

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_83910
Title of the Manuscript:	Multilingualism in Action The Case of Aytas in the Mountains of Bamban Tarlac
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajl2c.com/index.php/AJL2C/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>OVERALL EVALUATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">It is a good article. But there are some recommendations for the authors to improve the article, as stated below: <p>PLEASE DO SOME CORRECTIONS AS SUGGESTED BELOW:</p> <p>SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1- Author/s should strengthen the main gap of the paper considering why this paper needs to extend the knowledge in this field. This information is missing.</p> <p>2- “There is an important connection among language, culture, and even survival in the environment. This means that languages as time passes by become fine-tuned to environmental conditions”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Please provide reference/references. <p>3- “Probably, one reason for this is that the next generations of users of language, i.e., the children, have this natural ability and that they effortlessly learn multiple languages that they also unconsciously take for granted immense amount of complicated knowledge being construed and adopted by the children. On the other hand, adult users of language use particular language for specific reason. This can be social, religious, or economic reasons”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">What is the basis for these statements? Are there any statistics or any evidence from previous studies? <p>SECTION 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <p>1- “82 participants from Sitios Burog, San Martin (SM), and Sta. Rosa were invited to answer the survey”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">How do you choose the respondents? What are the criteria? Who is the population? How many total numbers of the population? How do you decide your sampling? Which formula you use? <p>SECTION 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <p>1- This implies that the respondents are using the dominant language in the community (i.e.) Kapampangan, not their heritage language (i.e. Mag-Antsi). Fishman (1991) also observed the same scenario in the reality of language loss in the United States of America. He found that this language loss can occur completely within three generations (as cited in Szilágyi, Giambo & Szecsi, 2013). In the case of the children in the three communities, it was evident that they use Kapampangan in communicating with other members of the community. With this phenomenon, it can be inferred that heritage language loss is imminent in the three communities as more and more members of the community are using Kapampangan especially among the generation of the community's children today. In terms of the connection between age and</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>heritage language loss, findings show that younger learners are more at risk to miss proficiency in their heritage language if the appropriate preemptive measures are not taken (Carreira & Kagan, 2011; MacSwan, 2000; Porcel, 2006). According to Wang, one of the key contributors to heritage language loss is the negative connections between the heritage language and the school, specifically “negative peer pressure, discrimination, assimilative nature of curriculum,” and “absence of opportunities to learn and speak the heritage language in school” (2009, p. 15-16). Crawford agrees that societal anxiety causes a shift of values within individuals which manifests itself in the inattention of the heritage language (2000). With this, Hinton, and Hale (2001) proposed five main approaches to language revitalisation: school-based programs, out of school programs for children (after school, summer programs), adult language programs, documentation and materials development, and home-based programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Author/s should stress more on the analysis by considering the latest publications in the field (5 recent years). <p>SECTION 4. CONCLUSION</p> <p>1- Suggestion to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Restate the background of the paper giving that the paper aims to• State the main limitations of the paper.• State the main future research elements to be addressed. <p>INTEXT-CITATION AND REFERENCES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Most of the sources listed in the references are considered outdated. Please add more recent sources to support the findings and discussions.2. Please check the way to write a reference. Make sure it is consistent and follow the journal template. <p>GRAMMATICAL AND SPELLING ERRORS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need English editing as some grammatical and spelling errors are found in places.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sazelin Arif
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka (Utem), Malaysia