

p-ISSN:2708-2091
e-ISSN:2708-3586

www.gsrjournal.com
GSR
Global Sociological Review

GSR

GLOBAL SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

HEC-RECOGNIZED CATEGORY-Y

VOL. X ISSUE IV, Fall (DECEMBER-2025)

Double-blind Peer-review Research Journal

www.gsrjournal.com

© Global Sociological Review

DOI (Journal): 10.31703/gsr
DOI (Volume): 10.31703/gsr.2025(X)
DOI (Issue): 10.31703/gsr.2025(X-IV)

Humanity Publications
sharing research

Article title

Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective

Abstract

This paper examines the overlapping forces of gender, power, and justice in tribal and state laws in South Asia with special focus on honor-based violence and customary dispute resolution systems. Using the Three-Dimensional Model of Critical Discourse Analysis developed by Fairclough and Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis (FCDA), the paper will examine a range of legal texts, case-based narratives, and oral narratives in order to reveal the manner in which discursive power is created and maintained by patriarchy. This particular focus is put on culturally established practices like mairh (peace delegation), faislo (sexual consent), and sang (women as compensation) in an attempt to show how these linguistic and ritual practices have been used to legitimize male dominance at the expense of female agency. Such discourses make gender inequality natural by enshrining it in tradition, legality, and collective memory.

Keywords: Marginalization, Discourse Analysis, Power and Gender, Gender Inequality, Patriarchy


Authors:

Amna Bibi: M.Phil Scholar, Department of Linguistics and Language Studies (DLLS), University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.

Tazanfal Tehseem: (Corresponding Author)

Associate Professor, Department of Linguistics and Language Studies (DLLS), University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.

(Email: razanfaltehseem@uos.edu.pk)

Asad Nazar : PhD Scholar, Department of Linguistics and Language Studies (DLLS), University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0009-0000-1019-9787>

Pages: 53-68

DOI: 10.31703/gsr.2025(X-IV).05

DOI link: [https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2025\(X-IV\).05](https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2025(X-IV).05)

Article link: <http://www.gsrjournal.com/article/unveiling-honour-and-marginalization-in-the-honor-unmasked-2017-by-nafisa-shah-a-critical-feminist-perspective>

Full-text Link: <https://gsrjournal.com/article/unveiling-honour-and-marginalization-in-the-honor-unmasked-2017-by-nafisa-shah-a-critical-feminist-perspective>

Pdf link: <https://www.gsrjournal.com/jadmin/Author/31rvIolA2.pdf>

Global Sociological Review

p-ISSN: [2708-2091](https://doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2025(X-IV).05) e-ISSN: [2708-3586](https://doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2025(X-IV).05)

DOI(journal): 10.31703/gsr

Volume: X (2025)

DOI (volume): 10.31703/gsr.2025(X)

Issue: IV Fall (December-2025)

DOI(Issue): 10.31703/gsr.2024(X-IV)

Home Page

www.gsrjournal.com

Volume: (2025)

<https://www.gsrjournal.com/Current-issues>

Issue: IV-Fall (December -2025)

<https://www.gsrjournal.com/issue/10/4/2025>

Scope

<https://www.gsrjournal.com/about-us/scope>

Submission

<https://humaglobe.com/index.php/gsr/submissions>



Visit Us



Citing this Article

05	Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective		
Authors	Amna Bibi Tazanfal Tehseem Asad Nazar	DOI	10.31703/gsr.2025(X-IV).05
		Pages	53-68
		Year	2025
		Volume	X
		Issue	IV

Referencing & Citing Styles

APA	Bibi, A., Tehseem, T., & Nazar, A. (2025). Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective. <i>Global Sociological Review</i> , X(IV), 53-68. https://doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2025(X-IV).05
CHICAGO	Bibi, Amna, Tazanfal Tehseem, and Asad Nazar. 2025. "Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective." <i>Global Sociological Review</i> X (IV):53-68. doi: 10.31703/gsr.2025(X-IV).05.
HARVARD	BIBI, A., TEHSEEM, T. & NAZAR, A. 2025. Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective. <i>Global Sociological Review</i> , X, 53-68.
MHRA	Bibi, Amna, Tazanfal Tehseem, and Asad Nazar. 2025. 'Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective', <i>Global Sociological Review</i> , X: 53-68.
MLA	Bibi, Amna, Tazanfal Tehseem, and Asad Nazar. "Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective." <i>Global Sociological Review</i> X.IV (2025): 53-68. Print.
OXFORD	Bibi, Amna, Tehseem, Tazanfal, and Nazar, Asad (2025), 'Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective', <i>Global Sociological Review</i> , X (IV), 53-68.
TURABIAN	Bibi, Amna, Tazanfal Tehseem, and Asad Nazar. "Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective." <i>Global Sociological Review</i> X, no. IV (2025): 53-68. https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2025(X-IV).05 .



Cite Us



Title

Unveiling Honour and Marginalization in the Honor Unmasked (2017) by Nafisa Shah: A Critical Feminist Perspective

Authors:

Amna Bibi

M.Phil Scholar, Department of Linguistics and Language Studies (DLLS), University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.

Tazanfal Tehseem

(Corresponding Author)

Associate Professor, Department of Linguistics and Language Studies (DLLS), University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.

(Email: tazanfal.tehseem@uos.edu.pk)

Asad Nazar

PhD Scholar, Department of Linguistics and Language Studies (DLLS), University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0009-0000-1019-9787>

Contents

- [Introduction](#)
- [Literature Review](#)
- [Research Methodology](#)
- [Data Analysis](#)
- [Social Practices](#)
- [Textual Analysis](#)
- [Discursive Practices](#)
- [Social Practices](#)
- [Textual Analysis](#)
- [Discursive Practices](#)
- [Textual Analysis](#)
- [Discursive Practices](#)
- [Social Practices](#)
- [Conclusion](#)
- [References](#)

Abstract

This paper examines the overlapping forces of gender, power, and justice in tribal and state laws in South Asia with special focus on honor-based violence and customary dispute resolution systems. Using the Three-Dimensional Model of Critical Discourse Analysis developed by Fairclough and Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis (FCDA), the paper will examine a range of legal texts, case-based narratives, and oral narratives in order to reveal the manner in which discursive power is created and maintained by patriarchy. This particular focus is put on culturally established practices like mairh (peace delegation), faislo (sexual consent), and sang (women as compensation) in an attempt to show how these linguistic and ritual practices have been used to legitimize male dominance at the expense of female agency. Such discourses make gender inequality natural by enshrining it in tradition, legality, and collective memory.

Keywords: Marginalization, Discourse Analysis, Power and Gender, Gender Inequality, Patriarchy

Introduction

CDA examines the relationship between language and power. It reveals that language is never neutral, that it has the power either to uphold authority or to overturn it. For instance, how words are used in media, politics, or education can shape people's beliefs. Norman Fairclough (1995, 2003) accounted for this in

his three-dimensional conception of text, discourse practice, and social practice. The relation of discourse with ideology in media and politics was taken up by Teun van Dijk (1993, 2008), and Ruth Wodak (2001) demonstrated how the language power relations historically change. CDA is situated in media, politics, education, and law contexts through which we find



bias, concealed ideologies, and inequality (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

Gender Studies considers how roles, behavior, and actions are socially determined in relation to gender as opposed to being 'just biological'. Sex is about biology, but gender is about social expectations and behaviors (West & Zimmerman, 1987). For example, Judith Butler's (1990) notion of performativity claims that gender is something we 'do', it is performed in and through habitual acts. It developed from the feminist movements and includes, among others, masculinity studies (Connell, 2005) and intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989), which reveals how gender intersects with race, class, and sexuality. Gender stereotypes influence career choices: girls typically are encouraged to engage in caring roles, while boys are sent into science or leadership (Eccles, 2011). These stereotypes are exacerbated when men are framed as being in assertive roles and women in affective or subordinate roles in the media (Collins, 2011; Cheryan et al., 2017). Similar pressures also disincentivize men from pursuing professions like "feminine" nursing (Simpson, 2005). Gender and Development: Questions of gender are brought to light by studies, and this creates a platform where they can be discussed openly and freely. Gender Studies is committed to the study of gender with the hope of eradicating these unfair practices, thereby enhancing inclusivity.

This study draws primarily on Nafisa Shah's 2017 *Honor Unmasked* in order to demonstrate how the concept of honor is employed to rationalize violence against women within an ethos based on gender hierarchy. Employing a Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis approach (Lazar, 2005), the research examines how language in the novel represents women as victims and resists systems of oppression. Shah (2015) argues that women's mobility is curtailed in the name of family honor, which is related to class position (Khan, 2014). This paper contends that the discussion of honor upholds patriarchy, offers sanction for violence, and constructs women as passive victims (Gill 2010; Kapur 2002). The analysis attends to dialogues, tone, and word choices, demonstrating the

discursive link between honor-words and control and violence. The independent variable is cultural honor; the dependent variable is the representation of women and linguistic policies of oppression and resistance. The primary inquiry is how Nafisa Shah's language represents honor killings of women. The aims will be to take honor as an abused justification of violence and analyze discourse as the continuation of patriarchal domination.

The work is significant, as it interlaces the literature, language, and gender studies, demonstrating how narratives reflect the oppression and offer the possibilities of resisting it, too. This shows how discourse creates a relation of power and how it illuminates feminist discourse about honor-based violence. The work is limited, nevertheless, to a single text and relies on a conversation analysis which might be interpreted differently by the analyst. Nonetheless, it also answers major questions about the connection between language, gender, and power in patriarchal settings.

Literature Review

Language and gender are tied together because language, on the one hand, reflects society and supports change in it. The use of language is not just a form of communication, but also an exercise in power and molding gender roles. Discourse refers to language use in context and for a purpose, spoken or written. The fact is that discourse operates in a plethora of domains, such as formal educational institutions as well as informal settings (Gee, 2011), or that it is a new social practice where the meaning forms itself within certain socio-cultural and historical contexts (Fairclough, 2003). Van Leeuwen (2008) points out its structured and rule-governed character, and Wodak (2009) even reminds us that discourse is an action tool manipulated by its users.

The term of discourse also contains ideologies and social meanings which are not only then carrier to the words in sociolinguistics. Unlike sex, gender is socially constructed and associated with male, female, or non-binary expectations and behaviors. Language often encodes gender bias. For instance, in many languages nouns and pronouns have gender, and

English phrases such as “chairman” or describing a woman as “bossy” reflect male-focused norms. Marie Southard Ospina is a writer, editor, and advocate who says the phrase “man up” perpetuates the idea that strength and leadership are male qualities. Such speech patterns reinforce the stereotype that men are natural leaders and women are expected to be followers. Communicative gender differences thus seem to be dominated by negotiation and not by biology (van Dijk et al., 2008).

It is the media that has a significant part to play in sculpting discourse on gender. Women are often depicted in the media as responsible for the care of others and men, as economically successful and in positions of authority (Bell, 1991). These representations shape the way women see themselves and how others see them, maintaining unequal relationships. The institutional language, as well as schools, workplaces, and government, is destructive. However, the use of male-related names such as fireman, passing laws that assume gender, and even referring to intersex infants whose sex is not known as male or female is all a way of exclusion and marginalization of women and non-binary individuals. However, these inequalities can also be addressed by language. Fairclough (2013) also notes that the stereotypes can be challenged through such inclusive language reforms as using the term chairperson in place of chairman or using they as a gender-neutral manner of addressing the pronoun. It has turned into an icon of opposition and empowerment of the marginalized communities, such as the LGBTQ+ communities, that have reclaimed derogatory labels like queer. The process of the promotion of discrimination by the language has long been used in feminist linguistics, whereas queer theory remains critical of the two-polar system of male/female and promotes a more fluid identity. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is not an exception in that controversy, as it reveals the veiled force that is behind texts and speech, especially those that perpetuate male chauvinism. Baker et al. (2008) believe that sexist language and stereotypes are declining, but also express disagreement with the acceptance of gender-neutral terms and demand more research in the accounting field that explores these

problems. This becomes a problem in technology like automated systems, which strengthen stereotypes through speech and communication. Nevertheless, a digital setting can also provide activism, such as feminist and queer oratory that challenges the dominant discourses. Generally, there is no way of extracting discourse, which is gendered. Language is a reflection of the gender practices in our society, yet it can be resisted by the language itself. We can draw our societies nearer to the potential of attaining equality with the help of more inclusive and equitable language. Language is not only a tool of communication, but a power of society; not only can the language reinforce stereotypes, but it can also break them in the process of activism for social justice and gender equality.

Research Methodology

This study is a qualitative study that adopts the Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis (FCDA). The aim is to analyze how the concept of honour is misused" as a pretext for violence against women in Nafisa Shah's *Honor Unmasked* (2017). FCDA offers the analytic lenses through which to read the language of the novel that mirrors and at last contributes to the institution's behalf those elided. Through textual and discourse analysis, the study analyzes the ways that female characters are described in terms of behaviors normalized, as well as the language ideologies that position honor within women's subordination. Using the textual analysis, selected words and sentences, along with tone and narrative voice, are examined to illustrate how the oppression of honor is performed and perpetuated.

All data is directly sourced from 'Honor Unmasked' (2017). The quoted excerpts, dialogues, and monologues that illustrate the honor crime, gender violence, and subordination of women are chosen for scrutiny. In the analysis, both linguistic (keywords, syntax, lexicogrammatical features) and narrative items (tone, perspective, and style). It further places the novel within a broader socio-political context and shows that patriarchal discourses are not merely devices of literature but mirrors of societal and cultural systems themselves.

The collection of data is based on purposive sampling. Only the parts directly related to the main research question are selected, especially those that illustrate how honor is used to legitimize violence. The sampling shows how female identity is shaped, how the establishment of a patriarchal system is depicted and linked to 'honour' and, through that, violence. It analyzes line by line. First, in terms of text analysis, it facilitates the exploration of lexical/relational modality and grammatical patterns: expressing passive or active voice in relation to women. Narrative analysis iteratively considers the impact that perspective and tone have on women as victims, survivors, or agents. Finally, contextual review establishes the links between these patterns and larger cultural or political frameworks, being concerned with the question of whether the novel poses a challenge to or an acceptance of patriarchal ideologies.

While this is a qualitative study, quantitative data are occasionally offered to expose the prevalence of particular linguistic or narrative patterns. Honor and shame terms are quantified in relation to violence-related terms to identify relative frequency and emphasis. Examples of patriarchal language, power-imbued sentence structure, and representations of women as passive or active are detected to establish a pattern. This mix of qualitative and restricted quantitative methods serves to form a clearer discursive account of how honor-based violence is constructed.

The analysis is situated in (the framework of) Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis à la Lazar (2005), being concerned with power and inequality in language. It also draws upon Kandiyohi's (1988) analysis of patriarchal bargains to explain how women sometimes navigate their oppression by dealing with tradeoffs that quite often end up strengthening male dominance. Gill and Brah's (2014) cultural narratives of honor offer a wider cultural explanation, while Sen's (2006) identity and violence explain how untenable gendered identities exacerbate social conflict. These theories, in conjunction, help interpret how Shah's text presents violence, power, and gender.

The linguistic and social variables were analyzed. Language variables are the words used, the type of

sentences, and the relationships at a linguistic level. Narrative aspects, such as tone, subjectivity, and the portrayal of (female) character(s), are obvious. Material and social cultural factors mirror the patriarchal thinking and the script on how to reproduce violence in matters of honour. Ideological variables explore how notions of honour and shame inform women's identities in the text. The study is situated in a critical paradigm, which challenges socially constructed realities and patriarchal discourse, and adopts an interpretive paradigm to view the text from the perspective of subjective meanings. The primary question focuses on how the language is used to depict honor crimes against females. Sub-questions focus on the ways that women are constructed in the context of honor crimes and how patriarchal narratives are formulated and sustained in the novel.

This study has its constraints. It is, however, only one novel and does not reflect the entirety of all cultural concepts about honor-based violence. The analysis is also interpretive and relies on the reader's interpretation, considering textual rather than larger historical or political realities. It is further limited by considering only passages that clearly speak to the relation between honor, violence, and women's subordination. That's great for relevancy, but it doesn't carry everything else that occurs in the book. In general, the study intends to demonstrate how *Honor Unmasked* engages in producing and reproducing sociocultural perceptions about honor victims. By examining diction, story mode, and context, it exposes an unfolding as well as a challenge to patriarchal assumptions. Reading the novel through feminist theory, the study proves how discourse contributes to legitimizing HBV and determining both voices for and silencing of women.

Data Analysis

Part I: Analyzing case studies from the perspective of Fairclough's 3D Model.

[A] Case of Tahmina and Abida: First Information Report (FIR) – Complainant Fazal Din

"I, Fazal Din son of Abdul Ghafoor Bhutto resident of Jano village, say on oath that approximately six to seven months ago, I along with one of my brothers

Hidayatullah and uncle, Dad Mohammad, approximately between 1 and 1:30 a.m. in the night, were passing by the graveyards near the village, when we saw that on the way, some people fired at my sister Tahmina, and cousin Abida and killed them.”

Textual Analysis

The excerpt reflects an organized and formal account that covers the use of language, patterns of discourse, and that of power. Textually, the statement maintains the past simple tense (were passing, saw, fired, killed), to cement the event in the past and to create an impression of fixed, factual certainty. This tense choice suggests that this atrocity is a past fact, done with, and cannot be argued with. The register of the text is highly formal, impersonal, and non-expressive, consistent with the institutional requirement for objectivity, credibility, etc. of masculine testimony. There is no visible sign of an emotional effect, empathy, or sense of loss after the death of their close female relatives. It is not merely stylistic but operates ideologically in the articulation of the detachment of the male speaker from female suffering in honor-based violence.

Pronoun usage is highly significant in the formation of inclusion and exclusion in the speech. The use of first-person pronouns prevails, i.e., the use of I and we, which puts the speaker and his male relatives (his brother and uncle) in the middle of the story. Such pronouns demonstrate the territory of the story and the authenticity of the narrator as a witness. The female victims, in their turn, are never referred to as individuals, but only in relation, as my sister, Cousin Abida, etc. They only serve their roles as extensions of the patriarchal narrator; they are, therefore, deprived of subjectivity and turned into passive characters of the narration. It consists of a complex compound-complex structure and a complex sentence composed of five clauses that are embedded within it. This syntactic choice is a duplicate of the protracted and exact daisy-chaining of events that would be employed in a legal or institutional utterance in order to provide the speaker with the authority on his side of the story. The mechanics of this place not only allow the male speaker to occupy

the narrative space and monopolize all of the desk space, but also cram the description of violence into a tiny section of the conclusion as almost an afterword. The sentence is modal-free in all respects. There are also no modal verbs like might, could, or must to indicate the possibility, necessity, or obligation. This absence gives an air of unprofessional certitude to the awkward portraits, as though nothing of what had occurred was too easy to get or possessed any emotional coloring. This declaration appears to be complete and final and makes the speaker more powerful as an expert source of knowledge. This note of assurance, however, is also used to seal off any critical analysis of the context in which the act occurred: of the identity of the shooters, of the cause of the killing, of the broader forces operating in the society. More importantly, we are not told who the perpetrators are since they are under wraps of the impersonal some people, which is a phrase deliberately empty of content. This non-specified noun clause is a discursive gate against accountability, guarding the family or community pride that would otherwise have been destroyed had the culprits been identified, especially when they belong to the same bloodline. These words are purged of emotive or descriptive words, which contribute to the sense of detachment as well.

Discursive Practices

On the level of discursive practice, the circulation of this statement is likely embedded within a legal or institutional context: a police report, a court affidavit, an investigative hearing. It mirrors a system where male guardians are supposed—and allowed—to speak on behalf of female family members, even where there has been gendered violence. The norm shows how institutional designs and social attitudes combine in a project of enabling voice for men and disabling that voice for women. The audience for this discourse is likewise gendered: it is addressed to judges, police officers, jirga members, etc. — roles that are filled, more often than not, by men, and men who are part of the same social systems that are patriarchal. These institutional audiences are trained to read such official testimony as trustworthy, in part because it follows

legal language rules and in part because it esteems the performance of masculine reason. Yet such sentences have an omnipresent silence about them, what goes unspoken in the telling as significant as what is spoken. For the missing tones of women's voices, the missing lives or intents, they hide the thoughts of their victims, erase them from the scene, and in such silence point to a system which systematically silences not only women's existence but what counts as talk, whose talk is authoritative or legitimate, and how such talk is read.

Social Practices

On the level of social doings, such a statement underlines the general ideologies and power relations as inscribed in honor-based violence discourse. Within numerous patriarchal societies, female agency is stunted, and women's lives and deaths are narrated through the culture of male honor, shame, and protection. The male speaker in this tale not only takes over the narrative room of the tale, but also interprets female reality, even beyond death. His factual, emotionless tone reflects the social expectations for men in the family to remain stoically in authority (and certainly not become vulnerable) when speaking about issues of family honor and violence. The ambiguity in relation to the shooters and the absence of any emotive material about the victims indicates a rhetorical tactic of distancing in which the violent event is accepted as fact but is not linked to culpability. This is consistent with the sociology of honor-based violence, whereby the defense of male honor and social cohesion supersedes truth, justice, and empathy for their female victims.

Fairclough's model allows us to see that this is not simply a legal statement, but a social act, grounded in the wider structure of gendered power. The textual parameters – tense, tone, pronoun choices, modality, and most simply, structure – they do not just serve a story-function but replicate a world view in which male authority is absolute, and women's subjectivity is, quite literally, a blank page. Using the combined perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis and Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis, the quotation indicates how language naturalizes inequality, how

discourse legitimizes silence, and how institutions depend on certain discursive scripts that favor 'men' as the narrators and mute 'women's suffering textually. This is what Fairclough's model methodologically seeks, but, critically, needs to do when we take account of the highly ideological nature of such everyday texts in gendered situations.

Analyzing the Text from the Perspective of Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis

The text hides patriarchal discourse that may be represented in an application of CDA that is feminist in its orientation. The speaker himself is under a male genealogy and geography – his father, his village, his brother, his uncle—before he names the women who were killed. This sets up a system of presence in which male authority, kinship, and place are clearly focused, and the female characters are only lightly sketched, and only in relation to their status as victims. The women appear not as felt human entities with pasts, emotions, or agency, but as suffering victims, passive defenders of their expanding tent-like bodies—even their selfhood is nullified to fit into their nominal family roles with respect to the male speaker. This rhetoric reproduces the patriarchal line that women's worth and visibility is most closely tied to their relationship to men.

In the context of feminist discourse analysis, a very crucial site is control over representation—who speaks or not, whose voices are heard or muted. In this testimony, women are silenced, both literally and symbolically. They are not there as speakers but as what is spoken of; this mentions itself momentarily, at the end of a protracted, male-centered account. Nothing whatsoever of their doings, their sufferings, or their possible revolt is related, adding to the growing notion that women don't count when we publish the news of what is done to them. The act of violence is impersonally couched in the generalized expression "some people fired," which effaces agency and draws a veil over the social dynamics that tend to inform such acts of honor-based violence. Such anonymization of the perpetrators is not coincidental; it functions discursively [p. 353] to veil male complicity, particularly within the cultural zone in

which this type of violence may be perpetrated, or condoned, by male family members in the name of honor. So, no one is being held to account and the language is being actively used to maintain the gendered status quo.

A feminist interpretation further accounts for the discursive establishment of norms of emotionality, morality, and rationality. The poet maintains an entirely dispassionate stance; he describes his own female relatives being murdered in cold blood, and he shows no signs of anguish or indignation. Such emotional distance is not restricted to the institution's discourse, but it is also the sign of masculine self-control in patriarchal societies, which does not encourage the expression of empathy for women, especially in cases that are perceived as being of honor. Absence of shame or moral approbation of the killing of women is an element of the task of making them okay and imitating non-concern with them, not a fake non-concern, but a reflection of non-societal complicity. The calmness of the emotion is hardly neutral; it is very ideological, hiding the horror as well as repeating the dominant scripts regarding the male dominance and expendability of females. Otherwise, feminist CDA brings out the internal power relations of the witnessing. The speaker does not actually discuss an event so much as it claims its entitlement to decide what actually transpired, how it will be interpreted, and what to remember. The women do not have names in the line that defines them based on their deaths. It has no backstory to the identity of who they were, what they desired, or what they could have experienced prior to their being killed. It is a discursive action of foreclosure of complexity, which attempts to dehumanize the female subjects, and to support the cultural belief that their deaths are matters of unfortunate necessity rather than moral crisis. The narrative structure, in fact, is used to legitimate the women's life stories as well as legitimate the male interpretation. And further still, the details of place and time, the cemetery, the hour after midnight, the small road, are gears in a larger patriarchal story in which women are somehow thought to have crossed the boundaries of social acceptability by simply being out and about in the world or the marginal areas at specific times. Though it does not explicitly victim-

blame, the implication here is that these women were literally in the wrong place at the wrong time (heard so many times in cultures with strictly regulated and strictly high-police women's movements). (The very act of witnessing is laid out in a way that the speaker and his male entourage are exempted from any blame or complicity in the violence). They are, however, posed as bystanders in the story in which they play a central part. This framing complies with the notion that men are protectors and bystanders and are not engaged in the structures that support the violence.

All of this is to say, in a single utterance, the preceding issues come to represent many of the concerns at the heart of feminist CDA: the disappearance of female subjectivity, the replicating of male power through discourse, the naturalized form of violence against women, and the structural downtime of women, even in the telling of their dying process. What seems like a simple testimony is actually a greatly gendered and ideological narration of and for patriarchal domination. FCDA shows how language operates not only to represent the world but to create it—to naturalize hierarchies of gender, to render violence imperceptible, and to support cultural norms where the authority of men over women's bodies, voices, and stories goes largely without question.

Analyzing case studies from the perspective of Fairclough's 3D Model

[B] Court Testimony – Fazal Din (later statement)

“I never named anyone. I do not know who did this.”

This analysis is divided into Fairclough's three levels – text (description), discursive practice (interpretation), and social practice (explanation) – formatted as a paragraph text, concentrating on tense, modality, voice, and grammar as specified by the model.

Textual Analysis

The phrase “I never named anybody. I don't know who did this” is two brief, declarative sentences in the simple present tense and present perfect tense (via “never named”). The first-person singular pronouns

("I") endow the speaker with the protagonist role in the game of discourse and further stress the involvement of a given speaker both in denial of knowledge or responsibility. The tone is defensive and blunt, created through negative structures ("never," "do not know"), and it serves to forge a distinction between the speaker and the naming or accusing process. This negative formulation puts some interpretive moral distance between the speaker and their act of description (in this case, a violent crime) while asserting a degree of objectivity or neutrality. I do not know who did that. In the example above, "I do not know who did that"— uses low-epistemic modality, that is, it signals a lack of certainty or lack of knowledge. It is the verb "know" that is negated and, as such, language-wise creates ignorance, whether true or only a device, and thereby a zone outside that of responsibility or duty for the speaker.

Discursive Practices

From a discursive practice view, this statement may be seen as an instance of the wider practice of denial talk that occurs in legal accounts or witness statements, or public interviews where individuals are trying to downplay their participation and/or responsibility. The speaker is probably speaking within an institutional context in which speech is regulated by legal or social sanctions, so the language is protective but also tactical. In stating "I never named anyone," the speaker is not only refusing to acknowledge (or is inadvertently renouncing) complicity but is also suggesting that those who did suffer consequences for such naming cannot have these attributed to them. At the same time, the phrase "I do not know who did this" removes the speaker from the sphere of knowledge and decision, diminishing his or her discursive agency at a time when legal or social systems may well require a precise identification of guilt or responsibility. This discursive positioning can function to prevent any further investigation or shield others who are complicit in some way.

Social Practices

At the level of social practice, this discourse mirrors

wider cultural and structural ideas about honor, protection, and silence – especially in patriarchal societies in which speaking truthfully may jeopardize family loyalty or community solidarity. The unwillingness to name or claim knowledge can be interpreted as part of a culture of bashful quiet, especially because naming the person responsible for a crime, particularly in honor crime contexts, could lead to shame, revenge, or loss of male authority. This silence is not neutral, but is socially constructed and ideologically driven. In gendered contexts, such as those involving so-called honor, this narrative also represents the common practice of hiding the truth so as to maintain male control or the reputation of the family. As I demonstrate in the analysis, therefore, the discursive construction of the statement, although it takes the guise of plain language, is nevertheless embedded in a nexus of power relations, gender expectations, and accountability practices – and it is precisely this interdisciplinary reflexive analysis that Fairclough's approach allows for, making it possible to map the mapping of linguistics to institution and ideology.

Analyzing the Text from the Perspective of Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis

The analysis of this article is based on the basic tenets of Feminist CDA as articulated mainly by Michelle Lazar (2005) with reference to power, agency, gendered silencing, denial, and evasion in patriarchal discourse. Its argument is presented in a single coherent paragraph.

"I haven't called anybody anything. I do not know who did this" serves here in my reading as a discursive form of distancing, denial, and deflection that, when embedded within patriarchal structures, does the work of protecting male-dominant systems from revelation or retribution, particularly when violence toward women is in question." With first-person pronouns speaker contends personal innocence and involuntariness in problem. The discourse is neutral on the surface, but in the field of feminist-critical discourse analysis, such statements are read as a technology of power in gender-based violence, a means of maintaining systems of silence

and impunity. In situations such as this, where the perpetrators would so frequently be family members or acquaintances from the Patriarchy (patriarchal network), it is no act of innocence to remain silent, not to name anyone; disclaim knowledge of the perpetrator. Rather, it is directly implicated in language, not for truth or justice, but for repression, for the hiding of the patriarchal system, even for the silencing of women.

This silence is not only personal but institutional. The speaker can't (or won't) name or know, a product of a larger social imperative-- that maintaining family honor, male control, or tribal unity is valued more than confronting gendered violence. In FCDA, these remarks are performances of loyalty, both gendered, where men with access to structural gender privilege lay claim to its effects by actively discounting women's realities. All this negation repetition has the effect, I think, of basically forcing the self-help as passive: of locating the self as where someone put a rock or a concrete block over top of, from which the self is then extracting itself (or not, since it's a passive thing). This unacknowledgement has the function of silencing not only the speaker's possible guilt, but also an entire history that might have come into existence as a result of an honest naming of the perpetrator. In the process, the discourse perpetuates the general trend in which women's suffering is either linguistically mitigated or made to vanish, and male speech remains the major mechanism by which events are interpreted, narrated, and judged.

In addition, feminist CDA would point to the ways in which this language once again supports the subaltern positioning of women. Though unmentioned in the statement, the victims themselves discursively disappeared, and that in itself is significant. And their erasure communicates that violence against them doesn't merit a voice or a name, of the victim or the assailant. It lays bare how silence has a gender, and how the refusal to talk is a manly prerogative, increasingly defended by institutional and cultural norms. Ultimately, this short yet forceful statement is illustrative of how male speech, couched as it may be in terms of neutrality or ignorance,

continues to operate in support of patriarchal forms of oppression, as well as the denial of female agency, and the manner in which it obscures the actualities of gendered violence. FCDA opens up, therefore, how mundane speech is part of the discursive reproduction of inequality, and how silence is, in its own right, a political and gendered choice embedded in power.

Analyzing case studies from the perspective of Fairclough's 3D Model

[C] Judgment – Lower Court Final Remarks

“All the principal witnesses saw the present accused in the court and categorically stated that they had not killed the girls. Even though the site of the offense, the recoveries of blood-stained earth, empties, clothes of deceased girls, and the testimony of the doctors clearly proved that the two girls were murdered, the ocular set of witnesses gave a complete go-by to the prosecution's case.”

Textual Analysis

Such a (longer) paragraph is a continuous text; paragraphs assume (being) contexts are texts. This study analyses linguistic features of continuous text (syntactic, imperative, and indicative forms), production of discourse as well as social practice (ideologies, power), running these elements through the paragraph.

Text The text is drawn up in a formal, legal-institutional register and is characterized by a high level of evaluative stance-taking and moral certainty, which is important in the construction of how the events are represented. It starts with an overview of trial testimony by the key witnesses, all of whom, it says, “categorically testified” that the defendant was not the murderer. The adverb “categorically” heightens the denial of the witnesses, giving it weights and a sense of firmness and at the same time casting a veiled suspicion that with some weird, unnatural uniformity they have been drilled to do that. The past simple tense (“saw,” “stated,” “proved,” “gave”) tells the story of the discrete steps in a court case that have already taken place. The tonal turn now happens with “even though” which sets up the narrator's contrastive judgment. The structure of this

passage implies that we have to doubt the reliability of the witness as opposed to “irrefutable [visual and medical] evidence which ‘plainly showed’ the murder”. The term “clearly proved” is high on epistemic modality, signifying the surety and confident recognition of the commission of the crime as against the fallible human testimony. The expression ‘gave complete go-by’ is colloquial, but evaluative, indicative of a strong disapproval only of the witnesses’ ignored-away (brushed aside) of the prosecution’s story.

Discursive Practices

From the discursive-practice point of view, the sentence is probably taken from a court ruling, a police statement, or a legal analysis, where the writer (presumably, a judge or a detective) is summarizing the inconsistency between forensic medicine and witness testimony. This discourse, although prescribed legally, and while qualified, actually employs evaluative language to communicate the author’s (non-neutral and critical— vis-à-vis the witnesses, implicitly favoring the prosecution) position. The conversation is formed around the requirements of institutions like the law, where evidence must be metered and narrativized, and credibility distributed. The author’s abstract is addressed to a legal public — lawyers, judges, or perhaps the public, who are supposed to understand the story, as the story we should privilege if the oral testimony evidence discrepancies, according to a forensic truth hierarchy. It’s an institutional power trip to claim the authority to make such judgments and a narrative power play to lead the audience to be suspicious about the witnesses and the crime line, to scream, this is obstruction of justice!

Social Practices

On the level of social practice, the text is complicit with a larger ideological complex of institutional truth-making in which some modes of evidence (medical, material, physical) are valorized above others (human, affective, oral)—particularly when the latter appear inconsistent with or driven by familial or social compulsion. In every honor-related crime, witness

silence, recantation, and the substitution of lies for the truth are seen as part of the problem, based on fear, loyalty, or compulsion associated with patriarchal power balances. This declaration indirectly mirrors the process through which the structural silencing of gendered violence is produced via unofficial complicity, community silence, or judicial red tape. Although the girls are referred only in passive constructs (“clothes of deceased girls”), the “murder ... of them is ‘clearly proved’,” however, justice is not served — disclosing a discursive strain between truth and testimony that Fairclough’s model can help lay bare. This disjunction is not just a matter of practices but a discursive symptom of the power relations that the practice reveals: the practices of legal reporting, which tell of failure whilst remaining conditioned within the same patriarchal and institutional ideologies that result in such failures.

Analyzing the Text from the Perspective of Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis

The text is an excellent example of a highly gendered discursive practice whereby the twofold killing of the girls is acknowledged and condemned by the law. The language instantly puts the female victims into the background of the plot. They have no names, identities, or subjectivities, with no names impersonally referred to as the girls, then the deceased girls. Such anonymization and objectification of women is suggestive of a broader patriarchal discursive tendency, where women, especially the victims of honor-based crime, are depersonalized as victims who are victims of violence, and passive subjects upon which men-based developmental and legal practices converge. They do not speak or act in this sentence, but as inhabitants of it, as remnants, clothes of dead girls, blood-streaked soil, not as voices and souls.

Feminist CDA demonstrates the way in which silence can be an element of an institutionalized order, and discourse can facilitate collaboration in the violence against women. In this case, the witnesses categorically testified that the appellant was not the killer in cases of murder against the backdrop of strong material and medical evidence. What is important

here is the adverb categorically, as it does not just show the strength of the refusal, but to some degree suggests a premeditated or staged attempt against the truth. FCDA interprets them as linguistic –and hence social and ideological– denials to narrate, thereby emphasizing the power of patriarchal loyalty and domination. Such witnesses can be male relatives or community members who maintain honor codes and whose inability to testify cannot be seen as a failure of memory; it is a failure of gendered protectionism: Defending male Predators despite female Victims.

The saying, they gave full go-by to the prosecution case, demonstrates the legal version of frustration, but it may also be considered a feminist cry of frustration upon the systemic hindrance women face on their way to justice. In the sentence, the as if is interpreted by FCDA as an active disparagement of the institutions trying to prosecute: a way of devaluing female victimhood discursively by way of complicit institutional protectiveness. Although the sentence does not deny that the two girls were murdered, the aftermath following the recognition is what I would term a structural erasure, that is, a vacuum between recognizing violence and actually taking some action to stop it.

Feminist CDA pays significant attention to these gaps in which institutional discourse is aware of harm but grants impunity. Also, the passive voice of the two girls who were murdered is linguistically relevant. It generates a smokescreen for the agent, so that the actual culprits do not get attention. This chat caution resembles a discourse erasure tradition taking male violence, which is one of the key feminist areas of analysis. Through concentrating on what was heard and not heard from those who testified, and what the doctors and evidence demonstrated, the talk dismisses the moral and political imperative of the girls' killing and refashions the wrong as a technical failure to synchronize law instead of as an example of gendered power and patriarchal control.

Finally, they argue that this text, as seen through a feminist critical discourse lens, exemplifies the capacity of institutions to name and deny gendered violence. The murdered girls exist in discourse as traces, as shells, not as subjects. The denial of

witnesses, articulated in abstract legal language, is a discursive strategy of patriarchal allegiance, and the acceptance without consummation of murder is a reminder of the mute disposition of women in and beyond death. Feminist CDA demonstrates, therefore, how such language, apparently procedural and factual, is deeply ideological, working to perpetuate systems of gendered inequality under the cover of impartial legal neutrality.

[D] Postmortem Report – Official Medical Examiner

“The dead body was female, young, aged about 17 years, foul smelling, average built, lying in left lateral position, head towards west and legs towards east, face was depressed on left side, tongue was pushed in between teeth, hair and nails were loose and easily pulled out, features were not very clear but visible, body was swollen. The dead body was taken out wearing one kameez of pink color, one shalwar of pink color, one dupatta of pink color, one white burqa, one pair of earrings, and one pair of black chappals. All clothes were wet and contained mud.”

Analyzing Case Studies from the Perspective of Fairclough's 3D Model

Textual Analysis

This paragraph is a very narrative, clinical style reminiscent of forensic or medico-legals about it. The whole story is in the past simple tense (“was,” “were,” “contained”), indicating an action that is finished — in this case, an act of observing and recording a dead body. The mood is also neutral, impersonal, and technical, without an affective index. This accords with the institutional requirement of objectivity in medico-legal 'talk' but also serves as a contribution to the discursive dehumanization of the object. The noun phrase “the dead body” is reiterated, not replaced by a pronoun like “she,” distancing from and objectifying the referent. There is never a personalization of the subject; although the sex and approximate age of the deceased is specified, the text never endows her or him with a proper name or story. These syntax features long, itemized lists of physical attributes and articles of clothing that direct attention

to the visible surface of the body, but not to the violent social conditions that were the cause of death. This manner of reporting enhances the leery, impersonal way in which material is observed in institutional discourses such as autopsies or police reports.

The lexicon sustains this medical-institutional register. “Sour (foul) smell,” “tongue retracted,” “features ‘not very clear,’” and “hair and nails loose” are expressions without evaluation and without affect. The modality is entirely missing – there are no modals for probability, uncertainty, and necessity. Remember everything is in the form of the directly reportable absolute observable here, which gives the text its epistemic authority but also switches off the emotionality or moral bearing in the death. The cataloguing-like, detailed color and layering of these clothes “one kameez of pink color,” “white burqa,” “one pair of black chappals,” etc. accelerates this scenery. Not that their textual presence as inventory lacks meaningful social and symbolic, but they are items not read for such and are never interpreted as more than they “factually” are.

Discursive Practices

On the level of discursive practice, the extract is believed to be an excerpt from a medico-legal or forensic report prepared for a court. It adheres to genre conventions in which neutrality, straightforwardness, and clinical fidelity are prized. The manufacture of the discourse is influenced by legal and medical norms that discourage individual subjectivity. But these practices also perpetuate a mode of institutional disconnection where violence can be captured without having to be morally or socially reconsidered. The audience for this kind of speech includes judges, lawyers, doctors, cops readers who learn to read these things as evidence rather than experience. Reading the text in this way privileges the literal observation of fact over context. So, the cultural and gendered implications of the discovery of a young, 17-year-old girl’s battered body are unchallenged by the text itself and can only be engaged with through an extra-textual reading.

Social Practices

At the level of social practice, the discourse mirrors the

overarching ideological formations in which the female body is made a site of objectification, control, and erasure. The description is ostensibly detached, but the distortion of her physical details, copied verbatim from a press release, devoid of any human context, reflects the dehumanizing culture and apparatus of the state and media, towards female victims of crime. Indeed, in patriarchal contexts where gendered violence is normalized (such as Guatemala and Mexico), such medical-legal language actually entrenches a logic of bureaucratic neutrality (the 12-year-old body opens, is measured, is described, is archived) rather than naming the crime, the social continuum, the systems that have produced the deadly girl. The absence of agency manifests itself not just in the girl’s death, but in what little we know or rather, are not allowed to know about her through institutional discourse. Fairclough’s model thus allows us to recognize that apparently neutral textual items are firmly embedded in social discourses that condition whose lives count and through which linguistic practices violence is made/visible and/legible.

Analyzing the Text from the Perspective of Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis

Reading through the lens of Feminist CDS, this statement is a chilling inscription of gendered dehumanization, institutional silencing, and erasure of female subjectivity. Prima facie, it seems to be a medico-legal observation intended to describe the physical condition of the dead in clinical terms. But FCDA wants to go further and interrogate how such seemingly neutral language also implicitly supports and reinforces patriarchal power relations. The girl is spoken of in language that reduces her completely to a lifeless thing: she is never referred to with the pronoun “she.” This discursive, repetitive objectification works to unmake the young girl deceased even in death erasing her subjectivity, humanness, and history.

The extensive description of the decomposition of the body stinky, puffy, face illegible, tongue forced, hair and nails loose is an example of how institutions value the female body as forensically useful while at

the same time, utterly meaningless. She experiences no emotional or moral awakening on account of being a woman, no pondering of the violence that she would have once encountered to become so insensate. This clinical detachment may seem neutral, but in a feminist discourse analysis, it can be seen to be an ideological act, still most powerfully representing a culture in which women's pain is archived but seldom respected, framed, or addressed. The girl's age "about 17 years" is included solely to denote developmental status, not to dwell on the tragedy or vulnerability of her death. In patriarchal institutions, this is the kind of language that works to launder horror and institutionalize gendered violence, so that it may only be unleashed like the humble water fountain, discreetly, by appointment.

Then too, the itemized description of her attire "one kameez of pink color....one white burqa.... earrings...." is distinctive not only for its detail, but for how it seems to imbue the demands of bearing witness with specific gendered, cultural values. The pink and clothing, accessories, and burqa cues emphasize that the victim was socially classified as an acceptable, traditionally female the-burqa-cues girl with a likely adherence to a gender-role stereotype as restraint and honor. Yet bizarrely, this expression of feminine virtue would even fail to protect her from violence. But the script doesn't make an appeal to this contradiction it just mentions the things in the evidence box, dislocated from their social significance. FCDA regards this as part of the discursive silencing of stories of gendered violence: the machine that watches but doesn't ask, writes but doesn't reply.

But more important than the act itself is the utter erasure of the girl's voice her name, history, or emotional record in yet another instance where patriarchal institutions diminish women and girls not only during life, but also after death. In life, such girls are frequently made silent; in death, they are made evidentiary. Feminist CDA would also question who may speak in it and who gains from the distancing. The masculine law-and-order discourse holds power by generating this sort of speech — speech that projects knowledge and lacks compassion, that documents rather than accepting responsibility for

harm. In so doing, the violence itself is shrouded in linguistic habit, and the victim transformed into a statistic, on a map, and out of sight.

Conclusion

The current research illustrated how language and discourse are crucial to the construction and maintenance of patriarchal structures in the area of honor-based violence. Based on the Adjudication Model (e.g., Wodak 2007), using FCDA as described above, a detailed analysis of Nafisa Shah's *Honor Unmasked* (2017) reveals how such honor is perverted to provide justification for violence against women. Linguistic patterns, narrative decisions, and omissions in the text reveal that women are often portrayed as powerless victims who lack a voice and whose identity is contingent upon men.

Meanwhile, the study demonstrates that discourse does not merely reflect reality; it strives to create and recreate gender and power ideologies. The law language being neutral, the silencing of women, and lastly, the natural power of the male, obviously, in patriarchal culture, assume the civil honor to be integrated within the society and culture. This paper took the route through the narrative structure and contextual meaning, in which the use of concepts such as honor and shame, points of view, and grammar as clues has shown that male-centric bias has been reproduced without any objections.

But FCDA assists us in determining where the spaces of resistance are. And dismantling these practices of language is a practice that subverts the institutions of honor-based violence. Placing the novel by Shah in the context of the feminist theory and relying on the work of other researchers, including Lazar (2005), Kandiyohi (1988), Gill and Brah (2014), Sen (2006) among others, the paper, therefore, focuses on the role of discourse criticality in disrupting dominant discursive formations with a view to creating the conditions of transformation.

As much as conclusions are made based on a single reading and cannot explain the honor-based violence with such an overwhelming complexity of culture, the research does do much in explaining how language perpetuates oppression. What it proves is

that language can never be neutral: It either contributes to making silence a legitimate thing or to showing injustices. This, in conclusion, has drawn us to the conclusion with which we started, as language, gender, and power are not an academic exercise but a feminist intervention. It is this form of scrutiny that enables us to talk of the way in which violence becomes justified, subjectivities are forgotten, and how the discourse can be reconstituted so as to produce a world that is eager towards equality and justice.

References

- Baker, P., Gabrielites, C., Khosravi Nik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). *A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press*. *Discourse & Society*, 19(3), 273–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508088962>
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Bell, A. (1991). *The language of news media*. Blackwell.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Cheryan, S., Master, A., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2017). Cultural stereotypes as gatekeepers: Increasing girls' interest in computer science and engineering by diversifying stereotypes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 49. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00049>
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748610839?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Collins, R. L. (2011). Content analysis of gender roles in media: Where are we now and where should we go? *Sex Roles*, 64(3–4), 290–298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9929-5>
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Polity.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139–167. <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1052&context=ucf>
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Eccles, J. S. (2011). Gendered educational and occupational choices: Applying the Eccles et al. model of achievement-related choices. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35(3), 195–201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025411398185>
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. Routledge.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Gill, A. K. (2010). 'Honour' killings and the quest for justice in black and minority ethnic communities in the UK. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 81(1), 1819. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403408329604?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Gill, A. K., & Brah, A. (2014). Interrogating cultural narratives about 'honour'-based violence. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 21(1), 72–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506813510424>
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Kandiyohi, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, 2(3), 274–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124388002003004>
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Kapur, R. (2002). The tragedy of victimization rhetoric: Resurrecting the "native" subject in international/post-colonial feminist legal politics. *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, 15, 1–38.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Khan, S. (2014). *Shame and honor: The violence of gendered norms under Pakistan's Hudood Ordinances*. In S. Abbas (Ed.), *Pakistan's counterterrorism challenge* (pp. 189–210). Georgetown University Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Lazar, M. M. (2005). Politicizing gender in discourse: Feminist critical discourse analysis as political perspective and praxis. In M. M. Lazar (Ed.), *Feminist*

- critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse (pp. 1–28). Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230599901_1
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence: The illusion of destiny*. W. W. Norton & Company.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Shah, N. (2015). The uses and abuses of honor: Honor-based violence, gender, and the state in Pakistan. *Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication*, 8(2–3), 219–241.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Shah, N. (2017). *Honor unmasked: Gender violence, law, and power in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Simpson, R. (2005). Men in non-traditional occupations: Career entry, career orientation, and experience of role strain. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 12(4), 363–380. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2005.00278.x>
[Google Scholar](#), [Worldcat](#) , [Fulltext](#)
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
[Google Scholar](#), [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- van Dijk, T. A., Ting-Toomey, S., Smitherman, G., & Troutman, D. (2008). *Discourse and diversity: Language in context*. Sage.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125–151.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243287001002002>
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Wodak, R. (2001). *The discourse-historical approach*. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63–94). Sage.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Wodak, R. (2007). Pragmatics and critical discourse analysis: A cross-disciplinary inquiry. *Pragmatics*, 17(2), 207–209.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.15.1.13wod>
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage.
https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020.d4?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
[Google Scholar](#) [Worldcat](#) [Fulltext](#)