LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY IN PAKISTAN: STAKEHOLDERS' INCLUSIVITY IN LPP DEVELOPMENT

Fozia Abbasi[1], Waheed Shahzad[2], Dr. Furrakh Abbas[3], Dr. Muhammad Anwar Farooq[4]

[1]Institute of Humanities and Arts, Khwaja Fareed University of Engineering and Information Technology Rahim Yar Khan foziaabbassi03@gmail.com

[2]Institute of Humanities and Arts, Khwaja Fareed University of Engineering and Information Technology Rahim Yar Khan waheed.shahzad@kfueit.edu.pk ORIC ID: 0000-0002-2237-8237, Researcher ID: S-9501-2017, IRED: AM2020059, Web of Science Researcher ID: HLQ-2923-2023

[3]Assistant Professor, Center for Languages and Translation Studies (CELTS), Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad furrakh.abbas@aiou.edu.pk

[4]Director Institute of Humanities and Arts, Khwaja Fareed University of Engineering and Information Technology Rahim Yar Khan anwar.farooq@kfueit.edu.pk

Corresponding author: Waheed Shahzad waheed.shahzad@kfueit.edu.pk

Abstract

This study explores Language Planning and Policy (LPP) in Pakistan, with a focus on stakeholder inclusivity in the development process. Language planning in multilingual societies like Pakistan is crucial for addressing linguistic diversity, promoting national integration, and enhancing equitable access to education. The research addresses gaps in existing language policy frameworks, which often overlook the needs and perspectives of various stakeholders, such as government bodies, educational institutions, language communities, civil society, and the media. By employing a combination of semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, and secondary data, this study identifies the challenges and requirements of an inclusive LPP that caters to diverse linguistic communities in Pakistan. The literature review examines the foundational principles of LPP, its significance in preserving linguistic diversity, and its role in socio-economic development. The analysis spans multiple LPP models and frameworks, including those by Spolsky, Hornberger, and Tollefson, emphasizing linguistic rights, social justice, and the value of multilingualism. The study reveals that stakeholder inclusivity in LPP fosters equitable policy outcomes and enhances the practical impact of language policies. Results indicate a strong need for policies that reflect Pakistan's linguistic diversity and are adaptable to regional and cultural nuances. Recommendations include community engagement strategies, capacity-building programs, and periodic policy evaluations to ensure effectiveness and inclusivity. This research contributes to the discourse on LPP by highlighting the importance of inclusive, adaptable frameworks that prioritize linguistic rights and empower local language communities, ultimately supporting sustainable social and educational development in Pakistan.

Keywords: Language Planning and Policy, Multilingualism, Linguistic Diversity, Regional Languages, Socio-Political Implications, Inclusive Language Policy, Cultural Identity, Educational Equity, Linguistic Inequality

Introduction

Language Planning and Policy (LPP) is important because it has a tremendous effect on the architectural basis of linguistic, educational, and socioeconomic infrastructure of such multinational states as Pakistan. Pakistan is a particular case in the sense that over 70 regional languages coexist with Urdu, the national language on one hand and with English, the official language (Sikandar A, 2017). Despite this, this diversity constitutes the country's rich cultural and historical heritage at the same time creating tremendous challenges for the crafting of equitable and inclusive language policies addressing the needs of all the linguistic communities. This research serves as an exploratory work to examine how developing and planning for inclusivity in language policies can create linguistic harmony, equity, and

development in the South Punjab region, which stands at a point amidst linguistic diversity and economic disadvantage.

Language planning is the activity aiming to promote a number of languages by means of government, education, and social interventions (Eberhard, 2020). The scope includes choices regarding the medium of instruction, language developing goals, and advocacy for linguistic diversity for equal opportunities for all (Richard B, 2004). Language policy, however, involves the rule, regulation, and guideline created for the use of the language in various contexts of education, governance, and in the public communication. These frameworks collectively want to provide communication needs to multilingual societies while preserving culture and inclusivity (Kir, 2025). The complex sociopolitical reality in Pakistan till date has led to the existence of a stratified linguistic hierarchy beleaguered by the legacy of colonialism. English is the language of power and prestige and almost always associated with socioeconomic advancement and global competitiveness, but English is unattainable for most of the population because there are not enough infrastructural and resources which facilitate the acquisition of this language (Ahmed R, 2021). Urdu is a national language that brings the country together but overpowers regional languages such as Saraiki, Punjabi. It reveals the need for LPP frameworks that are inclusive and promote equal opportunities for everyone, considering linguistic diversity.

The experience of linguistic marginalization is very evident in South Punjab, which is a linguistically diverse region where Saraki is widely spoken, just as much as Punjabi, and if these regions are the canters of artillery, we know that, if they speak the same language, they will remain either passive or neutral. However, these regional languages are not considered in educational and governance formalities, thus creating a gap between those who have and those who do not in terms of educational and socioeconomic advantages (Hussain F, 2020). It further exacerbates regional inequalities and decries the national identity. Empowering marginalized communities through integration of regional languages into education and governance structures is also a tool to integrate the marginalized communities from the national development.

LPP outcomes and their results are heavily dependent on the stakeholder. For example, teachers have the influence on their students' cognitive base linguistic attitudes and linguistic competencies. Yet, language policies tend to be not well implemented for reasons such as outdated teaching methods and insufficient training (Mattheoudakis, 2025). In like manner, they have great cultural and social influence, that is, they have great said in shaping public perceptions and language practices. It is imperative that people whose speech will reflect these values are actively involved in LPP discussions to bridge the gap between national language visions and everyday linguistic needs (Vanbuel M, 2021). To this end, the diverse perspectives of the communities must be considered in drafting inclusive language policies so that they are contextually appropriate and responsive to the aspirations of all communities (Mammadova, 2025). The historical and sociopolitical context of Pakistan sets the tone for the challenges of language planning in Pakistan. Society is divided by linguistic, and socioeconomic divisions are shown in the coexistence of elite English medium schools, Urdu medium public schools, and regional language institutions (De Soete, 2025). And these divisions are further exacerbated by the widespread domination of English, which is considered entrance to the great social mobility but remains out of reach for many because of systemic inequality (Amanat A, 2021). To respond to these challenges, an LPP framework is needed that needs to shift towards an inclusive LPP framework that values equity and inclusion over linguistic hierarchies.

Background of the Study

Particularly in nations like Pakistan where linguistic variety interacts with political, social, and cultural aspects, language planning and policy (LPP) have become increasingly important subjects of research in multilingual cultures. Theoretically foundations of LPP, its relevance in Pakistan, and the part stakeholders play in developing inclusive language policy are investigated in this part.

Introduction to Language Planning and Policy

Language planning is intended attempts to influence learning of structures, the purposes of Language planning is intentional attempts to affect the learning, structure, and purposes of language within a culture. Language planning, according to Haripriya (2023), is a methodical governmental endeavor to control language use to solve communication problems and advance linguistic justice. Usually with an eye on their usage in education, government, and public communication, it emphasizes putting plans to enhance certain languages into action.

Conversely, language policy is the set of rules and choices taken by governments or organizations on the use of language in certain sectors (Grabe et al., 2023). Reflecting society objectives and cultural identities, it describes the guidelines controlling language usage in media, businesses, and classrooms. Policy and language planning together seek to close gaps between linguistic variety and socioeconomic growth.

Language Planning and Policy in Pakistan

From Pakistan's 1947 independence, language policies have been fundamental to national identity and sociopolitical growth. While English, the official language, rules governmental, educational, and business spheres (Abbas et al., 2022), Urdu, assigned as the national language, represents cultural unity. Regional languages have been excluded by this dual-lingual approach, therefore producing differences in social mobility and educational access.

ClearGlobal (2022) emphasizes how Pakistan's linguistic diversity which includes Punjabi, Sindhi, Saraiki, Pashto, and Balochi requests inclusive policies to protect cultural legacy and thus fostering national cohesion. But current laws often ignore regional languages, therefore restricting their influence on education and government.

Stakeholders of Language Planning and Policy

Effective LPP development depends much on the participation of stakeholders including educators, local leaders, media professionals, and legislators. Stakeholder engagement guarantees policies are inclusive and contextually appropriate, Wright (2016) underlines. While leaders in communities impact attitudes about regional and national languages, teachers shape language practices in classrooms. For instance, teachers in rural regions might lack the tools and instruction needed to carry out language policy (Niaz & Shah, 2024). Including several points of view in policy development helps to provide more fair results.

Inclusivity in Language Planning and Policy Development

Effective language planning is mostly dependent on inclusivity, which guarantees that policies represent the points of view of every language community. (Smith P, 2024) contends that by emphasizing linguistic variety, inclusive LPP promotes cultural plurality. Underrepresented groups, including speakers of minority languages, are involved in this strategy in decision-making.

In South Punjab, where Urdu and English predominate over indigenous languages like Saraiki, inclusion in LPP is very important. Including regional languages into government and education will help to preserve cultural diversity and social justice (Hiader S, 2024) (Sultana, 2025). Inclusivity also promotes mutual respect among language groups, therefore strengthening society cohesiveness.

Levels of Language Planning and Policy

Language planning functions at three levels: micro, meso, and macro. It deals with micro level planning that covers personal and community activities of language use at home and at small business. The programs for teacher preparation and curriculum creation are regional and institutionalized activities at meso-level planning. (Michael D, 2016) act on a macro level of planning for more general linguistic and socioeconomic objectives such as national policies and international partnerships.

Cooperation at the three levels is essential to the efficiency of LPP in Pakistan. To provide fair access of government and education, macro level policies must fit local requirements.

Types of Language Planning

Status, corpus, acquisition, and prestige planning are four other divisions for language planning:

Focusses on figuring out the purposes of languages within a society, including choosing official and national languages, in status planning.

Corpus planning is the study and standardizing of language structures including vocabulary and grammar.

It addresses issues of language learning and instruction such that linguistic abilities meet society's requirements.

Prestige Planning: promotes the use of some languages in the high fields such that their social value.

In Pakistan, English and Urdu rule government as well as education, so status and acquisition planning are very important. The use of corpus planning in the attempt to standardize regional languages may attend to the improvement of their importance in public life.

Importance and Scope of LPP in Pakistan

Pakistan's socio-economic and cultural growth depends much on language planning and policy. Important spheres of influence consist of:

Inclusive LPP guarantees fair access to high-quality education, therefore addressing the language demands of underprivileged populations.

Policies using regional languages help to increase civic engagement and representation by means of governance (Shahzad W, 2025).

LPP is very important for preserving Pakistan's linguistic legacy and promoting national unity by means of cultural variety.

Economic Development: By arming people with several language abilities, multilingual policies may increase employment and global competitiveness.

Models of Language Planning and Policy

Different models provide structures for comprehending and using LPP. The paradigm of Spolsky and Ricenty on the interaction of management, beliefs, and linguistic practices. While Tollefson's model emphasizes power dynamics and linguistic rights, Hornberger's Continua of Biliteracy emphasizes the value of bilingual education (Tollefson, 2023). These models provide insightful analysis that will help Pakistan construct inclusive LPP.

Challenges in Implementing LPP

Although in Pakistan, LPP has great promise, it faces immense difficulties. Political unrest, insufficient resources, and as often, opposition to change often delay effective implementation of language policy (Ammar A, 2015). Finally, playing a spoiler is the lack of coordination between national and local players.

The research backdrop is dependent on the integral role inclusive and contextually appropriate LPPs play in the fight against the language problems in Pakistan. By incorporating the stakeholders, increasing the regional languages, and using bottom-up methods, policymakers

can create sustainable language policies that would help to create the social fairness, cultural preservation, and economic development. South Punjab results are needed for the cooperation and inclusion in the language planning and bring us insightful guidance for reaching this objective.

Exploring Language Practices of LPP Stakeholders in Pakistan

Language Planning and Policy (LPP) in Pakistan is, inextricably, a part of its political, social and cultural heritage. LPP is deliberate language use in education, governance and media to optimize language use and linguistic justice. Real practices of using languages among stakeholders' government officials, educators and community leaders in Pakistan find their congruence with the tension of dominance of official languages (English and Urdu) and marginalization of local languages like Punjabi, Sindhi and Saraiki (Sikandar A, 2017).

English is to be found in government and business; Urdu represents national unity; but regional languages are predominantly confined to informal community-based contexts. In this, there has been spilt and unequal access to educational and socioeconomic opportunities, especially from rural areas.

Language Beliefs Regarding English Supremacy

Many Pakistani stakeholders do consider English as the language that is superior to other languages and necessary for academic and professional success. Consequently, urban and affluent sectors look upon English proficiency as a social mobility and national progress measure, which is a colonial legacy. Thus, English is enhanced everywhere in educational systems, business communications and in government policies in comparison to the regional languages (Shahzad W, 2025).

On the other hand, the communities living in the rural areas and the groups having strong regional identities like the South Punjab consider the different languages like Saraiki as essential part of Pakistan cultural identity. Despite this, English remains in the institutional dominance and thus its superiority is perceived, and more local languages are marginalised.

Incorporating Stakeholders' Practices and Beliefs into LPP

To counter the marginalization of regional languages, there is a critical need for inclusive language policies that reflect the diverse linguistic practices and beliefs of all stakeholders. An inclusive approach can preserve linguistic diversity and ensure that every language community has a voice in policymaking (Barbara, 2023). One effective strategy is the promotion of multilingual education. Integrating regional languages into school curricula, especially in rural and underdeveloped areas, allows students to learn in their native tongues, thereby enhancing educational equity and preserving cultural heritage (Sonja, 2023). This approach can empower linguistic minorities, offering them better academic prospects and stronger community ties.

Inclusive LPP for Social Justice and Economic Development

Preservation of cultural values not only requires, but necessitates as well, the development of a policy of inclusive language. The most important element for Pakistan would be to value and recognize its regional languages and thus enable receipt back to education, government services as well as employment opportunities for all citizens (Shahzad W, 2025). The presence of languages of regions in the discourse constitutes a social cohesion and helps overcome the urban-rural divide.

Research Methodology

In this chapter, study approach to investigate the language planning and policy (LPP) development in multilingual District Rahim Yar Khan, South Punjab has been discussed. The approach is described through the study design, population sampling strategies involved, data collecting methods and support of decisions taken to ensure that the LPP practice and opinions are studied systematically and thoroughly.

Research Design

The research methodology was mixed methodologies which includes the qualitative and quantitative. This blended method was necessary because it insured that the study was able to gather the deep insights and quantifiable facts necessary to have a full grasp on the elaborate dynamics of LPP.

For the quantitative component of this study, structured questionnaires were used to collect data from student stakeholder that is a very important stakeholder. These questionnaires—adapted from validated studies were designed to provide statistical insights into the opinions, attitudes and experiences with language policy of students.

The qualitative component consisted of interviewing other major players such as teachers, religious leaders, attorneys, and media professionals using a semi structured manner. This strategy provided an opportunity for the attendees to express their ideas, to talk about their experiences, about what has worked and what has not in LPP. These particular techniques worked especially well together for managing the complex personality of LPP in the presence of multiple languages.

Population

This was research done within a wide array of people who have either proactively engaged in or have been impacted by LPP in the District Rahim Yar Khan. Included among these groups were:

Teachers since their opinions were crucial to grasp the pragmatic consequences of LPP as they were main users of language rules in learning environments.

When it is represented by the mostly beneficiary, students gave remarkable analysis on the way that LPP affects their future possibilities and education.

Religious people's opinions make their opinions clear on the influence of culture and society of the society.

Lawyers: Lawyers give the legal interpretation of linguistic rights and carry out of policy like legal opinions.

Media Professionals: Public opinion and LPP conversation were greatly shaped by reporters and media professionals.

Including these many organizations guaranteed a thorough investigation of the subject, therefore collecting several points of view on language policy and planning.

Sampling Frame

Accessible stakeholders within District Rahim Yar Khan who fit the inclusion criteria of the research and were eager to take part made up the sample frame. For qualitative data collecting, purposeful sampling was used, which enabled participants to be chosen depending on their relevance to the study goals. This non-probability sampling technique guaranteed that the research concentrated on those with most relevant knowledge and experiences.

Students from two colleges KFC and Superior College were included in the sample frame for quantitative data. These institutions were selected based on their varied student demographics and accessibility.

Sampling Size

An amount of sampling size was decided upon to be representative of the entire population. The breakdown is as follows:

	Stakeholder Group	Population	Sample Size	Description
Quan	*Students*	500	320	Students from two different colleges spanning many semesters

Qual	Teachers	50	4	Teachers from various learning institutions District Rahim Yar Khan schools
Qual	Religious Persons	52	4	Religious leaders from many different groups
Qual	Lawyers	48	4	District-based practicing attorneys

Data Collection

Several techniques were used in the research to accumulate complete information such as semi structured interviews and organised questionnaire. As it turns out, these techniques allow data to be collected both widely and deeply.

Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi structured questions were asked to teachers, religious leaders, attorneys and media professionals. Thus, it stimulated open-ended conversations in which participants expressed their thoughts on LPP from their respective language. The flexibility of the interviews proved useful to investigate such hard to address issues as inclusiveness, cultural preservation, and difficulties of executing policy.

Questionnaires

Regarding the quantitative side, organized questionnaires were provided to KFC and Superior College students in the fifth to the eighth semesters. Questions in the questionnaire were about inclusiveness, the effect of language regulations, and Wales' language practices itself. The quantifiable information matching the qualitative results was obtained using this methodical technique.

Data Analysis

Analysis of Language Practices

The survey shows the variation in linguistic settings of South Punjab though Punjabi, Saraiki, Sindhi, Pashto, Urdu and many more languages and their importance in planning and policy of language. Urdu and English guide formal and professional spheres and regional languages serve to reinforce cultural identity, so to speak, in informal settings. Respondents shared insights on language use in family, education, workplaces, and religious practices, underscoring the importance of multilingualism in shaping educational, cultural, and social frameworks.

4.1.1: In my family, we primarily speak the regional language (e.g., Punjabi, Sindhi) at home.
Table no.4.1

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	72	22.4	0.76	1
Urdu	40	12.5	0.42	1
Saraiki	34	10.6	0.36	1
Sindhi	40	12.5	0.42	1
Others	174	42	1.43	2
Total	320	100.0	3.41	4

Explanation: This table shows the language distribution, with "Others" making up the largest group at 42%, followed by Punjabi (22.4%), Urdu (12.5%), Sindhi (12.5%), and Saraiki (10.6%). The overall mean score is 3.41, and the median is 4, indicating that while Punjabi remains the most frequent language, the "Others" category has a higher preference. The data suggests a significant diversity in language usage, with a strong representation from non-regional languages.

4.1.2: Parents in my family prefer to communicate with their children in Urdu rather than in English.

Table no.4.2

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	52	16.2%	0.52	3
Urdu	53	16.5%	0.53	3
Saraiki	57	17.8%	0.57	3
Others	158	49.5%	1.59	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.41	3

Explanation: This table presents the distribution of language responses, with "Others" representing the largest group at 49.5%, followed by Saraiki (17.8%), Urdu (16.5%), and Punjabi (16.2%). The overall mean score is 3.41, and the median is 3, indicating that most respondents favor languages in the "Others" category. The data suggests a diversity of language preferences with a strong inclination toward non-Punjabi and non-Urdu languages.

4.1.3: During family gatherings, we switch between different languages depending on the topic of conversation.

Table no.4.3

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	70	21.8%	0.70	3
Urdu	55	17.1%	0.55	3
Saraiki	93	29.0%	0.93	3
Others	103	13.019	1.12	3
Total	320	100.0%	2.93	3

Explanation: This table summarizes the distribution of language responses. Saraiki accounts for the largest group at 29.0%, followed by Punjabi at 21.8%, Urdu at 17.1%, and Others at 13.0%. The overall mean is 2.93, with a median of 3, indicating that most responses are concentrated around the middle value, with a slight preference for Saraiki and higher scores in the "Others" group.

4.1.4: Elder family members prefer to speak in the mother tongue rather than in Urdu or English.

Table no.4.4

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	32	10.3%	0.33	3
Urdu	43	13.4%	0.43	3
Saraiki	60	18.7%	0.60	3
Others	185	57.6	1.85	4
Total	320	100.0%	3.71	4

Explanation: This table presents the distribution of responses across language groups. The "Others" group constitutes the largest portion at 57.6%, with a mean of 1.85. Saraiki, Urdu, and Punjabi make up 18.7%, 13.4%, and 10.3%, respectively, with means of 0.60, 0.43, and 0.33. The overall mean is 3.71, with a median of 4, indicating that most responses are concentrated at the higher end of the scale.

4.1.5: I mostly use English when communicating with my friends.
Table no.4.5

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	61	19.0%	0.61	3
Urdu	49	15.3%	0.49	3
Saraiki	99	30.8%	0.99	3
Others	111	34.9	1.12	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.02	3

Explanation: This table shows the distribution of responses across different language groups. The "Others" group represents 34.9% with a mean of 1.12, followed by Saraiki at 30.8% with a mean of 0.99. Punjabi (19.0%) and Urdu (15.3%) have means of 0.61 and 0.49, respectively. The overall mean is 3.02, with a median of 3, suggesting that most responses are near the middle of the scale.

4.1.6: I feel more comfortable speaking in my regional language when I am with close friends.
Table no.4.6

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	43	13.4%	0.43	4
Urdu	38	11.8%	0.38	4
Saraiki	58	18.4%	0.59	4
Others	181	56.4%	1.81	4
Total	320	100.0%	3.57	4

Explanation: This table illustrates the distribution of responses across different language groups. "Others" makes up the largest percentage at 56.4%, with a mean of 1.81. Saraiki (18.4%) has a mean of 0.59, while Punjabi (13.4%) and Urdu (11.8%) have means of 0.43 and 0.38, respectively. The overall mean is 3.57, with a median of 4, indicating that most responses are concentrated at the higher end of the scale.

4.1.7: Urdu is the dominant language during conversations with friends in a mixed group (different linguistic backgrounds).
Table no.4.7

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	50	15.9%	0.51	3
Urdu	45	14.0%	0.45	3
Saraiki	70	21.8%	0.70	3
Others	155	48.3%	1.55	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.37	3

Explanation: This table shows the distribution of responses by language group. "Others" represents the largest group at 48.3%, with a mean of 1.55. Saraiki (21.8%) has a mean of 0.70, while Punjabi (15.9%) and Urdu (14.0%) have means of 0.51 and 0.45, respectively. The

overall mean is 3.37, with a median of 3, indicating that responses are generally centred in the middle range.

4.1.8: I tend to mix languages (code-switching) when chatting with friends.
Table no.4.8

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	40	12.5%	0.40	3
Urdu	55	17.1%	0.55	3
Saraiki	86	26.8%	0.86	3
Others	139	43.6%	1.4	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.29	3

Explanation: This table presents the distribution of responses across language groups. "Others" comprises the largest percentage at 43.6%, with a mean score of 1.4. Saraiki (26.8%) follows with a mean of 0.86, while Urdu (17.1%) and Punjabi (12.5%) have mean scores of 0.55 and 0.40, respectively. The overall mean is 3.29, with the median at 3, indicating that most responses are centred around the middle range.

4.1.9: Urdu is the primary language used for communication in my workplace.
Table no.4.9

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	46	14.3%	0.46	3
Urdu	44	13.7%	0.44	3
Saraiki	77	24.0%	0.77	3
Others	153	47.9%	1.54	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.41	3

Explanation: This table shows the distribution of responses across different language groups. The "Others" category makes up the largest proportion at 47.9%, with a mean score of 1.54. Saraiki (24.0%) has a mean score of 0.77, while Urdu (13.7%) and Punjabi (14.3%) both have mean scores of 0.44 and 0.46, respectively. The overall mean score is 3.41, with the median at 3, suggesting a central tendency toward mid-range responses.

4.1.10: English is often used in formal meetings and official documents at my workplace.
Table no.4.10

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	48	15.0%	0.48	3
Urdu	63	19.6%	0.63	3
Saraiki	71	22.1%	0.71	3
Others	138	43.3%	1.39	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.21	3

Explanation: This table presents the distribution of responses across different language groups. "Others" represent the largest group at 43.3%, with a mean score of 1.39. Saraiki (22.1%) has a mean score of 0.71, while Urdu (19.6%) and Punjabi (15.0%) have mean scores of 0.63 and 0.48, respectively. The overall mean score is 3.21, with the median at 3, indicating a tendency toward mid-range responses.

4.1.11: Colleagues at my workplace often switch between English and Urdu during informal conversations.
Table no.4.11

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	32	10.0%	0.32	3
Urdu	57	17.8%	0.57	3
Saraiki	78	24.6%	0.79	3
Others	53	47.6%	1.54	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.4	3

Explanation: The table shows the frequency and distribution of responses across language groups. "Others" make up the largest group (47.6%) with a mean score of 1.54, while Saraiki (24.6%) has a mean score of 0.79. Punjabi (10.0%) and Urdu (17.8%) have lower mean scores of 0.32 and 0.57, respectively. The overall mean is 3.4, with a median of 3, reflecting a tendency towards mid-range responses.

4.1.12: In my workplace, using regional languages is encouraged during casual interactions.
Table no.4.12

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	52	16.2%	0.52	3
Urdu	60	18.7%	0.60	3
Saraiki	73	22.7%	0.73	3
Others	135	42.3%	1.36	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.16	3

Explanation: The table illustrates the distribution of responses by language group. "Others" represent the largest group (42.3%) with a mean of 1.36, followed by Saraiki (22.7%) with a mean of 0.73. Punjabi and Urdu have similar mean scores of 0.52 and 0.60, respectively. The overall mean score is 3.16, with a median of 3, indicating a general preference towards mid-range ratings across the groups.

4.1.13: During religious gatherings, Urdu is the main language used for sermons and discussions.
Table no.4.13

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	39	12.1%	0.39	4
Urdu	41	12.8%	0.41	4
Saraiki	67	20.9%	0.67	4
Others	173	54.2%	1.74	4
Total	320	100.0%	3.57	4

Explanation: The table shows the frequency and distribution of responses by language group. "Others" represent the largest group (54.2%) with the highest mean score of 1.74, followed by Saraiki (20.9%) with a mean of 0.67. Punjabi and Urdu have similar mean scores of 0.39 and 0.41, respectively. The overall mean is 3.57, with a median of 4, suggesting a tendency towards higher ratings.

4.1.14: Arabic phrases and terms are frequently used during religious conversations and practices.

Table no.4.14

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	57	17.8%	0.57	3
Urdu	51	15.9%	0.51	3
Saraiki	77	24.0%	0.77	3
Others	135	42.3%	1.36	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.19	3

Explanation: The table presents the distribution of responses by language group. The "Others" category, comprising 42.3% of the total, has the highest mean score of 1.36, followed by Saraiki (24.0%) with a mean of 0.77. Punjabi and Urdu groups have lower means of 0.57 and 0.51, respectively. The overall mean is 3.19, with a median of 3, indicating a trend toward neutral responses across all groups.

4.1.15: In religious contexts, using regional languages is common for informal discussions.

Table no.4.15

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	47	14.6%	0.47	3
Urdu	52	16.2%	0.52	3
Saraiki	85	26.5%	0.85	3
Others	136	42.6%	1.37	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.25	3

Explanation: The table shows the distribution of responses by language group. "Others" represent the largest group at 42.6%, followed by Saraiki (26.5%), Urdu (16.2%), and Punjabi (14.6%). The overall mean is 3.25 with a median of 3, indicating a general tendency toward neutral responses. The "Others" category has the highest mean of 1.37, reflecting a stronger positive response compared to the other groups.

4.1.16: Urdu translations are preferred over regional languages during religious readings and prayers.

Table no.4.16

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	53	16.5%	0.53	3
Urdu	55	17.1%	0.55	3
Saraiki	61	19.0%	0.61	3
Others	151	47.4%	1.52	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.31	3

Explanation: The table presents the frequency distribution of responses across language groups. "Others" represent the highest proportion at 47.4%, followed by Saraiki (19.0%), Urdu (17.1%), and Punjabi (16.5%). The overall mean is 3.31, with a median of 3, indicating a generally favourable response. The "Others" category has the highest mean (1.52), suggesting a stronger positive inclination in comparison to other groups.

4.1.17: Urdu is the primary medium of instruction in my educational experience.
Table no.4.17

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	49	15.3%	0.51	3
Urdu	54	16.8%	0.56	3
Saraiki	64	19.9%	0.64	3
Others	153	47.9%	1.53	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.36	3

Explanation: The table shows the distribution of responses by language group. "Others" account for the largest proportion at 47.9%, followed by Saraiki (19.9%), Urdu (16.8%), and Punjabi (15.3%). The overall mean is 3.36, with a median of 3, indicating a tendency towards higher ratings. The "Others" category has the highest mean (1.53), reflecting more favourable responses.

4.1.18: English is the dominant language in academic and scholarly activities.
Table no.4.18

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	53	16.5%	0.38	3
Urdu	48	15.0%	0.34	3
Saraiki	80	25.2%	0.59	3
Others	139	43.3%	0.98	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.23	3

Explanation: The table displays the frequency and distribution of responses across language groups. The "Others" category has the highest percentage at 43.3%, followed by Saraiki (25.2%), Punjabi (16.5%), and Urdu (15.0%). The overall mean is 3.23 with a median of 3, suggesting responses are skewed slightly towards the higher end of the scale. The "Others" group has the highest mean (0.98), indicating more positive responses compared to other language groups.

4.1.19: Regional languages are used during discussions in informal educational settings.
Table no.4.19

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	45	14.0%	0.31	3
Urdu	78	24.3%	0.50	3
Saraiki	82	25.9%	0.53	3
Others	115	35.8%	0.76	3
Total	320	100.0%	3.03	3

Explanation: The table presents the distribution of responses based on language groups. The "Others" category has the highest percentage at 35.8%, followed by Saraiki (25.9%), Urdu (24.3%), and Punjabi (14.0%). The overall mean is 3.03, with a median of 3, indicating that responses are fairly evenly distributed around the middle of the scale. The "Others" group has the highest mean (0.76), suggesting a more positive response compared to other groups.

4.1.20: I believe that fluency in English is essential for academic success in Pakistan.
Table no.4.20

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	46	14.3%	0.34	4
Urdu	47	14.6%	0.35	4
Saraiki	56	17.4%	0.43	4
Others	171	53.6%	1.3	4
Total	320	100.0%	3.45	4

Explanation: The table illustrates the distribution of responses across different language groups. The "Others" category constitutes the largest group at 53.6%, followed by Saraiki (17.4%), Urdu (14.6%), and Punjabi (14.3%). The overall mean is 3.45, with a median of 4, indicating that most responses are concentrated at the higher end of the scale. The "Others" group has the highest mean (1.3), showing more favourable responses compared to the other groups.

4.1.21: Firmly convinced that our family should continue using the regional language at home.
Table no.4.21

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	131	40.8%	0.94	3
Urdu	68	21.2%	0.49	2
Saraiki	52	16.2%	0.37	2
Others	69	21.8%	0.5	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.36	2

Explanation: The table shows the distribution of responses across language groups. Punjabi participants represent the largest group at 40.8%, followed by Urdu at 21.2%, Saraiki at 16.2%, and others at 21.8%. The overall mean is 2.36, with a median of 2, suggesting that most responses are clustered around the lower end of the scale. Punjabi has the highest mean (0.94), while other groups, such as Urdu and Saraiki, show lower means, indicating less favorable responses compared to Punjabi participants.

4.1.22: Convinced that Urdu should be the primary language for communicating with children in the family.
Table no.4.22

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	67	20.9%	0.61	2
Urdu	96	27.3%	0.88	3
Saraiki	70	21.8%	0.64	3
Others	87	30%	0.8	3
Total	320	100.0%	2.75	2

Explanation: The table displays the distribution of responses across different language groups. Punjabi participants make up 20.9%, Urdu 27.3%, Saraiki 21.8%, and "Others" 30%. The overall mean is 2.75, and the median is 2, indicating that responses are slightly more concentrated at the lower end of the scale. However, Urdu and "Others" groups have higher mean scores, suggesting a relatively more positive trend within those groups.

4.1.23: Strongly believe that switching between languages during family conversations enhances cultural connections.
Table no.4.23

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	80	24.9%	0.72	3
Urdu	70	21.8%	0.63	3
Saraiki	82	25.5%	0.73	3
Others	88	27.6	0.81	3
Total	320	100.0%	2.67	3

Explanation: The table illustrates the distribution of responses across various language groups. Punjabi participants represent 24.9%, Urdu 21.8%, Saraiki 25.5%, and "Others" 27.6%. The overall mean response is 2.67, indicating a slightly favorable trend, with a median of 3, suggesting that the majority of responses align closer to the positive end of the scale.

4.1.24: Steadfast in the belief that elder family members should speak in the mother tongue rather than Urdu or English.
Table no.4.24

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	82	25.5%	0.72	3
Urdu	83	25.9%	0.73	3
Saraiki	58	18.4%	0.52	2
Others	97	30.2%	0.86	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.69	2

Explanation: The table displays the distribution of responses across different language groups. Punjabi participants represent 25.5%, Urdu 25.9%, Saraiki 18.4%, and "Others" 30.2%. The mean response is 2.69, reflecting a somewhat positive trend, with a median of 2, indicating that most responses fall closer to a neutral or lower range of the scale.

4.1.25: Firmly believe that using English when communicating with friends is important for social mobility.
Table no.4.25

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	59	18.4%	0.56	3
Urdu	65	20.2%	0.61	3
Saraiki	98	30.5%	0.92	3
Others	98	30.8%	0.92	3
Total	320	100.0%	2.93	3

Explanation: The table presents the distribution of responses across different language groups. Punjabi participants account for 18.4%, Urdu for 20.2%, Saraiki for 30.5%, and "Others" for 30.8%. The overall mean response is 2.93, indicating a generally positive trend, with a median of 3, showing that the majority of responses are centred around a neutral or balanced position.

4.1.26: Convinced that the regional language should be preferred in conversations with close friends.
Table no.4.26

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	69	21.5%	0.68	3

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Urdu	82	25.9%	0.82	3
Saraiki	76	23.7%	0.76	3
Others	93	29%	0.91	3
Total	320	100.0%	2.75	3

Explanation: The table illustrates the distribution of responses across different language groups. Punjabi participants constitute 21.5%, Urdu 25.9%, Saraiki 23.7%, and "Others" make up 29%. The overall mean response is 2.75, indicating a moderately positive response, with the median of 3 suggesting that most responses are concentrated around the middle, indicating a balanced or neutral view in all groups.

4.1.27: Strongly hold that Urdu is the best language for conversations in mixed-language groups of friends.
Table no.4.27

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	83	25.9%	0.75	3
Urdu	74	23.1%	0.66	3
Saraiki	70	21.8%	0.64	3
Others	93	29.3%	0.85	3
Total	320	100.0%	2.71	3

Explanation: The table presents the distribution of responses among different language groups. Punjabi participants make up 25.9%, followed by Urdu at 23.1%, Saraiki at 21.8%, and "Others" at 29.3%. The overall mean is 2.71, indicating a moderate response, while the median is 3, suggesting that most responses were clustered around a higher value, reflecting a trend toward a positive or neutral assessment within each language group.

4.1.28: Believe that mixing languages (code-switching) during casual chats with friends is a natural practice.
Table no.4.28

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	87	27.1%	0.79	3
Urdu	82	25.9%	0.77	3
Saraiki	70	21.8%	0.64	3
Others	81	25.2%	0.75	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.6	2

Explanation: The table provides a distribution of responses across different language groups, showing that Punjabi leads with 27.1%, followed closely by Urdu at 25.9%. Saraiki and "Others" account for 21.8% and 25.2%, respectively. The overall mean is 2.6, indicating a moderate tendency, while the median is 2, reflecting a more balanced response across the groups.

4.1.29: Firmly believe that Urdu should be the primary language used for communication in the workplace.
Table no.4.29

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	77	24.0%	0.77	3
Urdu	80	24.9%	0.79	3
Saraiki	81	25.2%	0.80	3

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Others	82	25.8%	0.83	3
Total	320	100.0%	2.69	3

Explanation: The table shows the distribution of responses across different languages, with "Others" leading at 25.8%, followed by Saraiki at 25.2%, Urdu at 24.9%, and Punjabi at 24.0%. The mean value is 2.69, indicating a moderate overall response, while the median is consistently 3 across all language groups, suggesting a balanced preference for the languages surveyed.

4.1.30: Confident that English is necessary for formal meetings and official documents at work.

Table no.4.30

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	80	24.9%	0.75	2
Urdu	82	25.5%	0.76	2
Saraiki	63	19.6%	0.59	2
Others	95	29.6%	0.89	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.72	2

Explanation: The table presents the language distribution among participants, with "Others" leading at 29.6%, followed by Urdu at 25.5% and Punjabi at 24.9%. Saraiki accounts for 19.6%. The mean value is 2.72, indicating a moderate overall response, with a consistent median of 2 across all language groups, suggesting a preference for languages outside the primary regional languages.

4.1.31: Hold the view that switching between English and Urdu during informal workplace conversations is beneficial.

Table no.4.31

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	67	20.9%	0.68	3
Urdu	73	22.7%	0.73	3
Saraiki	87	27.1%	0.87	3
Others	93	29.3%	0.94	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.93	3

Explanation: The table shows the distribution of language preferences among participants, with Saraiki (27.1%) and Others (29.3%) having the highest frequencies. Urdu follows at 22.7% and Punjabi at 20.9%. The mean score is 2.93, reflecting a higher overall engagement level, with a median of 3 for most languages, except for "Others," which has a median of 2. This suggests a general preference for regional languages.

4.1.32: Believe that using regional languages in casual interactions at work fosters a positive environment.

Table no.4.32

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	71	22.1%	0.75	3
Urdu	85	26.5%	0.91	3
Saraiki	82	25.5%	0.88	3
Others	82	25.9%	0.9	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.68	3

Explanation: The table presents the language distribution, with Urdu (26.5%), Saraiki (25.5%), and Others (25.9%) leading in frequency, while Punjabi constitutes 22.1%. The mean score is 2.68, with a median of 3 for most categories, except for Others, which has a median of 2. This indicates a preference for commonly spoken regional languages, with slight variations in engagement levels.

4.1.33: Firmly believe that Urdu should be the main language used for sermons and discussions during religious gatherings.

Table no.4.33

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	71	22.1%	0.73	3
Urdu	92	28.7%	0.95	3
Saraiki	57	17.8%	0.59	3
Others	100	31.5%	1.03	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.77	3

Explanation: The table outlines language preferences, with Others at 31.5% having the highest frequency, followed by Urdu at 28.7%, Punjabi at 22.1%, and Saraiki at 17.8%. The total mean is 2.77, and the median is 3, except for Others with a median of 2. These findings highlight linguistic diversity and differing engagement levels among participants.

4.1.34: Confident that Arabic phrases and terms are essential in religious conversations and practices.

Table no.4.34

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	70	21.8%	0.68	3
Urdu	82	25.5%	0.78	3
Saraiki	71	22.1%	0.67	3
Others	97	30.5%	0.94	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.77	3

Explanation: The table showcases language preferences among participants, with Others leading at 30.5%, followed by Urdu at 25.5%, Saraiki at 22.1%, and Punjabi at 21.8%. The total mean score is 2.77, with a median of 3, except for Others at 2. These figures reflect diverse linguistic engagement, emphasizing inclusivity in communication patterns.

4.1.35: Convinced that using regional languages for informal discussions during religious gatherings is appropriate.

Table no.4.35

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	55	17.1%	0.52	3
Urdu	96	29.9%	0.89	3
Saraiki	86	26.8%	0.78	3
Others	83	26.5%	0.77	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.75	3

Explanation: The table highlights language preferences, with Urdu leading at 29.9%, followed by Saraiki at 26.8%, and Others at 26.5%, while Punjabi accounts for 17.1%. The mean score

of 2.75 and a consistent median of 3 (except for Others at 2) indicate strong engagement across languages, reflecting a diverse linguistic representation among participants.

4.1.36: Believe that Urdu translations are preferred over regional languages during religious readings and prayers.

Table no.4.36

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	82	25.5%	0.78	3
Urdu	77	24.0%	0.73	3
Saraiki	78	24.3%	0.75	3
Others	83	26.1%	0.81	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.66	3

Explanation: The table illustrates language distribution among participants: Punjabi (25.5%), Urdu (24.0%), Saraiki (24.3%), and others (26.1%). The mean of 2.66 and a median of 3 suggest relatively equal representation of languages, with slight variation in preferences, highlighting a diverse linguistic landscape across the group.

4.1.37: Firmly believe that Urdu should be the primary medium of instruction in educational institutions.

Table no.4.37

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	80	24.9%	0.79	2
Urdu	86	26.8%	0.71	2
Saraiki	55	17.1%	0.49	2
Others	99	31.1%	0.75	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.71	2

Explanation: The table highlights language preferences among participants. Punjabi accounts for 24.9%, Urdu for 26.8%, Saraiki for 17.1%, and other languages for 31.1%. With a total mean of 2.71 and a median of 2, the data suggests a balanced use of diverse languages, with Urdu slightly leading among the options.

4.1.38: Confident that English is essential for academic and scholarly success.

Table no.4.38

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	76	23.7%	0.79	3
Urdu	68	21.2%	0.55	3
Saraiki	88	27.4%	0.76	3
Others	88	27.7%	0.60	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.78	3

Explanation: The table outlines the linguistic distribution of 320 respondents: 23.7% speak Punjabi, 21.2% Urdu, 27.4% Saraiki, and 27.7% other languages. Mean values range between 0.55 and 0.79, with a total mean of 2.78. Median responses are 3 for all except "Others," which has a median of 2.

4.1.39: Hold the view that regional languages should be used more frequently in informal educational settings.

Table no.4.39

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	72	22.4%	0.76	3
Urdu	80	24.9%	0.81	3
Saraiki	89	27.7%	0.90	3
Others	79	24.9%	0.75	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.68	3

Explanation The table highlights the linguistic composition of 320 respondents: 22.4% speak Punjabi, 24.9% Urdu, 27.7% Saraiki, and 24.9% other languages. Mean values range from 0.75 to 0.90, with a total mean of 2.68. Median responses are consistently 3, except for "Others," which has a median of 2.

4.1.40: Believe that fluency in English is crucial for higher education opportunities in Pakistan.

Table no.4.40

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Median
Punjabi	89	27.7%	0.77	3
Urdu	57	17.8%	0.50	3
Saraiki	74	23.1%	0.64	3
Others	100	31.4%	1.42	2
Total	320	100.0%	2.78	3

Explanation: The table presents linguistic diversity among 320 respondents, showing 27.7% speak Punjabi, 17.8% Urdu, 23.1% Saraiki, and 31.4% other languages. Mean values range from 0.50 to 1.42, with a total mean of 2.78. Median responses for all groups are consistently 3, except for "Others," with a median of 2.

Data Analysis Qualitative

Insights from Stakeholders

Religious Perspectives on Language Use

By interviewing religious players, this thesis reveals Pakistan's multilingual character in religious expression. Languages such as English, Urdu, Arabic and Pashto are catered for different congregations. The official sermons use mainly Arabic and Urdu, but English is increasingly being used in order to attract younger listeners. This tendency addresses the new language status of religious organization, adjusting the new demographic and cultural needs.

Courses and religious books also emphasize linguistic inclusion as translations in several languages ensure that the books are inclusive. However, there are problems of adapting new language practices for the younger generations to the old ways of language. Generational gaps and involvement get underlined by stakeholders who require more linguistic flexibility to bridge them.

Teachers' Role in Promoting Multilingual Education

Much of the encouragement of multilingual competency amongst pupils is seen to depend on teachers. The interviews are replete with how well combined of English and Urdu as teaching languages works. It ensures that both kind of students can understand complicated things and also improves global communication skills.

Including regional language in the curriculum further helps educational results by making the learning more useful and relevant. Thus, teachers are known to support a participative method of curriculum development in which variety of lingua is not a blind spot but a positive force. The equitable way of providing access to education according to the language groups of all ensures being complementary to the more general design of language planning and policy.

Media Professionals and Multilingual Reporting

Media experts emphasize the importance of multilingualism in involvement of audience and coverage of the news. They cater for local and national audiences by broadcasting Urdu as well as English, regional languages like Sindhi and Pashto. Culturally sensitive reporting guarantees relevance to different cultures while multilingual content development (which creates multilingual) increases audience to register and also increases trustworthiness.

Where the interviews also call to the problems in the media practices of balancing cultural sensibility with language competency. Ongoing education and modification are emphasized to meet the needs of a changing audience by professionals.

Lawyers Profession and Language Accessibility

Legality experts and lawyers, however, agree, that language is crucial to guarantees of justice and accessibility. In particular, the use of regional languages in contacts with customers instils trust and understanding particularly in the rural and in poor areas. Although they face major obstacles due to the lack of translated legal materials and multilingual judicial processes, materials on Japanese jurisprudence are sometimes very different from their Eurocentric counterparts.

The stakeholders support the inclusion of regional language in legal documents and procedures so that communication gaps can be closed and the availability of legal services can be improved. This strategy provides that everyone has their full rights without any exception in their language background in a complementary manner to the general goals of linguistic equality and social justice.

Discussion on Language Planning and Policy

Specifically, Pakistan presents special difficulties to the policy creation and language planning within the multilingual scene. English and Urdu also become the only dominant language causing linguistic inequality and cultural estrangement. Even more, socio-economic inequalities exacerbate this mismatch through reinforcing the access to English education for affluent city areas.

The Bengali language riots are historical incidents that depict civil conflicts between the national language regulations and the regional linguistic identities. The above situations highlight the need of a more pluralistic and participatory policy making process that recognizes the linguistic and cultural diversity of the country.

Inclusivity and Stakeholder Participation

Active involvement of educators, religious leaders, media professionals, civil society organisations is necessary to contribute to the effectiveness of language planning and policy. Inclusive policies that would represent the needs, taste of the linguistic minority would foster social cohesion and preserve the cultural identity.

Legislators are ensured that language regulations are fair, relevant and sensitive to the needs of many linguistic groups when the community is included in the decision-making process.

Balancing Linguistic Diversity and Globalization

The results emphasize how English is both a means to the world integration and a symbol of the socioeconomic disparity. While English is essential for academic and work success, the more common dominance of the language often happens at the expense of regional languages.

Localized communities need to be safeguarded of the loss of their cultural and linguistic legacy, and English for worldwide purposes is to be pushed.

Another such answer may be the integration of bilingual education that provides children with instruction in the regional languages and English. This method does not only improve language, but cultural pride and identification.

Conclusion

It is seen how linguistic variation in multilingual community is difficult to control by examining language regulations and practice in South Punjab. Even though English and Urdu are bringing people together as uniting languages in the business and educational environments, regional languages still stand as the uniting languages of cultural identity and social interaction. This is important in that the results underline the importance of Inclusive and participatory strategies in language planning and policy which attempt to reach a compromise between the needs of globalization and the preservation of the linguistic legacy.

If Pakistan can develop building blocks to make society fair and cohesive with a nuanced sense of language and cultural variety, it can help a multilingual competency. Though language policies must cater as much to the need and aspiration of linguistic groups as they are, policymakers, teachers and community stakeholders must work hand in hand to make progress in this regard.

Recommendations for Future Research and Policy Development

To guide evidence-based policy formation, do thorough research on language usage, preferences, and socioeconomic elements.

Actively include teachers, religious leaders, and civic society organizations among other stakeholders in the creation and execution of language policy.

Create and apply courses combining regional languages with English and Urdu to promote linguistic diversity and educational fairness.

Training for media workers, lawyers, and teachers will help them to improve their linguistic competency and cultural awareness.

References

Ahmed R, e. a. (2021). Multilingual Language Practices in Education in Pakistan: The Conflict Between Policy and Practice. *SageOpen*, 12-25.

Amanat A, e. a. (2021). The Urdu and English Medium Divide in Punjab, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research* , 616-621.

Ammar A, e. a. (2015). Language Policy and Medium of Instruction Issue in Pakistan. *Acta Linguistica Asiatica*, 111-120.

Cardinal L, e. a. (2023, Sep 5). *Language policy and planning: From theory to practice*. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373674750_Language_policy_and_planning_From_theory_to_practice

De Soete, A. (2025). 'For the Dutch-speaking students, I will translate it': code-switching as discretionary transformation of EMI language policy. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1-24.

Eberhard, D. M. (2020). *Ethnologue: languages of the world.* Dallas: SIL International. Online version: http://www. ethnologue. com.

Hashmi M. (2025). *The dominance of english in pakistani education: analyzing student and teacher perspectives towards language policy. Journal of applied linguistics and tesol (jalt)*, 1648-1655.

Hiader S. (2024). Can English be a National Language in Pakistan? Possibilities of reducing

issues of language planning and policy in developing countries. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 109-126.

Hovel P. (2023). Importance and Necessity of StakeholderEngagement. *Ethics and Responsible Research and Innovation in Practice*, 38-53.

Hussain F, e. a. (2020, Jan 2). *Punjabi Language Perspectives: A Comprehensive Study on Marginalization and Advocacy in Pakistan*. Retrieved from www.ahbabtrust.org: https://www.ahbabtrust.org/ojs/index.php/jicc/article/view/188

Kir, F. S. (2025). Language ideologies in new media: grassroots resistance to a multilingual language policy. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1-19.

Mammadova, T. B. (2025). Sustainability of EMI programs in the countries of the expanding circle: language planning perspectives. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1-7.

Mattheoudakis, M. &. (2025). Language policy for multilingualism in Greek public administration: fact or fiction?.

Michael D. (2016). Moving the field forward: a micro–meso–macro model for critical language planning. The case of Estonia. *Current Issues in Language Planning* , 106-130.

Nekvapil J. (2011, Jan 5). *The history and theory of language planning*. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295912768_The_history_and_theory_of_language_planning

Richard B, e. a. (2004, Jan 8). *Language Planning and Policy: Recent Trends, Future Directions*. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37621349_Language_Planning_and_Policy_Recent_Trends_Future_Directions

Shahzad W. (2025, Jan 12). *Language planning for sustainable development in Pakistan*. Retrieved from www.pakistantoday.com.pk: https://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2025/01/12/language-planning-for-sustainable-development-in-pakistan/

Sikandar A. (2017, March 15). *Language Policy Planning in Pakistan: A Review*. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342734761_Language_Policy_Planning_in_Pakistan_A_Review

Smith P. (2024, July 5). The Effects of Language Policy on Minority Languages. *European Journal of Linguistics* , 54-66. Retrieved from European Journal of Linguistics : https://ejal.info/

Spolsky B. (2017, August 3). *Language Policy in Education: Practices, Ideology, and Management*. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319387507_Language_Policy_in_Education_Practices_Ideology_and_Management

Sultana, A. P. (2025). Shaping the status of indigenous languages through policy: Kurukh in Bengal. *Current Issues in Language Planning,* , 1-19.

Vanbuel M, e. a. (2021). How stakeholders see the implementation of language education policy: a Q-study. *Current Issues in Language Planning* , 1-20.