

Domains of Language Use among Gaddang Speakers in Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines

Zayda S. Asuncion

*University of Santo Tomas, España, Manila, The Philippines
Saint Mary's University, Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya, The Philippines
zjasuncion@yahoo.com*

Marilu Rañosa Madrunio, Ph.D.

*University of Santo Tomas, España, Manila, The Philippines
malumadrunio@gmail.com*

Abstract

As a sociolinguistic study, this paper investigated domains of language use among Gaddang speakers, a multilingual ethnic group in the northern part of the Philippines and its possible differences in using Gaddang, Tagalog/Filipino, Ilocano, and English in the public and internal domains considering geographical area, age, gender, economic status, and educational attainment. There were 568 Gaddang speakers who participated in the study. Employing survey questionnaire to gather quantitative data and a semi-structured interview to support quantitative results, the study revealed that the Gaddang speakers used Gaddang, Tagalog, Ilocano, and English in the public and internal domains, but the dominant language preferred is Tagalog. Significant differences in domains of language use were apparent in terms of geographical area, age, socio economic status, and educational attainment in the use of Gaddang and English in the public domain. In the internal domain, the Gaddang speakers vary in their use of Gaddang, Ilocano, Tagalog, and English considering geographical area, age, socio economic status, and educational attainment. Significant implications on two linguistic phenomena such as language maintenance and language shift can be deduced from the results.

Keywords: *sociolinguistics, domains of language use, public domain, internal domain, multilinguals, ethnic groups/communities*

1. Introduction

Language use has been a common interest in sociolinguistic studies in recent years particularly in multilingual communities. Fishman (1972) opines that in multilingual communities, speakers tend to choose a language they need to use considering the person they communicate with, the place or setting where the communication takes place, the reason for communicating, and the manner of communication. Hence, language domain may refer to the home, public domain, and even internal domain or self-directed speech situations such as talking to oneself, thinking in words, doing metal

calculation, praying, dreaming, and others. Romaine (2000) supports the same concept in her definition of domain as “an abstraction which refers to a sphere of activity representing a combination of specific time, settings, and role relationships” (p. 44). Identifying domains of language use in multilingual settings is essential in determining the vitality of a language, especially the native language or the mother tongue of a certain speech community.

The Philippines, as a multilingual and multicultural nation in Asia, consists of communities with diverse language and cultures. According to Gonzalez (1985 in Bautista, 1996) the Philippines consists of a “multi-ethnic population speaking various Austronesian languages of the West Indonesian branch, which are not mutually intelligible but are clearly related to each other under various sub-groupings” (p. 38). One of the communities with rich language and culture is the Gaddang speech group in the northern part of the country, in the province of Nueva Vizcaya.

The province of Nueva Vizcaya, where the sociolinguistic survey was conducted, is geographically situated in the north-central part of Luzon. As a province, it has the following boundaries: to the north, north and northwest, by Isabela; to the northwest by the province of Ifugao; to the west by Benguet, Mountain Province and a little portion of Pangasinan; to the south by Nueva Ecija and partly by Aurora Province. Nueva Vizcaya belongs to the Northern Luzon region in the Philippines. Its land area is 4,378.8 square kilometers. The province is composed of 15 municipalities with Bayombong as the provincial capital and major educational center, Bambang and Solano as the major commercial centers, and Kayapa as the summer capital and “vegetable bowl” of the province. According to the 2007 census, the total population of Nueva Vizcaya is estimated at 397,387.

Bayombong, Solano, and Bagabag are the three municipalities where the Gaddang communities reside. Specifically, three barangays in Bayombong and Bagabag and two in Solano were identified as the communities where the Gaddangs belong. As multilinguals, the Gaddangs speak at least four languages such as Gaddang, their native language; Filipino/Tagalog, the national language; Ilocano, the lingua franca of the province; and English, as their second language. As mentioned by Vinluan (1986) the Gaddang (Ga’dang) language is a member of the Ibanagic group of languages of Northeastern Luzon. As a linguistic group, there is a scarcity of literature that refers to the Gaddangs. The indigenous group of the Gaddangs is less-researched and linguistic studies about them are less common. Hence, this study was conceptualized primarily to contribute to the dearth of literature on minority languages in the Philippines like Gaddang. Through this study it is also hoped that other people’s knowledge of this specific language community will expand. As a sociolinguistic study, it aimed to identify domains of language use among the Gaddangs, specifically in the public and internal domains.

2. Review of Literature

Over the years, several studies have been conducted on language use or language choice in multilingual settings. Language use in these studies identified the domains where major or minor languages are used within speech communities. Several studies related language use with other variables such as language attitudes and motivation, age, gender, economic status, and educational attainment, among others. The following foreign and local studies are found to be relevant to the present study because they also investigated domains of language use, which is the focus in the present study.

2.1 Language choice in different domains

One interesting study was conducted by Adeniyi and Bello (2007) which examined the dominant language in the Lagos metropolis, the factors that determine language choice, and the language used in some selected domains. Findings revealed that the informants' common languages used in official domain were Yoruba and English, but some spoke Arabic as their mother tongue like Urhobo and Delta Igbo. Language in the domain of religion varied according to religion because Yoruba was the language of the immediate environment. The language used at home also varied with most informants preferring to use indigenous languages at home while others preferred to use English or either use English or Yoruba as the situation demands. In education, English played the role of the sole language of instruction. Yoruba was mostly used in selected radio stations and television houses. Finally, Yoruba was the language that was widely spoken in the Lagos metropolis.

Meanwhile, Katubi (2007) examined patterns of language use by native speakers in areas where the population was generally Lampungic, a native language spoken in Lampung Province and Parts of South Sumatra Province, Indonesia. The study presented that Lampungic was the language used in everyday life around the home although there were some families that indicated the use of mix Indonesian and Lampungic languages. In the neighbourhood domain, there were some subjects who spoke Indonesian and other languages. In relation to trading, there was a tendency for the native Lampungese to use a mixture of Lampungic, Indonesian, Palembang Malay, Javanese, and others. In the domain of education, not all teachers can use Lampungic because not all of them were Lampungese. Outside the classroom, students used mix languages, particularly code-switching, which mainly depended on their peers' ethnic group. In reference to traditional ceremonies, they used Indonesian and mix languages such as Palembang Malay, but Lampung predominated. In the domain of religion, they tended to use Arabic and Indonesian. As a consequence of such situations of language use in the different domains, a case of diglossia was present in the province. In such a situation, there is a tendency for language shift, unless efforts are exerted to reverse the shift.

In 2009, Magaspag studied language use and attitudes towards the languages spoken among Kachok speakers in Cambodia as well as the vitality status of their language. This descriptive research used survey questionnaire, observations, and interviews to gather data. The study discovered that Kachok was the language used at home by the respondents with their parents, siblings, grandparents, and extended family members. With respect to the language used with their Kachok friends in the village, the Kachok speakers reported that they used Kachok, but when they talk with non-Kachok friends, they used the language spoken by their friends. In the public domain, particularly in the market, a majority of the Kachok speakers used Khmer while they used Kachok during village ceremonies, weddings, funerals, and at village meetings. When the neighboring groups are concerned, the respondents expressed that they used the language of the neighboring village. In line with the religious domain, the three villagers dominantly used Kachok in preaching, giving announcements, including corporate and private prayers. Children used Kachok at school and at play. According to the author, although the Kachok language is not the language of education and literacy, mass media, and documentations, it is not endangered; however, as compared to the other languages in Cambodia, Khmer is the most vital, followed by Tampuan and Kreung and the least, Kachok.

Ting and Ling (2013) examined the use of indigenous languages among ethnic groups in Sarawak, Malaysia. Results revealed that the respondents' ethnic languages were commonly used in the religious and family domains. Moreover, the ethnic language was employed for the purpose

of intra-ethnic communication while the Malay varieties were purposely used for inter-ethnic communication. Bahasa Malaysia in particular was dominantly used in public domains consisting of education and transaction. In the domain of mass media, respondents reported that they preferred to use Bahasa Malaysia. For Internet and online communication, Malay varieties were dominantly used although a small number used their ethnic language, and some used English. Sarawak Malay was preferred over Bahasa Malaysia when it comes to spoken communication, but the latter was employed for written. The study also found that variables such as ethnic group, locality, both parents' ethnic group and economic status predict ethnic language use.

Combining language use and language attitudes of minority ethnic groups, Dweik, Nofal, and Qawasmeh (2014) studied the domains in which Arabic and English are used by 70 Muslim Arabs in Vancouver, Canada and their attitudes to these two languages. Results showed that Muslim Arabs mostly used Arabic at home and in school when communicating with teachers and classmates because they attended Arabic schools. In the domain of work and religion, the dominant language used was also Arabic. When communicating with their neighbours and friends and in the context of media, both English and Arabic were utilized. But they reported employing English in using mobile phones and writing emails. In terms of self-expression, the language that was more preferred is Arabic.

In the Philippines, Quakenbush (1996) studied language use, attitude, and proficiency among Agutaynen speakers in Palawan. He used survey questionnaire, participant observation, and personal interviewing to gather data. Results showed that the Agutaynen was the language of the home. Cuyonon was the language used when communicating with Cuyonon. Tagalog was favored as the national language and the language of education and used with strangers and unknown visitors. The Agutaynen people minimally used English in formal settings.

Borlongan (2009) found that English dominated most domains of use and verbal activities including intimate contexts among college students of a private university. The study concluded that the spread of English continues in Filipino society, as evidenced by the dominance of its use in various domains and activities and in intimate contexts such as the home, prayers, and expressions of intimate emotions. Moreover, the respondents still preferred Tagalog/Filipino to be the national language of the Philippines, but they also expressed that (Philippine) English could be a symbol of their being a Filipino.

In line with language use in the Internet, Watters and Watters (2015) investigated the choice of language among Filipino users of the Internet. Four Internet sites or domains on education, commercial, government, and non-profit organizations were used as sources of data. Based on the exploration, Filipinos commonly used English in these sites notwithstanding the fact that the Internet can be a platform where people are free to use any language including Filipino or indigenous languages, for instance. It was also noted in the study that the only Filipino words included in these sites were creative works with powerful expressive words and personal relevance. The authors opine that the dominant use of English in the Internet may have been influenced by the prestige that goes with the language, being the language of the educated and high class.

2.2 Language choice in relation to social variables

One study essential to the present paper was done by Yeh, Chan and Cheng (2004) focusing on the language proficiency and language use of three non-Mainlander groups in Taiwan. The authors examined the relationship of language choice and variables such as gender, age, educational level and social domains. In relation to language use with interlocutors, the Minnanrens spoke

Minnanyu more often with different interlocutors, speaking Mandarin only with teachers and with people from other ethnic groups. The aboriginals relied on using Mandarin more often than their native languages with their interlocutors except with parents and grandparents. The Hakka used their native language more often when speaking with parents, grandparents and siblings as well as with people of the same ethnicity. They only spoke Mandarin with others in the domains of work, education, and friendship. It is quite interesting to note that Mandarin was used more often than the ethnic language by the Hakka people when talking with their children. There was also significant difference in the use of ethnic language among the three groups in the study.

Ghazali (2014) identified domains of language use and attitudes among 67 speakers of Mah Meri in Malaysia. The researcher used questionnaire, interviews, and observations to answer the research problems. The respondents were categorized in three age groups: 45 years old and above, 21 respondents; 21-45, 25 respondents; and 12-20 years old, 21 respondents. There were three domains identified in the study, namely, cultural and religious domain, which includes cultural rites, religious rites, and own prayers; the domain of workplace and school, which consists of language use with colleagues, employers, and/or teachers. The last domain was the home. Based on the results, the majority of the respondents belonging to the first age group used Mah Meri in cultural and religious domains. Almost all of those in the second age group were found to use Mah Meri while only a small number used Malay, or a combination of Malay and Mah Meri in these domains. Among the last age group, variations in language use were noted in that the highest percentage of the respondents used Mah Meri, while a smaller percentage used Malay, a combination of Malay and Mah Meri, Arabic, and a mixture of Malay and Arabic. In the workplace domain, it was found that the five wage earners belonging to the old group used Malay with employer/superior while more than 50% used Mah Meri and less than 50% used Malay and Mah Meri with peers/colleagues. As to the middle-aged group, all those working used Malay with the employers/superiors, but when it comes to peers/colleague, most of them used Malay and Mah Meri. Only a few indicated the use of Mah Meri and the last choice was Malay. On the part of the young, all respondents earning wage expressed the use of Malay with employer/superior; however, more than half chose Malay and Mah Meri when they communicate with peers/colleagues, and only a few chose Mah Meri. In the school domain, the majority of the respondents going to school used Malay with teachers and only one indicated the use of Malay and English combined. When communicating with school friends, most of them combined Malay and Mah Meri and a few used Malay only. With respect to family domain, Mah Meri was dominantly used with family members among the old group. The same language was preferred by the middle-aged group although there were those who indicated the use of both Mah Meri and Malay. The same result as that of the middle-aged group was noted among the young group. The author concluded that the Mah Meri showed determination in maintaining their language; however, there is an indication of instability because of their desire for economic advancement.

In the Philippine context, the study of Pineda (2012) explored the domains of language use in relation to variables such as gender and age. The results of the study are as follows: 1) The local language was preferred by the native speakers in the province of Marinduque in the three domains, but it was most defined in the family domain; 2) Standard Tagalog and English were used only in the church and school domains by the professionals and the native speakers who were exposed to both languages; 3) In Eastern Marinduque, Marinduque Tagalog was the language used in the family and school domains in both formal and informal conversations; 4) In the church domain, Standard Tagalog and English were used in communicating with priests and nuns in formal conversations; however, in informal conversations, Marinduque Tagalog was preferred; 5) In

Western Marinduque, Marinduque Tagalog was preferably used in formal conversations particularly with lay ministers and nuns and very few native speakers used the local language in informal conversations in the church domain; 6) The use of English and Standard Tagalog was higher in Eastern Marinduque compared to Western Marinduque which could be attributed to the number of respondents who have been exposed to the outside world; 7) The use of Standard Tagalog was related to speaker's age in which the percentage of teens using Standard Tagalog in the school domain was comparably smaller than the percentage of other groups; 8) The use of English was also related to age since teenagers preferred to use English in the church and family domains, while adults and senior citizens also indicated the use of English in the family; 9) More males used Marinduque Tagalog in the church domain compared to females; 10) More females used the local language in the school domain compared to male speakers; 11) More males used Standard Tagalog and English in the church domain; and 12) More females used Standard Tagalog and English in the family and school domains.

2.3 Factors affecting language choice

In Singapore, Cavallaro and Serwe (2010) identified factors that influence language choice for communication. Based on the data, age was found to be the most influential factor on language choice where grandparents were considered as instruments in the use of Malay. In addition, media input in Malay also motivated the speakers to use the ethnic language instead of English. Moreover, age was another factor where younger generation was related to the increased use of English. Further, gender and age also influenced language choice in that older women used Malay more often than the younger ones. Younger women in the working group dominantly used English with siblings and relatives. Also, those belonging to the highest income group and educational attainment were more inclined to use English than any of the other groups. Those with low income had the tendency to use more Malay at home.

Using survey questionnaire, Qawar (2014) examined the language choice and use of 100 Arab Canadians with varying ages, educational attainments, occupations, religions, gender, and residences. The study identified the domains of use of Arabic, English, and French among the Arabic Canadians; the factors that influenced their language choice and use; and their attitudes towards Arabic, English and French. Results revealed that language choice in the home domain and with family members was mostly Arabic, but there were those who claimed that they used Arabic and French with children, brothers and sisters, and spouse. Language choice in terms of neighbourhood and friends was Arabic and French, followed by Arabic, English, and French; however, when it comes to relatives in the neighbourhood, they chose Arabic more often than the other languages. As regards worship and other matters related to it, the dominant language used was Arabic although a few used Arabic and French with friends inside and outside place of worship. At work places and educational institutions, the dominant language was French, followed by English and French, then Arabic, and the last was English. In line with media, varying responses were identified; however, the respondents chose Arabic and French more often, followed by Arabic, English, and French. When it comes to language choice in using smart phones programs and applications, English was dominantly used. For government offices and formal applications, French was dominantly used, followed by English. Varied responses were noted with respect to language choice for emotional expressions. When it comes to dreaming, expressing happiness and frustration as well as telling a joke, Arabic was the choice. But when the respondents were in a hurry or hungry, or when they intended to flatter, show off, or brag, they used Arabic and French, but in greeting, they mostly used Arabic, English, and French. For the respondents, the use of

Arabic was mostly influenced by family and home, social interaction, religion, ethnic identity, and listening to the radio. Their choice of English was influenced by factors such as national identity, watching TV, listening to radio stations, and work. With respect to French, their choice was influenced by education, listening to radio stations, watching TV, social networking sites, and work.

Chuchu and Noorashid (2014) focused on language choices of Bruneians within interethnic communication. Two multiple ethnic communities in Brunei were chosen in the study, Kampong Kiudang and Kampong Mungkom (Kiudang/Mungkom) where the ethnic minorities were free to employ their native tongues in their daily communications. The 60 respondents with varying age groups and educational backgrounds came from four ethnicities such as Dusun, Bruneian Malay, Tutung, and Chinese. Based on observations and interviews, the authors initially found that the respondents were able to use Brunei Malay, the local vernacular, and their ethnic dialects. All the Brunei Malay respondents chose Brunei Malay as their daily code; however, this did not hold true to both Dusun and Tutung minority groups. The Dusun generally preferred to use Meting/Belait in their everyday speech while the Tutung chose Dusun dialect. For the Chinese, their language choice was Mandarin. The authors concluded that language choice among the four minority groups depend upon comprehensibility of the language as well as the audience or interlocutors, the addressee, migration, and intermarriage. More interestingly, the respondents' choice of Brunei Malay indicates its value as a local vernacular not only within interethnic communities but also among the non-indigenes as well. Their choice of their native language is based on its value of reflecting their identity and constructing intergroup solidarity.

Nguyen, Trieschnigg, and Cornips (2015) studied the use of minority languages in Twitter among respondents from Friesland, a Dutch province, and possible factors that influenced their choice. They found that language choice in Twitter among the Dutch depended upon the language choice of the addressee. In other words, a minority language was used by a Twitter user when the addressed user also used a minority language. The study also showed that language choice was affected by the language of the Twit the user was responding to. Lastly, there was a tendency for the respondents to switch to minority languages during conversations in Twitter.

2.4 Language choice and language vitality

Exploring multilingualism in Taiwan, Chen (2010) focused on the frequency of language use in different domains, language proficiency, and language attitudes of Taiwanese respondents. The study found that Taiwanese people were proficient enough in Mandarin, their national language, in all ages and educational attainment while there was a decrease in proficiency as regards their ethnic languages. With respect to English as their foreign language, the Taiwanese people's proficiency was influenced by their education in that the higher the educational attainment of a Taiwanese, the higher is his/her proficiency in English. As regards domains of language use, Mandarin dominated all domains involved in the study, followed by Taiwanese ethnic languages, then English. The results suggested the decline of the vitality of the Taiwanese ethnic languages. In relation to language attitudes, Taiwanese people recognized Mandarin positively because of its role as the primary tool for communication in Taiwan. English was also viewed positively because of its instrumental value while the ethnic languages were regarded as tools for group solidarity and worthy of cross-generational transmission. The author concluded that Taiwan ethnic languages are being threatened in relation to their functions in the community while Mandarin and English are gaining their power and vitality.

Based on the study conducted by Adams, Matu, and Ongagora (2012), the Kinubi speakers of Kibera, Kenya dominantly used Kinubi at home with family members. It was found that this minority language was not threatened with the presence of Kiswahili, a major language of the Nubians because members of the family including extended family members perpetuated the use of Kinubi at home and as a cultural language. By observation, the younger generation would use Sheng or Kiswahili more often than the older generation indicating that the maintenance of Kinubi is encouraged by this generation. The study also affirmed conclusions of previous studies that language choice is influenced by the interlocutors, which was also practiced by the Nubians to show respect to the non-Kinubi speakers. The authors concluded that Kinubi was still vital and vibrant because it was the choice of the community as the language of the home. As Coulmas (2005) posits, “a shift can be detected from a speaker's language choice in the home domain, which is generally agreed to be the last bastion of language maintenance” (p. 104).

To identify the vitality of Chabacano in five communities in the Philippines namely Zamboanga, Ternate, Cavite City, Davao City, and Ermita, Genuino (2005) examined the most preferred language and possible factors that affected language choice among the Chabacanos. The study found that Chabacano was the most preferred language in Zamboanga while Filipino was most preferred in Ternate. In Cavite City, Filipino was also the most preferred and the youngest generation was familiar only with Filipino and English. Chabacano no longer existed in the city of Davao and Ermita. Additionally, the most important factor affecting language choice was the interlocutor. Other factors were age and role-relationship. Finally, migration, intermarriage, language policy, economic advancement, and language attitude were the factors that negatively affected language vitality.

Kobari (2009) studied the language situation of the Butuanon speakers and found that Butuanon was still used by the speakers in the home domain as well as in the local community. Butuanon was also regarded as the language that marked their identity as Butuanons and a marker of positive emotional significance.

Tejalosa's (2012) dissertation also determined domains of language use in order to identify the ethnolinguistic vitality of the three Batak communities in Palawan. The study revealed that the majority of the respondents dominantly used Batak at home, in the neighbourhood, and at work. In the church domain, Batak and Tagalog were the dominant languages while the language used outside the community during conversations was dependent on the language of the interlocutor.

Campos' (2014) study about Manobo speakers considered language use, language vitality, language attitudes, and attitudes towards language displacement in relation to the respondents' age, gender, and location. Considering all these variables, she investigated which language was used in the different domains and the attitudes they had towards their native language and other languages they spoke in order to determine the vitality of the Manobo language of Agusan. Results revealed that for the home domain, the most preferred language was Manobo only; for social and public domains, Cebuano was preferred as well for the religious domain. It can be implied that there was a decline in the use of Manobo in these domains. The vitality of the Manobo language was described as fair in the home domain because of change in language use considering the respondents' generation. Hence, the author concluded the likelihood of language shift. It was also found that between the remote and non-remote barangays, language choice was primarily on Manobo for remote, but Cebuano for non-remote. When speaking with their friends, the Manobo speakers generally used Manobo. However, when communicating with non-Manobo friends, almost all the respondents claimed that they used Cebuano. For remote barangays, Manobo was preferred over Cebuano when they talked to their neighbors while Cebuano was dominantly used

by the Manobo speakers in this particular domain. In the social/public domain, most of the Manobo speakers claimed that they used Manobo in the market with other Manobos; however, when they communicated with non-Manobos in the market, they preferred to use Cebuano, but a small number was noted to use both Cebuano and Manobo. During barangay meetings, remote barangays used Manobo while the non-remote barangays preferred to use Cebuano. When talking with barangay officials, the dominant language used for both remote and non-remote barangays was Cebuano although some preferred the use of both Cebuano and Manobo. Similarly, when they talked with their teachers, they dominantly used Cebuano. Quite a number expressed the use of both Manobo and Cebuano. When talking to city people, they used Cebuano more than they used Manobo. In church gatherings, singing church songs, corporate prayer, church announcements, personal prayer, and use of Bible, Cebuano emerged as the dominant language.

The foregoing studies on language use provide a rich background for the present study. Although language use has been extensively studied, this study somehow fills the gap in the scarce literature on language choices that indigenous speakers such as Gaddangs have in the public and internal domains. This study concentrated on investigating language use of an indigenous group in Nueva Vizcaya and its relationship to social factors like location, gender, age, economic status, and educational level.

2.5 Research Problems

This study sought to identify domains of language use among Gaddang speakers in selected barangays of three municipalities in the province of Nueva Vizcaya in relation to certain social variables. The following research problems are the main concern of this paper:

1. What language do the Gaddang speakers prefer to use in public and internal domains?
2. Are there significant differences in language use when the Gaddang speakers are grouped according to the following social variables:
 - 2.1 geographical area;
 - 2.2 age;
 - 2.3 gender;
 - 2.4 economic status; and
 - 2.5 educational attainment?

2.6 Theoretical Framework

The study is grounded in the domain theory of Fishman (1965), which explains that a certain language is used by a speaker in a particular domain such as the home, school, neighbourhood, church, self-expression, and others. Moreover, this theory also postulates that speakers in multilingual communities have the tendency to relate language to specific domains in that the language used at home may be different from the language used in church, in the neighbourhood, at work or school. Thus, a certain language has its specific function in a particular domain. Further, Fishman (1967) avers that “proper usage dictates that only one of the theoretically coavailable languages or varieties will be chosen by particular kinds of interlocutors on particular kinds of occasions to discuss particular kinds of topics” (p. 437).

Schmidt-Rohr (1963, in Fishman, 1965) recommends nine domains: family, the playground and street, the school, the church, literature, the press, the military, the courts, and the governmental administration. These domains are said to be similar to those spheres of activity related to the study of acculturation, intergroup relations, and bilingualism. Based on this concept, Fishman (1965 in Gumperz and Hymes, 1972) suggests that domains should be defined “in terms

of institutional contexts and their congruent behavioral co-occurrences. They attempt to summate the major clusters of interaction that occur in clusters of multilingual settings and involving clusters of interlocutors" (p. 441). Hence, at this point, domains help us to recognize that language choice and topic are connected to widespread sociocultural norms and expectations. In addition, domains may also be classified according to sociophysiological level, which encompasses domains like intimate, informal, formal, and intergroup. Further, Fishman (1965 in Gumperz and Hymes, 1972) also adds governmental administration domain as referring to a "social nexus which normally brings certain kinds of people together primarily for a certain cluster of purposes" (p. 442). This has something to do with role relation that exists when, for instance, mother talks to father, father to mother, father to child, child to mother, mother to child, grandfather to mother, mother to grandfather, grandmother to father, father to grandmother, and other that exemplify dyads in the family. In the same manner, dyads manifesting role relation may be shown between teacher and student, principal and teacher, buyer and vendor, priest and parishioner, and the like.

In this study, some social variables like age, gender, geographical area, economic status, and educational attainment are related to language use to identify possible significant differences.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

As a sociolinguistic study, the present research utilized both qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative data were essential to supplement quantitative results. To determine language use among Gaddang speakers in public and internal domains, it used the descriptive analytical design.

3.2 Participants

Following the ethics of research, the study included 568 Gaddang speakers, who were all willing to participate in the study. However, in some cases, the sample size was not the same because of missing data; therefore, some were excluded in the analysis. All participants came from the lineage of the Gaddang ethnic group. The respondents were chosen using purposive sampling based on gender, age group, geographical area, economic status, and educational attainment. As mentioned in the previous discussion, three municipalities namely Bayombong, Solano, and Bagabag were chosen because these were the towns where the Gaddangs live. In Bayombong, Salvacion, Vista Alegre, and San Nicolas were the three barangays chosen. In Solano, Barangay Roxas and Quirino were included while three barangays namely San Pedro, San Geronimo, and Villa Coloma were included in Bagabag.

3.3 Research instruments

A survey questionnaire consisting of two parts was employed to gather quantitative data. Part I consisted of the respondents' personal profile which included the respondents' social variables such as geographical area, age, gender, economic status, and educational attainment. Part II comprised of two domains: the public domain with 13 sub-domains, and the internal domain with nine sub-domains. In Part II, the respondents were asked to indicate how often they used Gaddang, Ilocano, Tagalog, and English in communicating with each of the persons or in each situation indicated. These domains were patterned after various sources like the study of Quakenbush (1996). Moreover, some modifications in the items were made to suit the context of the study. A four-point Likert scale was used: 4, always; 3, most of the times; 2, sometimes; and 1, never. The instrument was piloted and subjected to reliability test with Cronbach's alpha of .912. To

determine the respondents' reasons in using a particular language, a semi-structured oral interview was conducted. The interview was conducted orally with respondents who were willing to be interviewed. However, there were some who did not concede to the oral interview due to time constraint; hence, the written interview was employed.

3.4 Data collection and analysis

The main source of data was the survey questionnaire, which was subjected to reliability test. After securing the reliability of the questionnaire, the respondents were purposively identified. Letters of request were forwarded to concerned people to seek permission for the administration of the questionnaire. Only those who were willing to participate were given the questionnaire. Student respondents were given a maximum of 30 minutes to answer while the questionnaires given to non-student respondents, who requested to be given more time, were retrieved a little later. To support the quantitative data, oral interviews were likewise conducted with some respondents. However, some preferred to answer written interviews. After all questionnaires and written interviews were retrieved, the data were collated and encoded for analysis. Written interviews were encoded while oral interviews were transcribed.

3.5 Statistical treatment

For purposes of classification and interpretation of the respondents' use of language in the two domains and 22 sub-domains, means, median and standard deviations were used. Using ANOVA, the differences on language use when the respondents were grouped according to geographical area, age groups, economic status, and educational attainment were computed. *t*-test was used to identify significant differences in relation to the variable for gender.

4. Results

4.1 Language use in the public domain

The first aim of the study was to determine the language that the Gaddang speakers prefer to use in the public domain, which consists of 13 sub-domains such as friends, workmates, neighbors, teachers, classmates, older schoolmates, school heads, older school personnel, priests and nuns, lay ministers and catechists, fellow brothers and sisters in the church, texting, and social media. Table 1 summarizes the languages that Gaddangs used in the public domain.

Table 1

Language Use in the Public Domain

Public Domain		Gaddang	Ilocano	Tagalog	English
Friends	N	555	546	548	548
	Mean	2.587	3.060	3.026	1.626
	Median	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.000
	SD	1.1960	.8405	.8759	.8469
Workmates	N	304	295	297	295
	Mean	2.720	3.132	2.889	1.631
	Median	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.000
	SD	1.0518	.8803	.8450	.9489

Public Domain		Gaddang	Ilocano	Tagalog	English
Neighbors	N	556	546	548	548
	Mean	2.646	3.099	2.903	1.434
	Median	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.000
	SD	1.1910	.8765	.8635	.7463
Teachers	N	556	546	548	547
	Mean	1.853	2.755	3.407	2.163
	Median	2.000	3.000	4.000	2.000
	SD	1.0240	.8956	.7956	.9876
Classmates	N	556	546	548	547
	Mean	1.853	2.755	3.407	2.163
	Median	2.000	3.000	4.000	2.000
	SD	1.0240	.8956	.7956	.9876
Older schoolmates	N	556	546	548	548
	Mean	1.973	2.864	3.334	1.781
	Median	2.000	3.000	4.000	2.000
	SD	1.0506	.8567	.8290	.8441
School heads (principals, supervisors, deans, administrators)	N	556	546	548	548
	Mean	1.741	2.645	3.456	2.066
	Median	1.000	3.000	4.000	2.000
	SD	1.0158	.8536	.7672	.9576
Older school personnel (guard, secretaries, etc.)	N	556	546	548	548
	Mean	1.862	2.841	3.387	1.776
	Median	2.000	3.000	4.000	2.000
	SD	1.0012	.8832	.8202	.8651
Priests and nuns	N	556	546	548	547
	Mean	1.737	2.729	3.412	1.929
	Median	1.000	3.000	4.000	2.000
	SD	.9843	.9325	.8344	.9020
Lay ministers and catechists	N	556	546	548	548
	Mean	1.824	2.786	3.301	1.805
	Median	1.000	3.000	4.000	2.000
	SD	1.0194	.9325	.8672	.9171
Fellow brothers and sisters in the church	N	555	546	548	548
	Mean	2.056	2.894	3.252	1.752
	Median	2.000	3.000	4.000	1.000
	SD	1.1347	.9085	.8796	.9153
Texting	N	516	507	507	509
	Mean	1.804	2.679	3.396	2.063
	Median	1.000	3.000	4.000	2.000
	SD	1.0175	.9268	.8772	.9391
Social media (email, facebook, twitter)	N	422	414	417	419
	Mean	1.640	2.234	3.300	2.487
	Median	1.000	2.000	4.000	3.000
	SD	.9955	.9288	.9271	1.0944
Overall	N	566	546	548	548
	Mean	1.926	2.860	3.336	1.808
	Median	1.909	2.905	3.500	1.760
	SD	.9075	.6967	.6435	.6890

Legend: 4- always 3-almost all the time 2-sometimes 1-never

The analysis of the data is based on the median and mean scores to reflect appropriately how often the respondents used a particular language at a particular domain. Apparently, based on the medians, the Gaddangs used Gaddang, Ilocano, and Tagalog with friends almost all the time. However, if the basis is the mean scores, the most dominant was Ilocano (mn=3.060), followed by Tagalog (mn=3.026), then Gaddang (mn=2.587). The Gaddangs never used English with their friends as reflected in the median of 1.000. The same pattern can be gleaned from the data with respect to the language they used with workmates and neighbors. When it comes to the language they used with their teachers, the median (4.000) reflects that they always used Tagalog, Ilocano (md=3.000) almost all the time, Gaddang and English (md=2.000) were used sometimes. The same pattern of language choice can be seen in terms of the language they used with classmates, older schoolmates, and older school personnel. However, the Gaddangs disclosed that they never used Gaddang (md=1.000) with school heads. Instead, they used Tagalog always (md=4.000), Ilocano most of the time (md=3.000), and English sometimes (md=2.000). Therefore, the most preferred language in the school domain was Tagalog. When they communicated with priests and nuns, lay ministers and catechists, the Gaddangs expressed that they use Tagalog always (md=4.000), Ilocano almost all the time (md=3.000), English sometimes (md=2.000), and Gaddang never (md=1.000). When they communicated with fellow brothers and sisters in the church, Tagalog was rated always, Ilocano almost all the time, Gaddang sometimes, and English never. With respect to texting, they also chose Tagalog, followed by Ilocano, then English, and the last was Gaddang. Lastly, Tagalog was again the most dominant language they used in social media, followed by English, then Ilocano, but they never used Gaddang. Overall, the Gaddang speakers' most preferred language in the public domain was Tagalog, followed by Ilocano, then Gaddang, and the last was English.

4.2 Language use in the internal domain

The Gaddang speakers were also asked to indicate the language they preferred to use in the internal domain. This domain is categorized into two. The first category refers to the cognitive domain, which includes activities such as talking to oneself, writing oneself a note, thinking in words, and doing mental calculation. In this category, although the median scores suggest that the Gaddang speakers used Tagalog, Ilocano, and Gaddang most of the time when they talked to themselves, they dominantly used Tagalog as reflected in the mean (mn=2.831). The same result can be gleaned from the sub-domain of writing themselves a note. When they thought in words and even when they did mental calculation, they also chose Tagalog. However, there were some who claimed to use English rather than Gaddang in doing mental calculation.

Table 2

Language Use in the Internal Domain

Internal domain		Gaddang	Ilocano	Tagalog	English
Talking to oneself	N	568	568	568	568
	Mean	2.576	2.683	2.831	1.70
	Median	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.00
	SD	1.2895	1.0157	.9739	.922
	N	567	568	568	568

Writing oneself a note	Mean	2.215	2.472	3.081	1.944
	Median	2.000	2.000	3.000	2.000
	SD	1.2108	.9827	.9780	1.0306
	N	568	568	568	568
Thinking in words	Mean	2.539	2.702	2.979	1.831
	Median	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.000
	SD	1.2704	.9944	.9537	1.0251
	N	568	567	568	568
Mental Calculation	Mean	2.243	2.499	2.914	2.264
	Median	2.000	2.000	3.000	2.000
	SD	1.2476	1.0138	.9730	1.1626
Affective Domain	N	567	560	558	550
Praying	Mean	2.173	2.570	3.156	2.284
	Median	2.000	3.000	3.000	2.000
	SD	1.1956	1.0232	.9316	1.0879
Dreaming	N	566	559	558	550
	Mean	2.274	2.619	2.921	1.673
	Median	2.000	3.000	3.000	1.000
	SD	1.2484	1.0437	.9833	.9004
Swearing	N	566	560	558	550
	Mean	2.435	2.698	2.751	1.673
	Median	2.000	3.000	3.000	1.000
	SD	1.2643	1.0169	.9831	.9065
Expressions of feelings	N	566	560	558	550
	Mean	2.415	2.727	3.013	1.676
	Median	2.000	3.000	3.000	1.000
	SD	1.2391	1.0405	.9175	.8688
Telling Jokes	N	567	560	558	550
	Mean	2.515	2.895	2.989	1.724
	Median	3.000	3.000	3.000	1.000
	SD	1.2509	1.0105	.9398	.8993
Overall	N	566	560	558	540
	Mean	2.412	2.678	2.992	1.706
	Median	2.333	2.778	3.000	1.444
	SD	1.1603	.8903	.7901	.7229
Legend:	4- always	2-sometimes			
	3-almost all the time	1-never			

The second category of the internal domain was the affective domain, which consists of activities such as praying, dreaming, swearing, expressing feelings, and telling jokes. The respondents revealed that they also used Tagalog and Ilocano (md=3.000) most of the time when they prayed, but sometimes, they also prayed using Gaddang and English (md=2.000). In fact, they claimed that they used English more than Gaddang when they prayed (mn=2.284, 2.173

respectively). They also disclosed that their dreams were in Tagalog or Ilocano most of the time as well as when they swore and when they expressed their feelings. However, when they told jokes, they used Gaddang, Ilocano, or Tagalog almost all the time and they never used English in telling jokes as reflected in the medians. Overall, language choice in the internal domain was dominantly Tagalog, followed by Ilocano, then Gaddang, and the last was English.

4.3 Differences in Language Use in the Public Domain

4.3.1 Significant differences in language use in the public domain in geographical area

Table 3 presents the results of the statistical analysis on language use in the public domain considering geographical area. As shown in table 3, significant differences were yielded in the respondents' use of the four languages in the public domain as reflected in the coefficient values. Comparing the eight barangays, Villa Coloma displayed the highest mean signifying that their language preference in the public domain was Ilocano. Meanwhile, barangay Salvacion preferred to use Tagalog over the other three languages in the public domain. As regards English, the highest mean was displayed by San Nicolas (mn=1.947). In sum, language use in the public domain among the Gaddang speakers varied considerably from one geographical area to another.

Table 3

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Public Domain in Geographical Area

Geographical Area	Gaddang N=556		Ilocano N=546		Tagalog N=548		English N=548	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
San Nicolas	1.552	.5478	2.243	.7209	3.677	.4142	1.942	.7007
Salvacion	1.445	.7256	3.147	.5841	3.458	.4781	2.058	.4437
Vista Alegre	1.875	.7918	3.037	.6319	3.165	.6821	1.718	.6742
Quirino	1.716	.7216	3.045	.7490	3.548	.4220	1.835	.8099
Roxas	2.285	1.1746	2.712	.6048	3.258	.8189	1.896	.7926
San Geronimo	1.947	.8080	2.774	.5311	3.322	.5497	1.627	.6114
San Pedro	2.026	.9305	2.915	.6237	3.359	.5795	1.908	.6686
Villa Coloma	2.911	.8603	3.274	.6017	3.098	.7120	1.447	.4550
Overall	1.926	.9075	2.860	.6967	3.336	.6435	1.808	.6890
F ² /Brown Forsythe	13.603		16.900		7.323		4.262	
df	7		7		7		7	
Sig	.000		.000		.000		.000	

4.3.2 Differences in language use in the public domain in terms of age

Age is another variable considered in the study. The respondents were grouped according to four age groups such as the young group (10-19), adult group (20-39), middle-aged (40-59), and the senior citizens (60 above). Significant differences can also be gleaned from the table based on the coefficient values of .000. This means that the Gaddangs differed in their language choice in the public domain considering age groups. For instance, among the young adult and middle-aged groups, they dominantly used Tagalog. In the same manner, the adult group also preferred Tagalog. The senior citizens, however, dominantly used Ilocano. Comparing the four age groups, the middle-aged group differed significantly from the rest of the groups in terms of the Gaddang language. For Ilocano, the senior citizens were significantly different from the other three groups. In using Tagalog and English, the young group significantly differed from the other groups as

reflected in the mean. To summarize the findings, when age groups were considered, the Gaddang speakers significantly differed in their language choice in the public domain.

Table 4

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Public Domain in Terms of Age

Age Group	Gaddang N=556		Ilocano N=546		Tagalog N=568		English N=559	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
10-19	1.458	.5718	2.616	.6873	3.546	.5530	2.011	.6733
20-39	2.203	1.0010	2.895	.6960	3.228	.6633	1.636	.6511
40-59	2.431	.9033	3.126	.5383	3.164	.6511	1.533	.5572
60 above	2.317	.9510	3.232	.6352	3.038	.6714	1.764	.7659
Overall	1.926	.9075	2.860	.6967	3.336	.6435	1.808	.6890
F ^a /Brown Forsythe	44.470		27.874		18.132		16.882	
df	3		3		3		3	
Sig	.000		.000		.000		.000	

4.3.3 Differences in language use in the public domain in terms of gender

Like other previous studies, the present study also determined significant differences in language use in the public domain among the Gaddang speakers when they are grouped according to gender. It is apparent in the table that the Gaddang speakers' use of language in the public domain did not differ when gender is concerned as reflected in the coefficients higher than .05. In other words, gender did not determine language use. The male respondents did not significantly differ in their language preferences in the public domain as compared to their female counterparts. Both males and females had the same language choice in the public domain.

Table 5

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Public Domain in Terms of Gender

Language Use	Gender	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig
Gaddang N=556	Male	235	1.943	.8595	3.634	.709
	Female	321	1.914	.9423		
Ilocano N=546	Male	231	2.848	.6693	2.455	.721
	Female	315	2.869	.7171		
Tagalog N=548	Male	229	3.332	.6444	.004	.906
	Female	319	3.339	.6439		
English N=548	Male	230	1.804	.6827	.058	.902
	Female	318	1.811	.6945		

4.3.4 Differences in language use in the public domain terms of economic status

Considering economic status, the Gaddangs were grouped into five, namely: 1) income is very little, not always enough for the family; 2) income is little and sometimes not enough for the family; 3) income is just enough for the family's needs, but can hardly save; 4) income is very

sufficient for the family's needs and can save some money; and 5) have much money and properties than they need and can buy whatever they like. Based on the coefficient values, significant differences were displayed only on Gaddang and English. Among the five economic status groups, the respondents who preferred to use Gaddang in the public domain were those whose income was very little, not always enough for the family. In relation to English, although the means did not reach 2.000, the highest mean was shown by those whose income is very sufficient for the family's daily needs and can save some money.

Table 6

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Public Domain in Economic Status

Economic Status	Gaddang N=553		Ilocano N=545		Tagalog N=545		English N=545	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Income is very little, not always enough for the family	2.760	1.1243	2.991	.3811	3.060	.8230	1.338	.4512
Income is little, sometimes not enough for our family	2.054	.9095	2.943	.7126	3.298	.6720	1.601	.6579
Income is just enough for our family's daily needs; but can hardly save	1.947	.8805	2.857	.7054	3.358	.5979	1.820	.6694
Income is very sufficient for our family's daily needs; can save some money	1.692	.8285	2.811	.7180	3.369	.6530	1.980	.7054
Have much money and properties than we need; we can buy whatever we like	1.838	.8660	2.841	.4211	3.165	.7678	1.660	.7051
Overall	1.929	.9083	2.863	.6965	3.333	.6434	1.804	.6881
F ² /Brown Forsythe	7.860		1.000		1.267		8.896	
df	4		4		4		4	
Sig	.000		.408		.290		.000	

4.3.5 Differences in language use in the public domain in terms of educational attainment

Educational attainment is the last social variable considered in the study. The Gaddangs, in this variable, were grouped into three: elementary, secondary, and post secondary. The same results as those of economic status can be seen in Table 7. Only Gaddang and English showed significant differences. Comparing the three groups, those in the post secondary group gave the highest rating for the Gaddang language. In relation to English, the highest rating was displayed by the secondary group. Overall, the Gaddang speakers when grouped according to educational attainment vary significantly in their choice of Gaddang and English in the public domain.

4.4. Differences in Language Use in the Internal Domain

Significant differences in language use in the internal domain were also identified statistically in the study considering the same social variables in the aforementioned presentation.

4.4.1 Significant differences in language use in the internal domain in geographical area

In the internal domain, possible significant differences were computed in line with geographical area and results are summarized in Table 8. As seen in the table, the Gaddangs' use of language in the internal domain was significantly different from one geographical area to another. Comparing the eight barangays, Villa Coloma had the highest mean in relation to Gaddang and Ilocano. The

respondents from the different barangays also differed significantly in choosing Tagalog in the internal domain. The highest mean can be noted among the respondents in San Nicolas. Although the mean scores in English were rather low, the highest mean was recorded in San Nicolas. In general, the Gaddangs from the different barangays varied significantly in their choice of language in the internal domain, preferring to use Tagalog, followed by Ilocano, then Gaddang, and the last, English.

Table 7

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Public Domain in Terms of Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Gaddang N=549		Ilocano N=539		Tagalog N=541		English N=541	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Elementary	1.767	.7662	2.869	.7927	3.325	.6594	1.622	.6099
Secondary	1.921	.9258	2.850	.6629	3.381	.6524	1.922	.7050
Post Secondary	2.159	1.0055	2.885	.6321	3.228	.5953	1.807	.7030
Overall	1.929	.9099	2.864	.6975	3.329	.6438	1.806	.6882
F ^a /Brown Forsythe	6.760		.109		2.433		9.815	
df	2		2		2		2	
Sig	.001		.897		.089		.000	

Table 8

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Internal Domain in Terms of Geographical Area

Geographic-al Area	Gaddang N=566		Ilocano N=560		Tagalog N=558		English N=540	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
San Nicolas	1.899	1.0057	2.000	.7786	3.603	.5297	1.947	.8208
Salvacion	1.801	1.0854	3.075	.8094	2.959	.8757	1.919	.7118
Vista Alegre	2.258	1.1372	3.033	.7865	2.900	.7265	1.647	.7267
Quirino	2.136	1.1308	2.982	.8469	3.230	.7130	1.675	.7459
Roxas	3.057	1.1885	2.312	.9113	2.831	.7231	1.545	.6231
San Geronimo	2.677	.9042	2.322	.6081	2.765	.8808	1.672	.5999
San Pedro	2.527	1.0862	2.743	.8413	2.969	.8248	1.799	.7869
Villa Coloma	3.373	.7227	3.133	.6755	2.698	.7694	1.389	.5250
Overall	2.412	1.1603	2.678	.8903	2.992	.7901	1.706	.7229
F ^a /Brown Forsythe	15.388		21.532		9.506		3.784	
df	7		7		7		7	
Sig	.000		.000		.000		.001	

4.4.2 Significant differences in language use in the internal domain in terms of age

The differences in the Gaddangs' use of language in the internal domain were very significant when they were grouped according to age. Among the four age groups, the middle-aged group used Gaddang more often in the internal domain than the other groups. The same result is recorded

in Ilocano. In relation to Tagalog, the young group had the highest mean. English was chosen by the young group as compared to the other groups. In sum, the Gaddangs in the different age groups vary very significantly in their use of language in the internal domain.

Table 9

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Internal Domain in terms of Age

Age Group	Gaddang N=566		Ilocano N=560		Tagalog N=558		English N=540	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
10-19	1.765	.9444	2.504	.8505	3.380	.6651	1.996	.7649
20-39	2.840	1.0805	2.716	.9052	2.844	.6852	1.590	.6808
40-59	3.073	.9644	2.946	.8548	2.584	.7385	1.353	.4406
60 above	2.993	1.0613	2.799	.9428	2.533	.7488	1.412	.5710
Overall	2.412	1.1603	2.678	.8903	2.992	.7901	1.706	.7229
F ^a /Brown Forsythe	66.960		7.545		51.128		38.909	
df	3		3		3		3	
Sig	.000		.000		.000		.000	

4.4.3 Significant differences in language use in the internal domain in terms of gender

As shown in Table 10, language use in the internal domain among the Gaddang speakers was not significant as reflected in the coefficients higher than .05 when gender was concerned. In other words, the females did not differ in their choice of language from the males. Male and female respondents more or less used the same language in the internal domain. Hence, gender did not determine language use in the internal domain.

Table 10

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Internal Domain in Terms of Gender

Language Use	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig
Gadding N=566	Male	239	2.492	1.1292	3.272	.160
	Female	327	2.353	1.1808		
Ilocano N=560	Male	235	2.600	.8993	.065	.075
	Female	325	2.735	.8808		
Tagalog N=558	Male	234	2.991	.7722	1.769	.961
	Female	324	2.994	.8040		
English N=540	Male	231	1.663	.6863	3.148	.226
	Female	309	1.739	.7485		

4.4.4 Significant differences in language use in the internal domain in economic status

When the respondents were grouped according to economic status, very significant differences in language use in the internal domain were also noted. Constantly, the group with very little income had the highest mean in using the Gaddang language in the internal domain, making this group significantly different from the other groups. Ilocano was also preferred by the same group more

than the others. In terms of Tagalog, the highest mean was noted among those whose income was very sufficient for their family's needs. Hence, the difference among these groups was highly significant. Lastly, English was chosen more than the other groups by those with very sufficient income. To summarize, the Gaddang speakers from the different economic status groups very significantly differed in their use of language in the internal domain.

Table 11

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Internal Domain in Economic Status

Economic Status	Gaddang N=563		Ilocano N=557		Tagalog N=555		English N=537	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Income is very little, not always enough for the family	2.920	1.0616	3.213	.6103	2.542	.6529	1.189	.2652
Income is little, sometimes not enough for our family	2.646	1.1462	2.754	.9316	2.914	.7991	1.463	.6062
Income is just enough for our family's daily needs; but can hardly save	2.515	1.1729	2.605	.9213	2.996	.8048	1.673	.6554
Income is very sufficient for our family's daily needs; can save some money	2.029	1.0653	2.662	.8348	3.100	.7483	1.969	.8397
Have much money and properties than we need; we can buy whatever we like	2.537	1.2031	2.972	.6769	2.818	.8363	1.787	.7177
Overall	2.418	1.1601	2.682	.8903	2.987	.7888	1.703	.7226
F ² /Brown Forsythe	7.533		4.023		3.302		13.615	
df	4		4		4		4	
Sig	.000		.004		.014		.000	

4.4.5 Significant differences in language use in the internal domain in educational attainment

Table 12 displays the results of the statistical analysis on the Gaddang speakers' use of language in the internal domain with reference to educational attainment.

Table 12

Significant Differences in Language Use in the Internal Domain in Terms of Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Gaddang N=559		Ilocano N=539		Tagalog N=541		English N=541	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Elementary	2.122	1.1005	2.844	.9031	3.106	.7768	1.578	.6570
Secondary	2.406	1.1801	2.631	.8596	3.060	.7733	1.830	.7732
Post Secondary	2.821	1.0912	2.589	.9132	2.654	.7510	1.624	.6656
Overall	2.416	1.1623	2.687	.8900	2.982	.7885	1.706	.7237
F ² /Brown Forsythe	14.306		3.843		14.996		7.591	
df	2		2		2		2	
Sig	.000		.022		.000		.001	

Similar to the previous results already discussed, significant differences are also seen in the table. In terms of Gaddang, the highest mean can be noted among the post secondary group. Conversely, the highest mean for Ilocano was expressed by the elementary group. The same results can be seen

in relation to Tagalog in that the elementary group got the highest mean. Finally, English was preferred by the secondary group more than the other groups. Overall, educational attainment influenced language use in the internal domain among the Gaddangs.

5. Discussion

Results related to language use among the Gaddang speakers reveal that they used different languages like Ilocano, Tagalog, and Gaddang in different sub-domains in public. For instance, when they talked with friends, workmates, and neighbors, the three languages were used always; however, the most dominant language used is Ilocano with little difference from Tagalog. This can be explained by the fact that Ilocano is the lingua franca of the province, and the respondents believed that almost everybody in Nueva Vizcaya knew how to speak Ilocano. Based on the interview, several mentioned that they have many friends who were Ilocano speakers so accordingly, they found it appropriate to use Ilocano with friends. Others expressed that they used Tagalog almost all the time with friends, workmates, and neighbors who used Tagalog in communicating. Others also mentioned that Tagalog was known by everyone because it was learned in school so they talked with friends in Tagalog. Additionally, when their friends, workmates, and neighbors were also speakers of Gaddang, they used Gaddang as well because for them, it was a symbol of their identity as Gaddangs. This finding confirms that of Kobari's (2009) in that Butuanon is a mark of the speakers' identity. For the Gaddangs, language choice with friends, neighbours, and workmates depended upon the interlocutors, which means that the language used by the person with whom another person communicates is the same language used. This further clarifies what Myers-Scotton (2006) explains that the tendency of the speakers of a minority language like the Gaddangs is to accommodate the mainstream language like Ilocano and Tagalog. Genuino (2005) also found that the most important factor affecting language choice is the interlocutor. Further, Adams, Matu, and Ongarora (2012) opine that the identity of the interlocutor is a more important factor influencing language choice than topic, setting, and occasion. This finding coincides with that of Yeh, Chan and Cheng (2004), in which the aboriginals in Taiwan use Mandarin, their national language, with interlocutors in the community, and in the domains of work, education, and friendship. The same finding is in consonance with the study of Adeniyi and Bello (2007) where the respondents in the Lagos Metropolis used Yoruba as the language of the immediate environment, which is likened to Ilocano or Tagalog as the language of the environment in the study. The same result supports the studies of Campos (2014) where Manobo speakers dominantly used Cebuano in the social and public domains; Magaspag (2009) where Kachok speakers used the language spoken by their non-Kachok friends and the language of the neighboring village; and Ting and Ling (2013) in which the ethnic language was used for intra-communication while the national language was used for inter-communication.

A different pattern was yielded at the school domain where the Gaddangs always used Tagalog with their teachers, classmates, older schoolmates, school heads, and older school personnel; they used Ilocano with these people almost all the time; and they sometimes used Gaddang and English with their teachers, classmates, older schoolmates, and with older school personnel. However, they claimed that they never used Gaddang with school heads like the principals, supervisors, and the like. The choice of Tagalog at the school domain can be attributed to the fact that in the Philippines, Tagalog/Filipino is one of the official languages and a medium of instruction in school. The respondents commonly claimed that it was appropriate to use Tagalog with teachers, schoolmates, school heads, and school personnel. Several respondents claimed too that when they

communicated with their teachers, they readily used Tagalog. Almost all the time, they used Ilocano because this was the common language used by people in Nueva Vizcaya. Other respondents believe that they used Ilocano with their teachers and classmates when they talked to them. The most common reason for using Ilocano and Tagalog in the school domain was that these languages were easier to speak and understand when they communicated with others in school. It is interesting to note that they did not use Gaddang with school heads because the school heads were not Gaddangs; they did not speak their native language; therefore, they were not expected to use Gaddang with them. English was sometimes used in the school setting by the Gaddangs because according to them, English was used in teaching. But there were those who confided that they only used English sometimes because they were not proficient in the language. This statement explains that language choice may also be influenced by one's proficiency with the language. The preference to use Tagalog at the school domain coincides with the study of Ghazali (2014), in which respondents used Malay dominantly at the school domain. Also, the same finding supports the studies of Quakenbush (1996) where Tagalog was favoured as the language of education; Pineda (2012) where respondents used standard Tagalog and English in the school domain; However, the finding opposes the study of Borlongan (2009) where English dominated most domains of use since the respondents were college students studying in a private university. Finally, this finding also does not coincide with the finding of Magaspag (2009) where children used Kachok, their native language at school.

As regards the domain of religion, Tagalog is dominantly used with priests and nuns, lay ministers and catechists, and with fellow brothers and sisters in the church. Almost all the time, they used Ilocano with these people. They sometimes used English with priests and nuns and with lay ministers and catechists but not with fellow brothers and sisters in the church. They sometimes used Gaddang instead, most especially when the fellow brothers or sisters also spoke Gaddang. Their reason for not using Gaddang with priests and nuns and lay ministers and catechists was that they were not native speakers of Gaddang. The priests and nuns assigned to their place did not have Gaddang ethnicity. For them, it was better to use Tagalog or Ilocano or even English with them because these were the languages that they understood. Such a finding corresponds to that of Pineda (2012) in which the respondents in Marinduque used standard Tagalog and English in church. However, the present study counters the finding of Ghazali (2014) since the respondents in Malaysia dominantly used Mah Meri in religious domain; also the study of Magaspag (2009) where respondents used the Kachok language in the religious domain. Some respondents mentioned that choosing a language that the priests, nuns, lay ministers and catechists can understand is a sign of respect to them. In this sense, language choice is influenced by their sense of politeness to the person they are communicating with. The use of Tagalog by the Gaddangs in the religious domain, and not their native language, coincides with the study of Campos (2014) where Manobo speakers dominantly used Cebuano and not Manobo in the domain of the church and that of Tejalosa (2012) where Tagalog co-exists with Batak. The rare use of Gaddang in the church domain can also be attributed to the fact that no provision is accorded to the use of Gaddang in Eucharistic celebrations. Unlike English, Ilocano and Tagalog, these languages were used in masses.

Language use in texting and using social media like email, Facebook, and Twitter is again dominantly taken over by Tagalog. This was the language that they always used in texting and in using social media. But there was a difference in the language they used most of the time in texting and in using social media because in the former, they used Ilocano and in the latter, they used English. According to the respondents interviewed, Tagalog was the language they dominantly

used in texting because text messages that they received were in Tagalog. The same reason applied in their email, Facebook and Twitter. But English was most often times used in social media for them because, most often than not, those who used social media, received emails in English, and wrote comments in Facebook also in English, most especially when posts were also done in English. One respondent claimed that English was particularly used in social media because he seldom saw other people using the native language or Ilocano in social media. This corroborates with the study of Watters and Watters (2015), which reported that English was the dominant language in the Internet. In this regard, the finding supports Fishman (1965) when he postulates that certain language is assigned to a particular domain. However, the use of English or Tagalog in Twitter among the Gaddangs does not coincide with the study of Nguyen, Trieschnigg and Cornips (2015) in that the respondents switched to minority languages in the conversations in Twitter.

In general, the use of other languages such as Ilocano and Tagalog in the public domain among the Gaddang speakers reflects the richness of their language repertoire as multilingual speakers. As such, they can easily use the language that is available in the speech community to facilitate communication with people who do not speak their language. Hence, the Gaddangs possessed the skill of using more than one language, the skill of shifting from one language to another as the situation called for it in order to communicate freely and effectively with others. As Wardhaugh (2006) puts it “Multilingualism is actually seen as a source of strength, for it enables the speakers of the various linguistic communities to maintain contact with one another” (p. 97).

However, in instances or domains where the Gaddangs rarely used their native language such as in school, church, and social media, there is a tendency that such situations may lead to the endangerment of Gaddang, their native language. This opposes the conclusion of Dweik and Al-Obaidi (2014 in Dweik, Nofal, & Qawasmeh, 2014) that religion and religious affiliations are vital in maintaining the ethnic language and that of Holmes et al. (1993 also in Dweik, Nofal, & Qawasmeh, 2014) who accentuate the role that the school plays in maintaining the ethnic language.

One glaring reality presented in the study is that the overall most preferred language in the public domain is Tagalog/Filipino. Based on the interview, most children whose parents were products of mixed marriage were no longer taught their native language at home. According to them, their parents seldom used the Gaddang language when communicating with them. As a consequence, only a few of them claimed that they can speak and understand the language, but they rarely used it in public. Although the Gaddangs claimed that they valued their native language and that they had positive attitude towards it, it seems that there is a dichotomy between what they claimed and what they practiced in reality. If the non-use of Gaddang in the home by family members prevails, it can be theorized that Gaddang will be on the verge of language loss or it may eventually die a few decades from now, most especially since the young preferred to use Tagalog/Filipino over their native language.

The same assumption applies in relation to the internal domain because the dominant language preferred in this domain was Tagalog in both cognitive and affective. However, a closer look at the results indicates that they used Tagalog, Ilocano, and Gaddang almost equally, most of the time when they talked to themselves and when they wrote themselves a note. This suggests a promising indication of language maintenance as Fishman (1966) puts emphasis on the “psychological processes that are relevant in preserving ethnic languages” (p. 424) like Gaddang. Doing mental calculation was mostly done in English as reported by the respondents. In the interview, most of the respondents mentioned that they were used to doing mental calculation in English because they had been taught to do it that way in school. They also added that it was easier to do mathematical

calculations in English than in Tagalog, Ilocano, or Gaddang because there were limited mathematical terms in these languages. One even claimed that for her, it took a longer time to compute or mentally calculate using Tagalog, Ilocano, or Gaddang. Conversely, other psychological activities such as praying, dreaming, swearing, expressing feelings, were reported as dominantly done in Tagalog and Ilocano most of the time, but others reported praying in Gaddang and English. The most common reason they had for using these languages in these activities was that they were used to it. It seemed to be automatic for them to use these languages. Those who reported praying in English more than Gaddang claimed that their prayers were those taught to them in English like *Our Father*, *Hail Mary*, and *Glory Be*. Those who used Tagalog in praying disclosed that they can express their intentions to God better in Tagalog. Others who used Ilocano claimed they could easily say their prayers in Ilocano.

In telling jokes, they reported not using English since jokes were better done in Gaddang, Ilocano, or Tagalog. They added that the joke was funnier or others easily laughed at the joke when told using a language easily understood. One even added that it took a longer time for the joke to sink in when told in English. This finding matches the study of Qawar (2014) where Arab Canadians used varied languages for emotional expressions, but they used Arabic when they told jokes and in dreaming. Somehow, this finding contests that of Dweik, Nofal, and Qawasmeh (2014) where Muslim Arabs used Arabic for self expressions.

Significant differences on language use in both public and internal domain were also noted in the study considering geographical area, age, economic status, and educational attainment. The results on significant differences imply that these social variables influence language use in the two domains. In other words, the Gaddang speakers, when grouped according to the social variables, significantly differ in their use of language or language preference. For one, one geographical area very significantly differs in language use from other areas considered. Villa Coloma, on the one hand, is located the farthest among the eight barangays from the capital town of the province, displayed the highest mean in using Gaddang as well as Ilocano. On the other hand, San Nicolas and Salvacion, both in the capital town of the province, had the highest mean for Tagalog and English, respectively. Language choice in this case can perhaps be attributed to the location of the barangays. This supports the study of Campos (2014) where Manobo speakers from remote barangays preferred Manobo and Cebuano for non-remote barangays. The study of Pineda found the same thing in that the exposure of speakers to the outside world may probably affect their language choice.

Language use among the Gaddangs in both public and internal domains significantly differed from one age group to another. Hence, language use depends upon the age group of the respondents. The younger the group is, the tendency for the group members not to choose their native language. Their choice of Tagalog or English in the public and internal domains is probably related to their exposure to the languages in the school domain. The middle-aged group had the highest mean for Gaddang. In the interview, they expressed their strong belief that Gaddang is the language of their ethnicity and identity. They added that using it in public means, they owned their language. Others believed that they spoke Gaddang because it was their native language and that they were expected to do that. This finding conforms to that of Pineda's (2012) where language use was also related to age and that of Kobari's (2009) where the older group preferred using their native language than the younger group. Note that the respondents in different age groups in the studies of Quakenbush (1996), Ghazali (2014), Adams, Matu, and Ongagora (2012), and Cavallero and Serwe (2010) also varied in their use of language.

No significant differences in language use in both public and internal domains with respect to gender were reported in the study. This implies that gender did not determine or influence language use among the Gaddangs. Males and females alike did not vary in their language preferences. This finding contradicts the result of Pineda's (2012) study where more males used Standard Tagalog in the church domain than females while more females used Standard Tagalog and English in the family and school domains.

Significant differences on language use in the public and internal domains were also recorded in terms of economic status. Therefore, it can be surmised that the Gaddangs significantly differed in their choice of language considering the economic status which they belonged. In the public domain, only the use of Gaddang and English was highly significant among the groups, but in the internal domain, the respondents in the different groups significantly differed from one another in their choice of the four languages. The choice of Gaddang and Ilocano in both public and internal domains by those whose income was little and sometimes not enough for their family was probably due to their exposure to other languages such as Filipino and English, which could be related to their educational level as well. A few revealed in the interview that they did not use English or Tagalog in their communication because they were not fluent in the language. Others claimed that most often than not, when they used Tagalog, they had the tendency to mix it with Gaddang. Hence, in this case, language choice was determined by their fluency of the language. Another reason mentioned in the interview was that most of the time they talked with their co-Gaddangs and others who spoke Ilocano, so their native language or Ilocano was used instead of Tagalog or English. The same reasons may also be applicable to the language preference they had in the internal domain. It is understandable that those who had very sufficient income for their family and could save some money used English and Tagalog more often than the other groups. Perhaps their exposure to the English language through education prompted them to use English or Tagalog. Additionally, according to them, they had opportunities to mingle with people who spoke the same language; hence, this gave them an avenue to use the language. This finding corroborates Wardhaugh's (2006) study stating that multilinguals choose the language that is appropriate to the circumstance that they are in. In addition, Wei (1993) opines that language choice depends upon the linguistic identities of the participants in a communication situation.

The respondents, when grouped according to educational attainment, varied significantly in language use in relation to Gaddang and English in the public domain, but in the internal domain, they differed in the use of the four languages. With respect to the Gaddang language, the post secondary group significantly differed from the two other groups for they used Gaddang in the public and internal domains more often than the other groups. This may be attributed to the more frequent occasions or instances where they communicate with their fellow Gaddangs. Those who were interviewed believed that they had friends and neighbours who were also Gaddangs. They saw it appropriate to use their native language than any other language. In the aspect of internal domain, they believed they were used to using Gaddang more than the other languages because this had been their language since birth. This could have influenced their choice of Gaddang even in the internal domain. The use of Gaddang among the post-secondary group indicates desired to preserve or maintain their ethnic language. This conforms to the study of Dweik, Nofal, and Qawashme (2014) where Muslim Arabs in Canada used their native language in the public domain as well as for self-expression. However, when the respondents communicated with non-Gaddang speakers, they used the language of their interlocutor to show respect to them and to facilitate their communication. They also expressed their anxiety that if they used their native language communicating with the non-native Gaddangs, it may create misunderstanding. It can be deduced

that the Gaddangs considered their interlocutors when choosing a language for communication. Same findings were yielded in the study of Adams, Matu, and Ongarora where Kinubi speakers also considered the types of their interlocutors as influencing their language choice. It is also noteworthy that the elementary group preferred to use Tagalog and Ilocano in the internal domain. This indicates that the respondents in this group have already accommodated the language of the mainstream most especially Tagalog so that even in the internal domain, this language was dominantly used. Another indication of this phenomenon was language shift, where respondents used another available language in the community. However, if such a case continued, the ethnic language might possibly lead to language loss. As Myers-Scotton (2006) explains, choosing the mainstream language to assimilate the language of the community may result in language shift.

Considering language choices in multilingual societies like the Philippines, the findings presented in the study provide a better understanding of the language choices of multilinguals in the different domains. For speakers of a native language like Gaddang, they are expected to use their indigenous language in most of the domains or contexts of communication. They have been assumed to prefer to use their native language in the domains of the home, public including internal domain. However, the findings in this study contradict this assumption, providing a new perspective on language use or language choice among speakers of indigenous languages. Considering Fishman's (1965) theory postulating that a certain language is assigned in a particular domain, the findings in the study somehow reveals a situation towards the opposite direction in that the dominant language preferred in most of the domains included in the study is the national language, that is, Filipino/Tagalog. This phenomenon may indicate that among the native speakers, particularly the Gaddang, language choice is geared towards the preference of the national language. This may also imply that contexts or domains are no longer seen as the basis of language choice in multilingual settings but the dominant language used in everyday communication in the speech community.

6. Conclusion

This paper has presented findings and discussion on language use in the public and internal domains. From the findings, it can be concluded that the motivation to use Tagalog, the national language, or Ilocano, the lingua franca of the province, in the public domain is basically for the purpose of facilitating communication, maximizing understanding between interlocutors and minimizing or completely avoiding confusion or misunderstanding. Since the respondents, most especially the younger generation and those in the elementary group preferred to use Tagalog in the public and internal domain, this indicates language shift from the ethnic language, Gaddang, to Tagalog, the national language or Ilocano, the lingua franca of the province. It can be theorized that language shift which exists among the Gaddangs as a multilingual group can be attributed to the young or the elementary group. And if this phenomenon persists, it may be possible that the Gaddangs of the future generation may experience ethnic language loss. On a positive sense, however, the Gaddang speakers' use of other languages besides their language in the public and internal domain may mean richness of linguistic diversity or linguistic repertoire necessary for communication in multilingual communities. Sociolinguistic studies have proven that language shift is a natural phenomenon in multilingual societies such as the community of the Gaddang speakers. Their assumed linguistic competence in using four languages or more indicates linguistic flexibility to accommodate the language of the people they are communicating with in order to

facilitate communication. After all, language is a vehicle for establishing successful communication with other people.

The study is limited only to identifying language use in the public and internal domain, excluding the domain of the home. For future research on Gaddangs and other ethnic languages in the Philippines, it might be interesting to determine language use of the Gaddangs in the domain of the home and include more sub-domains such as language use with vendors in the market, with strangers, in meetings, among others in the public domain. Sub-domains such as language use in mass celebrations, songs, prayer books, and others may also be added to the domain of religion.

References

- Adams, Y., Matu, P., & Ongagora, D. (2012). Language use and choice: A case study of Kinubi in Kibera, Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(4), 99-104. Retrieved from http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_4_Special_Issue_February_2012/13.pdf.
- Adeniyi, H., & Bello, R. (2007). Urban linguistics in Nigeria: A case of language use in Lagos metropolis. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies*, 1(2), 119-132. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/26457887_Urban_linguistics_in_Nigeria_A_Case_of_Language_Use_in_Lagos_Metropolis.
- Bautista, M. L. (Ed.) (1996). *Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics*. Manila: De La Salle University Press, Inc.
- Borlongan, A. (2009). A survey on language use, attitudes, and identity in relation to Philippine English among young generation Filipinos: An initial sample from a private university. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 3, 74-107. Retrieved from <https://www.philippine-esl-journal.com/journals/79/2009-articles/>.
- Campos, R. (2014). *Language attitudes among Agusan Manobo speakers in the Philippines*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Payap University, Thailand. Retrieved from https://inter.payap.ac.th/wp-content/uploads/linguistics_students/Rose_Campos_Thesis.pdf.
- Cavallaro, F., & Serwe, S. K. (2010). Language use and language shift among the Malays in Singapore. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1, 129-170. doi: 10.1515/9783110222654.129.
- Chen, S. (2010). Multilingualism in Taiwan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 205, 79-104. DOI 10.1515/IJSL.2010.040.
- Chuchu, F. & Noorashid, N. (2014). Language choice and co-construction within Interethnic Communication in Kiudang/Munhkom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 134, 176-187. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.237.
- Dweik, B., Nofal, M., & Qawasmeh, R. (2014). Language use and language attitudes among the Muslim Arabs of Vancouver/ Canada: A sociolinguistic study. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 2(2), 75-99. Retrieved from http://ijlcnec.com/journals/ijlc/Vol_2_No_2_June_2014/5.pdf.
- Fishman, J. (1965). Who speaks what language to whom and when? *La Linguistique*, 2, 67-88. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30248773>.
- Fishman, J. (Ed.) (1966). *Language loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 29-38.

- Fishman, J. (1972). Domains and the relationship between micro-and macrolinguistics. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 435-451). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Genuino, C. (2005). *Language extinction in process across Chabacano communities: A sociolinguistic approach*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). De La Salle University, Taft Avenue, Manila.
- Ghazali, K. (2014). *Domains of language use and attitudes: Mah Meri*. Retrieved from <http://repository.um.edu.my/87923/1/FESCHRIFT%20FOR%20BAUTISTA.pdf>.
- Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. (eds.) (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt and Rinehart Winston.
- Katubi, O. (2007). Lampungic languages: Looking for new evidence of language shift in Lampung and the question of its reversal. *Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures*, 16, 1-10. Retrieved from <http://www.philippines.sil.org/resources/archives/26079>.
- Kobari, Y. (2009). *The current status of the Butuanon language and its speakers in northern Mindanao: Findings on ethnic identity, language attitudes, language ability, language use, and language change*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). De La Salle University, Taft Avenue, Manila.
- Magaspag, C. (2009). *Language use and attitudes of Kachok speakers: Towards an assessment of the Kachok language vitality*. SIL International Digital Resources. Retrieved from http://www-01.sil.org/silesr/2012/2012-038_ESR_379_Magaspag_Kachok.pdf.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. MA: Blackwell.
- Nguyen, D., Trieschnigg, D. & Cornips, L. (2015). Audience and the use of minority languages on twitter. Proceedings of the Ninth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media. Retrieved from <https://ris.utwente.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/5490745>.
- Pineda, S. (2012). *Morphological affixations of eastern and western Marinduque Tagalog: A sociolinguistic study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). De La Salle University, Manila.
- Qawar, H. (2014). Language choice and language use in an Arab Canadian multilingual community (Quebec-Canada): A sociolinguistic study. (Unpublished master's thesis) Middle East University, Quebec, Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Language-Choice-and-Language-Attitudes-in-a-Multilingual-Arab-Canadian-Community.pdf>.
- Quakenbush, J. S. (1996). Conclusion of language use and proficiency in multilingual setting: A sociolinguistic survey of Agutaynen speakers in Palawan, Philippines. In Bautista, M. L. S. (Ed.) *Readings in Philippine Sociolinguistics* (pp. 23-37). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Romaine, S. (2000). *Language in Society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tejalosa, T. (2012). *Predicting the ethnolinguistic vitality of an endangered Philippine language: The case of three Batak communities in Palawan*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). De La Salle University, Taft Avenue, Manila.
- Ting, S., & Ling, T. (2013) Language use and sustainability status of indigenous languages in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(1), 77-93. DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2012.706301.
- Vinluan, R. (July 1986-January 1987). A study of Gaddang literature. *Journal of Northern Luzon*, 17, 1-2.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. USA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Watters, M., & Watters, P. (2015). The internet and indigenous language use: A Filipino case study. *South Pacific Journal of Psychology*, 10(1), 54-60. doi:10.1017/S0257543400001000.
- Wei, L. (2006). Complementary schools, past, present and future. *Language and Education*, 20(1), 76-83.
- Yeh, H., Chan, H., & Cheng, Y. (2004). Language use in Taiwan: Language proficiency and domain analysis. *Journal of Taiwan Normal University: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 49(1), 75-108. Retrieved from <http://jntnu.ord.ntnu.edu.tw/Uploads/Papers/634589>.