Polarized Discourse in Revive Your Heart: A Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective

Rida Fatima [1]

Abstract

Revive Your Heart by, Nouman Ali Khan is studied within the critical discourse analysis (CDA) frame for the analysis of polarized discourse of the book. Making use of Van Dijk's Ideological Square Model (2006), the research explores how polarization is incorporated in the discourse, especially via positive-self characterization, negative-other characterization. The data highlights the way in which Khan's discourse embodies ideological polarization as encouraging 'us vs them' type narratives that are familiar in religious and statewide discourse. Khan's discourse does not only breed belonging through group identity but also certifies definite religious and cultural code of conduct, which may impact upward social interaction in multicultural context. This aspect really presents the necessity for critical literacy in religious and ideological writings as to allow individuals with more analytical readings of the texts and prevent the risky misunderstandings leading to schism. The study makes a contribution to the expanding field of discourse analysis by identifying the language use as a shaping force of an ideological divide. This research also examines the larger sociopolitical effects of polarized discourse, particularly in influencing views of religious and cultural identity.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, Ideology, Nouman Ali Khan, Polarization, Revive Your Heart, Van Dijk's Ideological Square Model

1. Introduction

Polarization, a vital issue in everyday discourse, creates analysis reflecting ideological split terms between parties (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Language not only carries meaning but social reality as well, the meanings it delivers through producing social realities, constructing perceptions of identity, power and belonging (Fairclough, 1995). Polarization in discourse comes through discourse formation strategies that build up an

---

[1]English Language Instructor, Govt. Boys High School Padder Syedian, Bagh

'us against them' narrative and strengthen group identity by way of excluding others (Van Dijk, 2006).

Language is a potent instrument for social construction as much as it is a means of communication. It shapes ideas of exclusion, belonging, and identity (Fairclough, 1995). Often splitting individuals into rival groups depending on religious, political, or social ideas, language in ideological discourse is a tool for building power relations (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Particularly religious discourse is a strong tool for strengthening ideological rifts. It offers moral frameworks that classify people into categories of righteousness and deviance (Richardson, 2004). Religious language's dualism emphasizes group identity and paints outsiders as ideological enemies. Religious discourse is steeped in the idea of ideological division, which promotes exclusion and conflict (Van Dijk, 2006).

In this paper, the author analyzes the discourse in Revive Your Heart by Nouman Ali Khan, a contemporary issues-oriented book aimed at the Muslim community. Religious discourse especially in Islamic settings, has shown to-be particularly powerful instrument in shaping attitudes and promoting group solidarity (Baker et al., 2013). This study applies Van Dijk's (2006) Ideological Square Model to explore how Khan generates a polarized discourse through the positive characterization of in-group (Muslims) and the negative portrayal of out-group (non-Muslims or opposition voices). This conforms to previous studies showing the reliance of religious language on moral dualism in stating difference between righteousness and deviance (Richardson, 2004).

Research Objectives
1. To employ polarized discourse in *Revive Your Heart* employ?
2. To contribute the linguistic strategies to the 'us vs. them' narrative?
3. To analyze this polarization through Van Dijk's Ideological Square Model?
4. To describe the implications of ideological polarization in religious discourse?

Research Questions
1. How does *Revive Your Heart* employ polarized discourse?
2. What linguistic strategies contribute to the 'us vs. them' narrative?

3. How does Van Dijk's Ideological Square Model help analyze this polarization?
4. What are the broader implications of ideological polarization in religious discourse?

Through the CDA analysis of the text, this study aims to expose the ideational constructions which are reflections of ideological parameters of ideologically savvy and polarized discourse and its impact towards the reader and the society in general. It may even reveal as to how religious narratives form attitudes to society and interculturality (societal) dialogue (Wodak & Riegels, 2015) to be enabled. This findings of this study will aid to grow the literatures on discourse, ideology, and refute in religious communication.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Polarization in Discourse

Polarization in discourse refers to the ideological division between opposing groups, often constructed through language. According to Van Dijk (1998), polarization is a fundamental characteristic of ideological discourse, where in-groups are depicted positively, and out-groups are portrayed negatively. Such discourse is prevalent in political, religious, and media texts where power dynamics and identity formations are at play. Previous studies in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) suggest that polarized discourse reinforces existing divisions and contributes to ideological rigidity in social thought (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

Studies on discourse polarization have found that it usually comes with rhetorical techniques like exaggeration, metaphor, and emotive appeal used to deepen political polarization (Chilton, 2004). In religious debates, polarization takes form through framed moral dichotomies, in which one group is portrayed as saving grace and the other group is perceived as a moral deviant or misguided (Reisigl and Wodak 2001). This procedure does not only strengthen the sense of group identity but also smother opposition, sway social along with political opinions.

Polarization in conversation shows up as linguistic techniques stressing group distinctions. Among these tactics are discursive frameworks building group identification and antagonism, rhetorical techniques, and lexical selections. According to Van Dijk (2006), polarization usually includes binary oppositions like "us vs. them," "good

vs. evil," or "rational vs. irrational." These dichotomies serve to generate and maintain ideological battles by showing the in-group in a good light and the out-group in a bad one. Overlexicalization—the excessive use of certain words or phrases reinforcing a certain point of view—is one of the main drivers of polarization (Fowler, 1991). In political discourse, for instance, words like "freedom," "democracy," and "terrorism" are often used to justify one point of view and undermine the other. Another important tool is metaphor, which shapes problems to elicit intense emotional responses. Metaphors, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) claim, shape thinking and may be utilized to sway public opinion. Calling immigration, a "flood" or "invasion," for example, implies a catastrophe that shapes audience perception of the problem. Furthermore, framing is quite important in conversation polarization. Entman (1993) claims that framing is the process of choosing certain facets of reality to support a specific reading. By stressing some stories and minimizing other points of view, the media frequently utilizes framing to influence public conversation. By means of selective representation, this increases ideological rifts by means of reinforcement of pre-existing ideas and attitudes.

One of the most clear-cut fields of division is political speech. Political parties, leaders, and media outlets in modern democracies often use discursive techniques that exacerbate ideological rifts. According to Laclau and Mouffe (1985), political identities are produced through antagonistic interactions, where competing organizations identify themselves in opposition to their enemies. Often using hyperbole, negative other-representation, and emotional appeals, political speeches, debates, and campaign language seek to energize supporters and undermine rivals (Chilton, 2004). For instance, in the American political scene, debate on topics such immigration, healthcare, and social justice is quite divided. Conservative and liberal politicians utilize different terminology, which shapes different ideological perspectives. While left-leaning conversation stresses "social justice" and "equality," right-leaning speech usually stresses ideals like "law and order" and "traditional family." These different perspectives influence public perception and help to create political polarization (Iyengar & Krupenkin, 2018). By building echo chambers—places where people are exposed mostly to material matching their pre-existing beliefs—social media has intensified political division. Studies indicate that algorithms employed by sites like Facebook and Twitter promote division by pushing material that provokes indignation

and sensationalism, hence fostering participation (Pariser, 2011). Misinformation and slanted reporting help to stoke ideological rifts even more, hence complicating compromise and conversation (Benkler et al., 2018).

Especially in interfaith and intra-faith discussions, religious discourse shows notable divisiveness as well. According to Reisigl and Wodak (2001), religious polarization usually shows itself as moral dichotomies in which one group is portrayed as the keeper of truth and justice while others are seen as misguided or heretical. This discursive approach not only marginalizes dissenting views but also reinforces group identification. Historically, wars and sectarian splits have been significantly influenced by religious polarization. For instance, the conversation over the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century was quite contentious as Catholic and Protestant authorities used theological writings to invalidate one another. Likewise, modern religious arguments on themes such secularism, women's rights, and LGBTQ+ concerns expose clear ideological splits. Often relying on biblical authority, historical tales, and emotive appeals to support opinions, the language utilized in these disputes reflects Fairclough, 1995. Often using orientalist cliches—where Western media depicts Muslim populations as naturally radical or oppressive—the conversation on terrorism, migration, and cultural integration reflects these views (Said, 1978). On the other hand, several Islamic discourses see the West as imperialistic and morally corrupt. These skewed stories fuel animosity, anxiety, and misconceptions between people.

By highlighting ideological battles, the media helps to shape divided debate rather much. Through selective reporting, agenda-setting, and sensationalism, traditional news sources, digital platforms, and social media all help to create polarizing narratives (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Partisan news coverage is one of the main ways media promotes divisiveness. Research has indicated that U.S. news networks with different ideological slants, such as Fox News (right-leaning) and MSNBC (left-leaning), portray news events in ways that fit their audience's political views (Stroud, 2011). This selective portrayal strengthens ideological worldviews and reduces audience interest in interacting with other points of view. Moreover, social media algorithms give priority to material that elicits intense emotional responses, sometimes highlighting radical points of view (Sunstein, 2017). Controversial posts, conspiracy theories, and

politically inflammatory material all have viral potential; their divisive effects come from their creation of a divided public space in which hostility takes the place of conversation. Studies show that those exposed to highly polarized online debates tend to take increasingly radical views over time, hence deepening ideological splits (Bail et al., 2018).

Polarization in language has effects on social cohesiveness, policymaking, and democratic stability as well as on rhetoric. Among the main outcomes is the fall of positive conversation. Meaningful conversations are uncommon as organizations grow more entrenched in their ideological stances, hence lowering possibilities for consensus-building and compromise (Tannen, 1998). Social strife is another significant outcome. Deeply divided discourse can lead people and organizations to see one another as existential dangers instead than political or ideological foes. As demonstrated in instances of political upheaval and sectarian wars, this viewpoint can cause increased disagreement, demonstrations, and even bloodshed (Mason, 2018). Furthermore, polarization makes bipartisan cooperation impossible, hence eroding democratic government. Legislative deadlock becomes usual in highly divided cultures as political leaders give ideological purity first priority over practical decision-making. Countries including the United States have seen this trend; legislative divisiveness there has caused regular government shutdowns and policy standstill (Hacker & Pierson, 2020).

Reducing discourse polarization calls for a several-pronged strategy supporting media literacy, inclusive conversation, and institutional changes. Promoting media literacy and critical thinking will enable people to identify rhetorical manipulation and biased reporting, hence lowering their vulnerability to polarized narratives (Kahne & Bowyer, 2017). Encouraging inclusive conversation by means of inter-group communication projects can also serve to reduce ideological gaps. Research indicates that in respectful environments, exposure to other points of view lowers antagonism and fosters mutual understanding (Putnam, 2007). Media companies and social media channels may also help to reduce polarization by giving balanced reporting first priority and downplaying sensationalism (Guess et al., 2020).

2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Ideology

CDA is a perspective which makes discourse socially iniquitous and constructs and maintains inequality. Fairclough (1995) and Van Dijk (2006) highlight that discourse is place of power fights, where language used is to enforce or undermine the ideological postures. CDA is particularly appropriate for looking into how language authorizes power relations and ideological domination in discourse (Blommaert, 2005). Van Dijk (2006) also establishes, in addition, that the ideology is realized through the vocabulary, the sentence structure and narrative framing in discourse. Research of faith oriented and political reads through within the lens OF CDA shows how support shapes few and sustains strength structures (Wodak & Reisigl, 2015). Linguistic decisions that underline in-group bias while downplaying out-groups reflect these ideological frameworks. The power dynamics and ideological prejudices are consequently much shaped by the language employed in media, religious, and political discourse. News reporting, for example, can discreetly frame events in line with a certain ideological viewpoint by means of strategic use of certain words, metaphors, and presuppositions (Van Dijk, 2006).

Studies on faith-oriented and political speech seen via CDA have revealed how language shapes and maintains systems of power and domination (Wodak & Reisigl, 2015). To justify power and influence people, religious and political discourses frequently use rhetorical techniques like moral dichotomies, emotional language, and intertextuality. According to Wodak and Reisigl (2015), political leaders and religious leaders use speech techniques that support group identification but silence opposing viewpoints. Political campaign speeches, religious sermons, and ideological manifestos all show this polarization as language is used to create a shared worldview among supporters and to undermine adversaries. Polarization in Nouman Ali Khan's Revive Your Heart is examined in the current work using Van Dijk's (2006) Ideological Square Model. The Ideological Square Model holds that speech usually stresses good qualities of the in-group while stressing negative ones of the out-group.

2.3 Van Dijk's Ideological Square Model

Van Dijk's model outlines four primary strategies used to construct polarized discourse:
- Emphasize our good things

- De-emphasize our bad things
- Emphasize their bad things
- De-emphasize their good things

These strategies act as metaphors for the representation of in-groups and out-groups (Van Dijk, 2011). By using selective representation, discourse producers produce a binary that endorse ideological conviction and socio-econ. The use of Dijk's van model in the Religious Discourse Widely studied. Moreover, research on religious sermon and texts has shown how a moral binary is established to validate certain beliefs and reject counter-arguments (Richardson, 2004). This is a study that builds out Van Dijk's framework by looking at the ways in which Revive Your Heart is using these techniques to construct an ideological narrative, in terms of lexical choice, rhetorical form and discursive strategy, that fuels polarization.

2.4 Religious Discourse and Polarization
Religious discourse is a facilitative media of ideological thought and shaping social attitude. Research further demonstrates that religious language and religious speeches frequently endowed a dichotomous language to differentiate between the 'good/right' and the 'bad/evil' (Gee, 2014). This form of polarization is depicted in religious discourses past and present, narratives of inclusion and exclusion establish community limits (Asad, 2003).

In Islamic studies, scholars have examined how linguistic means to establish a particular rhetorical position as well as to sway the belief of addressees on social questions (Euben, 1999). The position of authority in religious talk is also vital, as stockholders of religious reputation urge language in the interest of developing ideological legitimacy and marking up the moral terrain for their audience (Baker et al., 2013). Through the analysis of Revive Your Heart, this study adds to understanding of how religious texts use polarization for making ideological narratives and shaping reader perspectives.

2.5 The Role of Media in Ideological Polarization
Media have an important place in the process of constructing and transmitting a disjointed language. It has been demonstrated in the literature that media news organizations use framing techniques that match a particular ideological orientation and thereby they reinforce group

differences and further sculpt public opinion (Entman, 2007). The interface of the media and religious discourse is of special significance in current debates, as the digital media fuels ideologic narratives and to the world-wide distributing of communal messages (Castells, 2009).

Social media and also online religion based forums have actually come to be important locations for ideological contention, in which expressions of dispute such as Van Dijk's ideological square are taken advantage of in order to promote or conflict arguments (Zappavigna, 2012). Seeing how Revive Your Heart fits into that larger media environment reveals why religious talk participates in the debates of our time and polarizations.

3. Research Methodology
3.1 Research Approach
This study uses a qualitative study design with a most primary analysis approach called Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). CDA has a good fit for the analysis of those texts that carry ideological meaning and power relations (Fairclough, 1995). This study specifically uses Van Dijk's (2006) Ideological Square Model, according to which discourse creates group identities through positive self-representation and negative other-representation. This framework permits a principled analysis both of how language choices generate ideological polarization in Revive Your Heart.

As discourse analysis is interpretative in nature, this research carries out textual analysis as opposed to numerical data. The study is an exploratory one that is intended to reveal both implicit and explicit ideological perspectives in Khan's own words. By putting linguistic patterns in their context, this research gives an understanding into how religious texts create identity conflicts.

3.2 Data Collection
Revive Your Heart by Nouman Ali Khan is the main data for this paper. Some parts of the text were taken as an example to investigate polarized discourse. The criteria for including excerpts included:
- Passages that clearly describe Muslim – non Muslim differences.
- Sections in which the strategies of rhetoric highlight contrasts in ideology.

- Situations when the author is creating moral dichotomies or practicing exclusionary language.

To guarantee reliability and validity, excerpts were grouped according to Van Dijk's four ideological Strategies:

1. Emphasizing the in-group's good attributes
2. De-emphasizing the in-group's flaws
3. Highlighting the out-group's negative traits
4. Minimizing the out-group's positive aspects

This categorization permitted a structured analysis of how Khan's discourse constitutes an in-group/ out-group dichotomy.

3.3 Data Analysis

The data analysis process involved:

1. Lexical and semantic analysis – Looking at word selection, metaphors, meanings of words and phrases to see how people get polarized.
2. Syntactic constructions – Coercion sentence legislation correspondent to ideological payloads.
3. Contextual understanding – Making sense of how a particular discourse element is related to overall socio-religious story lines.

Analysis was cyclical permitting patterns to emerge over diverse excerpts. The outcomes were then checked against previously statements on religious polarization to assay out theoretical coherence.

4. Results

4.1 Actor Description and 'Us vs. Them' Narrative

Van Dijk (2006) defines an actor as a group member, an individual, based on their first name, family name, status, or relationships with other people. In fact, "us" and "them" philosophies control actor descriptions. This method emphasizes how people are described in speech and the roles, personalities, relationships, age, race, gender, and organizations that shape them. This method shows the basic ideological split between "us" and "them" seen in prejudiced, racist, and stereotyped discourses. Regarding the topic of the present inquiry, this approach is really crucial. Its use is founded on Van Dijk's (2006) idea that the ideology of the creator of discourse, rather shapes how people in a conversation are characterized. In the light of this approach, people are therefore categorized as belonging to in-groups or out-groups.

> *"He turns to the Israelites who are in the middle of the desert, complaining about the heat, complaining about the lack of food, complaining about the lack of water. He turns to them and says, 'Your Master had already declared that, if you can become grateful, I will absolutely increase you."(p.20)*

In this case, author emphasized good-self representation and negative-other representation by means of actor description. These phrases pertain to the loving Prophet of Allah, the Musa (A.S.), who teaches His people 'thankfulness'. His folks are quite ungrateful. Here, author employs the techniques of negative- other representation and positive- self representation. When Musa (A.S.) flees Egypt with a whole country, His people begin to grumble about heat, water scarcity, and food shortage. They once took Allah ta'ala's benefits for granted. They are never grateful for what they possess. They used to whine constantly. Turning toward them, he says, "your Master has already said that if you can grow appreciative, I will surely flourish you," he tells them he would offer you more if you are thankful. He is attempting to give Bani Israil this life lesson. He had already accomplished it. Allah ta'ala granted him more and more when He praised Him. Musa (A.S.) is teaching them the importance of being satisfied with what they have and not stressing too much on what they lack. The description of Bani Israil is in the negative sense.

> *"When you owe someone money, you are quick to pay it, especially if it's higher authority, you owe the government taxes, you pay it quickly, you owe the electricity company money or there are going to cut the electricity, you'll pay the bill quickly. When you owe something and you know that there are going to be consequences, you and I will pay it quickly. Allah is now the authority behind the close relative. The close relative may not have an authority, as a matter of fact, if he deserves zakat and he or she deserves sadaqah, then they are not financially capable. This means that they are most likely not in a position of authority, but now their authority is validated by Allah." (p.132)*

A key concept of Revive Your Heart is the representation of in-groups and out-groups. For example:

"Then complaints arise, complaints in the mid-barren-dunes dreaming complaints, thirst and hunger. the Israelites are bakery behind they hate search albeit are biblessness" (p.20)

In this case, the out-group (Israelites) is depicted negatively as ungrateful and always complaining, while the in-group (Muslim) have the status of being more resilient and faithful. These descriptions help to reinforce polarization as members of the ingroup are colored negatively in the imagination and guilt by association while members of the outgroup are seen as slave and vicious. The accounts in Revive Your Heart depend on emotional and moral differences supporting these separations. While the in-group is portrayed as moral, obedient, and strong in their views, the out-group is generally linked with negative qualities like avarice, ignorance, or rebellion. Though not exclusive to this book, this rhetorical device is often seen in religious and ideological writings. Contrasting group identification with an opposing force helps to reinforce it. Consequently, the in-group members experience moral superiority and solidarity, while the out-group is stigmatized as the "other."

Guilt by association is another way this book strengthens the "us vs. them" story. Negative qualities shown by out-group individuals help to stereotype the whole group by means of generalization. This could lead to a group identity seen as naturally defective or misguided. Conversely, in-group members are usually considered as directed by heavenly knowledge and portrayed as morally upright. This approach of generalization supports the belief that those outside the religion are either enemies or lost souls who need to be fixed. Moreover, this kind of story building could have effects in the real world. It could help to create social and ideological barriers by strengthening sharp differences between groups, hence hindering people's ability to find common ground with others outside their group. This could result in misinterpretations, prejudices, and even animosity towards perceived outsiders. Whether cultural, religious, or ideological, it also strengthens a perspective whereby the in-group must continually be watchful against outside dangers.

4.2 Authority and Religious Legitimization

The appeal to religious authority, especially via allusions to the Quran, is another technique employed in Revive Your Heart to create polarization. The chapter builds a compelling case for separating between people who are good and those who are mistaken by means of heavenly

scripture. Common rhetorical device in religious discourse, this technique presents ideological viewpoints as divinely sanctioned truths rather than just opinions. This method raises the in-group (Muslims) to a higher moral and spiritual level and gently or overtly shows the out-group as erroneous. Another method used to establish polarization is appealing to religious authority:

> *"In Surah Al-Asr, Allah told us, 'By the time! Lo! Man is in a state of loss, save those who have faith and do righteous deeds."* (p.47)

Khan used Quranic passages to justify his ideological stance, hence supporting the idea that Muslims in the group, being good, stood in opposition to outsiders—people without the genuine religion. This fits Van Dijk's (2006) research on legitimization via religious rhetoric. The writer underlines the notion that those who lack faith are doomed for failure and loss by alluding Surah Al-Asr, one of the most often mentioned chapters in Islamic discourse. Often read as stressing the need of both faith and good deed for salvation, this verse Khan positions his ideological viewpoint as in line with divine knowledge by putting this passage in the framework of the book's case. This is in line with Van Dijk's (2006) research on legitimization via religious discourse, which emphasizes how religious texts may be utilized to create authority and support ideological viewpoints. Van Dijk claims that religious legitimization is a potent persuasive weapon as it prevents critical involvement; if a claim is based on divine revelation, criticizing it might be perceived as opposing God's authority rather than just participating in intellectual argument. Quranic words in Revive Your Heart reinforce the notion that those who follow the religion properly are naturally good; outsiders—those who do not share the same beliefs—are portrayed as spiritually lacking. The book's treatment of morality and faith provides yet another illustration of religious legitimization.

> *"The Prophet ﷺ said, 'The best of you is those whose character is best.' But today, we find people who abandon this divine guidance and instead chase after worldly desires, forgetting that true success lies in submission to Allah."* (p.65)

The hadith is applied here to provide an ethical framework complementing the thesis of the book. The writer polarizes the devout and the misled by contrasting those who follow religious teachings with those

who give worldly benefits first priority. The book subtly implies that individuals outside the in-group are morally deficient by emphasizing religious devotion as the greatest moral value. Furthermore, appealing to supernatural power serves to strengthen community solidarity as well as a form of validating legitimacy. The book promotes the connection among Muslims and motivates people to stay firm in their religion by presenting Islamic teachings as the last source of truth. As it builds a common moral and spiritual basis, this approach is good in promoting communal togetherness. On the other hand, it may also increase rifts between those who embrace the religious framework and those who reject it. Religious legitimization, however, is usually accompanied with urgency and exclusiveness. The text often advises against leaving the religion and stresses the effects of unbelief. It claims, for instance,

> *"Those who turn away from Allah's guidance will find only darkness and despair. The world may offer them temporary pleasures, but in the end, they will face the consequences of their rejection."* (p.78)

This content underlines the contrast between the righteous—those who follow Allah's direction—and the lost—those who spurn it. The book bolsters the case that following Islam is the only road to genuine fulfillment by showing life outside of faith as naturally dreary. The use of religious authority in Revive Your Heart also reflects more general historical and theological patterns in Islamic discourse. Scholars and authorities have frequently turned to Quranic passages and hadith to create religious and political authority throughout Islamic history. Classical Islamic law shows this most clearly as judicial decisions are founded on readings of heavenly writings. Likewise, in modern religious fiction, writers often use scripture to back up their points and build authority. Khan's usage of hadith and Quranic texts follows this custom, so guaranteeing that his message speaks to a devoted audience. Though it may help to develop religion, religious legitimization may also foster exclusionary mindsets. Religious discourse can create the impression that individuals outside the religion are not merely different but actually defective. This is seen in remarks such as:

> *"Only those who hold firm to Allah's rope will find true success. Those who turn away will be left wandering without direction."* (p.92)

The book suggests that those who do not follow the recommended route are lost and aimless by stressing that only Allah provides direction. This deepens the separation between the in-group and the out-group and supports the belief that only within the religion can actual righteousness be discovered. Moreover, the legitimization of religious authority in Revive Your Heart helps to shape moral and social views. The book implies that secular values or other belief systems are naturally inferior by presenting religious devotion as the last standard for virtue. Readers' perceptions of others outside their religious group may be shaped by this, hence fostering suspicion or even animosity. The book, for instance, advises against embracing non-Islamic ideas and says:

> *"The modern world tries to convince us that we can find happiness in material success, but true peace is only found in submission to Allah."* (p.110).

The difference between religious values and secular goals here supports the notion that religion is the only valid source of satisfaction.

4.3 Hyperbole and Exaggeration

Another rhetorical tool often used in Revive Your Heart is hyperbole, which supports polarizing language and highlights the separation between the in-group (true Muslims) and the out-group (those who reject or depart from the religion). Exaggerated language in the book increases the perceived moral and spiritual differences between these groups, hence creating urgency and stronger emotional reaction in readers. Hyperbolic language not only reinforces the ideological position of the book but also inhibits neutrality or compromise, hence guiding the reader toward binary thinking—a characteristic of ideological polarization. Hyperbole is another device also responsible for polarized language:

> *"The unfortunate fact of the matter is that the wrongdoing discussed in the Ayat of Surah Al-Nahl in some way or other exists among Muslims even the Ayat addresses a wrongdoing of an unjust person."* (p.56)

"Unfortunate reality" and "evil" help to highlight separation by using them to label those who resist compliance as a corrupting influence. Such language promotes dichotomous thinking, a fundamental characteristic of ideological polarization. "Unfortunate fact of the matter"

suggests broad, deep-seated harm in question and instantly solemn tone. This sort of framing makes it appear as though the problem is not only a little worry but a major moral failure across the community. The statement that this sin exists "among Muslims" suggests that straying from the straight path is a systematic problem rather than an individual event. Furthermore, exaggeration is frequently employed to depict people who disobey Islamic beliefs as part of a corrupting influence. The text, for example, cautions:

> *"Those who ignore Allah's guidance are not just misguided—they are agents of moral decay, leading others into destruction."* (p.72)

The assertion that disobedience is "moral decay" here pushes the effects of deviation to an excessive degree. Rather than just saying that such people are making bad decisions, the article offers them as active agents of corruption helping to bring about social collapse. This style of discourse leaves no third ground; one either supports righteousness or is part of the corrupting influence. Another instance of exaggerated wording is seen in:

> *"The world today is drowning in sin, and only those who hold fast to Allah's rope will survive the flood."* (p.88)

The picture of the world "drowning in sin" calls to mind a disaster and parallels the narrative of Prophet Noah and the great flood. This metaphor emphasizes the difference between those who follow divine direction (the surviving) and those who reject it (the condemned). Extreme imagery helps to highlight the decision as one that is either total commitment to the religion or total destruction. Furthermore, exaggeration is quite important in the text to generate urgency. The book pushes readers to act right away by stressing the negative effects of deviating from the faith.

> *"Every moment spent away from Allah's remembrance is a step closer to spiritual destruction."* (p.105).

This assertion supports the notion that continuous vigilance is required for preserving virtue as it implies that even short times of negligence in religious practice have terrible effects. Although this could

inspire Christians to be unshakeable, it also creates a climate of worry and dread in which any departure is seen as causing certain disaster.

4.4 Broader Implications of Polarized Discourse

Polarization in ideological religion concerns a necessarily relevant pattern of belief in independence, which can move towards the picture of the Polarization in the discourse of social cohesion. By posing a binary opposition of 'us' and 'them' in his rhetoric Khan's discourse responded in a way that might further inflame the ideological divisions within it and beyond the Muslim community. This part explains how this discourse impacts interfaith relations and to ideological rigidity. For instance, the text states:

> *"Those who turn away from Allah's guidance are lost in the abyss of ignorance, forever wandering without purpose."* (p.162)

Besides, this study also outlines the digital religious communities' potential outcomes in echo chambers. As Khan's message is going out online widely, the enhancing of in-group preference and out-group derogation may more clearly define lines of division, affect how the individuals approach different views.

5. Conclusion

This study has shown how Revive Your Heart uses polarized discourse by means of linguistic and ideological means. By applying Van Dijk's Ideological Square Model the analysis shows how in-groups are positively constructed and out-group members are ideologically presented negatively to reinforce divisions. This study enhances the scholarship on religious rhetoric and its politics regarding social cohesion and social hierarchies, emphasizing the way language gets used by ideological rhetoricators to shape the understanding that the readers have of identity, belonging and social hierarchies. The results of this research show to polarized people in religious texts do not just group identity build, but also restrictutorial boundaries. The use of language for the purpose of highlighting in-group virtues and out-group flaws corresponds with past research concerning discourse and ideology, which indicates that religion discourse generally plays an important role in defining social attitudes. This research shows how rhetorical devices like focus, exclusions, and moral sharp divisions contribute to a defense mechanism us/our people, them consistent narrative that might shock any interfaith and interfaith

diplomatic relation. There is also a broader relevance for the study to our more general understanding of to-talitarianisms, to use that term, beyond religious discourse. Nowadays, political, media and digital language often pick up on identical linguistic tactics to solidify ideological splits on both sides. As digital platforms amplify polarized narratives, it makes her extremely interesting to learn about what discourse is doing particularly to the shaping of the public beliefs and confession to be maintaining social divisions. Knowing these mechanisms can also be very helpful in making strategies to fight extremism and build the kind of constructive dialogue in different ideological views.

Moreover, the impact of Religious Authority on discourse and followers' ideas are an additional considerable aspect that merits more inquiries. Khan's discourse does not only breed belonging through group identity but also certifies definite religious and cultural code of conduct, which may impact upward social interaction in multicultural context. This aspect really presents the necessity for critical literacy in religious and ideological writings as to allow individuals with more analytical readings of the texts and prevent the risky misunderstandings leading to schism. Because these results suggest this, future research might also examine the effect of the sort of polarized language people see, particularly in online environments in which a person's particular influences can consistently spread quickly. Comparative analyses might look at different styles of polarization themselves in other religious, political, or media compositions to gain a fuller comprehension as to ways of how polarization appears differentially by discourse. Furthermore interdisciplinary approaches that combine discussion write and psychology and/or sociology might offer additional bagging into cognitive social beliefs of iconic political beliefs that the successful initiate ideology comes from. Through a more critical examination of religious and ideological speechmakers' language both Piemon and de Wit initiative cantating academics, educators and decision makers on how to disseminate a more textured comprehension of the power of language to form identities and intersubjectivities. Promoting interfaith and intercultural discussion and media literacy can help reduce the negative impacts of polarized dialogue and produce a more united and well-informed public sphere. Given the current global conversation over religious and ideological opinion, keeping the lines of argument open with such texts continues to be important for crossing the distance between entering into their assumptions and being aware of present-day issues.

References

Asad, T. (2003). Formations of the secular: Christianity, Islam, modernity. Stanford University Press.

Bail, C. A., Argyle, L. P., Brown, T. W., Bumpus, J. P., Chen, H., Hunzaker, M. B. F., ... & Volfovsky, A. (2018). Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(37), 9216-9221.

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., & McEnery, T. (2013). Discourse analysis and media attitudes: The representation of Islam in the British press. Cambridge University Press.

Benkler, Y., Faris, R., & Roberts, H. (2018). *Network Propaganda: Manipulation, Disinformation, and Radicalization in American Politics.* Oxford University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction.* Cambridge University Press.

Castells, M. (2009). Communication power. Oxford University Press.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice.* Routledge.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.

Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. Journal of Communication, 57(1), 163–173. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00336.x

Euben, R. L. (1999). Enemy in the mirror: Islamic fundamentalism and the limits of modern rationalism. Princeton University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language.* Longman.

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press.* Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2014). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (4th ed.). Routledge.

Guess, A. M., Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2020). Exposure to untrustworthy websites in the 2016 US election. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(5), 472-480.

Hacker, J. S., & Pierson, P. (2020). *Let Them Eat Tweets: How the Right Rules in an Age of Extreme Inequality.* Liveright.

Iyengar, S., & Krupenkin, M. (2018). The strengthening of partisan affect. *Political Psychology*, 39(S1), 201-218.

Kahne, J., & Bowyer, B. (2017). Educating for democracy in a partisan age: Confronting the challenges of motivated reasoning and misinformation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 3-34.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics.* Verso.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By.* University of Chicago Press.

Mason, L. (2018). *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity.* University of Chicago Press.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176-187.

Pariser, E. (2011). *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet is Hiding from You.* Penguin.

Putnam, R. D. (2007). *E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century.* Scandinavian Political Studies, 30(2), 137-174.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism. Routledge.

Richardson, J. E. (2004). (Mis)Representing Islam: The racism and rhetoric of British broadsheet newspapers. John Benjamins Publishing.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism.* Pantheon Books.

Stroud, N. J. (2011). *Niche News: The Politics of News Choice.* Oxford University Press.

Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media.* Princeton University Press.

Tannen, D. (1998). *The Argument Culture: Stopping America's War of Words.* Ballantine Books.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach.* SAGE Publications.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Ideology and Discourse Analysis.* Journal of Political Ideologies, 11(2), 115-140.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse and ideology. Discourse Studies, 13(2), 153–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445610397662

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Methods of critical discourse analysis (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2015). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), Methods of critical discourse analysis (3rd ed., pp. 23–61). SAGE Publications.

Zappavigna, M. (2012). Discourse of Twitter and social media: How we use language to create affiliation on the web. Bloomsbury.