



THE ASIAN BULLETIN OF GREEN MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULAR ECONOMY

ISSN (online): 2959-0035

<http://abgmce.com/10.62019/abgmce.v5i1.178>

ISSN (Print): 2959-0027

Linguistic choices of Siraiiki speakers in the selected life domains

Furrah Abbas, Siti Jamilah Bidin

Chronicle

Article history

Received: March 23, 2025

Received in the revised format: April 22, 2025

Accepted: May 18, 2025

Available online: June 30, 2025

Furrah Abbas * is currently affiliated with Centre for Languages and Translation Studies, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Email: mehboobalikorejo11@gmail.com

Siti Jamilah Bidin is currently affiliated with School of Languages, Civilization and Philosophy (SLCP), University Utara Malaysia.

Email: sitij2004@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the linguistic choices of Siraiiki speakers in the seven selected domains of life. The study employs domain theory as the theoretical foundation of the research. It is often argued that linguistic choices provide a reflection on the status of language and how it is being maintained by a language community. Quantitative research design with questionnaire as a research instrument was used for collection of research data. The respondents were required to provide their linguistic choices in response to situations or interactions with certain person on a five-point scale ranging from always to never. The results show that There is lack of use of the native language of the Siraiiki community and this can be attributed to language policies. The findings from the current study reveal that there were three domains i.e. the domain of education, the domain of professional interaction and the domain of media in which the respondents preferred to use Urdu language. The imposition of dominant language in the domain of education can be attributed to politicized language policies which is an indirect violation of linguistic rights of ethnolinguistic groups. There were two domains in the current study which were dominated by the use of the Siraiiki language, and these were the domain of family and the domain of socialization. This leads to infer that ethnolinguistic community attach covert prestige to their mother tongue while they use dominant language in formal and public domains of language use. In the current study, it was noticed that the use of Siraiiki in the domain of family showed gradual lack of intergenerational language transfer. There was clear domain specificity in most of the domains of language use with exception of the language use in the domain of emotion representation. Education plays an important role in promotion of any language therefore, the language policies enforced by education must promote linguistic diversity and multilingualism.

***Corresponding Author:**

Keywords: Linguistic choices, Siraiiki speakers,

© 2025 Asian Academy of Business and social science research Ltd Pakistan.

INTRODUCTION

The survival of a language depends on the extent to which the members of that linguistic community use that language or what they think about the language (Rourke, 2005; Chiblow & Meighan, 2022; Pasang, Ramiana, Harbi & Amaluddin, 2023). Language shift is a process that automatically leads non-dominant or under privileged languages to the point of extinction (Ebo, 2022). Extensive research has been conducted in the area of language use across the globe which has led to the expansion of this research area and its wider acknowledgment. The study by Khokholva (2014) on the Punjabi language, states that the Punjabi language has lost its significance under the influence of Urdu and English languages. The Punjabi language is viewed as no more than a means of informal communication and an important identity marker. Habtoor (2012) studied the language attitude and shift in Tigrinya-speaking immigrants in Saudi Arabia, and concluded that a language shift

was taking place among second-generation Tigrinya-speaking immigrants in Saudi Arabia in favour of the Arabic language. With reference to the Pakistani scenario, English and Urdu have been the dominant languages in the country. English as the international language finds its use in important spheres of life such as bureaucracy, law and education as it is also the official language of the country (Umrani & Bughio, 2017; Soomro, 2016). Urdu is the national language of the country and is used as a national lingua franca for communication by people hailing from different backgrounds. There is a total of 73 languages including 8 non-indigenous languages used in the country. There are provincial languages like Punjabi, Pashto, Sindhi, Balochi and other indigenous languages are in use in the respective provinces and territories. The national language, the provincial languages and various other languages operational in various areas of the country make it a rich locale for linguistic research. The critics argue that the country has not provided a conducive environment for the development of indigenous languages (Rahman, 2011). Concerning Siraiki language, no studies are available that focus on the construct of language attitude and the relevance of issues like language maintenance and shift. Siraiki is among the top four languages with more than 10 percent of native speakers and the speakers of this language have been demanding a separate province out of a political, economic and linguistic sense of deprivation (Asif, 2005; Roofi & Alqama, 2013). In the context of a multilingual setting, research investigation into language choices especially concerning minority languages, constitutes a very important domain within sociolinguistics. Khokholova (2014), and Habtoor (2014), suggest that dominant languages can negatively influence the minority language as well. Furthermore, studies have also shown that language attitudes intersect with concepts such as language use, beliefs, ideologies, sense of identity, and acceptance of language policies. Steward (2012) in his study argues that ideologies, beliefs and a sense of identity play a very integral role in influencing the language attitudes among speakers.

The Siraiki ethnolinguistic community holds significant importance as it is one of the four major languages of Pakistan and it has over 10% native speakers. Initially, it was considered as a dialect of Punjabi language; but in the 1970s, it gained recognition as an independent language (Mughal, 2004; Jumani et al., 2011). Despite this recognition, the Siraiki language lacks its official status and faces challenges in education and other sectors, contributing to the deprivation felt by its speakers. The efforts by the Siraiki community to promote its language and ethnicity are notable and evident (Asif, 2005, 2010; Rahman, 2011; Garcia, 2016). Siraiki, despite being a major language in Pakistan, receives limited attention and it also lacks official recognition. This lack of recognition of the Siraiki language leads to a perception among the native people that their economic and socio-political rights are denied, especially in the underdeveloped areas of the province of Punjab. Siraiki, experiencing linguistic competition from Punjabi and Urdu, is positioned as an ethnic language. Consequently, its community strives for the recognition of their linguistic, economic, and political rights. Considering the evolving situation of Siraiki's linguistic landscape, this empirical research is necessary to examine the language choices of the Siraiki ethnolinguistic community.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the studies exploring the linguistic choices, domain theory provides an ideal framework, Domain theory of language was firstly proposed by Schmidt-Rohr in 1932 (as cited by Leuner, 2008). Later on, it was developed by Fishman (1991). He defined

domain as a sociocultural construct based on the relation between communicators, topics under discussion and the context of communication. It is understood now that language that is used by people gets influenced by many factors. Majorly, role relation and topic are major elements that influenced concept of domain. Fishman said that "topic" is an element that regulates use of language in multilingual settings. For instance, someone tends to shift his language to the interlocutor's when discussing various topics.

Another major contribution came from Marjohan (1988) who expanded the concept by introducing the role of interlocutors engaged in communication. Which language will be used in a domain is highly dependent upon who are the interlocutors you're going to speak with i.e. father talks to mother or mother talks to children and similarly children talk to their parents or with one another. He also focused that "locale" (place/places where conversation takes place) also is one of the factors to determine the selection and use of a language in domain. Tanner (1967) said that there are some factors of choice for setting "in locale". Those factors may constitute motivation, social and content basis.

Social factors can be explained in terms of "horizontal and vertical dimensions". Concept of this low domain and high domain came from the term 'diglossia' which in the earlier times meant that when two different languages are existing side by side then one becomes language of high people known as high domain and the other become language of low people hence called we refer it as low domain. Low domain is learnt informally but for high domain, one has to get proper education regarding language and its use. People try to use 'low code' when they are supposed to converse with someone who is close to them in context of religion, educational status or extent of friendship whereas the later describes that use of language is determined by "relative position of someone that is to be compared with other people". He said that you have to show respect for the person who is superior to you in terms of status or age.

According to this theory, when a language expands to a new domain which was originally dedicated to another language earlier, then there is a tendency of speakers to shift to the new language. Multilingualism is an act either to promote or to use more than one language by an individual or by a group of people (Calafato, 2020). In other words, in a situation where a certain language starts encroaching into a domain which has been stable in one language, then there is a danger of causing language shift. We were aware that there are some scholars like Tsunoda (2005) who indicates that there appears to be no adequate theory of language shift and that it is impossible to state in precise terms under what conditions and how language shift occurs. Change in language attitudes is one of the major factors affecting language shift among the linguistic communities in New Zealand (Albury, 2020). Kuncha and Bathula (2020) said that understanding how a small but rapidly growing Telugu community in New Zealand can face the challenges of language loss and maintenance can guide in designing appropriate strategies. Resultantly, some mothers are in favor of learning Telugu and they are learning to teach their young ones but some are considering it a waste of time.

Explaining the possibility of language shift in domain specificity, Fishman (1964) highlighted that language shift is the case that one language is more appropriate than the other in some domains and it is for sure that in high domains, prestigious language is to be used while the other is used in the low domains (Cited in His-nan,

Hui-Chen & Yuh-show, 2004). It also depicts that only one of theoretically available languages will be considered by a particular set of people or class on specific kinds of functions/occasions in order to discuss specific topics. Coulmas (2005) quoted Chatterjee who said, "Ridiculous or sometimes comical will be the effect if the norms of situational selection between the two are violated".

The term "Language shift" is attributed to the famous linguist named Fishman (1964, 1991) that means when people of one language shift their linguistic resources to the other language. This happens because one language proves to be dominant than the other one and people find advantages if they switch to that language. This way, when people switch to the other language and the domain of wanted language is increasing inhibiting use of the other language then there, a process is observed known as 'language loss' or more specifically 'language death' which occurs for the whole community. There are some theories that tend to explain why languages shift occurs. One of the theories is presented by (Fishman, 1964, 1991). He described that when one language's domain gets expanded as compared to the other languages then there are a lot of chances for bilingual speakers to shift towards that language. The studies on language maintenance and shift also indicate an ongoing conflict between the linguistic identity and functional utility of the Telugu language. The study (Kuncha & Bathula, 2020) showed evidence of an inter-generational gap between the two sets of respondents, namely mothers and children. 100% of mothers felt that it is important to speak in both English and Telugu, while only 85% of children felt it necessary to speak both languages. All mothers reported that their children mixed English words with Telugu when talking at home. This indicates that there is a perceptible shift from Telugu to English, which is occurring within a short period of four years and less.

Incidents of language shifts have been seen throughout the world (Ridge, 2004; Bastardas, 2007; Anyidoho & Kropp-Dakubu, 2008; Gilani & Mahmood 2014). The study in Ghanaian context revealed that the people gave premium to English language which is observed as ex-colonial language at the expense of number of other indigenous languages being used in Ghanaian community (Anyidoho & Kropp-Dakubu, 2008). Though Ghana was set free back in 1957 after colonialism ended but still they praise English language for number of reasons. One of the reasons is that people think that if they will change their official language from English to some indigenous language being used in Ghana then there are chances that in future there will be raised some issues about use of that language as not every person residing in Ghana use the same indigenous language. And this step might distribute people into divisions and parts within the country so English being a neutral language is considered to be more suitable. It would be highly difficult for government to decide which indigenous language should be given status of official language out of many being used (Anyidoho & Kropp-Dakubu, 2008). It is also observed that in a few past years, parents prefer for their children to learn English as their first language in Ghana because they believe that learning this language will help them to grow socially, economically and hence they will have a secured future that no indigenous language can offer them.

Another case is seen in Malaysia that says that the very first language to reach Malaysia was Portuguese followed by English when British colonized there as reported by Ridge (2004). He further reports that Chinese and Indian also started making their place in the land of Malaysia as those people migrated in Malaysia. This co-existence of languages helped Malaysia grow into a multilingual country. As it was a British Colony so English managed to occupy various formal as well as informal domains. This

way, use of English became popular and started spreading in a rapid manner moulding elite class of locals among Malays, Indians as well as Chinese. Hence, numbers of speakers who speak English progressed well and there was seen a trend of English Medium schools as language was becoming famous day by day there. But, after independence, English language started facing decline in the field of education and constitution of Malaya (1977) then declared Bahasa Malaysia as the national as well as official language of Malaysia. This language was then taught at school and even university level in Malaysia. Chinese schools continued to give education in their own languages. In mid of 1990's, language change again happened in the field of education that is considered as a milestone and this was regarding teaching science subjects in English language at tertiary level (Ridge, 2004). Furthermore, Prime minister, Tun Dr. Mahatir Mohamad announced in 2002 that science and mathematics will be taught in English language. So it is observed after that, trend has been set in Malaysia that people have become multilingual.

In 2006, Othman explored the language attitude of the Arabic English bilinguals using the domain theory of language. He conducted this research on Arab immigrants recently shifted to Manchester, Britain. The findings reveal that Arabic language finds its use in the domains of friendship, mosque and home while the domains specified for English are the university and work domains. Since Arab was used in schools, mosques, home domains, he concluded that the Arab immigrants held positive attitude towards their mother tongue. The research by Adams, Matu and Ongarora (2012) aims to analyze the linguistic choices of Kinubi speaking community in Kenya to explain their language attitude. The researchers contend that since it is a minority language, it is expected to face the issues of maintenance as its speakers are expected to hold negative language attitude towards it. The findings were contradictory to expectations as Kinubi language thrived in many domains of life and also the ethnolinguistic vitality of the language was also found to be high.

Jhatial and Khan (2021) showed that language shift is evident in various domains among Dhatki speaking youth living in Karachi. They explore the language preferences of Dhatki and Marwari speakers in different domains, investigate the extent to which the identity of Dhatki and Marwari speakers is shaped by their mother tongue, and examine the language maintenance efforts taken by Dhatki and Marwari speaking youth. Participants claimed that their ancestral legacy and heritage were linked to their native languages, and efforts are made at a familial level to ensure intergenerational transmission of language. The authors (Jhatial & Khan, 2021) also reported that locally funded seminars and public awareness programs were conducted to raise awareness about the importance of the survival of their languages. The participants of the study proudly identified themselves as part of their communities, using languages spoken in their communities as their identity marker (Jhatial & Khan, 2021).

Using the domain theory of language, the language attitude studies have been conducted in Pakistan as well. Pakistan remained a British colony and after its independence, English stayed as a British legacy. Though there have been many efforts to replace English but these efforts badly failed. There are various cases of language shift reported empirically in Pakistan where English has replaced other languages in some domains. Rahman (2011) reported that the indigenous languages have not been promoted so the speakers of indigenous languages are shifting to Urdu and English. In northern areas of Pakistan, many cases of language shift have also been reported. Khokhlova (2014) argues that many of the languages are on the verge

of death with limited number of speakers and have been enlisted among endangered languages. Such a situation is emerging with the expansion of Pashto language to these regions. Even in Punjab, Gilani and Mahmood (2014) reported that the young generation has developed a tolerated attitude towards Punjabi which is their mother tongue and if the situation continues, the language domains where Punjabi finds its use, even those domains will be dominated by Urdu or English.

Many research studies (like Ong, 2021; Ting & Ting, 2021) reported that some Chinese-Malaysians consider Mandarin not only as a symbolic language but also take it the only language of China that can represent their ethnic identity. Mandarin is being used in occupational, family, and religious domains, and it is also considered the language to be transferred culturally and intergenerationally.

Previous studies (Chua & Azlan, 2019; Koh, Hoon, & Haji-Othman, 2021 etc.) have shown that the growing relevance of Mandarin in education and public life has led many younger Chinese-Malaysians to see Mandarin as their mother tongue and an important part of their cultural identity rather than a legacy language. The participants indicated considerable use of Mandarin in domains previously handled by a legacy language, such as home, job, religion, and cultural upkeep. This suggests that older generation Chinese-Malaysians' use of Mandarin to participate with the present linguistic world is influenced by hegemonic local and global influences. As a result, Ong and Troyer (2020) emphasize the value of Mandarin as both a component of cultural identity and a tool for preserving heritage languages.

Some of the research studies that have been conducted by using the theory of domain include Andriyanti (2019), David, and Ali (2021), Zorčič (2022), Liang, Wu, and Li (2022), Gomashie (2022) and Kvietok (2023). The study by Andriyanti (2019) examined the amount of language shift among the city's young multilinguals and the youth's search for authentic local and national identities. David, and Ali (2021) investigate the causes of linguistic change among the global Sindhi Hindu diaspora and language preservation among Sindh's Hindu population. The research conducted by Zorčič (2022) aimed to explore their language choice based on their consideration of habitus in Austria. Liang, Wu, and Li (2022) explored the family language policy, along with the role of Chinese parent in Singapore for the preschoolers and their start of early bilingualism. The study by Gomashie (2022) aims at exploring the language use of bilingual youth of Tlaxco in Mexico. The use of language by Peruvian immigrant youth was investigated by Kvietok (2023), who argued that family language policies and the urban educational attitude play significant role in determining the preference of language use by the bilingual youth.

The effective emergence of Bahasa as the national language has influenced the position of local languages throughout the country. It has had a significant impact on young people's usage of Javanese, the primary local language in Yogyakarta, which is relevant to this study. Andriyanti (2019) examined the amount of language shift among the city's young multilinguals and the youth's search for authentic local and national identities. The findings shed light on the contemporary state of Javanese and Bahasa Indonesia as mother languages, as well as the identity language choice connections. The majority of young Javanese individuals stated that Bahasa Indonesia is their first language. This indicates a decline in Javanese intergenerational transmission. In terms of identity, the youth's feeling of national identity outweighs their sense of local identity. Intergenerational transmission and active usage of Javanese at school are required to boost the vitality of Javanese and strengthen local identity.

David, and Ali (2021) investigated the causes of linguistic change among the global Sindhi Hindu diaspora and language preservation among Sindh's Hindu population. Following the partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947, many Hindu Sindhis were forced to leave their former homeland of Sindh, however some did not leave and still reside there today. The diasporic Sindhis of today reside in India, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, and many other nations, rebuilding their lives from the ground up without having a home country of their own. In order to show the causes of the community's linguistic change, the history of the diasporic population has been qualitatively detailed and investigated. To find out why many Sindhi Hindus in Sindh have kept their language, as opposed to Sindhi Hindus in the diaspora, interviews, discussions, and surveys of certain Sindhi Hindus have been conducted. The study concluded that there are multiple factors which are responsible for transition and maintenance of their language in the same ethnic community. The causes include emotional, economic, political-social, and cultural issues.

Zorčič (2022) conducted a research study on school going bilingual kids to explore their language choice based on their consideration of habitus in Austria. The study explored the language choice and use of the Slovene youth in formal domains such as school, and home. The study concluded that there were domain specific language choices made by the community like in schools most of the time they prefer to use Slovene. The findings of the study show that there is complex hierarchy of attitude prevalent as Carinthian Slovene is considered a minority language while the attitude towards this language can be best presented in the words of 'loyalty'. A strong language policy is required to revitalize the language that could be started from family domain.

Liang, Wu, and Li (2022) explored the family language policy, along with the role of Chinese parent in Singapore for the preschoolers and their start of early bilingualism. The study argued about latent variables and the factors impacting on the start of early bilinguals. It is argued in the study that family attitude and the influence of community beliefs towards each language create an impact of its use in early ages. The study presents a deep understanding of the relationship among early bilingualism, parenting, school education and their impact on bilingual identity in the bilingual community of Chinese using both Chinese and English languages in Singapore.

The study by Gomashie (2022) aimed at exploring the language use of bilingual youth of Tlaxco in Mexico. His findings reveal that the linguistic environment is not very competitive and the students have almost fixed choices in different domains of language use. They prefer to use their home language in the informal scenarios like with their grandparents while in formal settings, they mostly prefer to use the dominant language i.e., Spanish. The locale of the research covered their interactions inside family and social settings of the community and included domains such as family where grandparents have covered the blank left by the parents, whereas, the youth have devised their strategies to use either only Spanish or a mix of Spanish and Nahauti in formal and professional domains. It is argued in the study that since the language practices are domain specific, there must be effective language planning to promote multilingual and to preserve linguistic diversity. The study highlights the need to consider the important contribution of domain in helping the language users choose which language to use.

Comajoan-Colomé, and Trueta, (2022) investigated Catalan language use from sociolinguistic perspective. It was observed that demographic changes like the

number of people are flooded towards Catalan. This has impacted the use of language in different domains. The most vulnerable domain was school. It also created the question of identity for the Catalan users. This attitudinal imbalance started a new trend of language shift in Catalan community which created identity crisis and study recommended a good policy in which every stake-holder should be given proper place to create a solution for this language shift.

It is said that the domains of language use such as family, and education play an important role in the overall language use and proficiency of the learners. The use of language by Peruvian immigrant youth was investigated by Kvietok (2023), who argued that family language policies and the urban educational attitude play significant role in determining the preference of language use by the bilingual youth. Therefore, the researcher contends that the language policies enforced by education must promote linguistic diversity and multilingualism. The research presents insights into the need of Urban Quechua education to think about how migrant youth experience and shape their bilingualism and that of their families across rural-urban continuums which can help their youth in strengthening their Quechua language practices and identities.

The current research uses domain theory as foundation as there is need to identify the patterns of language use by the Siraikei ethnolinguistic community. This can be done most appropriately by using this theory as it uses domain as its prime focus. The theory will help identify the linguistic preferences and then rationalize them with the use of insightful questions. This will also help identify the factors responsible for linguistic choices and preferences by the Siraikei ethnolinguistic community in Pakistan.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order to conduct the present research, the quantitative research design was selected keeping in view the appropriateness of this research design. Questionnaire comprising domains of language use and its sub-domains was employed for data collection. The questionnaire covered the preference of language choice in selected domains of life. The questionnaire comprised the languages uses in the domains like family life, education, community interaction, informal situations (socialization), professional interaction, formal situations and entertainment. The scale was developed on five-point (always, often, sometimes, rarely and never). Cronbach alpha value of reliability for domain wise language use scale was found to be 0.827.

The first domain of language use was family in which the questionnaire covered the situations of language use with the parents, the grandparents and with kids and siblings. There were two interactions from Mansoor (2017) included which were parents and other family. The interaction under other family was refined into two categories such as interaction with grand parents and interaction with siblings and kids. The second domain of language use in this study was the domain of education and the situations covered in the current study comprised interaction with the teachers, class fellows and the university administration. Mansoor (2017) has included interaction with teacher which was refined in the current study under the domain of education. The interaction with class fellows and university administration was included to refine the categories in this domain. The third domain of language use was the domain of community interaction and the language choices covered under this domain is the interaction on occasions like weddings, condolences and social gatherings. Adapting two interactions from Mansoor (2017), the third category i.e. interaction on the occasion of condolences was added to refine the domain. The

fourth domain was the domain of socialization also called as domain of informal language use. This domain consisted of language choices in interaction with close friends, language for cracking jokes and its use in other informal situations. The category of cracking jokes was added in the domain of socialization as it is quite important with reference to the concept of informal socialization. The fifth domain was the domain of professional interaction which covers the language use in offices, banks and workplaces. There were two interactions adapted from Mansoor (2017) while interaction at the workplaces was added to make the domain more comprehensive. There was the sixth domain of language use called the domain of formality and the situations covered within this domain were the linguistic choices with strangers, use of language in hotels and for serious discussions. There were two interactions i.e. language use with strangers and for discussions taken from Mansoor (2017) while the preference of language use in hotels was added to make the study more comprehensive. The last domain of language use explored by current research was the domain of entertainment. This covered the language choices with references to movies and drama, language used in print media as well as the social media. This domain name taken from Mansoor (2017) was refined and categories under three interactions for the current research. For the current research, the respondents rated their preferences on all three languages. They were required to rate the languages in terms of their preferences on a five-point scale with the following coding as Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The linguistic choices and language use of the respondents in seven domains was investigated by using questionnaire. In each domain, there were three situations or sub-domains included in order to give a comprehensive view of language use in each domain. The domain-wise data analysis is presented here in order to make the readers understand which language was used more or which language was used less in a particular domain and within each domain, and which language dominated in which situations of language use.

The first domain included in the questionnaire was the domain of family which comprised of three situations of language use; the use of language with grand-parents, the use of language with parents while the third situation was the use of language with siblings. The descriptive statistics in the domain of family are presented in table 4.15 in terms of frequencies and mean score. The results indicate that all three situations of language use in the domain of family were dominated by the Siraiki language overall. The mean score of the Siraiki language with grand-parents was 4.17, it was 4.05 for the language use with parents while the mean score for the language use with siblings was 3.58 and all the three situations were dominated by the use of the Siraiki language. The result indicate that there were 305 respondents (approximately 78 %) who often or always used the Siraiki language with grand-parents; 285 respondents (approximately 73 %) always or often used the Siraiki language with parents while there were 211 respondents (approximately 54 %) who always or often used the Siraiki language with siblings. This shows that the domain of the family was dominated by the use of the Siraiki language, the Urdu language was second in terms of its use whereas the Punjabi language was not much used in the domain of family. The overall mean score for the use of the Siraiki language was 3.93; it was 2.68 for the Urdu language whereas it was 1.92 for the Punjabi language in the domain of family. The details are given in table 4.21.

Table 1

Language use in the domain of family

	Language	Appr Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	MS	SD
		N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)		
Grand Parents	Punjabi	7(1.8)	27(6.9)	96(24.5)	112(28.6)	156(39.8)	2.01	1.00
	Urdu	14(3.6)	27(6.9)	162(41.3)	119(30.4)	42(10.7)	2.70	0.98
	Siraiki	203(51.8)	102(26.0)	75(19.1)	23(5.9)	9(2.3)	4.05	1.03
Parents	Punjabi	6(1.5)	22(5.6)	72(18.4)	76(19.4)	210(53.6)	1.83	1.06
	Urdu	17(4.3)	52(13.3)	77(19.6)	111(28.3)	163(41.6)	2.03	1.10
	Siraiki	169(43.1)	116(29.6)	53(13.5)	17(4.3)	17(4.3)	4.17	1.09
Siblings	Punjabi	7(1.8)	9(2.3)	98(25.0)	113(28.8)	165(42.1)	1.93	0.96
	Urdu	23(5.9)	138(35.2)	194(49.5)	18(4.6)	19(4.8)	3.33	0.85
	Siraiki	72(18.4)	139(35.5)	138(35.2)	31(7.9)	12(3.1)	3.58	0.98
	Punjabi						1.92	
	Urdu						2.68	
	Siraiki						3.93	

Appr Always = Approximately Always, MS = Mean score, SD = Standard Deviation

The second domain in which the research explored the perceived language use of the respondents was the domain of education. There were three situations in this domain: the use of language with teachers, the use of language with class-fellows and the use of language in university offices. The analysis of the results in the domain of education shows that this domain was dominated by the use of the Urdu language in all three sub-domains, the Urdu language dominated with more than 75 % of the respondents reporting to have either always or often used the Urdu language. Two out of the three situations in the domain of education recorded the mean score of above 4 while in the third situation, it was found to be 3.99. The overall mean score of the use of the Urdu language was found to be 4.21. This indicates highly positive attitude of the respondents towards the Urdu language in the domain of education.

The Punjabi language was the least used language as the percentage of the respondents who never or rarely used it in all the three situations was found to be above 70 % for all the three sub-domains. The Siraiki language was also nominally used in interaction with the teachers or university administration. The Siraiki language found some use in interaction with class-fellows as the mean score of the responses towards the Siraiki language was found to be 2.79. The overall mean score for the use of the Punjabi language in the domain of education was 2.14 whereas it was 2.41 for the Siraiki language. This indicates negative language attitude of the respondents towards both Punjabi and Siraiki. The details of the language use in the domain of education are presented in table 4.22.

Table 2

Language use in the domain of education

	Language	Appr Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	MS	SD
		N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)		
Teachers	Punjabi	143(36.5)	157(40.1)	68(17.3)	11(2.8)	13(3.3)	1.96	0.97
	Urdu	6(1.5)	4(1.0)	25(6.4)	141(36.0)	216(55.1)	4.42	0.79
Classfellows	Siraiki	104(26.5)	69(43.1)	85(21.7)	28(7.1)	6(1.5)	2.14	0.94
	Punjabi	54(13.8)	159(40.6)	162(41.3)	9(2.3)	8(2.0)	2.38	0.83
	Urdu	3(0.8)	9(2.3)	82(20.9)	191(48.7)	107(27.3)	3.99	0.80

Linguistic choices of Siraiki speakers

Abbas,, M & Bidin, S, J., (2025)

Uni Admin	Siraiki	29(7.4)	92(23.5)	214(54.6)	45(11.5)	12(3.1)	2.79	0.85
	Punjabi	108(27.6)	175(44.6)	91(23.2)	12(3.1)	6(1.5)	2.06	0.88
	Urdu	3(0.8)	12(3.3)	44(11.2)	167(42.6)	165(42.1)	4.22	0.83
	Siraiki	80(20.4)	152(38.8)	127(32.4)	29(7.4)	4(1.0)	2.29	0.91
Punjabi							2.14	
Urdu							4.21	
Siraiki							2.41	

Appr Always = Approximately Always, MS = Mean score, SD = Standard Deviation

The third domain was the domain of socialization which divided into three situations; the language used with close friends, the language used for informal conversation and the language used for jokes. All the three situations of this domain were dominated by the use of the Siraiki language whereas the use of the Urdu language was also closely similar to that of the Siraiki language. As shown in table 4.17, the overall mean score with respect to the use of the Siraiki language was found to be 3.37 whereas it was 3.15 for the Urdu language. The respondents displayed similarly positive attitude towards both Siraiki and Urdu whereas their attitude was negative towards the Punjabi language in the domain of socialization. The overall mean score for the use of the Punjabi language was 2.64, which was the lowest in this domain. The details of the results in the domain of socialization have been presented in table 4.23.

Table 3
Language use in the domain of socialization

	Language	Appr Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	MS	SD
		N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)		
Close friends	Punjabi	53(13.5)	135(34.2)	162(41.3)	37(9.4)	6(1.5)	2.51	0.90
	Urdu	8(2.0)	84(21.4)	157(40.1)	125(31.9)	18(4.6)	3.16	0.88
	Siraiki	5(1.3)	41(10.5)	133(33.9)	165(42.1)	48(12.2)	3.54	0.88
Informal Conversations	Punjabi	44(11.2)	151(38.5)	161(41.1)	32(8.2)	4(1.0)	2.49	0.84
	Urdu	3(0.8)	73(18.6)	159(40.6)	137(34.9)	20(5.1)	3.25	0.84
	Siraiki	9(2.3)	61(15.6)	169(43.1)	127(32.4)	26(6.6)	3.26	0.88
Jokes	Punjabi	18(4.6)	71(18.1)	239(61.0)	58(14.8)	6(1.5)	2.91	0.75
	Urdu	6(1.9)	86(21.9)	199(50.8)	88(22.4)	13(3.3)	3.04	0.80
	Siraiki	9(2.3)	34(8.7)	201(51.3)	124(31.6)	24(6.1)	3.31	0.80
Punjabi							2.64	
Urdu							3.15	
Siraiki							3.37	

Appr Always = Approximately Always, MS = Mean score, SD = Standard Deviation

The fourth domain included in this study was the domain of emotion representation which comprised three situations; the use of language for condolence, for expressing joy and the use of language on social gatherings. Two out of three situations, which were condolence and social gatherings, were dominated by the use of the Urdu

language while the third situation i.e. the use of language for expressing joy was dominated by the Siraiki language. The use of the Punjabi language was quite nominal as the overall mean score was found to be 2.44 for the use of the Punjabi language. It can be seen in table 18 that the respondents exhibited negative attitude towards the Punjabi language while their language attitude towards the Urdu language and the Siraiki language was closely similar with 3.41 and 3.36 mean score respectively. The details of the results with respect to the domain of emotion representation are given in table 4.24.

Table 4
Language use in the domain of emotion representation

	Language	Appr Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	MS	SD
		N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)		
Condolence	Punjabi	76(19.4)	120(30.6)	152(38.8)	34(8.7)	10(2.6)	2.44	0.98
	Urdu	12(3.1)	42(10.7)	129(32.9)	157(40.1)	52(13.3)	3.50	0.96
	Siraiki	17(4.3)	68(17.3)	140(35.7)	121(30.9)	46(11.7)	3.28	1.02
Weddings	Punjabi	69(17.6)	133(33.9)	148(37.8)	37(9.4)	5(1.3)	2.43	0.93
	Urdu	6(1.5)	52(13.3)	184(46.9)	123(31.4)	27(6.9)	3.29	0.84
	Siraiki	10(2.6)	42(10.7)	146(37.2)	139(35.5)	55(14.0)	3.47	0.95
Social Gatherings	Punjabi	63(16.1)	145(37.0)	136(34.7)	43(11.0)	5(1.3)	2.44	0.93
	Urdu	7(1.8)	39(9.9)	153(39.0)	163(41.6)	30(7.7)	3.43	0.84
	Siraiki	10(2.6)	56(14.3)	157(40.1)	131(33.4)	38(9.7)	3.33	0.93
	Punjabi						2.44	
	Urdu						3.41	
	Siraiki						3.36	

Appr Always = Approximately Always, MS = Mean score, SD = Standard Deviation

The fifth domain of the professional interaction consisted of the language use in three situations; in offices, in banks and on work places. All the three situations under this domain were dominated by the use of the Urdu language with an overall mean score of 4.23. The overall mean score for the use of the Siraiki language was 2.48 whereas it was 2.21 for the use of the Punjabi language as shown in the table 19. This indicates that the respondents expressed highly positive attitude towards the Urdu language whereas their attitude towards both the Siraiki language and the Punjabi language was quite negative. The details of language use in the domain of the professional interaction are given in table 4.25.

Table 5
Language use in the domain of professional transaction

	Language	Appr Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	MS	SD
		N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)		
Offices	Punjabi	81(20.7)	167(42.6)	116(21.6)	16(4.1)	12(3.1)	2.26	0.94
	Urdu	3(0.8)	8(2.0)	43(11.0)	187(47.7)	151(38.5)	4.21	0.78
	Siraiki	48(12.2)	182(46.4)	119(30.4)	32(8.2)	11(2.8)	2.43	0.91
Banks	Punjabi	126(32.1)	161(41.1)	85(21.7)	13(3.3)	7(1.8)	2.02	0.91
	Urdu	4(1.0)	10(2.6)	25(6.5)	160(40.8)	193(49.2)	4.35	0.79

Linguistic choices of Siraiki speakers

Abbas,, M & Bidin, S, J., (2025)

	Siraiki	94(24.0)	173(44.1)	88(22.4)	30(7.7)	7(1.8)	2.19	0.95
Work	Punjabi	45(11.5)	188(48.0)	139(35.5)	14(3.6)	6(1.5)	2.36	0.79
places	Urdu	1(0.3)	14(3.6)	78(19.9)	215(54.8)	84(21.4)	3.94	0.76
	Siraiki	18(4.6)	98(25.0)	214(54.6)	55(14.0)	7(1.8)	2.83	0.79
	Punjabi						2.21	
	Urdu						4.17	
	Siraiki						2.48	

Appr Always = Approximately Always, MS = Mean score, SD = Standard Deviation

The sixth and the penultimate domain included in the current study was the domain of formal interaction. This domain included three situations; interaction with strangers, interaction with hotel staff and the language use for serious discussion. As shown in table 4.20, all the three situations were dominated by the use of the Urdu language. The overall mean score of the use of the Urdu language was found to 3.96 whereas both the Siraiki language and the Punjabi language were nominally used as none of the situations recorded mean score of above 3 for the Siraiki language or the Punjabi language. The overall mean score for the use of the Siraiki language was 2.79 while the overall mean score for the use of the Punjabi language was 2.20. This reveals that the respondents held positive attitude towards the Urdu language while their language attitude towards both the Siraiki language and the Punjabi language was quite negative. The detailed analysis of the responses in the domain of formal interaction is presented in table 4.26.

Table 6
Language use in the domain of formal interaction

	Language	Appr Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	MS	SD
		N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)		
Strangers	Punjabi	93(23.7)	172(43.9)	111(28.3)	8(2.0)	8(2.0)	2.15	0.88
	Urdu	2(0.5)	9(2.3)	58(14.8)	216(55.1)	107(27.3)	4.06	0.75
	Siraiki	34(8.7)	136(34.7)	137(34.9)	63(16.1)	22(5.6)	2.75	1.01
Hotel Staff	Punjabi	92(23.5)	155(39.5)	120(30.6)	14(3.6)	11(2.8)	2.23	0.94
	Urdu	3(0.8)	13(3.3)	70(17.9)	204(52.0)	102(26.0)	3.99	0.80
	Siraiki	35(8.9)	131(33.4)	157(40.1)	48(12.2)	21(5.4)	2.72	0.97
Serious Discussion	Punjabi	87(22.2)	157(40.1)	126(23.1)	13(3.3)	9(2.3)	2.23	0.91
	Urdu	4(1.0)	14(3.6)	101(25.8)	196(50.0)	77(19.6)	3.84	0.84
	Siraiki	27(6.9)	101(25.8)	161(41.1)	92(23.5)	11(2.8)	2.90	0.93
	Punjabi						2.20	
	Urdu						3.96	
	Siraiki						2.79	

Appr Always = Approximately Always, MS = Mean score, SD = Standard Deviation

The last domain was the domain of media which explored the use of language in visual media, print media and social media. This domain was overwhelmingly dominated by the use of the Urdu language as the mean score for all the three sub-domains for the use of the Urdu language was above 4.3. The overall mean score for the use of the Urdu language was found to be 4.37 whereas the use of both the Siraiki language and the Punjabi language was non-existent in all the three sub-domains of the domain of media. The analysis of the responses in the domain of media shows that the respondents displayed highly positive attitude towards the Urdu language while their language attitude towards both the Siraiki language and the Punjabi language was very negative on the other hand. The details of the results in the domain of media have been presented in table 4.27.

Table 7.

Language use in the domain of media

	Language	Appr Always	Often	Sometime s	Rarely	Never	MS	SD
		N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)		
Visual	Punjabi	98(23.5)	191(48.7)	89(22.7)	10(2.6)	10(2.6)	2.12	0.88
	Urdu	6(1.5)	5(1.3)	23(5.9)	184(46.9)	174(44.4)	4.31	0.77
	Siraiki	89(22.7)	176(44.9)	93(23.7)	25(6.4)	9(2.3)	2.21	0.94
Print	Punjabi	163(41.6)	161(41.1)	53(13.5)	3(0.8)	12(3.1)	1.83	0.91
	Urdu	10(2.6)	5(1.3)	14(3.6)	162(41.3)	201(51.3)	4.38	0.83
	Siraiki	153(39.0)	152(38.8)	68(17.3)	11(2.8)	8(2.0)	1.90	0.92
Social	Punjabi	169(43.1)	164(41.8)	41(10.5)	7(1.8)	11(2.8)	1.79	0.91
	Urdu	7(1.8)	4(1.0)	16(4.1)	160(40.8)	205(52.3)	4.41	0.77
	Siraiki	153(39.0)	149(38.0)	64(16.3)	14(3.6)	12(3.1)	1.94	0.98
	Punjabi						1.91	
	Urdu						4.37	
	Siraiki						2.01	

Appr Always = Approximately Always, MS = Mean score, SD = Standard Deviation

There were seven domains of language use explored in the current study. The comparisons of mean scores for each language in all seven domains reveal that there were five out of seven situations dominated by the Urdu language. As shown in table 4.28, there were three domains i.e. the domain of education, the domain of the professional interaction and the domain of media which recorded the mean score of above 4 for the use of the Urdu language. There were two domains dominated by the use of the Siraiki language and these were the domain of family and the domain of socialization. There was no domain in which the Punjabi language was even significantly used. There were clear boundaries of language use, moving from one language to another except on the language use in the domain of emotion representation. In this domain, the language use of the Siraiki language and the Urdu language was closely similar. The detailed comparison of the language use in all domains has been presented in the table 4.28.

Table 8
Domain wise analysis of language use

No	Domain Name	Siraiki		Punjabi		Urdu	
		MS	SD	MS	SD	MS	SD
1	Family	3.93	0.91	1.92	0.92	2.68	0.77
2	Education	2.41	0.73	2.14	0.78	4.21	0.69
3	Socialization	3.37	0.74	2.64	0.72	3.15	0.71
4	Emotion Representation	3.36	0.84	2.44	0.87	3.41	0.74
5	Professional Transaction	2.45	0.74	2.21	0.78	4.17	0.66
6	Formal Interaction	2.79	0.85	2.20	0.83	3.96	0.69
7	Media	2.01	0.77	1.91	0.73	4.37	0.68

MS = Mean score, SD = Standard Deviation

Mean score and standard deviation on each domain of language use with reference to three languages involved in the study are given table 4.30 for comparison.

The paired sample statistics was applied to explore any significant differences that may exist in language to language use in these seven domains of language use. The statistics given in the table 4.29 show that there existed significant differences for all three comparisons (Siraiki vs Punjabi, Siraiki vs Urdu and Punjabi vs Urdu) in all seven domains except the domain of emotion representation with reference to comparison of responses towards the Siraiki language and the Urdu language. The comparisons of the Siraiki language and the Punjabi language for all the seven domains produced significant p-values, thus representing the significant difference for comparison of two

languages in all seven domains. The comparison of the responses towards the Punjabi language and the Urdu language also produced significant p-values for all comparisons in seven domains of language use. It is also shown in the table that there existed significant differences in the perceptions of respondents towards the Siraiki language and the Urdu language in six domains while the difference was not significant in the domain of emotion representation.

Table 9.**Paired Sample Statistics on Domain wise Language use**

Domain #	Domain Name	Siraiki to Punjabi		Siraiki to Urdu		Punjabi to Urdu	
		t-value	sign	t-value	Sign	t-value	Sign
1	Family	24.782	0.000	17.288	0.000	-15.717	0.000
2	Education	6.065	0.000	-30.261	0.000	-33.124	0.000
3	Socialization	13.148	0.000	3.723	0.000	-9.342	0.000
4	Emotion Representation	14.498	0.000	-0.640	0.523	-15.996	0.000
5	Professional Transaction	6.287	0.000	-29.195	0.000	-32.113	0.000
6	Formal Interaction	10.612	0.000	-18.448	0.000	-28.488	0.000
7	Media	2.796	0.005	-39.250	0.000	-41.223	0.000

Table 4.30 and table 4.31 present the descriptive and inferential results of paired sample t-test applied on the overall mean score of language use in seven domains with respect to three languages under investigation. Table 4.24 shows that the respondents rated the Urdu language the most favourably with mean score of 3.71 (SD = 0.46), the Siraiki language as their second choice with mean score of 2.91 (SD = 0.54) while the Punjabi language was rated as the least favourable choice with mean score 2.21 (SD = 0.64). The detailed descriptive statistics are given in the table 4.31. It is concluded from the results that the Urdu language recorded the highest overall language use in accumulative of seven domains of language use. The perceptions of language use towards the Urdu language were also found to be significantly different from perceptions of language use of both, the Punjabi language and the Siraiki language. The second language in terms of high use was the Siraiki language while the lowest use was recorded for the Punjabi language in seven domains under investigation. This indicates that the language attitude of the respondents was highly positive towards the Urdu language on the language use scale, it was also positive for the Siraiki language, but the language attitude of the respondents towards the Punjabi language was not positive on language use scale.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

There were seven domains of language use explored in the current study. The comparisons of mean scores for each language in all seven domains reveal that there were five out of seven situations dominated by the Urdu language. There is lack of use of the native language of the Siraiki community and this can be attributed to language policies. Klimchenko (2020) also highlighted in a previous study that policymakers play an important role in promoting a language, increasing its proficiency, and disseminating it in various important domains of language use. The findings from the current study reveal that there were three domains i.e. the domain of education, the domain of professional interaction and the domain of media in which the respondents preferred to use Urdu language. The findings are like Farisiyah and Zainuddin (2018) who explored the linguistic preferences of bilingual Indonesians. They found that the Indonesian preferred to use Indonesian language in education and other public domains. Skutnabb-Kangas (2020) also believes that the imposition of dominant language in the domain of education can be attributed to politicized

language policies which is an indirect violation of linguistic rights of ethnolinguistic groups. Investigating the language attitude of Simalungun people towards the maintenance of their vernacular language, Damanik and Purba (2020) also concluded similar implications that negative attitude towards their ethnic language was a norm in that community.

There were two domains in the current study which were dominated by the use of the Siraiki language, and these were the domain of family and the domain of socialization. The findings are optimistic as the Siraiki ethnolinguistic retains their language in some domains. Zorčič (2022) argues that the domains of family are important as any strong language policy is required to revitalize the language that could be started from family domain. Farisiyah and Zainuddin (2018) also found in the language preferences of bilingual Indonesians that they preferred their local language in the domain of family. This leads to infer that ethnolinguistic community attach covert prestige to their mother tongue while they use dominant language in formal and public domains of language use. In the current study, it was noticed that the use of Siraiki in the domain of family showed gradual lack of intergenerational language transfer. The findings from the study of Andriyanti (2019) is also relevant in the context as Javanese intergenerational transmission was threatened as Javanese speaking reported that Bahasa Indonesian was their mother tongue.

There was clear domain specificity in most of the domains of language use with exception of the language use in the domain of emotion representation. In exploring the language practices and ideologies of the Chinese communities in Brussels, Li et al (2022) revealed that they preferred to use Mandarin in intimate communicative spheres and English in more public communicative domains. This means that in Bilingual situations, speakers will attach certain language ideologies to languages; the language which they consider powerful will dominate the formal or communicative domains while the native language will serve intimate or personal domains. Kvietok (2023) expresses that education plays an important role in promotion of any language therefore, the language policies enforced by education must promote linguistic diversity and multilingualism.

DECLARATIONS

Acknowledgement: We appreciate the generous support from all the contributor to the research and their different affiliations.

Funding: No funding body in the public, private, or nonprofit sectors provided a particular grant for this research.

Availability of data and material: In the approach, the data sources for the variables are stated.

Authors' contributions: Each author participated equally in the creation of this work.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Consent to Participate: Yes

Consent for publication and Ethical approval: Because this study does not include human or animal data, ethical approval is not required for publication. All authors have given their consent.

REFERENCES

- Berisso, T. (2021). *Multilingualism and language choice in domains*. In *Multilingualism: Interdisciplinary Topics* (pp. 1–xx). IntechOpen.
- Baker, C. (2018). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (6th ed.). Multilingual Matters.

- Blommaert, J. (2015). *Sociolinguistics of globalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (2015). *Language maintenance, language shift, and reversing language shift*. Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. A. (2019). Domains and the relationship between micro- and macro-sociolinguistics. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2019(255), 7–20.
- Gabriel, H. (2024). Choice and use of Sangu language among Sangu speakers of Mbarali Mbeya region, Tanzania. *East African Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 62–73.
- Garrett, P. (2016). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hinmassia, R. (2024). Language choice and attitudes in public institutions: The case of the University of Maroua. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 12(6), 1–18.
- Holmes, J., & Wilson, N. (2017). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). Routledge.
- Kircher, R., & Zipp, L. (2022). Language choice, identity, and social meaning. In R. Kircher & L. Zipp (Eds.), *Research methods in language attitudes* (pp. 33–52). Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, T. L. M., Abdullah, A. N., & Heng, C. S. (2017). Language choice and use in the education domain: A Malaysian case study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(2), 26–36.
- Li, W. (2018). *Translanguaging as a practical theory of language*. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30.
- Llamas, C., Mullany, L., & Stockwell, P. (2017). *The Routledge companion to sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Mei, T. L. M., Abdullah, A. N., Swee Heng, C., & Mohd Kasim, Z. B. (2016). *Language choice and use of Malaysian public university lecturers in the education domain*. Australian International Academic Centre.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2016). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Myers-Scotton, C., & Bolonyai, A. (2021). Code choice and the sociolinguistics of globalization. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 42(4), 289–303.
- Pavlenko, A. (2017). *Emotions and multilingualism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffman, H. F. (2018). Language policy, domains, and linguistic culture. *Language Policy*, 17(2), 179–200.
- Skrynnik, Y. (2024). The choice theory in linguistic studies. *Migration Letters*, 21(4), 1490–1502.
- Spolsky, B. (2018). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, J. W., & Pérez-Milans, M. (2018). *The Oxford handbook of language policy and planning*. Oxford University Press.
- Wei, L., & García, O. (2022). Not a first language but one repertoire: Translanguaging and language choice. *Language, Culture and Society*, 4(1), 1–17.
- Yamamoto, M. (2020). Domain analysis and language choice in multilingual communities. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2020(264), 115–132.
- Zhou, M., & Sun, H. (2019). Language choice and language ideology in multilingual societies. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(6), 481–495.

