

## FIRST LANGUAGE ATTRITION: A STUDY OF LEXICAL ATTRITION AMONG ENGLISH STUDENTS AT SHAHEED BENAZIR BHUTTO UNIVERSITY, SHAHEED BENAZIRABAD

Ayaz Ahmed<sup>\*1</sup>, Waseem Ahmed Lakhmir<sup>2</sup>, Rajesh Kumar Lohana<sup>3</sup>, Faiza Fatah<sup>4</sup>

<sup>\*1</sup>Teaching Assistant, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Shaheed Benazirabad

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Shaheed Benazirabad

<sup>3,4</sup>Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Shaheed Benazirabad

<sup>1</sup>ayaz.maganhar@sbbusba.edu.pk, <sup>2</sup>waseemlakhmir90@gmail.com, <sup>3</sup>rajeshkumarlohana0@gmail.com,

<sup>4</sup>faizafatah879@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15280557>

### Keywords

Lexical Attrition, Multicultural Societies, Vocabulary Test, Language Preservation, Globalized Academic Spheres

### Article History

Received on 16 March 2025

Accepted on 16 April 2025

Published on 25 April 2025

Copyright © Author

Corresponding Author: \*

Ayaz Ahmed

### Abstract

Language, integral to communication, is equally vital for cultural identity. The pervasive use of second languages, particularly English as a global lingua franca, in contemporary multicultural societies raises concerns about the erosion of native languages. This research delves into the phenomenon of lexical attrition within the first language of final-year BS English students at Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazirabad. The study encompasses the entire final-year batch of the English Department at SBBU SBA, involving a sample of 100 participants selected through simple random sampling. A questionnaire-based vocabulary test, encompassing 10 common and 10 specialized words frequently encountered in the university context, was administered to gauge the participants' lexical proficiency without the aid of reference materials. Utilizing IBM SPSS Statistics 21 for analysis, the findings indicated that 63.5% of responses, on average, were inaccurately provided, pointing to a substantial level of lexical attrition among final-year BS English students at SBBU SBA. This research contributes to the understanding of the repercussions of heightened English usage within academic spheres and its impact on the preservation of students' native language proficiency. The study underscores the need for awareness and intervention to mitigate lexical attrition, thereby preserving linguistic diversity and cultural heritage.

Language is a tool for communicating ideas, feelings, and emotions, as articulated by Edward Sapir, who stated, "Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols." The significance of human language goes beyond distinguishing human beings from other creatures; it also plays a pivotal role in shaping human society. In our multicultural and multilingual societies, acquiring a second language has become imperative for survival. Since its independence in 1947, Pakistan boasts a rich linguistic tapestry with approximately 74 languages

spoken. Urdu holds the status of being the national and official language. In the provinces, Sindhi, Punjabi, Pashto, and Balochi are the main regional languages. Additionally, Siraiki, Kashmiri, Brahwi, Hindko, Pothwari, and English are among the prominent languages spoken throughout the country. Sindh, the third-largest and second-most populous province in Pakistan, is home to a population of 47.9 million, comprising diverse communities such as Sindhi, Muhajir, Baloch, Punjabi, and Brahvi. Despite this linguistic diversity, English holds significant importance in Sindh, influencing various

aspects of life, including education and administration.

Language, as articulated by Edward Sapir, serves as a fundamental human tool for expressing ideas, emotions, and desires. In our contemporary multicultural and multilingual societies, the acquisition of a second language becomes crucial for survival. This introduction explores a specific dimension of language dynamics—language attrition. Defined by Schmid (2011) as the (complete or partial) ignorance of a language by a fluent speaker, language attrition is a global phenomenon that affects individuals across different age groups. Despite being a relatively recent topic of scholarly and national interest, language attrition transcends disciplines, encompassing linguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics (Hansen, 1999).

The terminology surrounding language attrition is diverse, with researchers using terms such as language attrition, language regression, language loss, language shift, code-switching or code-mixing, and language death (Hansen, 1999). This exploration aims to delve into language attrition from various perspectives, drawing insights from different fields. Within bilingual contexts, language attrition often manifests when individuals in contact with two languages experience the dominance of one language over the other. This dominance, observed in linguistic skills such as phonology, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics, can result in the partial or complete forgetting of the less dominant language (Yukawa, 1997).

The Sindh province of Pakistan, despite its status as an underdeveloped area, is a rich tapestry of diverse cultures and languages. Navigating this linguistic diversity demands the local population to acquire multiple languages. However, the unintentional attrition of native languages is evident due to the frequent use of other languages, particularly the emphasis on English as a medium of instruction in modern education.

Languages, as essential tools for communication, have been flourished in both quality and quantity with the development of societies. Today, almost 6000 to 7000 languages are spoken worldwide, reflecting the linguistic diversity that individuals navigate in their daily lives. In regions where multiple languages coexist, individuals often find themselves compelled to learn

each other's languages for effective communication. These additional languages, beyond one's first language, are commonly referred to as second languages.

Second language learners, whether consciously or unconsciously, may diminish their proficiency in their first language to strengthen their grasp of the second language. This phenomenon is known as language attrition and is defined as "the decrease in language proficiency within an individual over time" (DeBot and Schrauf, 2009, pg. 11). Various factors contribute to language attrition, including feelings of inferiority about the native language, the pressing need for a second language, migration to areas without speakers of the native language, interracial marriages, or an interest in the culture of another language. Above all, the dire need for English as a medium of communication in business and other circumstances, as well as its role as a medium of instruction in educational settings, has shifted people's focus toward English at the expense of indigenous languages.

Furthermore, the modern age of science and technology has transformed the world into a global village, necessitating a common language for worldwide communication. English has emerged as a language that plays an indispensable role in connecting different countries and fostering global relations. Despite the expediency of English, its increasing importance has had various impacts on first languages. The allure of English is drawing more attention and affection, even from those whose native language is not English. Native languages are experiencing attrition at different extents.

While numerous Pakistani and foreign researchers have explored this issue, very few have specifically targeted the Sindh province of Pakistan. This study aims to fill this gap by evaluating the extent of first language lexical attrition among students of the English department at Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazirabad, whether partial or complete.

**The study was driven by the following main objectives:**

- To assess the extent of first language lexical attrition among English students at SBBU SBA.
- To elucidate the causes of lexical attrition among

students of English at SBBU SBA.

The research questions, integral to achieving the objective, guided the study's investigation. These were:

- To what extent does lexical attrition prevail among SBBUSBA students?
- What are the primary causes of lexical attrition among SBBUSBA students?

### Literature Review

The existing body of literature reflects a comprehensive exploration of language attrition, addressing various dimensions and contributing to our understanding of this complex phenomenon.

Multilingual societies, like Pakistan, have faced challenges with language attrition, leading to the gradual decline of native language proficiency over time. The interconnectedness of diverse languages in such societies has created an environment where individuals often prioritize a second language, contributing to the attrition of their native language.

Language, as an essential tool for communication, forms a unique system of expression across the globe. With properties such as arbitrariness, productivity, duality, and discreteness, human language plays a crucial role in shaping societies and fostering connections. The evolving ages have witnessed the introduction of various languages to meet the needs of the time, resulting in a mosaic of nearly 65,000 languages spoken worldwide.

In the context of language dynamics, the phenomenon of language attrition has gained significant attention. Language attrition refers to the loss of language proficiency within an individual over time. This phenomenon is particularly prevalent in today's multilingual societies, where interactions in a second language may lead individuals to prioritize fluency and accuracy in that language over their native tongue.

The need for interaction in a multilingual society often compels individuals to focus more on a second language than their native language, leading to language attrition. This phenomenon has been extensively studied, with a range of linguistic, psychological, and sociolinguistic factors contributing to the gradual decrease in native language performance.

In Europe, workshops and research projects in the 1980s, such as those at the University of Nijmegen, explored attrition phenomena through individual case studies. These studies contributed descriptive insights into language loss, laying the groundwork for further theoretical exploration.

Moving beyond individual cases, studies on language shift and attrition in broader societal contexts provide valuable insights. A notable example is the Language Skills Attrition Project (Ginsberg, 1986), which examined language attrition among selected U.S. populations in Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese. The project employed a pre-test/post-test design, focusing on attitudes, motivation, language use, and exposure.

In the specific context of Pakistan, a country with a rich linguistic landscape, language attrition has been studied extensively. Janjua (2005) notes that out of the 74 languages spoken in Pakistan since its independence in 1947, many have already become extinct, and some are endangered. Language shift, or attrition, is particularly prevalent in multilingual societies like Pakistan, where speakers adapt to a Lingua Franca or a dominant language for effective communication.

Researchers like Barbara Köpcke and Dobrinka Genevska-Hanke (2018) have studied language attrition in relation to language dominance, defining it as the relative availability of each language for processing. Their study on Bulgarian speakers in Germany illustrates how language dominance can contribute to attrition, emphasizing the interconnected nature of language systems.

The study of language attrition is not confined to a particular linguistic community. Research by Köpcke and Genevska-Hanke (2018) investigates language attrition and dominance among Bulgarian speakers residing in Germany. Employing an exploratory research method, they find a close relationship between language attrition and dominance, demonstrating how the constant use of a second language can influence the attrition of the first language.

The situation in Pakistan echoes broader global trends, where language attrition is fueled by the increasing need for interaction in multilingual societies. The study by Abbasi and Zakir (2019)

underscores the impact of language dominance on language attrition in Pakistan. Urdu, with its widespread use in media and education, has become a dominant language, leading to the attrition of regional languages.

Extending this line of inquiry, the literature on L1 attrition provides insights into vocabulary loss, lexical access problems, and the overall impact on linguistic proficiency. Researchers like Köpke et al. (2019) define language attrition as the gradual decrease of native language performance associated with increased use of L2 or decreased use of L1, illustrating the complex interplay between languages.

Exploring the cognitive dimensions of language attrition, Mickan et al. (2022) highlight experimental approaches used in L1 attrition research, suggesting the need to complement L3-specific methods. This emphasis on experimental approaches aligns with the broader trend in the field to employ diverse methodologies for a comprehensive understanding of language attrition. Research conducted by Mickan et al. (2022) delves into individual differences in foreign language attrition, specifically in the context of a 6-month longitudinal investigation after a study abroad program. Their study sheds light on the intricate processes of language attrition, exploring how exposure to a foreign language influences the retention and usage of previously acquired languages.

In the broader context of language attrition, studies have shown that an individual's first language is not a static system. Rather, it is subject to influences from second language acquisition, affecting lexical, morphosyntactic, and phonological levels. This dynamic interaction between languages has led researchers to investigate the impact of third language (L3) acquisition on previously acquired systems.

Cabrelli (2023), in "The Cambridge Handbook of Third Language Acquisition," emphasizes the growing body of research on L2 effects on L1 and posits that L3 can influence both L1 and L2. This suggests a bidirectional relationship among languages, where the acquisition of a new language can impact the previously acquired linguistic systems. The chapter discusses how linguistic factors among sequential L3 learners in a formal learning context contribute to the understanding of language attrition.

In the realm of L1 attrition, various theoretical frameworks have been applied to attrition data. These

include the regression hypothesis, markedness theory, learn ability theory, critical period hypothesis, social network theory, sociocultural theory, and ethnolinguistic vitality theory. These frameworks attempt to explain the mechanisms and constraints involved in language attrition, providing a theoretical foundation for empirical investigations.

In conclusion, language attrition is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that warrants continued exploration. The interdependence of languages, the influence of language dominance, and the cognitive dimensions of attrition contribute to the evolving landscape of linguistic diversity. Researchers and practitioners alike should collaborate across disciplines to deepen our understanding of language attrition, ensuring that linguistic diversity is preserved and celebrated in an increasingly interconnected world.

### Research Methodology

For the current study, Paradis's (2004) Activated Threshold Hypothesis (ATH) is employed. Paradis proposes that linguistic items possess a threshold that changes based on the frequency and recurrence of their use. When one language is acquired, the other language is automatically inhibited, leading to the elevation of the activation threshold of the acquired language. The procedures involved in this threshold analysis include analyzing the linguistic diversity of the user, noting acquisition time, studying the recurrence of language use, examining the use of the targeted language, assessing exposure to the language, and identifying factors responsible for language attrition. Paradis (2004) identifies lexical, phonological, grammatical, semantic, and syntactic levels as stages at which language attrition is possible.

The current study specifically focuses on studying the level of lexical attrition, utilizing Paradis's (2004) Activated Threshold Hypothesis (ATH). A quantitative method has been employed for data collection and analysis. Data were collected through simple random sampling and analyzed using SPSS software.

### Instrument

The research tools were developed considering the students' level, jargon, and register commonly used in educational institutes, especially in classroom

scenarios. The primary focus was on the lexical attrition of students in their native language, with students having different L1s, including Sindhi and Punjabi. A research questionnaire was designed, instructing students to answer in their native language for ease of understanding.

The questionnaire consisted of 10 simple and 10 specialized English words, serving as a task for participants to provide their exact meanings in their native language. The questionnaire design was inspired by Muhammad Riaz, Aneela Gill, & Sara Shahbaz's (2021) study on language attrition and its impacts on culture. While their study used a mixed method, the current research adopted the questionnaire idea within a quantitative research setting.

Questionnaire items were carefully selected, considering the classroom setting, jargon, and registers frequently used in students' daily lives within and outside the university premises. Lexical items were chosen for their frequent use in English language, and the lack of native substitutes was a key criterion. The researcher, facing difficulty in providing proper substitutes for these lexical items in the native language, considered it a suitable list for measuring the degree of lexical attrition among students of BS English at Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University.

### Data Collection

The data was collected from 100 final-year students pursuing BS English at Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazir abad, selected randomly, consisting of 58 male students and 42 female students. Final-year students were chosen as they are senior-most at the University, dealing extensively with language and likely having more lexical items from English language use in their daily routines, potentially facing more lexical attrition.

Data was collected from BS English linguistics and literature students through simple random sampling. The questionnaire was handed over to participants with clear instructions, asking them to write the exact meanings of given words carefully in their native languages. Participants were informed that it was a test for research purposes and would not affect their career or academic results. They were requested not to use a dictionary or any helping material, with the assurance that their identity would remain confidential, and the

data would only be used for the stated research purpose.

The collected data were converted into a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from Incorrect to Correct, and analyzed through SPSS software for statistical calculations, such as mean and standard deviations. Each item was assigned points: Correct=1, Almost correct=2, Unattempted=3, Almost incorrect=4, and Incorrect=5. Bar charts were also generated for a better graphical representation of the results.

### Results

The collected data were analyzed by using IBM SPSS Statistics 21 to obtain statistical calculations, including mean and mode of the responses from all participants, aiming to draw specific conclusions. The results supported the researcher's hypothesis that there is lexical attrition in the native language of learners pursuing BS English at Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazirabad.

The study revealed that a majority of the responses were either incorrect or almost correct and almost incorrect. Only a small number of responses fell into the category of exactly correct. Participants, who were final-year students of BS English at SBBUSBA, demonstrated a significant inclination towards English, neglecting their first language. English words were being used as if they were the actual native words, while their substitutes in the respective native language were largely unknown to the students.

These results pose a substantial threat to the participants' native language. The language appears to be undergoing the attrition process, primarily through lexical items, and this gradual shift may eventually lead to language shift or language death. The potential death of the language could also result in the demise of the associated culture.

The overall results are given in Table below, indicating that out of the 20 items, 6 received mean responses inclined towards the incorrect answer, 8 items were responded to in a way that their mean value inclined towards the unattempted category, while the remaining 6 words inclined toward a slightly correct value. This implies that no lexical item was found with 100% correct responses.



Lexical Items	Valid	Missing	Mean	SD
Normal	100	0	2.15	1.720
Anxiety	100	0	2.05	1.373
Regular	100	0	2.02	1.110
Punctual	100	0	1.60	1.155
Urgent	100	0	2.23	0.930
Fluency	100	0	3.25	1.714
Repairing	100	0	2.52	1.573
Routine	100	0	1.99	1.403
Discuss	99	1	2.24	1.333
Confidence	98	2	3.01	1.659
Campus	100	0	3.84	1.098
Management	100	0	2.69	1.398
Reference	100	0	2.33	1.602
Institution	100	0	1.53	1.123
Sessional	100	0	3.84	1.143
Assignment	100	0	3.21	1.313
Presentation	100	0	3.41	1.272
Scholarship	100	0	2.44	1.526
Definition	100	0	1.94	1.332
Remarks	100	0	3.47	1.605

The researcher organized the results into tables and graphs for a comprehensive view and better understanding. The tables and graphical representations of all 20 items showcase the responses from 100 participants. Frequency tables and graphs have been provided below, accompanied by a concise description to elucidate the researcher's findings. The frequency tables for each item have been separately given below along with the bar diagram of the results. It clearly shows the responses of the participants:

#### Normal

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Right	67	67.0	67.0	67.0
Almost right	2	2.0	2.0	69.0
Unattempt	2	2.0	2.0	71.0
Almost wrong		7.0	7.0	78.0
Wrong	22	22.0	22.0	100.0
Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 1**

Table 2 shows the responses for the word "Anxiety". Out of 100 participants 48 answered exactly right, 29 answers were almost right but not exactly, 6 participants could not respond to this item, 4

Table 1 shows the responses for the word "Normal". Out of 100 participants 67 answered exactly right, 2 answers were almost right but not exactly, 2 participants could not respond to this item, 7 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 22 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 33% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Normal.

participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 13 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 52% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Anxiety.

**Anxiety**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	48	48.0	48.0	48.0
	Almostright	29	29.0	29.0	77.0
Valid	Unattempt	6	6.0	6.0	83.0
	Almost wrong	4	4.0	4.0	87.0
	Wrong	13	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 2**

Table 3 shows the responses for the word “Regular”. Out of 100 participants 33 answered exactly right, 52 answers were almost right but not exactly, 2 participants could not respond to this item, 6

**Regular**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	33	33.0	33.0	33.0
	Almostright	52	52.0	52.0	85.0
Valid	Unattempt	2	2.0	2.0	87.0
	Almost wrong	6	6.0	6.0	93.0
	Wrong	7	7.0	7.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 7 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 67% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Regular.

**Table 3**

Table 4 shows the responses for the word “Punctual”. Out of 100 participants 74 answered exactly right, 7 answers were almost right but not exactly, 9 participants could not respond to this item, 5

participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 5 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 26% participants were unable to give the exact native word for punctual.

**Punctual**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	74	74.0	74.0	74.0
	Almostright	7	7.0	7.0	81.0
Valid	Unattempt	9	9.0	9.0	90.0
	Almost wrong	5	5.0	5.0	95.0
	Wrong	5	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 4**

Table 5 shows the responses for the word “Urgent”. Out of 100 participants 9 answered exactly right, 77 answers were almost right but not exactly, 3 participants

could not respond to this item, 4 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 7 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 91% participants were unable to give the exact native word for urgent.

**Urgent**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	9	9.0	9.0	9.0
	Almostright	77	77.0	77.0	86.0

Valid	Unattempt	3	3.0	3.0	89.0
	Almost wrong	4	4.0	4.0	93.0
	Wrong	7	7.0	7.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 5**

Table 6 shows the responses for the word "Fluency". Out of 100 participants 32 answered exactly right, 3 answers were almost right but not exactly, 10 participants could not to this item, 18 participants

gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 37 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 68% participants were respond unable to give the exact native word for fluency.

**Fluency**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Right	32	32.0	32.0	32.0
	Almostright	3	3.0	3.0	35.0
	Unattempt	10	10.0	10.0	45.0
	Almost wrong	18	18.0	18.0	63.0
	Wrong	37	37.0	37.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 6**

Table 7 shows the responses for the word "Repairing". Out of 100 participants 43 answered exactly right, 15 answers were almost right but not exactly, 3 participants could not respond to this item, 25

participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 14 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 57% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Repairing.

**Repairing**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Right	43	43.0	43.0	43.0
	Almostright	15	15.0	15.0	58.0
	Unattempt	3	3.0	3.0	61.0
	Almost wrong	25	25.0	25.0	86.0
	Wrong	14	14.0	14.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 7**

Table 8 shows the responses for the word "Routine". Out of 100 participants 55 answered exactly right, 22 answers were almost right but not exactly, 4 participants could not respond to this item, 7

participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 12 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 45% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Routine.

**Routine**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Right	55	55.0	55.0	55.0
	Almostright	22	22.0	22.0	77.0
	Unattempt	4	4.0	4.0	81.0
	Wrong	19	19.0	19.0	100.0



	Almost wrong	7	7.0	7.0	88.0
	Wrong	12	12.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 8**

Table 9 shows the responses for the word “Discuss”. Out of 100 participants 39 answered exactly right, 30 answers were almost right but not exactly, 3 participants could not respond to this item, 21

participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 6 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 61% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Discuss.

**Discuss**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	39	39.0	39.4	39.4
	Almostright	30	30.0	30.3	69.7
Valid	Unattempt	3	3.0	3.0	72.7
	Almost wrong	21	21.0	21.2	93.9
	Wrong	6	6.0	6.1	100.0
	Total	99	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.0		
Total		100	100.0		

**Table9**

Table 10 shows the responses for the word “confidence”. Out of 100 participants 31 answered exactly right, 12 answers were almost right but not exactly, 8 participants could not respond to this item,

19 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 28 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 69% participants were unable to give the exact native word for confidence.

**Confidence**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	31	31.0	31.6	31.6
	Almostright	12	12.0	12.2	43.9
Valid	Unattempt	8	8.0	8.2	52.0
	Almost wrong	19	19.0	19.4	71.4
	Wrong	28	28.0	28.6	100.0
	Total	98	98.0	100.0	
Missing		2	2.0		
	System				
Total		100	100.0		

**Table 10**

Table 11 shows the responses for the word “Campus”. Out of 100 participants 7 answered exactly right, 3 answers were almost right but not exactly, 18 participants could not respond to this item, 43

participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 29 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 93% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Campus.

**Campus**

		Frequency	Percent	ValidPercent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	7	7.0	7.0	7.0
	Almostright	3	3.0	3.0	10.0
Valid	Unattempt	18	18.0	18.0	28.0
	Almost wrong	43	43.0	43.0	71.0
	Wrong	29	29.0	29.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 11**

Table 12 shows the responses for the word "Management". Out of 100 participants 21 answered exactly right, 38 answers were almost right but not exactly, 8 participants could not

respond to this item, 17 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 16 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 79% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Management.

**Management**

		Frequency	Percent	ValidPercent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	21	21.0	21.0	21.0
	Almostright	38	38.0	38.0	59.0
Valid	Unattempt	8	8.0	8.0	67.0
	Almost wrong	17	17.0	17.0	84.0
	Wrong	16	16.0	16.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 12**

Table 13 shows the responses for the word "Reference". Out of 100 participants 51 answered exactly right, 12 answers were almost right but not exactly, 8 participants could not

respond to this item, 11 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 18 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 49% participants were unable to give the exact native word for reference.

**Reference**

		Frequency	Percent	ValidPercent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	51	51.0	51.0	51.0
	Almostright	12	12.0	12.0	63.0
Valid	Unattempt	8	8.0	8.0	71.0
	Almost wrong	11	11.0	11.0	
	Wrong	18	18.0	18.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 13**

Table 14 shows the responses for the word "institution". Out of 100 participants 75 answered exactly right, 12 answers were almost right but not exactly, 5 participants could not respond to this item,

1 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 7 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 25% participants were unable to give the exact native word for institution.

**Institution**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

	Right	75	75.0	75.0	75.0
	Almostright	12	12.0	12.0	87.0
Valid	Unattempt	5	5.0	5.0	92.0
	Almost wrong	1	1.0	1.0	93.0
	Wrong	7	7.0	7.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 14**

Table 15 shows the responses for the word "Sessional". Out of 100 participants 5 answered exactly right, 4 answers were almost right but not exactly, 32 participants could

not respond to this item, 20 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 39 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 95% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Sessional.

**Sessional**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	5	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Almostright	4	4.0	4.0	9.0
Valid	Unattempt	32	32.0	32.0	41.0
	Almost wrong	20	20.0	20.0	61.0
	Wrong	39	39.0	39.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 15**

Table 16 shows the responses for the word "Assignment". Out of 100 participants 2 answered exactly right, 42 answers were almost right but not exactly, 18 participants could not respond to this item,

9 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 29 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 98% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Assignment.

**Assignment**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Almostright	42	42.0	42.0	44.0
Valid	Unattempt	18	18.0	18.0	62.0
	Almost wrong	9	9.0	9.0	71.0
	Wrong	29	29.0	29.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 16**

Table 17 shows the responses for the word "Presentation". Out of 100 participants 8 answered exactly right, 21 answers were almost right but not exactly, 16 participants could not respond to this item,

32 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 23 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 92% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Presentation.

**Presentation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	8	8.0	8.0	8.0
	Almostright	21	21.0	21.0	29.0

Valid	Unattempt	16	16.0	16.0	45.0
	Almost wrong	32	32.0	32.0	77.0
	Wrong	23	23.0	23.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table17**

Table 18 shows the responses for the word “Scholarship”. Out of 100 participants 44 answered exactly right, 11 answers were almost right but not exactly, 18 participants could not respond to this

item, 11 participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 16 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 56% participants were unable to give the exact native word for scholarship.

**Scholarship**

		Frequency	Percent	ValidPercent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Right	44	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Almostright	11	11.0	11.0	55.0
	Unattempt	18	18.0	18.0	73.0
	Almost wrong	11	11.0	11.0	84.0
	Wrong	16	16.0	16.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table18**

Table 19 shows the responses for the word “Definition”. Out of 100 participants 55 answered exactly right, 22 answers were almost right but not exactly, 7 participants could not respond to this item, 6

participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 10 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 45% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Definition.

**Definition**

		Frequency	Percent	ValidPercent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Right	55	55.0	55.0	55.0
	Almostright	22	22.0	22.0	77.0
	Unattempt	7	7.0	7.0	84.0
	Almost wrong	6	6.0	6.0	90.0
	Wrong	10	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

**Table 19**

Table 20 shows the responses for the word “Remarks”. Out of 100 participants 23 answered exactly right, 6 answers were almost right but not exactly, 12 participants could not respond to this item, 19

participants gave almost wrong answers. Whereas; 40 participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 77% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Remarks.

**Remarks**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Right	23	23.0	23.0	23.0
	Almostright	6	6.0	6.0	29.0
	Unattempt	12	12.0	12.0	41.0

	Almost wrong	19	19.0	19.0	60.0
	Wrong	40	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 20

**Results & Discussion**

According to data analysis, 33% of participants failed to provide the exact native word for the English word "Normal." For the word "anxiety," 52% of participants could not provide a native word. Additionally, 67% of participants remained unsuccessful in providing the exact native word for "regular," and 26% were wrong in providing a proper native word for "punctual." A significant 91% of participants failed to give an appropriate word for the English word "urgent."

The lexical attrition continued with 68% of participants unable to provide a proper native word for "fluency," 57% for "repairing," and 45% for "routine." Moreover, 61% could not suggest a native word for "Discuss," while 69% failed for "confidence." The challenges persisted, with 93% unable to provide an exact native word for "campus" and 79% for "management." Participants faced difficulties with words like "Reference" (49% failure), "institution" (25% failure), "Sessional" (95% failure), and "assignment" (98% failure). Furthermore, 92% could not provide an exact native word for "presentation," 56% for "scholarship," 45% for "definition," and 77% for "Remarks."

The average percentage of participants unable to provide exact native words for different words was calculated at 63.9%. This substantial failure rate indicates significant lexical attrition among students pursuing BS English at Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazirabad.

The results reveal a concerning situation, with over 63% of responses being inaccurate. The excessive use of the English language in the daily lives of BS English students at Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazirabad, has led to the attrition of lexical items from their native language, where English words now serve as substitutes. This situation prompts reflection on the loss of language equating to the loss of identity. The study's findings act as a warning, drawing attention to an alarming situation that could unfold if lexical attrition is not addressed to recover the exact native words that have been lost.

The topic is of a very serious nature and requires a diligent approach for careful study. To comprehensively explore various types of first-language attrition in Sindh, it is necessary to conduct studies at a broader level. Due to time and resource constraints, this study was limited to lexical attrition and focused only on students in the English department at SBBU SBA. Future studies on the same topic are recommended to cover a larger population and consider other types of language attrition for a more comprehensive understanding.

**Conclusion**

The findings of the current study suggest that English students at SBBUSBA have undergone significant attrition of both simple and specialized words from their native language. The evidence of attrition in English students aligns with the researcher's expectations. The observed attrition may prove to be substantial in the long run, showcasing a trend of attrition at various stages. Contrary to previous studies, such as those by Bahrack (1984) and Olshtain (1989), which indicated that advanced students were more resistant to attrition compared to low-proficiency students, this study found that even advanced students experienced attrition.

Bahrack's study (1984) suggested that in the first five years of second language disuse, regardless of proficiency levels, all individuals facing attrition would undergo a similar process. Additionally, Ebbinghaus noted in 1885 that the more a person knows, the more likely they are to forget, establishing a positive correlation between the proficiency level of attriters and the extent of attrition. This study supports the idea that learners at advanced levels may experience higher levels of attrition than those with lower proficiency.

Tomiya (1999) claimed that first and second language attrition sets in within six months of disuse. Cohen (1986) proposed that recently acquired vocabulary is the most vulnerable to attrition. The findings of this study support these claims, indicating that attrition affects different vocabulary words across

various proficiency levels among final-year students of BS English at SBBUSBA. Importantly, this study contributes by shedding light on the role of class exposure in EFL vocabulary attrition, an aspect that has not been extensively explored in past studies.

## REFERENCES

1. Aftab, M. H., & Zaki, S. (2019). Language shift: Journey of third-generation Sindhi and Gujarati speakers in Karachi. *Bahria Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 60- 88.
2. Bot, K. D., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic system theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 10(1), 7-21.
3. Crystal, D. (2019). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. David, M., Ali, M., & Baloch, G. (2017). Language shift or maintenance: The case of the Sindhi language in Pakistan. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 41(1), 26-45. Doi: 10.1075/llp.41.1.02dav
5. Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Erwin, P. (2001). *Attitudes and persuasion*. Psychology Press.
7. Farisiyah, U., & Zamzani. (2018). Language shift and language maintenance of local languages towards Indonesian. *Advances in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities Research*, 165(1), 231-235.
8. Fill, A. F., & Penz, H. (Eds.). (2018). *The Routledge handbook of sociolinguistics*. Routledge.
9. Harlig, K. B., & Burghardt, B. (2020). Preventing attrition and promoting retention. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 19(spec), 66-81.
10. Janjua, F. (2005). *Political and sociocultural factors in language loss: A study of language shift in North Pakistan*. [Doctoral dissertation, National University of Modern Languages]. Higher Education Commission, Pakistan.
11. Ammerlaan, R. (1996). "You get a bit wobbly..." Exploring bilingual lexical retrieval processes in the context of first language attrition. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Nijmegen: Katholieke University Nijmegen.
12. Bahrack, H. (1984). Fifty years of second language attrition: Implications for programmatic research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 68, 105-118.
13. Cohen, A. (1986). Forgetting foreign language vocabulary. In B. Weltens, K. de Bot, & T. Van Els (Eds.), *Language Attrition in Progress*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Foris, 143-158.
14. De Bot, K., & Stoessel, S. (2000). In search of yesterday's words: Reactivating a long-forgotten language. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 333-353.
15. Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R. N., Moorcroft, R., & Evers, F. T. (1987). Second language attrition: The role of motivation and use. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 6(1), 29-47.
16. Gardner, R. C., & Macintyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 43, 157-194.
17. Hansen, L. (2001a). Language attrition: The fate of the first start. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 60-73.
18. Hansen, L. (2002). Saving in the relearning of second language vocabulary: The effect of time and proficiency. *Language Learning*, 52(4), 653-678.
19. Schmid, M. S. (2004). *First Language Attrition: The Methodology Revised*. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 8, 239-2