

IMPLICATIONS OF DOMAINS OF LANGUAGE USE AND ATTITUDE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MAGAR LANGUAGES AS OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN NEPAL

Dan Raj Regmi

Central Department of Linguistics, Tribhuvan University

Ambika Regmi

Linguistic Society of Nepal

Corresponding (second author): ambikaregmi@gmail.com

Language Commission has recommended the Magar language as official language in two provinces, viz. Gandaki and Karnali. However, implementation has been a Hercules task due to some extra-linguistic and linguistic problems. The languages spoken in the Magar community are not vibrantly used due to the weak 'instrumental' attitude. To implement the Magar languages as official languages some extra-linguistic strategies have to be executed. Moreover, effective linguistic strategies have to be framed to bring them to sustainable use.

Keywords: official language, sustainable literacy, language socialization, language empowerment, linguistic census

1. Introduction

This paper attempts to deal with the implications of the assessment of the domains of language use and language attitude for the implementation of the Magar languages as the official language in Gandaki and Karnali provinces in Nepal. Additionally, it attempts to suggest some specific extra-linguistic strategies to be adopted for the implementation of the Magar language as official language and linguistic strategies to uplift the Magar language to sustainable orality and sustainable literacy.¹

Magar, in Nepal, is an indigenous ethnic group endowed with 'one caste, many languages'. This ethnic group is spread in different parts of Nepal. The census of 2011 has enumerated 123 languages as the mother tongues of Nepal (CBS, 2012). Of them, Magar, Kham and Kaike are the

languages spoken by the Magar ethnic community. The ethnic community prefers to call these three languages as Magar Dhut, Magar Kham and Magar Kaike. All three languages belong to the Tibeto-Burman language family. Magar Dhut is spoken especially in districts like Udaipur, Tanahun, Syangja, Palpa, Nawalparasi and Surkhet. Genealogically, it is one of the members of Central Himalayan sub-section of Himalayan section under Bodic branch of Tibeto-Burman family (Eppele et al., 2012) with 7,88,530 speakers. Magar Kham, spoken in Rolpa, Rukum and surrounding districts, is one of the members of Central Himalayan sub-section of Himalayan section under Bodic branch of Tibeto-Burman family (Eppele et al., 2012) with 27,113 speakers. Magar Kaike is spoken in three villages of Dolpa, namely Sahartara, Tupatara and Tarakot. It is one of the members of West Bodish sub-section of Bodish section under Bodic branch of Tibeto-Burman family (Bradley, 2002). The 2011 census has shown that the number of speakers of Kaike is only 50. In reality, the actual number of speakers is about one thousand (Regmi, 2013). This language is also called the language of the fairies. The Magars living in some villages of this area and in some villages above this area speak a language called Poinke. This is genetically very close to Magar Kaike. Their population is estimated to be around 1000 to 1500 (Adhikari, 2015 VS). This language is spoken by Magar along with other castes/ethnicities. The Linguistic Survey of Nepal has conducted a sociolinguistic survey of Magar Dhut (Thakur, 2013), Magar Kham (Sapkota, 2013) and Magar Kaike (Regmi, 2013). Language Commission has also conducted a socio-linguistic survey of the Poinke language (Adhikari, 2015 VS). The reports of the surveys provide preliminary information on

¹ The Magar languages have to be obligatorily raised to the levels of sustainable use for being used as official language either in the provincial or local levels.

the domains of language use and language attitudes; however, their meticulous analysis has not yet taken place. Based upon data of the sociolinguistic survey of individual languages spoken in the Magar community, language vitality assessed in terms of domains of language use and language attitude insists that some specific strategies should be immediately adopted for the sustainable use (viz., sustainable orality and sustainable literacy) of the languages spoken in the Magar community.

The constitution of Nepal, 2015 has recognized Nepali in the Devanagari script as official language of Nepal (Article 7(1)). In Article 7(2), a province has been granted the right by the constitution to frame a province law to determine one or more than one language of the nation spoken by a majority of people within the province as its official language(s), in addition to Nepali. Thus, this, constitution, without considering the complex ethno-linguistic architecture of Nepal, has set the single criteria of majority (Regmi, 2018a, p. 4). Article 7(3) authorizes Language Commission to decide other matters relating to language on recommendation. A number of criteria other than the majority criterion to determine the official languages have been explored. However, at the end, the commission has recommended the mother tongues exclusively based on the majority criteria (Language Commission, 2078 VS).

This paper mainly relies on Fairclough (1989) as theoretical underpinning. Fairclough (1989) argues that social structure of power can be created, changed and maintained by the use of language in the community. The paper also utilizes basic insights from critical discourse analysis (CDA), a method proposed by Norman Fairclough (1995) to analyze the role of discourse plays in the construction of knowledge, ideology and power. In the context of Nepal, an attempt, in line with this theoretical underpinning, has been made to pull out the deep roots of monolingual official language policy prevailed in Panchayat System (1960-1990) by recommending some mother tongues as the official languages in the provinces of Nepal.

This paper is divided into seven sections. Section 2 deals with the domains of language use to assess the vitality in the languages spoken by the Magar community. In section 3, we critically examine the language attitude in the Magar community. Section 4 deals with the implications of language vitality and attitude for the implementation of the Magar languages as official languages. In section 5, we deal with the problems in the implementation of the mother tongues as official languages. Section 6 suggests some extra-linguistic strategies required for the implementation and linguistic strategies for sustainable use (viz., sustainable orality and sustainable literacy) of languages in the Magar community. In section 7, we provide a conclusion of the paper.

2. Domains of language use

Domains of language use refer to the social contexts of interaction in which a speaker makes a choice among his/her mother tongue, Nepali (viz., a language of wider communication) and both or other languages. Such choice is controlled by international and national economic policy and government language policy (Decker & Grummit, 2012, p. 23). Such choice may be influenced by the situation of language contact (Gautam, 2021). Language is used for a variety of activities or purposes. Such activities may include counting, singing, joking, bargaining, storytelling, discussing, praying, quarrelling, abusing (scolding/using taboo words), telling stories to children, singing at home, family gatherings and village meetings. They are also called primary domains of language use. Language vitality is primarily assessed on the basis of language use in such areas. Table 1 presents domains of language use in Magar Dhut (MD), Magar Kham (MK), Magar Kaike (Mk) and Poinke (PK) languages.

Table 1: Domains of language use in the Magar languages (in %)

	Domains	MD	MK	Mk	PK
1.	Counting	20.2	-	68.4	3.3
2.	Singing	1.2	5	-	-
3.	Joking	77.4	60	87.7	6.7
4.	Bargaining	45.2	26.7	31.6	-
5.	Story telling	59.5	35	70.1	-

6.	Discussing	64.3	35	85.9	-
7.	Praying	77.4	30	100	3.3
8.	Quarrelling	88.1	75	80.7	5
9.	Abusing	86.9	73.3	71.9	5
10.	Telling stories to children	67.9	35	84.2	5
11.	Singing at home	13.1	18.3	-	1.7
12.	Family gatherings	86.9	81.7	100	70
13.	Village meetings	45.2	73.3	33	-

Source: Sociolinguistic surveys of Magar Dhut, Magar Kham, Magar Kaike and Poinke

Table 1 shows that the languages spoken in the Magar community are not equally used in all the domains of language use. Magar Kham is not used in counting. Similarly, Magar Kaike is not used in singing songs at home. The Poinke speech community uses other languages when singing songs, holding village meetings, bargaining/shopping in the markets, telling story in general or to the children and discussing any matters. It is Magar Dhut which is used in all the domains of language use. Despite the fact that Magar Kaike is not used in singing, it, comparatively, seems more vibrant than other languages. In terms of vitality, Magar Kaike is the most vibrant as indicated by the percentages in the major domains of language use such as counting (68.4%), joking (87.7%), discussing (85.9%), praying (100%) and family gatherings (100%) (Regmi, 2013; Regmi, 2021). In the same domains, Magar Dhut shows the percentages smaller than those in Magar Kaike. Poinke is the least vigorous and Magar Kham is in between Magar Dhut and Poinke. In terms of the use of language in different domains, Magar Kaike is taken as 6(a) vigorous (Epele et al., 2012). This language is used orally by people of all age groups. Magar Dhut has been labeled as 6(b) threatened. This language is used orally by all generations but only some of the child-bearing generations are transmitting it to their children. The language which is used orally by people of all age groups and learned as the first language by the children of the community is labeled as 6(a) vigorous. Data motivate us to label Poinke as a threatened or shifting language. In such language,

the child-bearing generation knows the language well enough to use it among themselves but none are transmitting it to their children. However, according to the field study conducted in 2011, this language was found as vigorous as Magar Kaike. Thus, it has to be labeled as 6(a) vigorous as it is used orally by people of all age groups and children of the community learn it as the first language.

3. Language attitudes

Language attitude is some kind of feelings/thoughts that a speaker has towards the language he or she speaks. This is determined by the situation of language use in the community. This is, in particular, influenced by the language policy of the state. There are, broadly, two types of language attitudes: positive and negative. Negative attitudes tear down language while positive attitudes contribute to language use, preservation and development. In Nepal, no speech community is found having a negative attitude towards the language spoken as mother tongue. However, such attitude is exclusively sentimental in the Magar community. This community has both sentimental (viz., aspiration to use it) as well as instrumental (viz., using language) attitude towards the languages. They are briefly discussed as follows:

3.1 Sentimental attitude

Sentimental attitude involves some particular indicators. They may include loving mother tongue, craving to teach mother tongue to children at basic level, feeling increased prestige when speaking their mother tongue, feeling bad when son or daughter marries someone who does not speak their language, feeling good when children speak mother tongue, feeling bad if mother tongue is not spoken and feeling that children first has to learn their mother tongues. They may also include the feelings that mother tongue has to be spoken and bad feelings that when young people are not speaking their mother tongues. Table 2 presents an assessment of the positive sentimental attitude in the Magar community.

Table 2: Assessment of the positive sentimental language attitudes in the Magar community (in %)

	Sentimental indicators	MD	KM	Mk	PK
1.	Love for the mother tongue	98.8	88.3	98.3	100
2.	Mother tongue (medium) education at primary level	65.5	75	100	95
3.	Feeling prestige while speaking mother tongue	17.9	43	96.4	100
4.	Feeling bad if someone married who speaks another language	45.2	45	71.9	83.3
5.	Feeling good if children speak mother tongue	97.6	96.7	94.7	100
6.	Feeling bad if children do not speak mother tongue	63.9	75	96.4	100
7.	Feeling that one has to first speak mother tongue	98.8	95	100	100
8.	Feeling bad if young people do not speak mother tongue	60.7	58.3	75.4	100

Source: Sociolinguistic surveys of Magar Dhut, Magar Kham, Magar Kaike and Poinke

Table 2 confirms that in the Magar communities, there is a positive sentimental attitude towards their mother tongue. However, in most of the sentimental indicators, Poinke shows the highest percentages among the languages. Magar Kaike stands the second in such percentages. The position of Magar Dhut and Magar Kham is almost the same. Such positive attitude is direly needed to develop the instrumental attitude in this community. Unless language is used in the domains of language use sustainably, it cannot be

preserved, promoted and developed in the real sense.

3.2 Instrumental attitude

Instrumental attitude involves some particular indicators. They may include number of children who speak their mother tongue, the number of people who speak their mother tongue as it should be spoken, and number of parents who speak their mother tongue with their children and the situation of intermarriage. These indicators may be taken as primary instrumental indicators. There are secondary instrumental indicators. They include preparation of textbooks in mother tongue, introduction of education in mother tongue, writing grammar and dictionary, language awareness campaign and language classes and efforts for government work. Table 3 presents an assessment of instrumental attitudes in terms of primary indicators in the Magar community.

Table 3: Assessment of the instrumental attitudes in the Magar community (in %)

	Indicators	MD	KM	Mk	PK
1.	MT speaking children	88	100	100	100
2.	Speaking MT as it should be spoken	82	76.2	100	100
3.	Parents who speak their MT with their children	94	97	100	100
4.	Presence of intermarriage	44	55	43.8	91.7

Source: Sociolinguistic surveys of Magar Dhut, Magar Kham, Magar Kaike and Poinke

Table 3 shows that except in intermarriage, Magar Kaike and Poinke are stronger than other languages. In Dhut Magar, children who speak their mother tongue are fewer than in other languages. Although Poinke has the highest number of intermarriages, due to low migration and high inter-communal sentiments, this speech community has learned well other languages of

the community. This has not affected the use of mother tongue at all.

As secondary instrumental indicators, there have already been made some efforts. Magar Dhut and Magar Kham have been studied well by the foreigners as well as native speakers. Grammars have been written in these languages. A tri-lingual dictionary in Kham has been published. In Magar Kaike, a functional-typological grammar and analyzed texts have been published. Besides, various materials in Magar Dhut, Magar Kham and Magar Kaike have been published as well. In Magar Kham and Magar Dhut, education in the mother tongue has been started in by preparing the textbooks.

4. Implications of domains of language use and attitude

Domains of language use and attitude are directly related to the implementation of language policy. Except in Magar Kaike, even in family gatherings, Nepali is significantly used in other Magar languages. In Poinke, Nepali is exclusively used in village meetings. Even in Magar Kham, some significant numbers of people use Nepali in village meetings. There is, in general, no strong instrumental attitude in the community. In such situation, no language policy may be properly implemented in the community.

Language commission has recently recommended, primarily on the basis of number of speakers as enumerated by 2011 census, Maithili and Limbu for Province 1, Maithili, Bajjika and Bhojpuri for Madhesh, Tamang and Newar (Nepal Bhasa) for Bagmati, Magar, Gurung and Bhojpuri for Gandaki, Tharu and Awadhi for Lumbini, Magar for Karnali and Dotyali and Tharu for Sudurpashchim as official languages to be used in addition to Nepali, official language of Nepal. Magar Kham, Magar Kaike and Poinke, in terms of number of speakers, have been disqualified for being official languages of the province; however, the doors are not closed for them being used as official languages in the local levels. Looking at the patterns of language use in general domains, Magar Dhut may be labeled as 6 (b) threatened. It means that this language is used orally by all generations but only some of the child-bearing

generations are transmitting it to their children. Many children are learning Nepali as their mother tongue instead of their mother tongue. In other words, orality is not sustainable even in the Magar Dhut.

Language Commission (2078 VS, pp. 187-188) has set eight criteria for determining official languages of the provinces of Nepal. They include language used as lingua-franca, spread of the language, compilation of dictionary, writing of grammar, use of language in education, use of language in mass media, availability of published materials and language vitality. Considering these criteria, apart from the number of speakers (viz., majority criterion), a language, broadly, has, at least, to maintain language vitality (viz., considerable use of the language in the domains of language use) and writing tradition (viz., dictionary, grammar, textbooks, newspapers, literary works, etc.). Beside, people have to be instrumentally positive. Magar Kham, Magar Kaike and Poinke are not fully qualified for being used as official languages in the local levels. This is a serious matter for the life of the languages.

5. Problems in the implementation

There are a number of problems in the implementation of the Magar languages as official languages at the provincial and local levels in Nepal. They are briefly listed as follows:

- a) The federal structure of Nepal has to be framed based on the ethno-linguistic structure of the country. Due to this, many vibrant languages but with a few number of speakers are said to have been neglected whereas some languages have been recommended for more than one province.
- b) No doubt, number of speakers is by far the most important criteria for determining the official languages. However, in the present ethno-linguistic context of Nepal, other criteria like language vitality, ethno-linguistic identity, language of wider communication, linguistic geography, linguistic originality, development of writing system, linguistic material development, corpus development and availability of literature have to be considered while determining the

official languages (Regmi, 2018a, pp. 44-45). Regmi (2018 VS) has proposed a very practical model for the determination of official languages in Nepal. The recommendation of language commission is solely based on the number of speakers enumerated in 2011 census. Regmi (2018b, p. 143) has pointed a number of flaws in the number of languages and their speakers in 2011 census.

c) Some policies expressed in the constitution and in some related acts are not clear. The recommendation, which has been made in the vacuum of language policy, is prone to face number problems in the implementation not only of the Magar language, but also other languages recommended for the official languages of the provinces of Nepal.

d) Both local and provincial governments have to be concerned about the use of mother tongue as official language.

e) Official language is meant to be used for documentation. Thus, in writing there must as at least minimum level of standardization in spellings, use of words and grammatical rules. There is not a long tradition of writing in the Magar languages. Standardization is far way in the Magar speech community.

6. Some strategies

Basically, two types of strategies are to be framed: extra-linguistic and linguistic strategies. The first is meant to be framed for the implementation of the Magar languages as official languages and the second one is meant to be framed for uplifting the Magar languages to the sustainable language use viz., sustainable orality and sustainable literacy. They are briefly discussed below.

6.1 Extralinguistic strategies

The recommendation of mother tongues as official languages is not an end. This is just the first step for implementation. This step has been initiated by Language Commission. It is the government's responsibility to build a favourable environment for implementation. The speech community, experts and language activists have to be called upon by the government. Indeed, implementation is a very complicated process. The governments (viz., local, provincial and

central) have to take immediate steps for the implementation of the mother tongues as official languages. They are briefly listed as follows:

a) First and foremost, the government has to frame language policy based on multilingualism. It has to be framed addressing the main motif of the constitution so that a favorable environment may be created to use mother tongues as per their linguistic vitality in different domains of language use. Without policy, any interventions to uplift or develop any languages may be derailed from the major goals of the project.

b) Secondly, the government has to set up a proper mechanism at the central, provincial and local levels.

c) The government has to set up Implementation Directorate either under Ministry of Education or Ministry of Culture. It should include planners, linguists and speakers of related languages. Branches of Implementation Directorate should be set up in the province and local bodies.

d) The Directorate has to frame a ten year strategic plan for the implementation of mother tongues as official languages.

e) As per the strategic plan, the Magar languages which have not yet been brought into the writing practice have to be used as the medium of instruction, where possible, at the basic levels. Then, more effort has to be made to encourage the community in writing in the mother tongue.

f) With the consent and full involvement of the community, for the next two years, standard dictionary, standard grammar and reading materials have to be developed for the uniformity in writing in Magar. However, it is a most time consuming and complicated process from socio-political perspectives.

g) After two years, the laws in Nepali made by the province and local bodies should be officially translated into mother tongues. After doing this, at least one year has to be devoted for making known the people about it. One more year has to be spent for the management of the manpower in the local bodies.

h) It is not easy to manage multilingual manpower at once. Therefore, the available

manpower should be trained on multilingualism. Computer technology should be adapted to automatically translate from Nepali to the mother tongues. Every government office should be equipped with a multilingual interpreter.

i) After doing this, in the ninth year, a motivational program should be run to introduce or introduce recommended languages in addition to the Nepali language according to the wishes of the people taking government services. The languages may be implemented only from the tenth year onwards. Based on experience and background, implementation guidelines should be created and implemented. Language Commission should arrange a monitoring system under the Director General.

j) The currently recommended languages for government use are not the final. A new census may also create a new situation to rethink about the languages. There is a possibility of increasing or decreasing the number of speakers in some languages. Due to the awakening towards the language, ability in reading and writing in the mother tongue is also in flux. In order to address the situation, it is necessary to establish a mother tongue institute. It can systematically advance the language development plan in mother tongues.

k) The most important thing is that there should be a linguistic census in the country. It will bring out the actual situation of the languages in Nepal. Multilingualism is not only a strong part of a security strategy, but also a formula for emotional solidarity. Therefore, accurate data is necessary for the right implementation.

6. 2 Linguistic strategies

Lewis and Simons (2017) has recognized only two levels of language use, viz., 4 (Educational) and 6a (Vigorous) as two sustainable levels of language use viz., sustainable orality and sustainable literacy. Sustainable orality refers to a level of language use in which large numbers of people in the speech community, in fact, the vast majority, are highly proficient in the language which has been learned it as the first language. Such language is actively, and usually without conscious thought, is being passed on to their

children. Sustainable literacy is a level of language use in which life crucial knowledge is transmitted and reading and writing are widely done. Such language is used in writing literature and producing pedagogical materials (Lewis and Simons (2017)). The languages spoken in the Magar community appear to have different levels of language vitality. Eppele et al. (2012) divides the Magar/Magar Dhut into two geographical dialects, Magar Western and Magar Eastern. Both of them have been placed as 6(b) threatened. Magar Kham is divided into four dialects. Of them, Kham Gamale has been labeled as 6 (a) vigorous; Kham Western Parbate as 5(developing), Kham Eastern Parbate and Kham Sheshi have been labeled as 6(b) threatened. Languages or dialects labeled as 6(a) are in strong condition. Table 4 presents the sustainable language use (SLU) and non-sustainable language use (NSLU) levels of the Magar languages in Nepal.

Table 4: Sustainable and non-sustainable levels of Magar languages in Nepal

	Levels of use	Labels	Vitality levels	
1.	SLU	Sustainable literacy	4 (Educational)	x
		Sustainable orality	6a (Vigorous)	Kk, KM ²
2.	NSLU	Transitory levels	5 (Developing)	KM ³
			6b (Threatened)	MD, KM ⁴ , PK

Source: Sociolinguistic survey reports of the Magar languages

Table 4 shows that no language spoken in the Magar community has achieved the level of sustainable literacy which is obligatorily required for being implemented as official languages. The languages belonging to the transitory levels of

² Gamale Kham, a dialect of Kham

³ Western Parbate, a dialect of Kham

⁴ Eastern Parbate and Sheshi, dialects of Kham.

language use require special community-based activities/interventions to prevent them from deteriorating to the next lower level of sustainable use. The languages labeled as 5 (Developing) require uplifting from the incipient literacy to 4 (Educational), viz., the sustainable literacy. It is to be noted that the Magar languages labeled as 6b (Threatened) are likely to go down to 7(Shifting) unless they are uplifted to 6a (Vigorous), viz., sustainable orality by carrying out specific activities within the framework of Sustainable Use Model. They should be developed as a written language by developing writing system and primer with the consent of the speech community. Developing languages or dialects which have been developed as written languages should be developed as a medium or subject language for literacy. In order to make the 6 (b) threatened languages or dialects to be spoken as the first language by the children of the community, especially, the mothers should be internally motivated to understand the benefit of mother tongue (Regmi and Regmi, 2022). If they are properly motivated, they will teach their children to learn the respective languages. Apart from this, the secondary strategies should also be decided for the development of these different languages or dialects. Language can be socialized through literature by collecting stories, proverbs, etc. in vigorous languages or dialects. Similarly, training for bilingual teachers can be provided by establishing a technology center. Table 5 presents the strategies needed for the sustainable use of languages in the Magar community.

Table 5: Strategies for sustainable use of languages

	Languages	Strategies	
		Primary strategies	Secondary strategies
1.	Magar Dhut	Internal motivation	To develop writing system and primer
2.	Magar Kham (threatened)	Internal motivation	To develop writing system and primer

3.	Magar Kham (vigorous)	Developing writing system and primer	Socialization of language and linguistic empowerment
4.	Magar Kham (developmental)	As a medium or subject for literacy	Establishment of technology center
5.	Magar Kaike	To develop writing system and primer	Socialization of language and linguistic empowerment
6.	Poinke	To develop writing system and primer	Socialization of language and linguistic empowerment

Table 5 indicates that Magar Dhut and the dialect of Magar Kham labeled as threatened require special strategies. The mothers have to be internally motivated to teach mother tongues to their children. This may be taken as a primary strategy. As the secondary strategies, in such languages, writing system has to be decided with the consent of the speech community and primer has to be prepared. A dialect of Magar Kham (viz., vigorous), Magar Kaike and Poinke require developing writing system and they require primer as the primary strategies. Moreover, in such languages, the programs such as socialization of language and linguistic empowerment have to be conducted as the secondary strategies. Another dialect of Magar Kham (viz., developmental) requires using the language as a medium or subject for literacy as the primary strategy and establishment of technology center as the secondary strategy.

7. Conclusion

Magar languages are gradually shrinking in the primary domains of language use. They are gradually shifting to Nepali, the official language of Nepal. The positive sentimental attitude in the Magar community seems to be satisfactory. However, looking at the primary positive instrumental attitude, the situation is not pleasing. The community seems to be committed to the preservation of the language. However, the government is lingering as to the issue of granting linguistic rights as provided by the constitution. It can also be called government indifference. It is necessary to develop and preserve the languages by framing strategies compatible with the situation of the languages. By far the most important strategy is to inform the mothers about the benefits of mother tongue in order to protect the endangered language or dialects in the Magar community. Other important strategies include language socialization, language empowerment and establishment of technology center in the community. To sum up, extra-linguistic strategies for the implementation and linguistic strategies for uplifting the languages up to sustainable language use have to be framed by the concerned bodies without making any delay.

References

- Adhikari, D. R. (2075 VS). *Poinke bhāṣāko samājabhāṣāvaijñānika sarvekṣana* [Sociolinguistic survey of Poinke language] [Report, Central Department of Linguistics, TU and Language Commission].
- Bradley, D. (2002). The Sub-grouping of Tibeto-Burman. In: C. I. Beckwith (Ed.), *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages* (pp. 73-112). Brill.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. (2012). *National population and housing census 2011: National report*. Government of Nepal.
- Decker, K., & Grummit, J. (2012). *Understanding language choice: A guide to sociolinguistic assessment*. SIL International.
- Eppele, J. W., Lewis, M. P., Regmi, D. R., & Yadava, Y. P. (Eds.). (2012). *Ethnologue: Languages of Nepal*. Linguistic Survey of Nepal (LinSuN) and SIL International.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Gautam, B. L. (2021). *Language contact in Nepal: A study on language use and attitudes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Government of Nepal. (2015). *The constitution of Nepal*. Ministry of Law, Justice, and Parliamentary Affairs.
- Language Commission. (2078 VS). *Sarakārī kāmākājakā bhāṣāsambandhī siphārisaharū* [Recommendations on official languages]. Language Commission, Nepal.
- Lewis, M. P., & Simons, G. F. (2017). *Sustaining language use: Perspectives on community-based language development*. Pike Center for Integrative Scholarship, SIL.
- Regmi, A. (2013). *A Sociolinguistic survey of Magar Kaike: A Tibeto-Burman language* [Report, Linguistic Survey of Nepal (LinSuN), Central Department of Linguistics, Tribhuvan University].
- Regmi, B. N. (2078 VS). *Nepālakā bhāṣā ra sarakārī kāmākāja: Saṃvaidhānika vyavasthā ra vikalpa* [Languages of Nepal and government business: Constitutional provisions and an alternative]. FACTS.
- Regmi, D. R. (2018a). Determining official languages in the federal states of Nepal. *Nepalese Linguistics*, 33(01), 42-51.
- Regmi, D. R. (2018b). *Nepālakā bhāṣāharūko samājabhāṣāvaijñānika sthiti: samīkṣātmaka viśleṣaṇa* [Sociolinguistic situation of languages of Nepal: A critical appraisal]. *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Endangered Languages of Himalaya, Almora, 2018*, 131-148.
- Regmi, D. R. (2021). *A sociolinguistic survey of the languages of Nepal: A synopsis, Volume I: Tibeto-Burman Languages* (Including a sociolinguistic typology of the Tibeto-Burman languages spoken in Nepal). LINCOM GmbH.
- Regmi, D. R., & Regmi, A. (2022). Assessing and uplifting sustainable orality languages in

Nepal: A case study of Magar Kaike and Athapariya. *Nepalese Linguistics*, 35(01), 98-106. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nl.v35i01.46567>

Sapkota, S. (2013). *A sociolinguistic survey of Magar Kham* [Report, Linguistic Survey of Nepal (LinSuN), Central Department of Linguistics, Tribhuvan University].

Thakur, I. (2013). *A sociolinguistic survey of Magar Dhut* [Report, Linguistic Survey of Nepal (LinSuN), Central Department of Linguistics, Tribhuvan University].