Policy Research Journal
ISSN (E): 3006-7030 ISSN (P) : 3006-7022 Volume 3, Issue 4, 2025

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

Ayaz Ahmed[*1], Waseem Ahmed Lakhmir[2], Rajesh Kumar[3], Faiza Fatah[4]

[*1]*Teaching Assistant, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Shaheed Benazirabad*
[2]*Lecturer, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Shaheed Benazirabad*
[3,4]*Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Shaheed Benazirabad*

[*1]Ayaz.maganhar@sbbusba.edu.pk, [2]waseemlakhmir90@gmail.com, [3]rajeshkumarlohana0@gmail.com, [4]faizafatah879@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15294577

Keywords
LexicalAttrition,Multicultural Societies,VocabularyTest, LanguagePreservation, Globalized Academic Spheres

Article History
Received on 16 March 2025
Accepted on 16 April 2025
Published on 24 April 2025

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 languageof 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'lexicalproficiencywithouttheaidofreferencematerials.UtilizingIBM SPSSStatistics21foranalysis, 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 Englishare 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, languageattrition is a global phenomenon that affects individuals across different age groups. Despite being a relativelyrecent 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 diversitythat individuals navigate in their dailylives. 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"thedecreaseinlanguageproficiencywithinanindividualovertime"(DeBot andSchrauf,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 increasingimportance has had various impacts on first languages. Theallure of English is drawingmore 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 studyaims to fill this gap byevaluating the extent of first language lexical attrition among students of the English department at Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Shaheed Benazirabad, whether partial or complete.

Thestudywasdriven bythefollowingmainobjectives:

- Toassesstheextentoffirstlanguagelexicalattritionamong Englishstudentsat SBBU SBA.
- Toelucidatethe causesoflexicalattrition amongstudentsofEnglishatSBBU SBA.

Theresearchquestions,integraltoachievingtheobjectives,guidedthestudy'sinvestigation.These were:

- Towhatextentdoeslexicalattritionprevailamong SBBUSBA students?
- Whatarethe primarycauses oflexical attritionamongSBBUSBA students?

LiteratureReview

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, likePakistan,havefacedchallengeswithlanguageattrition,leadingtothegradualdeclineofnativelanguageproficiency 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 shapingsocietiesandfosteringconnections.Theevolvingageshavewitnessedtheintroductionofvariouslanguages 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 particularlyprevalent in today's multilingual societies, where interactions in a second language maylead individuals to prioritize fluency and accuracy in that language over their native tongue.

Theneed forinteractioninamultilingualsocietyoftencompelsindividuals tofocusmoreon asecondlanguagethan 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.

Movingbeyondindividualcases,studiesonlanguageshiftandattritioninbroadersocietalcontextsprovidevaluable 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 prevalentinmultilingualsocieties likePakistan,wherespeakersadaptto aLinguaFrancaoradominant languageforeffective communication.

Researcherslike Barbara Köpkeand DobrinkaGenevska-Hanke(2018)havestudied 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 Köpke 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 firstlanguage.

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 decreaseduse 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 longitudinalinvestigation 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 acquiredlinguistic 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 useof 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 ineducational institutes, especiallyinclassroom scenarios.The primaryfocuswas onthelexical attritionof studentsin 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 useda mixed method, the current research adopted the questionnaire idea within a quantitative research setting.

Questionnaire items were carefullyselected, 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 usein 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 femalestudents.Final-yearstudents 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-yearstudents 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.

Thefrequencytablesforeachitemhasbeenseparatelygivenbelowalongwiththebardiagramofthe results. It clearly shows the responses of the participants:

Table 1 shows the responses for the word “Normal”. Out of 100 participants 67 answered exactly right, 2answerswerealmostrightbutnotexactly,2participantscouldnotrespondtothisitem,7participantsgave almostwronganswers.Whereas;22participantsgavetotallywronganswers.Itshowsthat33% participants were unable to give the exact native word for Normal.

Normal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	67	67.0	67.0	67.0
	Almostright	2	2.0	2.0	69.0
Valid	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	

Table1

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 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

		Frequ ency	Perce nt	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	48	48.0	48.0	48.0
	Almostright	29	29.0	29.0	77.0
Vali d	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 participants gave almost wrong answers.Whereas;7participantsgavetotallywronganswers.Itshowsthat67%participantswereunabletogivethe exact native word for Regular.

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	

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	ValidPercent	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	

Table4

Table 5 shows the responses for the word "Urgent". Out of 100 participants 9 answered exactlyright,77 answers werealmostrightbut notexactly, 3participants couldnotrespond tothis item, 4 participants gave almost wrong answers.Whereas;7participants gave totally wrong answers. It shows that 91% participants were unable to give the exact native word for urgent.

Urgent

		Frequency	Percent	ValidPercent	CumulativePercent
	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	

Table5

Table6showstheresponsesfortheword"Fluency".Outof 100participants32answeredexactly 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
	Right	32	32.0	32.0	32.0
	Almostright	3	3.0	3.0	35.0
	Unattempt	10	10.0	10.0	45.0
Valid	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
	Right	43	43.0	43.0	43.0
	Almostright	15	15.0	15.0	58.0
V	Unattempt	3	3.0	3.0	61.0
al id	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 answerswere 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	Percen t	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	55	55.0	55.0	55.0
	Almostright	22	22.0	22.0	77.0
Valid	Unattempt	4	4.0	4.0	81.0
	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, 3participants 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 nativeword for Discuss.

Discuss

		Freque ncy	Perce nt	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	39	39.0	39.4	39.4
	Almostright	30	30.0	30.3	69.7
Vali D	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 confidenc.

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

		Frequenc y	Percen t	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 exactlyright,38answers werealmostrightbutnotexactly,8participantscouldnotrespondtothis 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 exactlyright,12answers werealmostrightbutnotexactly,8participantscouldnotrespondtothis 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	Cumulat ive 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	

Table13

Table 14 shows the responses for the word "institution". Out of 100 participants 75 answered exactlyright, 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 answeredexactlyright,4answerswerealmostrightbutnotexactly, 32participants could notrespondtothis 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	ValidPercent	Cumulat ive Percent
	Right	5	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Almostright	4	4.0	4.0	9.0
V	Unattempt	32	32.0	32.0	41.0
al id	Almost wrong	20	20.0	20.0	61.0
	Wrong	39	39.0	39.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table15

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. Itshowsthat98%participantswereunabletogivethe exactnativewordforAssignment.

Assignment

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

Table16

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 thisitem, 32participants gave almost wronganswers.Whereas; 23 participants gave totallywrong answers. It shows that 92% participants were unable to give the exact native word forPresentation.

Presentation

		Frequency	Percent	ValidPercent	Cumulat ive 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	Cumulat ive Percent
	Right	44	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Almostright	11	11.0	11.0	55.0
V	Unattempt	18	18.0	18.0	73.0
al id	Almost wrong	11	11.0	11.0	84.0
	Wrong	16	16.0	16.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table18

Table19 shows theresponses fortheword "Definition". Out of100 participants 55 answered exactlyright, 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
	Right	55	55.0	55.0	55.0
	Almostright	22	22.0	22.0	77.0
V	Unattempt	7	7.0	7.0	84.0
al id	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

		Frequecy	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Right	23	23.0	23.0	23.0
	Almostright	6	6.0	6.0	29.0
V al id	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	

Table20

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 comprehensivelyexplore various types offirst-languageattrition in Sindh,it is necessaryto 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 besubstantial in the long run, showcasing a trend of attrition at various stages. Contraryto previous studies, such asthosebyBahrick (1984)and Olshtain(1989),whichindicatedthat advanced studentsweremoreresistantto attrition compared to low-proficiency students, this study found that even advanced students experienced attrition.

Bahrick'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.

Tomiyama (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 thisstudy 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 GujaratispeakersinKarachi.BahriaJournalofHumanitiesandSocialSciences,2(1),60- 88.
2. Bot,K.D.,Lowie,W.,&Verspoor,M.(2007).Adynamicsystemtheoryapproachto second language acquisition. Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 10(1), 7-21.
3. Crystal,D.(2019).TheCambridgeencyclopediaoflanguage (3rded.).Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. David,M., Ali, M., & Baloch, G. (2017).

Language shift or maintenance: The case of the SindhilanguageinPakistan.LanguageProblems&LanguagePlanning,41(1),26-45.Doi: 10.1075/llp.41.1.02dav

5. Duranti,A.(1997).Linguisticanthropology.CambridgeUniversityPress.
6. Erwin,P.(2001).Attitudesandpersuasion.PsychologyPress.
7. Farisiyah,U., & Zamzani. (2018). Language shift and language maintenance of local languagestowardsIndonesian. AdvancesinSocialSciences,EducationandHumanities Research, 165(1), 231-235.
8. Fill,A.F.,&Penz,H.(Eds.).(2018).TheRoutledgehandbookofecolinguistics. Routledge.
9. Harlig,K.B.,&Burghardt,B.(2020).Preventingattritionandpromotingretention. Language Teaching Research Quarterly, 19(spec), 66-81.
10. Janjua,F.(2005).Politicalandsocioculturalfactorsinlanguageloss:Astudyoflanguage 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 processesinthecontextoffirstlanguageattrition. UnpublishedDoctoralDissertation, Nijmegen: Katholieke University Nijmegen.
12. Bahrick,H.(1984).Fiftyyearsofsecondlanguageattrition:Implicationsfor programmatic research. The Modern Language Journal, 68, 105-118.
13. Cohen,A.(1986).Forgettingforeignlanguagevocabulary.InB.Weltens,K.deBot,&T. Van Els (Eds.), Language Attrition in Progress. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Foris, 143-158.
14. DeBot,K.,&Stoessel,S.(2000).Insearchofyesterday'swords:Reactivatingalong- forgotten language. Applied Linguistics, 21(3), 333-353.
15. Gardner,R. C., Lalonde, R. N., Moorcroft, R., & Evers, F. T. (1987). Second language attrition:Theroleofmotivationanduse.JournalofLanguageandSocialPsychology, 6(1), 29-47.
16. Gardner,R.C.,&Macintyre,P.D.(1993).Onthemeasurementofaffectivevariablesin second language learning. Language learning, 43, 157-194.
17. Hansen,L.(2001a).Languageattrition:Thefateoftheestart.AnnualReviewofApplied Linguistics, 21, 60-73.
18. Hansen,L.(2002).Savingintherelearningofsecondlanguagevocabulary:Theeffectof time and proficiency. Language Learning, 52(4), 653-678.
19. Schmid,M.S.(2004).FirstLanguageAttrition:The MethodologyRevised.International Journal of Bilingualism, 8, 239–2