



The Interplay of Gender and Ethnicity towards Language Choice of Filipino Youth

Anniebelle A. Diaz

Western Mindanao State University

Correspondent: lc201700128@wmsu.edu.ph

Received : February 20, 2022

Accepted : April 15, 2022

Published : April 30, 2022

Citation: Diaz, A, A. (2022). The Interplay of Gender and Ethnicity towards Language Choice of Filipino Youth.

Ijomata International Journal of Social Science, 3(2), 133-145.

<https://doi.org/10.52728/ijss.v3i2.445>

ABSTRACT: This study investigated on the most used languages of Filipino youth in the family domain of language used and investigated on the relationship of gender and ethnicity towards language use. A total of fifty-three individuals participated in the study who were aged between 15-24 and they were of different ethnicities. To gather the needed data for the study, a self-administered questionnaire was developed which was divided into two sections: (1) the first section of the instrument sought the necessary information as regards to the participants' demographic profile which basically included the age, gender, and ethnicity; and, (2) the second section was composed of the twelve (12) different social events in the family domain to determine the language choice and its frequency of use in each of the social event. To analyze the data, SPSS software was used. describe the profile of the respondents and to determine the relationship of the variables. The study considered five under investigation languages, namely English, Tagalog, Chavacano, Bisaya, and Tausug. According to the results of the study, Tagalog was the most used language in the family domain of language use. Furthermore, in the family domain, both gender and ethnicity played no significant role in determining that language choice of Filipino individuals.

Keywords: multilingualism, language choice, family domain of language use, ethnicity, gender.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license.

INTRODUCTION

Language is by and large recognized as an “organized medium of communication” distinct to human and is as much a system governed by rules (Okal, 2014). This system of communication then allows one to perform varied social functions such as conveying information (Hemat & Heng, 2012; Okal, 2014), expressing feelings, evoking response from others, making connections and building relationships, demonstrate authority over others, and empower a sense of identity

(Okal, 2014) which are all achieved through the manifestation of their individual lifestyles (Tong & Cheung, 2011). Thus, languages are an embodiment of one's cultural and social identities (Tong & Cheung, 2011).

Interestingly, there are instances when individuals would learn to perform some if not all of the aforementioned functions utilizing more than one language other than his own with as much competence and proficiency as that of a native speaker of the other language. This phenomenon contributed to the rise of multilingualism (Okal, 2014). The systematic use of more than one language in a multilingual context is widespread (Hemat & Abdullah, 2017) and inevitable (Caparaz & Gustilo, 2017). For some reasons, this phenomenon may have brought forth the idea of language choices which served as the focal point of this study. Language choice was defined as the language, variety or code employed by individuals to perform a communication function or purpose in a speech community (Fishman, 1972 cited in (Hemat et al., 2015)). Hence, it can be inferred that perhaps the code or language choice is what shapes and defines the purpose of communication.

The concept of multilingualism and language choice is broad in context and because of the compelling prevalence of multilingualism and language choice, numerous researchers rendered their efforts to examine the rationality behind the phenomenon (Kang, 2013). Some researchers have narrowed down their investigations by referring mainly to the concept of Joshua Fishman's (1972) domain analysis where he proposed different linguistic domains to determine the language pattern of multilingual individuals (Nugraheni et al., 2013). Many researchers attested to the correlation of language choice and the five linguistic domains, namely family (Abdullah & Leo, 2014; Adams et al., 2012; Hemat & Abdullah, 2017; Kurniasih, 2006; Nugraheni et al., 2013), friendship (Abdullah & Leo, 2014; Lee, 2014; Nugraheni et al., 2013; Rahman et al., 2008), relationship (Greenfield, 1972 in (Nugraheni et al., 2013; Rahman et al., 2008), education (Hemat et al., 2015; Hidalgo, 1998; Kurniasih, 2006; Lee, 2014; Nugraheni et al., 2013), and transaction domain (Hemat et al., 2015; Hemat; Hidalgo, 1998; Kurniasih, 2006).

In addition to the above mentioned linguistic domains, some other factors were as well reported to be determinants of language choice, a few examples of which are the language style, that is language being formal or informal (Adams et al., 2012; Hemat & Abdullah, 2017; Nugraheni et al., 2013; Romaine, 2000), and factors such as age, gender, ethnicity, and social identity (Abdullah & Leo, 2014; Hemat et al., 2015; Hemat & Abdullah, 2017; Rahman et al., 2008). Furthermore, this may be influenced by various factors, for instance the competence and proficiency in language use, language policy, and linguistic domain (Rahman et al., 2008).

Notwithstanding the wide acceptance of the domain analysis and the establishment of successful conclusions with regard the effects of different societal factors towards language choice, there were also arguments that posited otherwise to the concept. These criticisms created a gap in the research field suggesting that the linguistic domain may only partially if not totally determine language choice (Hidalgo, 1998; Rahman et al., 2008). Domains and the speech situations does not shape and neither does it play an important role in the choice of language use (Hidalgo, 1998). In connection to what created a gap with regard this research study is the scarcity of literature of language choice and domain analysis within the Philippine context which would probably result in failure to build a strong foundation of the issue.

In light of the problem, this research study aims to investigate more deeply on the relationship of the language choice and linguistic domains within the context of the pluralistic Philippines, as described by (Osborne, 2015), among Filipino individuals in connection to their gender and

ethnicity. Furthermore, this study is inclined to two directions. First, the preferred language of Filipino youth in light of family domain and secondly, the interplay of gender and ethnicity towards language choice of Filipino youth.

- Research Questions:

This study is inclined to contribute findings on language choice and specifically sought to determine two problems:

1. What are the most used languages of Filipino youths in the family domain of language use?
2. What is the relationship between Filipino youths' most used languages and their gender as well as ethnicity in the family domain of language use?

- Review of Related Literature

- a. Language Choice

As an aftermath of the work authored by Fishman in 1972, language choice was defined as the language, variety or code employed by individuals to perform a communication function or purpose in a speech community ([Hemat et al., 2015](#)). This expression suggested that the code or language choice is what shaped and defined the purpose of communication. Interestingly, the idea is further echoed by ([Abdulai & Owusu-Ansah, 2014](#)) who suggested that some aspects of communication such as the participants involved in the communication, the subject matter, the situation, the distance between the speakers, and the locale of the communication are predominant determinants of language choice. This may indicate that the choice of language utilized in different communication may not be limited, generic, or static but may rather be as changing and dynamic as the context of its use.

Language choice is occasionally distinguished by the choice of which language to use by a multilingual individual who possess a total control of the language ([Torto, 2014](#)). Also, it is more likely that the code may change whilst a conversation takes place, and so ([Yildirim, 2020](#)) suggested, that the choice of language itself is quite a telling factor which signals the shift from one communication code to another.

Put forth, in a multilingual speech community, it may be challenging for one to instantly decide or desire what language to use in order to communicate. However, the desirability and one's decision of which language to use is determined by a number of factors such as the choice of language itself, the speaker's vocabulary and diction, the speaker's attitude towards the language, as well as the motivation of the speaker to use the language ([Abdullah & Leo, 2014](#)).

In light of the domain, some studies suggested that domains deemed effective to influence language choice. For example, in the seminal work conducted by Greenfield (1972) cited in ([Rahman et al., 2008](#)) reported that upon investigating the language choice of bilingual Puerto Rican community in New York, the use of English and Spanish languages varied in terms of domain and level of formality. The said languages were identified as high and low, the English language considered as the high language and commonly spoken in discourses involving

education and employment domain. The Spanish language, on the other hand, was considered as the low language and is mainly used in discourses or in domains where participants have intimate or close relationship with each other such as family and friendship domains.

Another to add is the study by Parasher (1980) who shed light on the language use in India. It is reported that the English language dominated most linguistic domains such as the education, government and employment, friendship, and neighborhood domain although the language that is predominantly used in the family domain is the Indian, i.e., the mother tongue of the speakers. However, the domains of language use may not always entirely affect language choice of individuals ([Rahman et al., 2008](#)). Researchers objected on the influence of domains on language use as well as ([Hidalgo, 1998](#)) cited in ([Rahman et al., 2008](#)) that upon investigating the language choice of bilingual Filipinos, the domain and speech situations did not influence the phenomenon.

Moreover, language choice is an interesting aspect that greatly defines the purpose of communication Fishman (1972) cited in and defined by the context of communication ([Abdulai & Owusu-Ansah, 2014](#)). Although contrary to that opinion, some researchers suggest that domains were ineffective and a failed determinant of language choice. This indicates that the choice of language is dependent on the speaker ([Torto, 2014](#)), and may vary from favorability, instinct, or unavoidability based on the speaker's control over the language.

b. Gender

Gender is what distinguishes the identity of a man from that of a woman. For quite some time in the recent years, gender is regarded to be grounded on biological and physical differences. However, as time passed by, it was eventually perceived to be a pivotal variable in different disciplines such as psychology, economics, politics, as well as in the linguistic fields. In similar vein, Butler (1990) in ([Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013](#)) adds to this by defining language as a transparent manifestation of ourselves although it is not something inherent to us ([Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013](#); [West & Zimmerman, 1987](#)). Societal ideologies, actions, and personal desires are by and large the bedrock of our gender identity and causes it to become or manifest as no less than natural.

Interactions between communication where both men and women are participants would be dynamic and changing as the communicative styles of the interlocutors vary ([Mahmud & Nur, 2018](#)). Hence, the ideas suggest that gender plays an important role in the communication. The different social activities and social context are important determinants of gender as a dynamic characteristic of language choice ([Główka, 2014](#)).

In some notable sociolinguistic studies, gender and language has been for quite a time an interwoven aspect. Gender is reported to be a contributory factor with regard to individual disposition toward language maintenance of native languages and dynamic language choice ([Hemat & Abdullah, 2017](#)). In order to clearly see the perception of an individual, his/her background, such as gender is important to take account of ([Baxter & Jack, 2015](#)).

Some characteristics of men and women contribute to some functions of language. The former suggesting that gender affects the phatic and expressive functions of language such as politeness and expression of opinions emotionally ([Mahmud & Nur, 2018](#)). The latter then suggesting that women have the tendency of getting or feeling more offensive than men upon hearing swear

words. Hence saying, that gender, is an important variable in language choice ([Parangan & Buslon, 2020](#)).

Notwithstanding the statements of the prior mentioned authors, there were also some who posited otherwise. The language choice and use in Malaysia in light of family, friendship, and neighbor domains, determined that gender played no significant role or effect towards language choice ([Abdullah & Leo, 2014](#); [Hemat et al., 2015](#); [Hemat & Abdullah, 2017](#); [Rahman et al., 2008](#)).

Further, upon investigating the Arabic-English code-switching, it was reported that quoting, interjecting, reiterating, message qualifying, personifying, and objectifying are the most common functions of code-switching among Jordan speaker, especially the females ([Alhourani, 2018](#)).

Remarkably, gender is deemed to be an important aspect in the study of language choice. Some authors suggest that it may determine the versatility of the language ([Główka, 2014](#)), it contributes to an effective expression of language functions ([Mahmud & Nur, 2018](#)), and it appeals to emotions ([Parangan & Buslon, 2020](#)). However, with all the ideas gathered, gender being an important variable in discourse, linguists and experts have only focused at large on the female aspects towards language use ([Hidalgo, 1998](#)). This observation may have indicated that there is an unconscious bias in the study of gender and its effect on language.

c. Ethnicity

Ethnicity is suggested to be originated from a shared ancestry or genealogy. Hence, ethnicity amplifies the identity and the sense of belongingness of an individual in a certain ethnic group or community ([Parangan & Buslon, 2020](#)). It is as well shaped by different societal or cultural aspects relative to geographical boundaries which may include religion, beliefs, customs, and historical events that influenced the majority of today's culture ([Parangan & Buslon, 2020](#)). In similar vein, in the field of anthropology, ethnicity is defined to be the demarcation between different cultural and social groups/identities which is in contrary to how ethnicity is defined in the everyday use as a "minority issues" and "race relations" ([Chakraborty et al., 2015](#)).

In light of language use, determined three components of ethnicity of which language plays an important scheme, namely "being, knowing, and doing". Hence, language is a key to perform social life and as contrary to the popular opinion, it is beyond from just being a mirror of an ethnicity's perception ([Hemat et al., 2015](#)).

It may be said that ethnicity is greatly intertwined to language more than gender as expressed in the earlier part of the literature. Several studies suggest that ethnicity does play an immense role to shape language choice. Ethnicity plays a significant factor in the choice of language of the study respondents ([Abdullah & Leo, 2014](#); [Hemat et al., 2015](#); [Hemat & Abdullah, 2017](#); [Rahman et al., 2008](#)).

There is an investigation about the Laz language, which nearing to extinction. It was reported that when the respondents are inquired about their ethnic identity, they defined to have a mixed identity as a result of being ground on two mixing cultures, namely the Laz and Turkish culture. Therefore, that when situations called for matters involving national values, the respondents respond in Turkish and when matters involved local interests, such as those limited in the Laz culture, respondents then naturally respond using the Laz language ([Kavakli, 2017](#)).

Notably, ethnicity and language are two greatly interwoven aspects which would seem that it may be deemed as a reflection of each other that the lack of the other therefore bears a problematic case.

METHOD

The research problems being the focal point of an investigation serves as the basis of the selection of a research design (Alhourani, 2018; Creswell, 2017). Hence, in order to determine the most preferred language in the family domain among Filipino youth and the languages' relation to gender and ethnicity, a descriptive-quantitative-correlational design was utilized. Since the current study aims to measure variables and to simply describe the intervening variables toward language choice, i.e., gender and ethnicity, it is hence regarded as descriptive-quantitative design (Cabangcala et al., 2021; Perez & Alieto, 2018). Additionally, the entire period of the data gathering procedure was comparatively short and thus suggests that the study is cross-sectional (Perez & Alieto, 2018).

The data set of the study was supplied by a total of 53 participants who are Filipino individuals between the age range of 15-24 that has an equivalent mean score of 19.94 (SD-1.92). In terms of gender, the majority are female individuals which corresponds to seventy-three-point eight percent (73.6%). Also, majority of the population are Chavacano individuals which corresponds to forty-six percent (47.2%). The information about the age group, gender, and ethnicity of the respondents is presented in Table 1.0.

Table 1.0 Profile of the Respondents

Variables		N*	Pct (%)
Age	15-17	12	22.6%
	18-20	19	35.8%
	21-23	22	41.6%
Gender	Male	14	26.4%
	Female	39	73.6%
Ethnicity	Chavacano	25	47.2%
	Bisaya	14	26.4%
	Tausug	10	18.9%
	Others	4	7.5%

N* indicates the frequency of respondents

A quantitative research tool was used in this study. To determine the most preferred language choice of Filipino youth in the family domain and to investigate the interplay of gender and ethnicity towards the language choice, a two-sectioned questionnaire was utilized to gather the necessary data which was adapted from the research instrument (Hemat & Abdullah, 2017). The first section of the instrument sought the necessary information as regards to the participants' demographic profile which basically included the age, gender, and ethnicity. On the second section of the instrument, twelve (12) different social events in the family domain were presented to the participants where they were asked to determine their language choice and its frequency of use in each of the social event. The items were answerable using a 5-point Likert scale.

- Declared Reliability Results

In order to perform reliability testing, the instrument was pilot-tested, and the data set were analyzed through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20 using the Cronbach Alpha measure and the reliability test of the instrument had a score of .784. The score is relatively low compared to the instrument of the original study which garnered a Cronbach Alpha score of .945. Such occurrence is suspected to have been caused by the number of respondents who participated in the studies which was around 500 participants in the original study and only 65 participants in this current study, respectively.

- Data Gathering Procedure

The research instrument was digitalized using Google forms which is a method deemed to be most suitable to gather data considering the current situation of the society where close physical contact is discouraged (Cabangcala et al., 2021). The digital forms were forwarded to the respondents who were informed prior to participate in the study. Initially, the goal was to solicit responses from a hundred (100) individuals however, only 65 were received for the analysis of data.

- Coding Procedure

A coding strategy was utilized by the researcher to ease the analysis of data. As regards the student's demographic profile that is gender (1 for male and 2 for female) and ethnicity (1 for Chavacano, 2 for Bisaya, 3 for Tagalog, and 4 for Tausug). Additionally for the language choice in the family domain, the responses were coded as 1=English, 2=Tagalog, 3=Chavacano, 4=Bisaya, and 5=Tausug. Lastly, for the Likert-scale the responses were coded as 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Frequently, and 5=Very Frequently. None of the items implied a negative statement, therefore there was no need for reverse coding.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

- Most Used Languages in the Family Domain

In order to examine the most used language in the family domain, there were twelve (12) social events that were presented to the participants as shown in Table 2.0. The participants were instructed to indicate their language choice for each social event for the five (5) under investigation languages (English, Tagalog, Chavacano, Bisaya, and Tausug) according to a five-point Likert scale that ranges from 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Frequently, and 5=Very Frequently.

Table 2.0

The Family Domain and its 12 Social Events

Domain of Language Use	SOCIAL EVENTS
	1. What language do you use when speaking to your grandparents?
	2. What language do you use when speaking to your parents?

Family

3. What language do you use when speaking to your siblings [brother(s) and/or sister(s)]?
4. What language do you use to express your happiness towards your siblings [brother(s) and/or sister(s)]?
5. What language do you use to express your anger towards your siblings [brother(s) and/or sister(s)]?
6. What language do you use to discuss a personnel matter at home?
7. What language do you use to joke with your family members at home?
8. In what spoken language do you prefer watching movies/television shows?
9. What language do you use when speaking to a *Chavacano* relative/guest?
10. What language do you use when speaking to a *Bisaya* relative/guest?
11. What language do you use when speaking to a *Tausug* relative/guest?
12. What language do you use when speaking to your family members in the presence of a relative/guest of a different race?

After the responses were gathered, the frequency of use of each language choice was tallied according to each of the twelve (12) social events (see Table 3.0).

Table 3.0

Participants' Language Choices in the Family Domain

Social Events									
1. What language do you use when speaking to your grandparents?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
2	3.77	12	22.64	20	2	3.77	12	22.64	20
2. What language do you use when speaking to your parents?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
0	0.00	15	28.30	21	39.62	9	16.98	8	15.09
3. What language do you use when speaking to your siblings [brother(s) and/or sister(s)]?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
1	1.89	16	30.19	21	39.62	8	15.09	7	13.21
4. What language do you use to express your happiness towards your siblings [brother(s) and/or sister(s)]?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
8	15.09	16	30.19	19	35.85	6	11.32	4	7.55
5. What language do you use to express your anger towards your siblings [brother(s) and/or sister(s)]?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
3	5.66	15	28.30	21	39.62	7	13.21	7	13.21
6. What language do you use to discuss a personnel matter at home?									

English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
1	1.89	16	30.19	21	39.62	7	13.21	8	15.09
7. What language do you use to joke with your family members at home?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
1	1.89	16	30.19	18	33.96	12	22.64	6	11.32
8. In what spoken language do you prefer watching movies/television shows?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
43	81.13	4	7.55	4	7.55	2	3.77	0	0.00
9. What language do you use when speaking to a <i>Chavacano</i> relative/guest?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
0	0.00	19	35.85	32	60.38	2	3.77	0	0.00
10. What language do you use when speaking to a Bisaya relative/guest?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
0	0.00	24	45.28	0	0.00	29	54.72	0	0.00
11. What language do you use when speaking to a Tausug relative/guest?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
0	0.00	38	71.70	2	3.77	7	13.21	6	11.32
12. What language do you use when speaking to your family members in the presence of a relative/guest of a different race?									
English		Tagalog		Chavacano		Bisaya		Tausug	
N*	%	N*	%	N*	N*	%	N*	%	N*
6	11.32	29	54.72	9	16.98	6	11.32	3	5.66

Note: N* denotes the frequency of participants

The responses were coded and analyzed. Descriptive statistics, mean, and standard deviation was utilized. Table 4.0 presents the analysis of the data which includes the mean average of each under investigation languages and their respective interpretation relative to the frequency of use according to the following range: 1.0-1.7 (Never), 1.8-2.5 (Rarely), 2.6-3.3 (Sometimes), 3.4-4.1 (Frequently), and 4.2-5.0 (Very Frequently).

Table 4.0

Most Used Language Choice in the Family Domain

Domain of Language Use	Language Choices	Mean	Interpretation
Family	English	1.23	Never
	Tagalog	3.85	Very Frequently
	Chavacano	3.55	Frequently
	Bisaya	2.00	Rarely
	Tausug	1.1	Never

It can be inferred from this data that the most used language of the total population is Tagalog (SD – 1.75) with a percentage of 83%, followed by Chavacano with a percentage of 71% (1.15),

Bisaya with a percentage of 40% (SD – 0.16), English with a percentage of ,24.4% (SD – 1.39), and Tausug with a percentage of 22% (SD – 1.69, 22%).

As what the result shows, Tagalog is the most used language of Filipino youth. Intriguingly so, the Chavacano language could have also ranked as the most used language because the locale of the research study was conducted in Zamboanga City, Philippines and where most of the respondents of the study are currently residing. What could have influenced this phenomenon is the immense diversity of the city in aspects of ethnic identity, culture, and language. In addition, this could be a natural thing to occur or to expect since Tagalog and English are considered to be the official languages in the country.

- Influence of Gender and Ethnicity on Language Choice

To determine the relationship among the respondents’ gender, ethnicity, and language choice, the data set was analyzed using a test of relationship, the parametric test known as Pearson Product Moment Coefficient (also known as Pearson r). The participants’ gender and ethnicity were considered to be independent variable while their language choices were considered as dependent variable. Table 5.0 provides the analysis if the data.

Table 5.0

Relationship of gender and Ethnicity on Language Choice					
Domain of Language Choice	Variables		p-value	r-value	Interpretation
Family	Gender	Language Choice	0.000	0.259	Not Significant
	Ethnicity		0.000	0.212	Not Significant

*Significant at alpha = 0.05 (2-tailed)

As what was presented in Table 5.0, gender has no significant influence on language choice of Filipino individuals (p-value = 0.259 > $\alpha=0.05$). This means that the respondent’s language choice in the family domain is not associated with his/her gender. Also, it was found out that the ethnicity of the respondents had no significant influence of their language choice (p-value = 0.212 > $\alpha=0.05$). Moreover, the correlations both has positive r-values which means that the relationship of gender and ethnicity towards language choice are both direct. However, even though the relation of both independent variables resulted as positive, the strength of the relationship is relatively indifferent which means that it may not be very accurate or reliable.

CONCLUSION

The use of different languages or code is a common phenomenon to occur in the province of multilingualism. An individual's choice of language is by and large influenced by social constructs and that their choices are varied, changing, dynamic, and may or may not be pre-determined ([Hemat & Abdullah, 2017](#)).

The study at present is inclined to two directions. First, it aimed to investigate on the most used languages in the Family domain among Filipino individuals and an aftermath of the investigation, it was found out that most Filipino individuals preferred to use the Tagalog language in the family domain. Interestingly, the Chavacano language could have also ranked as the most used language in the family domain since the majority of individuals who participated in the study were of the Chavacano ethnicity. However, since Tagalog (besides English) was declared as one of the two official languages in the country, the result may be anchored on the concept that a language's extent of use may be influenced by the official language policy ([Hemat & Abdullah, 2017](#)).

Secondly, the study aimed to investigate on the influence of gender and ethnicity towards the language choice of Filipino youth in the family domain. From the results presented, it was identified that both gender and the individual's ethnicity were not a determinant of their language preferences. As regards to gender, the findings were incongruent to the studies of ([Rahman et al., 2008](#)) as well as of ([Hemat & Abdullah, 2017](#)). However, as regards to ethnicity, the findings were contrarywise to Fishman (1975) in ([Hemat & Abdullah, 2017](#)) who argued that language may be a strong determinant of ethnicity.

In a nutshell, this study found out that social constructs such that of gender and ethnicity, may not be an excellent determinant of language choice in communication especially in light of the family domain. What seemed to be the focal interest of the interlocutors in the communication is universality and better expression as well as comprehension of ideas regardless of their personal background or social identities. Moreover, in the case of this study, it was found out that the concept of official language policy serves as a rule of thumb in communication.

REFERENCES

- Abdulai, R. T., & Owusu-Ansah, A. (2014). Essential Ingredients of a Good Research Proposal for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students in the Social Sciences. *SAGE Open*, 4(3), 215824401454817. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014548178>
- Abdullah, A. N., & Leo, A. R. (2014). Language Choice and Use of Malaysian Tamil Christian Youths: A Survey. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 4, 149–166. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342923450_Language_Choice_and_Use_of_Malaysian_Tamil_Christian_Youths_A_Survey
- Adams, Y., Matu, P., & Ongarora, 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. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1043.6817&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Alhourani, A. Q. (2018). Code Switching as a Communicative Strategy for the Bilingual Saudi Speakers at Jouf University. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 1(4), 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2018.1.4.9>
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2015). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and

- Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*.
<https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1573>
- Cabangcala, R. B., Alieto, E. O., Estigoy, E. B., Santos, M. R. D., & Torres, J. M. (2021). When Language Learning Suddenly Becomes Online: Analyzing English as Second Language Learners' (ELLs) Attitude and Technological Competence. *TESOL International Journal*, 16, 122–138. <https://pesquisa.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/resource/pt/covidwho-1273909>
- Caparaz, P., & Gustilo, L. (2017). Communicative Aspects of Multilingual Code Switching in Computer-Mediated Communication. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 111. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8137>
- Chakraborty, R., Ghosh, A., Ghosh, S., & Mukherjee, S. (2015). Evaluation of contaminant transport parameters for hexavalent chromium migration through saturated soil media. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 74(7), 5687–5697. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-015-4586-1>
- Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Research Design Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed* (S. Z. Qudsy (ed.); 3rd ed.). Pustaka Pelajar. <https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/DetailOpac.aspx?id=1213690>
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2013). *Language and Gender* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/id/academic/subjects/languages-linguistics/sociolinguistics/language-and-gender-2nd-edition?format=PB>
- Główka, D. (2014). The impact of gender on attainment in learning English as a foreign language. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(4), 617. <https://doi.org/10.14746/sslt.2014.4.4.3>
- Hemat, M. G., & Abdullah, A. N. (2017). Gender, Ethnicity, Ethnic Identity, and Language Choices of Malaysian Youths: the Case of the Family Domain. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(2), 26. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.2p.26>
- Hemat, M. G., Abdullah, A. N., Heng, C. S., & Tan, H. (2015). The Influence of Gender and Ethnicity on the Choice of Language in the Transaction Domain of Language Use: The Case of Undergraduates. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4(5). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.5p.249>
- Hemat, M. G., & Heng, C. S. (2012). Interplay of Language Policy, Ethnic Identity and National Identity in Five Different Linguistic Settings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(7), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.7p.1>
- Hidalgo, C. A. (1998). Language choice in a multilingual society: the case of the Philippines. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 130(1), 23–33. <https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/de-gruyter/language-choice-in-a-multilingual-society-the-case-of-the-philippines-a3hIjw2XkI>
- Kang, E. Y. (2013). Multilingual Competence. *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 55–56. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7916/salt.v13i2.1334>
- Kavaklı, N. (2017). Language choice, use and transmission: Laz at the crossroads. *Journal of Endangered Language*, 51–66. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED581694.pdf>
- Kurniasih, Y. K. (2006). Gender, Class and Language Preference: A case study in Yogyakarta. *Australian Linguistic Society*, 12, 1–25. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.500.7988>
- Lee, S. Y. (2014). Language Choice & Language Power: Children's Use of Korean & English in a

- Two-Way Immersion Program. *Multicultural Education*, 22(1), 12–19.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1065314>
- Mahmud, M., & Nur, S. (2018). Exploring Students' Learning Strategies and Gender Differences in English Language Teaching. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), 51.
<https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v2i1.4346>
- Nugraheni, R., Santika, S., Pramita, S., Sari, M., & Valentino, Y. B. (2013). Joshua Fishman's Domains of Language Use in Relation to Multicultural Life in English. *Language Education Study*, 13, 50–57.
https://www.academia.edu/4152760/JOSHUA_FISHMANS_DOMAINS_OF_LANGUAGE_USE_IN_RELATION_TO_MULTICULTURAL_LIFE
- Okal, B. O. (2014). Benefits of Multilingualism in Education. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2(3), 223–229. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2014.020304>
- Osborne, D. (2015). *Negotiating the Hierarchy of Languages in Ilocandia: The Social and Cognitive Implications of Massive Multilingualism in the Philippines* [The University of Arizona].
https://repository.arizona.edu/bitstream/handle/10150/556859/azu_etd_13914_sip1_m.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Parangan, B. P., & Buslon, J. (2020). The Construct of Gender and Ethnicity in Language Proficiency of Post-Colonial ESL Learners. *TESOL International Journal*, 15(1).
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3628273
- Perez, A. L., & Alieto, E. (2018). Change of “Tongue” from English to a Local Language: A Correlation of Mother Tongue Proficiency and Mathematics Achievement. *Asian ESP Journal*, 14(7), 132–150. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED597105>
- Rahman, M. M., Rashed, A., Heng, C. S., & Abdullah, A. N. (2008). What determines the choice of language with friends and neighbors? the case of Malaysian university undergraduates. *Language in India*, 8(10), 1–16. <http://psasir.upm.edu.my/id/eprint/17638/>
- Romaine, S. (2000). Colin Baker & Sylvia Prys Jones, Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education. *Language in Society*, 29(4), 600–602.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450026404X>
- Tong, H. K., & Cheung, L. H. (2011). Cultural identity and language: a proposed framework for cultural globalisation and glocalisation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(1), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2010.527344>
- Torto, R. (2014). Language Choice in Communication in a Multilingual Setting: A Case Study of a Cross Section of First Year Students of the University of Cape Coast, Ghana. *Language in Indiage*, 14(12), 339–359.
<https://doi.org/http://journalcra.com/article/language-choice-communication-multilingual-setting-case-study-students-university-cape-coast>
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 1(2), 125–151.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/189945>
- Yildirim, F. Ç. (2020). Language choice and identity: An investigation based on the comparison of language attitudes from two different localities. *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 16(2), 1032–1042. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.759361>