ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT



# EXPLORING THE CAUSES FOR LANGUAGE ATTRITION AMONG PUNJABI SPEAKERS IN PAKISTAN: A SOCIO-LINGUISTIC STUDY

**Tazanfal Tehseem,**
Assistant Professor, Department of Linguistics and Language Studies, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan, Email: tazanfal@ymail.com
**Ayesha Mukhtar,**
M.Phil Scholar, Department of English, University of Sargodha, Sargodha Pakistan, Email: ayesha23warraich@gmail.com
**Maryam Ali Nawaz,**
M.Phil Scholar, Department of English, University of Sargodha, Sargodha Pakistan,Email: ma1574085@gmail.com

## Abstract

*This study investigates language attrition in Punjabi among young adults in a multilingual Pakistani context. A total of 100 respondents, consisting of 50 males and 50 females aged between 20 and 25, participated in the research. To measure language attrition, a lexical recall test was employed, where participants were asked to identify 100 Punjabi words, including nouns, adjectives, and verbs. A Yes/No scale was used to assess lexical attrition, providing a direct measure of the respondents' retention or loss of vocabulary. Additionally, a Likert scale was administered to explore potential causes of attrition, such as language use patterns, social influences, and the prevalence of other dominant languages. The questionnaire design was informed by the work of prominent researchers, including Köpke and Schmidt (2004), Grosjean (2001), and Fishman (1991), to ensure a comprehensive examination of language attrition factors. The findings of this study offer insight into the factors contributing to Punjabi language attrition in young speakers and highlight gender-based differences in language retention. This analysis of lexical attrition among male and female respondents highlights significant gender differences in the retention of vocabulary items. Female respondents generally retain more lexical items than males, with 76% retaining "Mat" versus 68% of males, and 64% recognizing "Sur" compared to 46% of males. However, some items show higher attrition rates for females, such as "Pichokar," retained by only 10% of females compared to 20% of males. In the context of adjectives, both genders struggled, with males outperforming females in most categories, yet females excelled in specific terms like "Tata." Verbs showed a similar trend, with males generally recognizing more items but females outperforming in some cases. Contributing factors to language attrition include a preference for Urdu and English, social pressures discouraging Punjabi use, and a generational gap in language engagement. Statistical analysis confirms that age and gender significantly influence language attrition, rejecting the null hypothesis. Overall, while females exhibit higher retention in many areas, exceptions exist, indicating a complex pattern of lexical attrition influenced by social and contextual factors.*

**Keywords:** Lexical Attrition, Punjabi, Multilingualism, Shahpuri, Causes

## 1.Introduction

Language attrition refers to the gradual loss of proficiency in a language due to insufficient use or exposure that affect both first (L1) and second languages (L2). Factors which contribute to attrition include medical conditions like Broca's and Wernicke's aphasia but this study focuses on sociological aspects. In multilingual settings the dominant language often influences and the mother tongue thus leading to fluency loss, vocabulary recall issues, and the adoption of second language features. Key factors influencing attrition include social prestige, age, motivation, and language dominance. This research is significant for policymakers because it examines Punjabi language attrition within the multilingual context of Pakistan especially focusing on the Shahpuri dialect influenced by Urdu. The study highlights the generational loss of Punjabi vocabulary due to the prestige of Urdu and the effects of geographical distance on language retention. It emphasizes that higher linguistic diversity correlates with increased attrition rates. The study aims to investigate language attrition in Punjabi speakers, considering gender and age, and seeks to identify contributing factors—social, cultural, and linguistic. Specific objectives of the study include assessing the impact of dominant languages on Punjabi attrition and quantifying lexical loss. Key questions

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



address the influence of socio-cultural and linguistic factors on Punjabi attrition, the impact of dominant languages on lexical loss, and the extent of various factors contributing to this phenomenon. The study proposes a null hypothesis stating that age and gender do not influence language attrition contrasted by an alternate hypothesis suggesting a significant relationship between these variables and attrition. The research employs purposive sampling involving 100 participants (50 males and 50 females) aged 20 to 25 all native Punjabi speakers with Urdu and English as second languages. The study aims to measure attrition within a multilingual context.

## 2.Literature Review

Language attrition refers to the gradual loss of proficiency or competence in a language which often results in the erosion of the sociocultural identity tied to that language. According to Mahboob (2014) the decline in the use of local and indigenous languages is accelerated by the societal preference for dominant languages which are often associated with prestige and practical benefits (ibid). This process is increasingly recognized as a distinct field within second language acquisition and bilingualism studies (de Bot et al., 2011). Historically speaking, Punjabi has been central to daily communication, folklore, and religious discourses (Jalal, 1995). However, recent decades have seen a shift in attitudes toward the language especially among the urban and younger generations due to significant neglect (Shafi, 2013). Turning to the language loss, it is a complex issue because speakers are always aware that languages are disappearing but they often do not fully grasp the extent of the decline (Crystal, 2000). Therefore, language death is not an immediate event but rather the culmination of a long process.

On the top of that, language attrition refers to the gradual decline or loss of fluency and competence in a language (Hansen, 2001). When speakers lose a language they also lose the sociocultural identity. Individuals undergoing this process are known as ‘attriters’ and the decline in their linguistic ability is termed as language loss (Hansen, 2001). Language attrition is thus recognized as a distinct research area after a landmark conference held at the University of Pennsylvania in 1980 (Lambert & Freed, 1982). Seliger (1989) and Vago (1991) observed that children who migrate from their home countries and transition from an L1 to an L2 environment often face substantial language attrition. One of the key challenges in studying language attrition in children is to identify what linguistic skills the children had acquired before the onset of attrition and which specific areas of the language have been lost (Seliger, 1989). Obler (Ibid) elucidates how aphasia—a speech disorder that impairs linguistic as well as academic skills—leads to language attrition. Individuals with brain damage often struggle to process and comprehend language which directly contributes to language loss (Schiller, 2000). Additionally, Nicolai (2001) noted that certain neurological conditions hinder the mental processes involved in language production.

Seliger (1996) outlines several key characteristics of first language attrition that further elucidate this process. For instance, speakers may find it increasingly difficult to retrieve or recall words in their L1 instead on vocabulary from the dominant language that has taken precedence in their mental lexicon. Kopke and Schmidt (2004) identify several factors that contribute to lexical attrition. One significant factor is the disuse of language especially when speakers are rarely engaged with a particular language they gradually forget it. There are several reasons why bilinguals tend to perform less effectively in verbal fluency tasks (Köpke et al., 2011) and on these lines, one significant factor can be cross-linguistic interference. Bilingual speakers often speak their dominant language more fluently than their native language. The reason is that the dominant language is used more frequently and offers better opportunities. It is noteworthy to say that before individuals develop productive language

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL (JALT)
Vol.8.No.2 2025

skills like speaking and writing they must first focus on understanding the language which involves receptive skills (Ellis, 1994 and Harris and Muztagh, 1999).

## 3.Background of the Research

Language attrition refers to the gradual loss of proficiency in a language either by communities or individuals. In communities, it can result from language shift or language death. For individuals, pathological issues like aphasia may cause loss while in healthy individuals it's termed as attrition that often occurs in multilingual societies where frequent use of another language leads to forgetting the mother tongue. Multicompetence or the ability to speak multiple languages can also cause attrition largely because the dominant language overtakes others. Vocabulary is the first aspect to be lost right after syntax. Common causes of language attrition include lack of use, migration, age, interference from other languages, and social pressure to abandon minority languages. In educational settings dominant languages can cause to erode minority languages. Cognitive decline in older individuals also contributes to language attrition. These factors often overlap thus leading to varying degrees of language loss across different individuals.

## 4.Research Methodology

### 4.1. Data set

The research adopts a quantitative approach that offers objective insights by using statistical methods like mean, frequency, and correlation. This method is chosen for its ability to handle gender-related data distribution effectively. The researcher employed purposive sampling in which participants are selected based on age and gender in order to study language attrition especially how these factors influence linguistic decline. Data collection involved in a research study was a questionnaire with 100 Punjabi lexical items and 11 questions about the status of Punjabi in a multilingual context. A Likert scale was used to analyze socio-psychological and neurological causes of language attrition. A word recognition test with 100 Punjabi words such as verbs, adjectives and nouns was used to measure lexical attrition.

### 4.2. Procedure

The study involved 100 Punjabi-speaking participants (50 males, 50 females) aged 20-25 living in multilingual environments. The participants' sociocultural backgrounds are similar because they speak Punjabi at home but learn Urdu as their national language and use English in academic settings. Purposive sampling especially homogenous sampling was employed with gender and age as key variables. The research was aimed at exploring how these factors impact language attrition in relation to age and gender. The yes/no scale and Likert scale were employed for measuring responses. SPSS software was used for statistical analysis that focuses on descriptive statistics like mean and frequency and a correlation was drawn between male and female participants regarding language attrition. A word recognition task following the lexical decision method helped assess participants' ability to recall words.

## 5.Data Analysis

### 5.1. Basic Demographic Information of the Respondents

Part 1 provides some of the core information regarding participants like their native language, the use of second language as well as about their residency etc.

**Frequencies: Nouns**

**Table 4.1.** *Native Language*

| native language | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| **female** | Valid | 0 | 46 | 92.0 | 92.0 | 92.0 |
| | | 1 | 4 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Tot | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT



| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | al | | | | |
| **Male** | Valid | 0 | 46 | 92.0 | 92.0 | 92.0 |
| | | 1 | 4 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

As the table 4.1. shows that female respondents and male respondents used Punjabi more extensively in Punjab because Punjabi is a native language which is utilized in a variety of contexts. The only contextual parameters include *tenor, field* and *mode* and on these lines the *tenor* means the interaction among the participants, *field* means the subject matter while *mode* of the discussion includes whether the interaction was a *vis-à-vis interaction* or *written* mode. My data shows that both male and female respondents make no statistically significant difference in using Urdu so Punjabi can be fairly largely said to be the most spoken language between both male and female respondents.

**Table 4.2.** *The Use of Second Language*

| **Gender** | | | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **female** | Valid | 0 | 30 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 |
| | | 1 | 4 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 68.0 |
| | | 2 | 16 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **male** | Valid | 0 | 29 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 58.0 |
| | | 1 | 3 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 64.0 |
| | | 2 | 18 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table 4.2. showcases that majority of the participants use Urdu as a second language in their day to day activities. In this context, there is no statistically significant difference between both group of the respondents use English in a very limited way but the above table reveals that males use both of these languages slightly more so than their female counterparts.

**Table 4.4.** *How long have you been living in a city?*

| **Gender** | | | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | 0 | 4 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| | | 1 | 17 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 42.0 |
| | | 2 | 29 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | 0 | 3 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| | | 1 | 16 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 38.0 |
| | | 2 | 31 | 62.0 | 62.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

When the respondents were asked how long they had been living in cities, majority of the respondents were those who had been living more than 10 years in cities in which 62% were males and 58% were females. There were very few respondents (6 to 8%) who had been

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



living less than ten years in cities while 32-34% of the respondents were those who had been living there for almost last ten years. In this way, the data shows that majority of the respondents were permanent residents of cities and by teleporting the previous findings within the paradigm of this question, it is interesting to note that despite having been lived in cities for quite a larger span of time, majority of the respondents were speaking Punjabi which is a watertight demarcation that majority uses Punjabi even by moving to cities as well.

**5.2. Lexical Recognition Test**

Part 2 is concerned with lexical recognition test in which all of the participants were given 100 typical Punjabi words to identify. This test was conduct to measure language attrition in terms of vocabulary items.

**Table 4.5.** *Tary (Thirst)*

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **female** | Valid | Yes | 20 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| | | No | 30 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **male** | Valid | Yes | 19 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 |
| | | No | 31 | 62.0 | 62.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The respondents were presented a lexical item in Punjabi in which majority of the respondents (almost 60-62%) couldn't be able to identify this word albeit it is a typical Punjabi word while 38-40% identified the semantics of this word. The data shows that majority of the native speakers irrespective of gender differences have lost this word although they use this language most often. The only reasonable answer to this very condition is that very unlikely this word would have been replaced by another word like 'piyaas' from Urdu which is so common now-a-days.

**Table 4.6.** *Kaang (flood)*

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| female | Valid | Yes | 14 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| | | No | 36 | 72.0 | 72.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| male | Valid | Yes | 12 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| | | No | 38 | 76.0 | 76.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

In this case, too, majority of the respondents couldn't identify the semantics of this very typical word of Punjabi (72-76%) which shows that this word is rapidly disappearing from younger generation's speech while only 24-28% of the respondents succeeded in recalling this word. Another interesting thing is that mostly females recognized this very item.

**Table 4.7.** *Mat (Wisdom)*

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| female | Valid | Yes | 38 | 76.0 | 76.0 | 76.0 |

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT



| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No | 12 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | Yes | 34 | 68.0 | 68.0 | 68.0 |
| male | Valid | No | 16 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The participants were presented another typical word which was used most extensively among many Punjabi speakers. This time, quite interestingly, majority of male and female respondents (almost 68-76%) identified the semantics of this word mainly because it makes a rhyming scheme with 'wat' meaning 'again'. It is so because all those typically occurring words in Punjabi rhyming with other words unlikely less attrite. Only 24-32% respondents couldn't identify this word in which male respondents reported attrition slightly more so than female participants in this context.

**Table 4.8.** *Pakhand (Pretention)*

| **Gender** | | | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **female** | Valid | Yes | 18 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 |
| | | No | 32 | 64.0 | 64.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **male** | Valid | Yes | 15 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| | | No | 35 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

In the context of this word, almost 64-70% respondents were unable to identify this word and in doing so, males reported to attrite this word. The reason is that only villagers can identify this word. In Urdu, the inflected form of this word 'Paakhandi' is most frequently used but just the same the base word lost in the speech of males. However, 36% of males fairly identified semantics while male respondents 30% were unable to identify.

***Table 4.9.*** *Wadha (Growth)*

| **Gender** | | | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **female** | Valid | Yes | 21 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 |
| | | No | 29 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **male** | Valid | Yes | 13 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 |
| | | No | 37 | 74.0 | 74.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

To identify this typical word, mostly female respondents in almost 42% recognized this word while only 26% male respondents could be able to recall this word. Majority of the respondents were unable to recall.

**5.3. Lexical Attrition in Nominal category**

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



**Table 4.10.** *Lexical Attrition in Nominal category*

| *Lexical Item* | *Gender* | *Yes (Frequency)* | *Yes (%)* | *No (Frequency)* | *No (%)* | *Total (n)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Tary* | Female | 20 | 40.0% | 30 | 60.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 19 | 38.0% | 31 | 62.0% | 50 |
| *Kang* | Female | 14 | 28.0% | 36 | 72.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 12 | 24.0% | 38 | 76.0% | 50 |
| *Mat* | Female | 38 | 76.0% | 12 | 24.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 34 | 68.0% | 16 | 32.0% | 50 |
| *Pakhand* | Female | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 15 | 30.0% | 35 | 70.0% | 50 |
| *Sabhao* | Female | 21 | 42.0% | 29 | 58.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 21 | 42.0% | 29 | 58.0% | 50 |
| *Wadhaa* | Female | 21 | 42.0% | 29 | 58.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 13 | 26.0% | 37 | 74.0% | 50 |
| *Tangh* | Female | 19 | 38.0% | 31 | 62.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 13 | 26.0% | 37 | 74.0% | 50 |
| *Buwa* | Female | 25 | 50.0% | 25 | 50.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 31 | 62.0% | 19 | 38.0% | 50 |
| *Khakhan* | Female | 16 | 32.0% | 34 | 68.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 21 | 42.0% | 29 | 58.0% | 50 |
| *Pankhu* | Female | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 11 | 22.0% | 39 | 78.0% | 50 |
| *Siyanap* | Female | 14 | 28.0% | 36 | 72.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| *Rurak* | Female | 23 | 46.0% | 27 | 54.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 21 | 42.0% | 29 | 58.0% | 50 |
| *Neena* | Female | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 19 | 38.0% | 31 | 62.0% | 50 |
| *Lip* | Female | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 20 | 40.0% | 30 | 60.0% | 50 |
| *Mahandra* | Female | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 19 | 38.0% | 31 | 62.0% | 50 |
| *Sur* | Female | 32 | 64.0% | 18 | 36.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 23 | 46.0% | 27 | 54.0% | 50 |
| *Reej* | Female | 26 | 52.0% | 24 | 48.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 22 | 44.0% | 28 | 56.0% | 50 |
| *Saor* | Female | 14 | 28.0% | 36 | 72.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 16 | 32.0% | 34 | 68.0% | 50 |
| *Tewa* | Female | 15 | 30.0% | 35 | 70.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 16 | 32.0% | 34 | 68.0% | 50 |
| *Chaa* | Female | 31 | 62.0% | 19 | 38.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 30 | 60.0% | 20 | 40.0% | 50 |
| *Pichukar* | Female | 5 | 10.0% | 45 | 90.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 10 | 20.0% | 40 | 80.0% | 50 |
| *Vihaar* | Female | 12 | 24.0% | 38 | 76.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 11 | 22.0% | 39 | 78.0% | 50 |
| *Gheira* | Female | 22 | 44.0% | 28 | 56.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| *Sabhaon* | Female | 23 | 46.0% | 27 | 54.0% | 50 |

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL (JALT)
Vol.8.No.2 2025

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| *Mashkri* | Female | 13 | 26.0% | 37 | 74.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 9 | 18.0% | 41 | 82.0% | 50 |
| *Lery* | Female | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| *Vadha* | Female | 19 | 38.0% | 31 | 62.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 21 | 42.0% | 29 | 58.0% | 50 |
| *Tanghh* | Female | 16 | 32.0% | 34 | 68.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 14 | 28.0% | 36 | 72.0% | 50 |
| *Sevenk* | Female | 12 | 24.0% | 38 | 76.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 9 | 18.0% | 41 | 82.0% | 50 |
| *Masha* | Female | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| *Varha* | Female | 23 | 46.0% | 27 | 54.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 22 | 44.0% | 28 | 56.0% | 50 |
| *Khechhal* | Female | 21 | 41.18% | 29 | 58.82% | 50 |
| | Male | 26 | 52.0% | 24 | 48.0% | 50 |
| *Tomab* | Female | 7 | 14.58% | 43 | 85.42% | 50 |
| | Male | 12 | 24.0% | 38 | 76.0% | 50 |
| *Sik* | Female | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 15 | 30.0% | 35 | 70.0% | 50 |
| *Buk* | Female | 25 | 50.0% | 25 | 50.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 19 | 38.0% | 31 | 62.0% | 50 |
| *Baghlol* | Female | 11 | 22.0% | 39 | 78.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 13 | 26.0% | 37 | 74.0% | 50 |
| *Khandak* | Female | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 13 | 26.0% | 37 | 74.0% | 50 |
| *Sejal* | Female | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| *Aar* | Female | 15 | 30.0% | 35 | 70.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 19 | 38.0% | 31 | 62.0% | 50 |
| *Alki* | Female | 6 | 12.0% | 44 | 88.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 10 | 20.0% | 40 | 80.0% | 50 |
| *Aphara* | Female | 9 | 18.0% | 41 | 82.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 12 | 24.0% | 38 | 76.0% | 50 |
| *Adh* | Female | 16 | 32.0% | 34 | 68.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| *Tukr* | Female | 23 | 46.0% | 27 | 54.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 30 | 60.0% | 20 | 40.0% | 50 |
| *Sajn* | Female | 24 | 48.0% | 26 | 52.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 31 | 62.0% | 19 | 38.0% | 50 |
| *Tapay* | Female | 30 | 60.0% | 20 | 40.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 31 | 62.0% | 19 | 38.0% | 50 |
| *Jwak* | Female | 24 | 48.0% | 26 | 52.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 19 | 38.0% | 31 | 62.0% | 50 |
| *Tham* | Female | 13 | 26.0% | 37 | 74.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 14 | 28.0% | 36 | 72.0% | 50 |
| *Rukh* | Female | 22 | 44.0% | 28 | 56.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL (JALT)
Vol.8.No.2 2025

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Larah* | Female | 16 | 32.0% | 34 | 68.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 18 | 36.0% | 32 | 64.0% | 50 |
| *Silona* | Female | 15 | 30.0% | 35 | 70.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 14 | 28.0% | 36 | 72.0% | 50 |
| *Baal* | Female | 28 | 70.0% | 12 | 30.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 31 | 62.0% | 19 | 38.0% | 50 |
| *Nheera* | Female | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 25 | 50.0% | 25 | 50.0% | 50 |
| *Mora* | Female | 14 | 28.0% | 36 | 72.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 17 | 34.0% | 33 | 66.0% | 50 |
| *Dand* | Female | 21 | 42.0% | 29 | 58.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 19 | 38.0% | 31 | 62.0% | 50 |
| *Tabar* | Female | 26 | 52.0% | 24 | 48.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 31 | 62.0% | 19 | 38.0% | 50 |
| *Pio* | Female | 27 | 54.0% | 23 | 46.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 29 | 58.0% | 21 | 42.0% | 50 |
| *Dhe* | Female | 23 | 46.0% | 27 | 54.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 24 | 48.0% | 26 | 52.0% | 50 |
| *Pend* | Female | 25 | 50.0% | 25 | 50.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 26 | 52.0% | 24 | 48.0% | 50 |
| *Khand* | Female | 21 | 42.0% | 29 | 58.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 22 | 44.0% | 28 | 56.0% | 50 |
| *Kasa* | Female | 12 | 24.0% | 38 | 76.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 9 | 18.0% | 41 | 82.0% | 50 |
| *Pawa* | Female | 16 | 32.0% | 34 | 68.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 16 | 32.0% | 34 | 68.0% | 50 |
| *Kand* | Female | 7 | 14.0% | 43 | 86.0% | 50 |
| | Male | 8 | 16.0% | 42 | 84.0% | 50 |

In analyzing the data on lexical attrition across male and female respondents, the frequencies and percentages of affirmative ("Yes") and negative ("No") responses for various lexical items provide insight into whether males or females have experienced more lexical attrition. For many of the lexical items, female respondents tend to demonstrate a higher frequency of affirmative responses than male respondents. For instance, in the case of "Mat" 76% of female respondents retained the term compared to 68% of male respondents. Similarly, "Sur" shows that 64% of female respondents still recognize this term ‘Sur’ while 46% of male respondents do. This pattern continues with "Chaa" where 62% of females retained the term against 60% of males. However, some items illustrate the opposite trend. For example, in "Pichokar" only 10% of female respondents retained the term compared to 20% of male respondents indicate a higher attrition rate among females. Similarly, "Sevenk" and "Tomab" display lower retention rates among females compared to male respondents with females at 24% and 14.58% respectively. As a whole, while the evidence suggests that females may have higher retention rates for several items certain items indicate that males have experienced less attrition. In summary, while both male and female respondents face attrition, the data implies that female respondents generally demonstrate a higher retention of lexical items compared to those of male respondents. However, certain lexical items show the contrary results indicating that attrition is not uniformly distributed and may vary depending

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



on specific terms. Thus, females are more likely to retain vocabulary overall but there are notable exceptions.

**5.4. Measuring Language Attrition in Grammatical Category of Adjectives**

The table includes frequencies and percentages for both female and male respondents across adjectives.

| *Category* | *Gender* | *Yes* | *No* | *Total* | *Yes (%)* | *No (%)* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Mahanadra*** | Female | 5 | 45 | 50 | 10.0% | 90.0 % |
| | Male | 9 | 41 | 50 | 18.0% | 82.0 % |
| ***Tata*** | Female | 25 | 25 | 50 | 50.0% | 50.0 % |
| | Male | 15 | 35 | 50 | 30.0% | 70.0 % |
| ***Adl*** | Female | 5 | 45 | 50 | 10.0% | 90.0 % |
| | Male | 5 | 45 | 50 | 10.0% | 90.0 % |
| ***Virlyvirly*** | Female | 13 | 37 | 50 | 26.0% | 74.0 % |
| | Male | 18 | 32 | 50 | 36.0% | 64.0 % |
| ***Jamandron*** | Female | 3 | 47 | 50 | 6.0% | 94.0 % |
| | Male | 6 | 44 | 50 | 12.0% | 88.0 % |
| ***Kovaylay*** | Female | 6 | 44 | 50 | 12.0% | 88.0 % |
| | Male | 14 | 36 | 50 | 28.0% | 72.0 % |
| ***Wakaao*** | Female | 10 | 40 | 50 | 20.0% | 80.0 % |
| | Male | 11 | 39 | 50 | 22.0% | 78.0 % |
| ***Sajra*** | Female | 9 | 41 | 50 | 18.0% | 82.0 % |
| | Male | 11 | 39 | 50 | 22.0% | 78.0 % |
| ***Nweikla*** | Female | 10 | 40 | 50 | 20.0% | 80.0 % |
| | Male | 10 | 40 | 50 | 20.0% | 80.0 % |
| ***Adal*** | Female | 13 | 37 | 50 | 26.0% | 74.0 % |
| | Male | 9 | 41 | 50 | 18.0% | 82.0 % |
| ***Khla*** | Female | 11 | 39 | 50 | 22.0% | 78.0 % |

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT



| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | 10 | 40 | 50 | 20.0% | 80.0 % |
| ***Tarikha*** | Female | 11 | 39 | 50 | 22.0% | 78.0 % |
| | Male | 11 | 39 | 50 | 22.0% | 78.0 % |
| ***Wasnik*** | Female | 16 | 34 | 50 | 32.0% | 68.0 % |
| | Male | 10 | 40 | 50 | 20.0% | 80.0 % |

This unified table provides a clear overview of the responses that shows the number and percentage of respondents who either recognized or unrecognized adjectives distributed into gender. This table presents the results of a study where respondents were asked to recognize adjectives. The data is categorized by gender (female and male respondents). The "Yes" column represents the number of respondents who recognized adjectives while the "No" column shows the number of those who did not. The percentages indicate the proportion of respondents who answered "Yes" or "No" out of the total sample in each category. Each row corresponds to a specific group and these categories likely represent different experimental groups, contexts, or regional samples within the study and each category has separate data for female and male respondents. The detail of each is given below:

In this particular case, recognition of adjectives is very low in both female (10%) and males (18%) respondents which is the indication that both respondents have faced a significant difficulty in recognizing adjectives. Most respondents particularly females did not recognize adjectives [90% for females and 82% for males. In this context, female respondents recognized a much higher percentage in almost 50%, however, only 30% of male respondents recognized this adjective. The male recognition rate is much lower compared to female respondents. Both female and male respondents showed poor performance in recognizing ‘Adl’ with only 10% of each of them were thus able to identify that which suggests that the matter of recognizing this adjective was particularly challenging with a very high percentage (90%) of respondents.

Almost 26% of female respondents were able to recognize this particular item while male respondents outperformed in a much better way in 36%. When this item was presented to respondents, very few female respondents (6%) and male respondents (12%) were able to recognize this adjective mainly because this is one of the lowest performances across all categories with 94% of female and 88% of male respondents. Female respondents again have a very low success rate (12%) but male respondents, on the contrary, show a much higher recognition rate (28%). While most respondents in both groups still failed to recognize ‘Kovaylay’ while male performance is notably better than female ones. So far as this case is concerned the recognition is slightly better in 20% of female respondents while 22% of male respondents recognized that item. Therefore, my data shows relatively similar rates between both respondents although most participants still could not recognize the word ‘Wakaao’. In this context, 18% of female respondents and 22% of male respondents recognized the word ‘Sajra’ so the difference between the two is smaller although majority like 82% of female and 78% of male respondents were dominant.

Both female and male respondents outperformed almost equally in 20% recognition while this symmetry is the indication of a consistent challenge across both respondents in this category because 80% of respondents couldn’t identify the word. Female respondents (26%) performed better than male respondents (18%) although a significant portion of both

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



respondents failed to recognize it (74% and 82%, respectively). In this context, 22% of female respondents and 20% of male respondents identified the word 'Khla'. Both female and male respondents performed equally with 22% of both respondents in each group. Female respondents, in the context of this word 'Wasnik' (32%) outperformed males (20%). The success rate for female respondents is relatively high compared to other categories although a majority of both groups still struggled.

Across all categories, a significant portion of respondents (both male and female) struggled to recognize adjectives and in most categories, over 70% of the respondents were unable to do so which is the indication that adjective recognition was a challenging task for the majority. Male respondents generally outperformed females in recognizing adjectives across most categories. In 8 out of 13 categories (Mahanadra, Adl, Virly (Virly), Jamandron, Kovaylay, Wakaao, Sajra, and Nweikla) while the percentage of male respondents identified adjectives as higher than that of female respondents. However, in some categories, female respondents performed better, notably, in Tata, Adal, Khla, and Wasnik. In that case, female respondents had higher recognition rates than male respondents.

Categories like **Tata** and **Wasnik** had comparatively higher adjective recognition rates especially among females. In Tata, 50% of females and 30% of males recognized adjectives while in Wasnik, 32% of female respondents did so. In addition, categories such as Mahanadra, Adl, and Jamandron showed very low adjective recognition rates with over 80% of the respondents. Some categories, such as Nweikla and Tarikha, displayed relatively equal performance between males and females, indicating that the challenge was fairly uniform. In both cases, 20-22% of respondents in each gender group recognized adjectives showing a similar level of difficulty across the board.

### 5.5. Investigating Causes of Language Attrition

**Q.1. which of the following best describes the current use of Punjabi in your household?**

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | Historical | 17 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 34.0 |
| | | Heritage | 33 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Historical | 16 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| | | Heritage | 34 | 68.0 | 68.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table shows that both female (66%) and male (68%) respondents primarily describe Punjabi as a **heritage language** in their households which is the indication that its cultural rather than everyday use. A smaller portion of both female (34%) and male (32%) respondents view Punjabi as having a **historical role** mainly because of less frequent use in daily conversations. Anyhow, the distribution is similar across gender with the majority associating Punjabi with heritage rather than active historical usage.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | 0 | 24 | 48.0 | 48.0 | 48.0 |
| | | Strongly Disagree | 8 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 64.0 |
| | | Disagree | 11 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 86.0 |
| | | Neutral | 7 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | 0 | 21 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 |
| | | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 62.0 |
| | | Disagree | 12 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 86.0 |
| | | Neutral | 7 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table shows that a significant proportion of both males and females prefer to speak Urdu or English rather than Punjabi in professional settings. Among females, 48% strongly agree with this preference, while 16% strongly disagree, 22% disagree, and 14% are neutral. Similarly, 42% of males strongly agree, 20% strongly disagree, 24% disagree, and 14% are neutral. Overall, both genders display a strong inclination toward using Urdu or English in professional environments, with a slightly higher percentage of females expressing this preference.

**Q.3. Speaking Punjabi is not necessary for success in education or the job market in Pakistan.**

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 |
| | | Neutral | 6 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 20.0 |
| | | Agree | 21 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 62.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 19 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | | Disagree | 3 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 8.0 |
| | | Neutral | 4 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 16.0 |
| | | Agree | 22 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 60.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 20 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table illustrates that both males and females largely agree that speaking Punjabi is not necessary for success in education or the job market in Pakistan. Among females, 42% agree and 38% strongly agree, while smaller percentages strongly disagree (4%), disagree (4%), or remain neutral (12%). Similarly, among males, 44% agree and 40% strongly agree, with a

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



minority strongly disagreeing (2%), disagreeing (6%), or staying neutral (8%). Overall, the data indicates that the majority of both genders perceive Punjabi as not being essential for professional or educational success, with slight variations in their level of agreement.

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | Disagree | 7 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| | | Neutral | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 24.0 |
| | | Agree | 20 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 64.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 18 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 6.0 |
| | | Neutral | 4 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 14.0 |
| | | Agree | 24 | 48.0 | 48.0 | 62.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 19 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table reveals that a significant portion of both males and females agree that their families do not encourage speaking Punjabi at home. Among females, 40% agree and 36% strongly agree, while smaller proportions disagree (14%) or are neutral (10%). For males, 48% agree and 38% strongly agree, with fewer strongly disagreeing (4%), disagreeing (2%), or being neutral (8%). Overall, the majority of both genders feel their families discourage speaking Punjabi, with males showing a slightly higher tendency to agree, reflecting a shared perception across genders that Punjabi is not actively promoted at home.

**Q.5. The media I consume (TV, internet, radio) is mostly in Urdu or English.**

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | | Disagree | 12 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 26.0 |
| | | Neutral | 6 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 38.0 |
| | | Agree | 17 | 34.0 | 34.0 | 72.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 14 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Disagree | 4 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| | | Neutral | 8 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 24.0 |
| | | Agree | 28 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 80.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 10 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table indicates that both males and females predominantly consume media in Urdu or English. Among females, 34% agree and 28% strongly agree with this statement, while smaller proportions disagree (24%), are neutral (12%), or strongly disagree (2%). In comparison, 56% of males agree and 20% strongly agree, with fewer disagreeing (8%) or being neutral (16%). Overall, the majority of both genders consume media primarily in Urdu or English, with males showing a stronger preference, while a smaller portion of both groups either disagrees or remains neutral on the matter.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL (JALT)
Vol.8.No.2 2025

**Q.6. I feel embarrassed or hesitant to speak Punjabi in public.**

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | Disagree | 4 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| | | Neutral | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 10.0 |
| | | Agree | 23 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 56.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 22 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Neutral | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 |
| | | Agree | 27 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 62.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 19 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table reveals that a significant number of both males and females feel embarrassed or hesitant to speak Punjabi in public. Among females, 46% agree and 44% strongly agree with this sentiment, while a small proportion disagrees (8%) and only 2% are neutral. Similarly, 54% of males agree and 38% strongly agree, with fewer males disagreeing (4%) or remaining neutral (4%). Overall, the data suggests that a majority of both genders experience embarrassment or hesitation when speaking Punjabi in public settings, with slightly higher agreement rates among females compared to males.

**Q.7. I do not believe that speaking Punjabi is important for maintaining cultural identity.**

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 7 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 18.0 |
| | | Neutral | 10 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 38.0 |
| | | Agree | 19 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 76.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 12 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 3 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| | | Disagree | 8 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 22.0 |
| | | Neutral | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 26.0 |
| | | Agree | 21 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 68.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 16 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table shows that a considerable number of both males and females do not believe that speaking Punjabi is essential for maintaining cultural identity. Among females, 38% agree and 24% strongly agree with this viewpoint, while smaller percentages disagree (14%) or remain neutral (20%). For males, 42% agree and 32% strongly agree, with fewer disagreeing

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



(16%) or being neutral (4%). Overall, the data indicates that a majority of both genders perceive speaking Punjabi as less important for cultural identity, with a slightly higher percentage of males expressing this belief compared to females.

**Q. 8. I believe that Punjabi is becoming irrelevant in modern society compared to Urdu or English.**

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 9 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 22.0 |
| | | Neutral | 9 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 40.0 |
| | | Agree | 22 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 84.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 8 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 6 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 16.0 |
| | | Neutral | 12 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 40.0 |
| | | Agree | 20 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 80.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 10 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table indicates that many respondents believe Punjabi is becoming increasingly irrelevant in modern society compared to Urdu or English. Among females, 44% agree and 16% strongly agree with this assertion, while smaller proportions disagree (18%) or remain neutral (18%). In the male group, 40% agree and 20% strongly agree, with fewer disagreeing (12%) or being neutral (24%). Overall, the findings suggest that a significant number of both genders perceive Punjabi as losing relevance in contemporary contexts, with females showing slightly higher agreement than males regarding its diminishing significance.

**Q.9. I only use Punjabi with older family members and rarely with younger people.**

| Gender | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | | Disagree | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 |
| | | Neutral | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 16.0 |
| | | Agree | 27 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 70.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 15 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 3 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 10.0 |
| | | Neutral | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 |

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT



| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Agree | 24 | 48.0 | 48.0 | 68.0 |
| | Strongly agree | 16 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table reflects a notable trend where many individuals predominantly use Punjabi with older family members while infrequently speaking it with younger relatives. Among female respondents, a majority of **54%** agree with this statement, and **30%** strongly agree, whereas a smaller percentage disagree (**10%**) or remain neutral (**4%**). Similarly, for males, **48%** agree and **32%** strongly agree, with fewer respondents disagreeing (**4%**) or being neutral (**10%**). Collectively, the results indicate that both genders primarily reserve Punjabi for interactions with older family members, highlighting a generational gap in language use.

**Q.10. I believe that learning and speaking Urdu and English is more important than maintaining Punjabi.**

| **Gender** | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **female** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 7 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 18.0 |
| | | Neutral | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 28.0 |
| | | Agree | 26 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 80.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 10 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 14.0 |
| | | Neutral | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 24.0 |
| | | Agree | 25 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 74.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 13 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table reveals a significant sentiment among both males and females regarding the perceived importance of learning and speaking Urdu and English over maintaining Punjabi. Among female respondents, **52%** agree and **20%** strongly agree with this belief, while **14%** disagree and **10%** remain neutral. In the male group, **50%** agree and **26%** strongly agree, with a smaller percentage disagreeing (**10%**) or being neutral (**10%**). Overall, these findings indicate that a majority of both genders prioritize proficiency in Urdu and English over the preservation of Punjabi, reflecting a broader trend towards valuing these languages in contemporary society.

**Q.11. I believe that learning and speaking Urdu and English is more important than maintaining Punjabi.**

| **Gender** | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **female** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 7 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 18.0 |
| | | Neutral | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 28.0 |
| | | Agree | 26 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 80.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 10 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| **Male** | Valid | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | | Disagree | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 14.0 |
| | | Neutral | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 24.0 |
| | | Agree | 25 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 74.0 |
| | | Strongly agree | 13 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 50 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The table highlights a concerning trend among both males and females regarding their perception of declining abilities to speak or understand Punjabi over time. Among female respondents **38%** agree and **28%** strongly agree that they have noticed a decline while a smaller proportion disagree (**16%**) or remain neutral (**16%**). In the male cohort, **40%** agree and **30%** strongly agree with this observation, with fewer disagreeing (**12%**) or being neutral (**16%**). Overall, the data indicates that a significant number of individuals from both genders recognize a deterioration in their Punjabi language skills, underscoring a potential cultural shift away from the language.

### 5.6. Descriptive Statistics and Pearson Correlation Test

**Table 5.5. (a). Descriptive Statistics**

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| gender | 0.50 | 0.503 | 100 |
| Age | 22.72 | 1.393 | 100 |

Table 5.5 (a) reveals that the sample comprises 100 individuals with an equal distribution of genders indicated by a mean of 0.50. Additionally, the average age of participants is approximately 22.72 years with a standard deviation of 1.393 which suggests that most individuals are closely clustered around this average.

**Table 5.5. (b). Correlations**

| | | gender | Age |
|---|---|---|---|
| gender | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 0.231* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 0.021 |
| | N | 100 | 100 |
| Age | Pearson Correlation | 0.231* | 1 |

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT



| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.021 | |
| | N | 100 | 100 |
| *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). | | | |

Based on the above mentioned table it can be stated that the value of *p* is less than 0.05 (the value of alpha) and in this case the values calculated of both gender and age are less than the value of alpha i-e. 0.021 < 0.05 so we can say that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted that statistical evidence demonstrates that age and gender determine language attrition.

**Conclusion**

The analysis of data on lexical attrition among male and female respondents reveals significant differences in the retention of various lexical items as evidenced by the frequencies and percentages of affirmative ("Yes") and negative ("No") responses. Generally, female respondents exhibit higher rates of retention for many lexical items compared to their male counterparts. For instance, 76% of female respondents retained the term "Mat" in contrast to 68% of males. Similarly, 64% of females recognize the term "Sur" whereas only 46% of males do. This trend persists with the item "Chaa" where 62% of females retained the term compared to 60% of males. However, certain lexical items present a different picture which is the indication of a higher attrition rate among females. For example, only 10% of female respondents retained "Pichokar" compared to 20% of male respondents. Additionally, retention rates for "Sevenk" and "Tomab" are lower among females, with only 24% and 14.58% respectively retaining these terms.

As a whole, while the evidence suggests that females generally have higher retention rates for several lexical items some terms indicate that males experience less attrition. In summary, although both male and female respondents encounter lexical attrition, the data imply that female respondents tend to retain vocabulary more effectively. Nevertheless, specific exceptions highlight that attrition is not consistent across all terms and can vary significantly. Thus, while females are more likely to retain vocabulary overall, notable exceptions exist within certain lexical items. The data provides an analysis of adjective recognition across male and female respondents, revealing notable trends in lexical attrition. Overall, both genders struggled with adjective recognition, with over 70% of respondents failing to recognize adjectives in most categories, indicating that the task was challenging for the majority. Female respondents generally demonstrated lower recognition rates compared to males, with male respondents outperforming females in 8 out of 13 categories. For example, in the case of "Mahanadra," only 10% of females and 18% of males recognized the adjective, indicating significant difficulty across both genders.

Similarly, in categories like "Adl" and "Jamandron," less than 15% of respondents from either group recognized the adjectives. However, in some cases, female respondents exhibited better performance, such as in "Tata" (50% of females vs. 30% of males) and "Wasnik" (32% of females vs. 20% of males). Categories like "Nweikla" and "Tarikha" showed equal performance between the genders, with both male and female respondents recognizing the adjectives at around 20-22%. This uniformity suggests that the challenge was consistent across genders in these specific cases. In summary, while males generally performed better in adjective recognition, female respondents demonstrated higher recognition rates in specific categories, and both genders faced significant difficulty overall.

The findings suggest that the frequency and percentage of "yes" and "no" responses for various categories, broken down by gender. Overall, respondents exhibit a higher frequency of "No" responses, suggesting significant lexical attrition as they struggle to recall specific

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



items. In most categories, male respondents display a slightly higher frequency of "Yes" responses than females, indicating that males have a marginally better ability to retrieve or recognize lexical items. For example, males show higher recognition rates in categories like "Partna" (26% for males vs. 14% for females) and "Nikharna" (26% vs. 22%). In categories such as "Khunjana" and "Daspeena," both genders demonstrate equal recognition rates (20% each), suggesting an equal rate of lexical retrieval between men and women. However, in some cases, females outperform males, such as with "Addek" (34% for females vs. 30% for males) and "Honjana" (24% for females). Categories like "Thurkana" and "Triliyan Chatjna" show very low recognition rates (10% or lower), likely due to the uncommon nature of these words or their susceptibility to faster attrition across all respondents.

The findings suggest several key reasons behind the decline of the Punjabi language, known as language attrition. Firstly, many people prefer to use Urdu and English instead of Punjabi, especially in professional settings and when consuming media. This shift shows that these languages are seen as more valuable or important, which diminishes the perceived worth of Punjabi. Additionally, a significant number of respondents feel embarrassed or hesitant to speak Punjabi in public, indicating a social pressure that discourages its use. Many believe that knowing Punjabi is not necessary for success in school or work, reinforcing the idea that it is less important than Urdu or English. The results also reveal that people mainly speak Punjabi only with older family members, which suggests that younger generations are not using the language as much. This creates a gap where younger individuals may not feel connected to Punjabi, contributing to its decline. Lastly, both males and females acknowledge a decrease in their ability to speak or understand Punjabi over time. This decline is likely due to the reduced use and exposure to the language in daily life.

The data reveals that the sample comprises 100 individuals with an equal distribution of genders indicated by a mean of 0.50. Additionally, the average age of participants is approximately 22.72 years with a standard deviation of 1.393 which suggests that most individuals are closely clustered around this average. Based on the data it can be stated that the value of $p$ is less than 0.05 (the value of alpha) and in this case the values calculated of both gender and age are less than the value of alpha i-e. $0.021 < 0.05$ so we can say that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted that statistical evidence demonstrates that age and gender determine language attrition.

**References**

Crystal, D. (2000). Language death. Cambridge University Press.

de Bot, K., Schrauf, R. W., & Winnykamen, M. (2011). Language attrition: Theoretical perspectives. In M. S. Schmid & B. Köpke (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language attrition* (pp. 43–57). Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Multilingual Matters.

Grosjean, F. (2001). The bilingual's language modes. In J. L. Nicol (Ed.), *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing* (pp. 1–22). Blackwell.

Hansen, L. (2001). Language attrition: The fate of the start. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 60–73. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000040

Harris, R., & Muztagh, K. (1999). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Heinemann.

Jalal, Z. (1995). *A history of Punjabi language and literature*. National Book Foundation.

Köpke, B., & Schmid, M. S. (2004). Language attrition: The next phase. In M. S. Schmid, B. Köpke, M. Keijzer, & L. Weilemar (Eds.), *First language attrition: Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues* (pp. 1–43). John Benjamins.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL



Köpke, B., Schmid, M. S., Keijzer, M., & Weilemar, L. (2011). *Language attrition: Theoretical perspectives*. John Benjamins.

Lambert, R. D., & Freed, B. F. (Eds.). (1982). *The loss of language skills*. Newbury House.

Mahboob, A. (2014). Teaching and researching English for local needs. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 144–158). Routledge.

Nicolai, R. (2001). Language attrition and neurological disorders. *Journal of Neurolinguistics, 14*(2–4), 223–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0911-6044(00)00010-3

Obler, L. K. (1982). The parsimonious model of language loss. In R. D. Lambert & B. F. Freed (Eds.), *The loss of language skills* (pp. 151–165). Newbury House.

Schiller, N. O. (2000). Neurocognitive models of language attrition. *Brain and Language, 75*(2), 232–236. https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.2000.2332

Seliger, H. W. (1989). Second language attrition. *Cambridge Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 25–40.

Seliger, H. W. (1996). Primary language attrition in the context of bilingualism. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 605–626). Academic Press.

Shafi, M. (2013). *Punjabi language: History and decline*. Lahore University Press.

Vago, R. M. (1991). Language loss and the two-generation model. In H. W. Seliger & R. M. Vago (Eds.), *First language attrition* (pp. 73–86). Cambridge University Press.