologies embedded in it. For linguistic analysis, Fairclough employs Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (SFL). SFL examines linguistic categories of grammar and genre as social functions. So a relational view is

used. Based on supervisory meetings' transcripts the relationship between levels of dimensions and analysis is analyzed. The text is positioned at the centre of analysis and by examining its textual-linguistic characteristics one can understand power and hegemony. CDA follows a theoretical design not a concrete one, so when applied to larger society faces some difficulties as well. Its flexibility is also its peculiarity. Multiple theories and approaches are used to analyze the data depending upon the unfolded phenomenon. In this study the transcripts were read a number of times before concluding the final results.

Limitation of the Study

As Language ideology is a wider term and all the impacts relating to the language ideology in higher education institutions need wider study to see the wider results. Earlier dr Aliya Sikandar made a case study on power and hegemony in consultation meetings on a wider level. As far as this study is concerned this only contextualize to BS English final year students of University of Sindh for a brief period of time and it is qualitative research in nature and the study cases were deliberately limited to the four participants as male supervisor and male supervisee, male supervisor and female supervisee, no attempt to extend cases was made, as these cases were rich in depth data so researcher limited herself to these cases. The study is limited to identify to measure the power and hegemony potentiality in IELL of University of Sindh, Jamshoro.

Within an area like Sindh University, which is under researched, it is pretty difficult to conduct research on one of CDA tool. The data/result estimated as the final result is based on the CDA method may be hypothetical (imaginary) data. Data availability is a limitation to this study. There was no attempt made to generalize the findings for organizational research and a bigger audience

Methodology

The study used two case studies of two supervisors and their two supervisees of BS English final-year students of IELL who were at initial stage of thesis-writing chosen from this purposive sample of cases so that the research could explore their discourses on the development of their theses. These two case studies attempted to present an insider's viewpoint on linguistic ideology. The study used Halliday's SFL model to collect the data in which supervisory meetings were transcribed and the text was categorized according to SFL. A matrix was formed to analyze the text, in which there were different categories like auxiliary verbs, grammatical mood, personal pronouns, code switching, lexical items, internal relations, voice quality along with use of humor in these meetings. Similarly, for discourse analysis Fairclough's CDA model was used for description and interpretation.

Results and Discussion

This chapter lays out the result and analysis of the data related to language ideologies and power and hegemony in research supervision as unfolded by the analysis of CDA. The first level of analysis of CDA focuses on description which includes textual analysis: grammar, vocabulary and cohesion through these one can find out the latent language ideologies in the discourse. Thereby, the focus is only on first level, hence, the study will look latent language ideologies on textual level. In Case A supervisory meeting the topic of research is Sin and Repentance in The ancient mariner. In case B the supervisee was conducting research on 'Impact of reading ability on academic performance.' These meetings were recorded and transcribed by the researcher. This study adapted Halliday's SFL categories of linguistic analysis, which categorized the textual-linguistic features of data, such as grammar, vocabulary and cohesion. Following are findings of the cases of the study.

Grammatical mood:

The grammatical mood combines to create the discourse style in this studies meetings a number of grammatical moods were used by supervisors and supervisees. However, the supervisees were mostly declarative in their tone while the supervisors were mostly interrogative or assertive in their tone. This was also ideational as the supervisor could ask a series of questions, allowed by their powerful role In sentence A.1, the supervisor chooses the grammatical tone that is interrogative and assertive simultaneously, there was element of absoluteness in supervisor's discourse.

Hello, start from the research, so the topic of your research is an analysis of sin and repentance a case study of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's the ancient mariner how do you analyze this topic of the ancient mariner?(A.1)

In case B also, the grammatical mood was largely interrogative and assertive. The meeting started with short statement questions and answers. The supervisor was asking questions on and on while the supervisee was explaining in short few words answer. Supervisee rarely came up with longer explanation. The connection

between referring expressions is referred to as grammatical cohesiveness. Reference, substitution, and ellipsis are three components that make up grammatical coherence (Cutting, 2002:13).

Auxiliary verbs:

For the study of obligation, suggestion, assertiveness, possibility, probability or definitiveness of action are expressed in auxiliary verbs. The use of certain verbs can determine the latent power in supervisory discourse. It was observed that the supervisee in both cases was, most of the times definitive in use of auxiliary verbs. they chooses the verbs that gave a sense of subordinate and politeness towards the supervisor. Supervisees tried to avoid the assertions or coercions in their utterances. As they accepted the hegemony of supervisor.

Sir basically I have Submitted three to four methods like first of all I have read the research paper or research journals and a complete analysis according to the poem then I have selected that(A.9)

The tone of the supervisor and the use of auxiliaries indicated that there was more directness and a sense of coercion. The discourses highlight the unequal supervisory practises. When talking about the latent power and hegemony structured it is important to mention that the auxiliary verbs play an important in studying power and hegemony. It shows how one way power works. While transcribing the supervisory meeting the auxiliary verbs were separated from the main subjects in order to express how auxiliary verbs relies power to the supervisor.

Now you have been at the concept of sin how did you come to know about? Do you find this concept of sin in the ancient mariner for example give me any textual reference ...a.10

Voice quality:

In both cases the overall voice quality of discourse is good and understandable by both participants. Supervisor's voice was clear it is understandable while supervisee's English fluency is not so good so sometimes mixes up the sentences and in case A the supervisee is not heard by his supervisor and also he is obedient in his tone, may be he might be under pressure of his supervisor being fluent and speaking English largely. In general sense, it was more like a formal meeting with no humor at all. The supervisor took up more conversational space in speech since the supervisee didn't respond to the points highlighted by the supervisor very much. The supervisee, on the other hand, grew more subservient and silent. This might also be seen as the supervisee being reluctant to express his opinions or take a stand on any issue. He was direct mostly because of his supervisory skills and control of the circumstance. Again the command of English gave supervisors more strong position.

Use of personal pronouns:

Likewise, the use of personal pronouns plays a vital role in CDA analysis. The personal pronouns carry a deep latent power and hegemony. From the use of personal pronouns one can see asymmetrical power relations between supervisee and supervisor. The personal pronouns as I, we and you have a connotation meaning as well. The use of 'we' pronoun carries a positive meaning as politeness, togetherness and cooperation but the use of pronouns 'I and you' have a negative and authoritative connotation and in case A study the both participants only used I, and you, thus giving a sense of difference which was unsuitable on the part of supervisee as this created a gap in politeness as explains Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness where they say seniors require high level of politeness from juniors or supervisor from supervisee . So, to some extent the use of personal pronouns from supervisors could be justified but it is highly inappropriate for supervisees the politeness aspect in view.

How do you come to know about this sin element is present where are the citations? How do you justify this that you know the concept of sin is present the concept of repentance is present A.3

The analysis of case B shows not the indifferent results. The supervisee and supervisor excessively used the pronouns like I,you in their supervisory meeting. however the tone was homogenous and democratic in giving instructions to the supervisee. They talked in more general sense

Code switching:

Code switching refers to using more than two languages simultaneously. In this study the participants also used code switching in case A the supervisee used Sindhi language to clear his stance on his research work.it also shows his poor command of English that he has to use native language for better transfer of this thoughts

Un me jeke writers ahin mostly uhe kehra ahin aen matlab according to poem basically the problem is this.()

. In CDA analysis Code switching analysis is very helpful tool. It gives in depth insights.

Similarly, in case B language was not the concern the supervisee and supervisor conducted meeting in Sindhi language predominantly. There was flow of sentences without any hurdle as was in case A. the supervisee exchanged her views in her native language while the supervisor responded her in Sindhi language as well.

However, English tag switching was common in case B. It is not like English was not used, English was used in their conversation but rarely Sindhi was predominant in their converse. In terms of style, case B supervisory meeting was much flexible and supervisee friendly than the case A owing to native language exchange.

Internal relations:

The predicament of the students is explained by the supervisor's concern: at the BS level, the students' educational background as well as research abilities is subpar, further increasing their dependency on the supervisor. This reliance explains how the effects of disempowerment also harm language. Fairclough (1989) asserts that language is a social activity and that both linguistic and non-linguistic parts of society are socially conditioned by language in the same fashion, supervisor retained authoritative position throughout the meetings on many occasions clarifications were sought by the supervisor.

who told you this...B.13

It was partly the supervision style and partly because the research writing could not make the aspects clear.

but its not there why haven't you done this B.15 ...

however at many instances, because of the seeming deficiency in supervisee's research skills and writing skills, the supervisor had to stop reading repeatedly and ask for clarifications.

you did the analysis of questions, where is that? B.17

in case B the supervisor vividly explained many things for supervisee

the entire material is there. B.18

In the first supervisory meeting for case A, the supervisee received very little opportunity to participate in the supervisory meeting because it was totally run by the supervisor. The supervisor's inquiries during the meeting essentially set the agenda:

Hello, start from the research, so the topic of your research is an analysis of sin and repentance a case study of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's the ancient mariner how do you analyze this topic of the ancient mariner...
A.1

In both cases English language was main issue between the participants especially for supervisees. Whenever they felt short of words they chose to remain silent. Silence was the powerful tool for supervisees to cover up their English incompetence. According to Fairclough (1989), silence works as a tool for the lesser powerful as they can refrain from being corrected or checked. So the gap was taken up by the supervisor in a more powerful frame.

Lexical items:

Many lexical items related to research were named in supervisory meetings. As in case A the items discussed were literature review, methodology, analysis, references, contextual/textual references. However no in depth discussions were made on these items for supervisees understanding. But, in case B the supervisor explained many lexical items to his supervisee and she picked up them immediately many new lexical items like layman, ground level, co relation etc were discussed and the supervisor elaborated the terms to the supervisee on many occasions before she start her research work. . The choice of vocabulary pertained largely to research writing was included in case B supervisory meeting.

now means you are clear that questionnaire is about reliability and it is done and validity is done by pilot study , there is no problem in questionnaire. Ability and performance have no co relation in your study. B.36

Contrary, no explanation of lexical items was made in case A. In Pakistani society English language is considered symbol of high status, it is language of media, elite, education, power, authority and control, thus giving way to exploitation also. English is the language of most powerful people. In such situation, a supervisor having a good command of English also enjoys a higher status relative to supervisee thus leaving less room for supervisee to express. A student coming from middle or lower background has already fewer opportunities and a powerful supervisor with good English blocks almost all doors to him same was the condition with case study's supervisees, who had less or no grip of English thus remaining no space for them in front of supervisors.

Conclusion

The study continues with the claim that whereas in example A the research supervisee's voice was not heard, in case B the participant was encouraged by the supervisor's techniques. Their degree of engagement in the supervisory meetings was impacted by this. The prior experience and knowledge gave an edge to the

supervisors. The supervisees were most of the time left naïve and inexperienced, which gave supervisors dominance over them. However the tone used by all participants of the meetings was somehow formal and strict lacking room for politeness as conceived by their use of auxiliary verb; I&you. The code switching was rampant in all meetings specifically in case A for the sake of clarification owing to the poor command of supervisee, but it was flexible in another case as the supervisor gave chance to his supervisee to converse in her native language. From the use of grammatical mood one can conclude that it was authoritative on the side of supervisors. They chose the tone that was interrogative or assertive in nature on the contrary, the tone of the supervisee was mostly declarative. The institutional framework and control, which impacted the supervisory practices and gave them a highly organized form, had a significant impact on the discourses of the participants. The use of language was a significant issue in the supervisory sessions, which contributed to the development of unequal power relations between the participants. Social conflict based on class had an impact on the discourses. Language ideologies allowed for the emergence of classes among the populace, which was a manifestation of the non-egalitarian stratum of power. Language beliefs were crucial in maintaining the strong agent's position as the dominating force. The dominant partner's soft power was also demonstrated. On several instances, the supervisee's voice went mute. According to the study, language was a major factor in limiting the contributions of the participant with less influence along with less knowledge of the research, contributing to inequity and their inability to accomplish their goals.

References

- Sikandar, A. (2018). "Power and hegemony in research supervision: A critical discourse analysis" *Journal of Education and Educational Development*. Vol 5. (2018) No.2. Pakistan
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Ideology and ideological state apparatus. Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* Monthly Review Press, 127-186.
- Bach, K. & Harnish, K. (1982). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2006). Language policy and national identity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy*. London: Blackwell.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Boltanski, L. (1971) *Maldidier, La défense du corps*. In *Social Science Information*, 10 (4). 45–86.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bublitz, W. (1988) Transferred negation and modality. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 18 (6). 551-577.
- Calvet, L. J. (1974). *Linguistique et Colonialisme: Petit Traité de Glottophagie. Parcourir Les Collections*. Paris: Payot.
- Carreira, J. M. (2011). Relationship between motivation for learning EFL and intrinsic motivation for learning in general among Japanese elementary school students. *System*, 39 (1), 90-102.
- Cazden, C. B., John, V. P., & Hymes, D. (1972). *Functions of language in the classroom*. Oxford, England: Columbia U. Press.
- Crowley, S. (1989). Linguistics and composition instruction: *Written Communication*, 6 (4), 480-505.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- De Costa, P. I. (2010). Language ideologies and standard English language policy in Singapore: Responses of a designer immigrant student. *Language Policy*, 9(3), 217-239.
- Errington, J. (2001). Colonial linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 30, 19-39
- Flores, S. Y., & Murillo, E. G. (2001). Power, language, and ideology: Historical and contemporary notes on the dismantling of bilingual education. *The Urban Review*, 33(3), 183-206.
- Finegan, E. (1980). *Attitudes toward English usage: The history of a war of words*. Teachers College Press: Columbia University.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An introduction to Sociolinguistics*. UK: Longman Group
- Joseph, J. E., & Taylor, T. J. (Eds) (1990). *Ideologies of language*. London: Routledge.
- Levinson, S. (2005). *Information-Theoretic Analysis of Speech Communication*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 143-156
- Luykx, A., Lee, O., Mahotiere, M., Lester, B., Hart, J., & Deaktor, R. (2008). Cultural and home language influences on children's responses to science assessments. *Teachers College Record*, 109(4), 897-926.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (1985). *Authority in language: Investigating language prescription and standardization*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mori, J. (2014). Border crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation

- analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 849-862.
- Philips, S. U. (1983). *The Invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warm Springs. Indian Reservation*. New York: Longman.
- Rogers, R., & Christian, J. (2007). What could I say? A critical discourse analysis of the construction of race in children's literature. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 10 (1), 21-46.
- Silverstein, M. (2006). Pragmatic indexing. In K. Brown (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 6: 14017, Oxford: Elsevier.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. Clyne, W. Hanks & C. Hofbauer (Eds.) *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, 193-247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, J. (1999). Language ideology and language education. In *Proceedings from the Fourth International Conference on Language and Development*.
- Volk, D., & Angelova, M. (2007). Language ideology and the mediation of language choice in peer interactions in a dual-language first grade. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 6 (3), 177-199.
- Woolard, K. (1992). Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *Pragmatics*, 2(3), 235-249.