

Eliminating Lingual Heir of AJKMigrants in Rawalpindi and Islamabad

Farooq Abdullah
University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Muzaffarabad
E-mail: gemini.soc@hotmail.com
Cell No. 03003740116

Abstract: Prior studies concentrated the process of migration and its holistic bearing upon the native language of migrants whereas migration is an effective process which bring about changes in patterns and stimulate social and cultural change. Socialization plays, radical agent of change, pivotal role at destination and migrants get assimilated with the trends and adopt the culture and especially the language undergoes agony. It may have strong impact of modernization to which the individuals and groups are vulnerable. Language of migrants is often under stresses and strains because of dominant language at destination. The research focused on "Obliterating Lingual Heir of Migrants: A Case Study of AJK Nationals in Rawalpindi and Islamabad." Objective of the study was to explore the lingual variation and domination among the migrants at destination for which a hypothesis was originated, migrants from AJK prefer to speak mother tongue at home, public places and also with natives, and was tested through statistical techniques. Mixed design, quantitative and qualitative, was employed and narratives were gathered through interview guide and carefully codified and analysed through, chi-square test, SPSS. Random sampling technique was smeared. It was concluded that the migrants that if children do not know their local language how could they be able to practice the values and rituals of their forefathers, especially when they do not understand the meanings of their language. Hence such situations do not only diminish the local language but also contributes in fading away a complete set of knowledge, information and deep rooted domestic and social practices. Language maintenance occurs at two inter linked level; where Parents adapt their own language use in order to promote desired linguistic competencies in their children and secondly Parents learn new language varieties, or elements thereof, from their children, who have greater access to the new varieties and eventually start to use them at home.

Keywords: Migration, Language, Development, Domination and Destination

1. Introduction

Migration is the "movement across the boundary of an area unit" (Boyle, et al. 1998), whereas a move within an area unit is, simply, a "Local Move" (Lewis, 1982a). Migration also has far-reaching charges for the social web of the communities affected i.e. the society of origin, the society of destination, and the migrants themselves (Mangalam, 1968). The interaction in natural language take place both written and spoken and language content of these interactions has been along acknowledged missing ingredients. Signals within language could provide insight into the social structure of the groups (Bramsen, at al. 2011). Weinreich (1953) expressed, "Language shift, which is defined as "the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another." Language is often regarded as a prerequisite for the integration of immigrants and as an indicator of adaptation (Mitchell and Myles, 2004). We focused on the time period of adolescence as this period is not only formative for adult years, but also seems a very sensitive time for change in second language use (Tseng, and Fuligni, 2000).

1.1.Pakistan

Language is a crucial part of any culture. It is a dominant feature in determining the bases of nationalism or ethnicity, as it represents a nation's identity and preserves its heritage. Language is also the driving force behind the unity of the peoples and makes them distinct from other nations. Language is never imposed but adopted and once a language is adopted, it is difficult to eliminate it from the society until the society decides to change or adopt something different. The question about the State language of Pakistan was raised immediately after the independence in 1947. Imposition of Urdu as the national language of Pakistan created disastrous problems for the country in the coming years. This decision was resented in East Pakistan and strong opposition came from its masses when the central government of Pakistan started the unilateral use of Urdu in money order forms, postal stamps, currencies, coins, railway tickets and official letterheads even without formally adopting Urdu as state language of Pakistan (Zaheer, 1994).

Rehman (2002) identified that power is the quality which enables the users of a language to obtain more means of gratification than the speakers of other languages. Forms of gratification can be tangible goods: houses, cars, good food etc. or, they may be intangibles like ego boosting, pleasure, and self-esteem.

The report, Pakistan Academy of Letters (PAL)¹, in connection with International Mother Day observed on Monday (Feb 21, 2011), revealed that language is the source of communication, education and progress and their extinction discontinues the transfer of social values to the coming generation and eventually the language is declared as dead languages. In Pakistan, Punjabi has the highest number of speakers which are 48 per cent of the total population. However, Sindhi language is spoken by 12 per cent, Pashto and Urdu 8 per cent, Balochi 3 per cent, Hindko 2 per cent and Barohi 1 per cent^{2,3}.

However, it is also possible for a dominant language to spread without an actual migration of its speakers. Typically, this second kind of language spread is related to the large power inequalities that emerge between groups of people as a result of modernization. When

¹http://pal.gov.pk/?page_id=604

²<http://www.dawn.com/news/608020/twenty-seven-pakistani-languages-may-extinct-soonunesco>

³<http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2011/02/22/national/27-pakistani-languages-nearing-extinction/>

modernization arrives, the traditional means of subsistence of an indigenous community often become unsustainable. In order to make a living, they have to look to the larger society and economy that have engulfed them and they have to learn the languages that are associated with the powerful groups in that larger society. It is these languages that may open the doors of advancement for them. As a result, the old languages lose much of their utility and come to be associated with backwardness (they come to be seen by their own speakers as “ghettoising”, as Tariq Rahman would say), while the dominant languages are associated with progress. In such cases, then, the dominant languages spread not because their speakers settle in new areas, but because members of the indigenous communities give up their inherited languages and shift to the dominant languages (Rahman, 2002).

1.2. Language: An Essential Component

Cargile et al. (1994) argued that “Language is an influential social force that does more than convey intended referential information”. Languages are a lived phenomenon stated by Soyinka (1988) and are vehicles of cultures, collective memory and values. They are an essential component of our identities (Edwards, 1985; Fishman, 1991; Giles et al., 1977; Khemlani, 1998) and a building block of our diversity and living heritage. The interaction in natural language takes place both in written and spoken forms, and language contents of these interactions has been acknowledged to have missing ingredients. According to Bramsen (2011), signals within language could provide insight into the social structure of the groups.

1.3. Adaptation

Language shift is defined as “the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another clearly stated by Vago (1991). Language loss is defined as language change that is speeded up within the individual or within the community and has been empirically verified. According to Mitchell and (2004), language is often viewed as a prerequisite for the integration of immigrants and as an indicator of adaptation. Tseng and (2000) focused on the time period of adolescence as this period seems a very sensitive time for change in second language use and is not only formative for adult years.

1.4. Extinction

Krauss (1992) quantified that 50% of the world’s languages are no longer being learned by new generations of speakers. This led him to conclude that “the number of languages which, at the rate things are going, will become extinct during the coming century is 3,000 of 6,000.” In

recognition of the importance of linguistic diversity, UNESCO in its 30th session of General Conference in 1999, declared 21st February as International Mother Language Day (IMLD). The declaration was motivated by the current threat to linguistic diversity posed by globalization and as well as the tendency to use a single language in communication, at the risk of marginalizing the other languages. According to a UN report, people of the world use about 6000 languages today. 3000 out of these 6000 languages are considered under threat of extinction mainly in America, Australia and Pacific regions. Today about 7000 different languages are spoken, and about one of them dies out in every ten days according to Yang (2006) and Harrison (2007). The split of Latin into different languages spoken from Portugal to Romania is well documented. Crystal (2000) aptly expresses, “that means, on average, there is a language dying off somewhere in the world every two weeks or so.” On the other hand, as argued by Baart (2003), nearly 70 languages for Pakistan are listed on the Ethnologue lists, a few of which are already on the verge of extinction. Others are quite subject to the modernization- related language attrition processes. In Pakistan, too, there is a genuine possibility that the number of living languages will be significantly reduced during this century.

1.5.Reasons

Miroslav (2010) explained that the reasons for language loss and language shift towards a stronger language which is frequently English, Gordon (2005) identified in ethnologue that languages of the world are numerous. Besides natural disasters (earthquakes, tsunamis, etc.) colonization, migration, and invasion, often resulting in cultural assimilation, or even genocide should also be considered as explained by Kachru (1985), Phillipson (1992) and Joseph (1995) in their work. Additionally, Grenoble and Whaley (1998) stated that factors such as the vitality of the language societal and cultural trends, which include migration Calvin (1983) and intermarriage; and language status and attitudes toward the language (Bley, 1989; Selinker, 1972) among others, possibly contribute to the endangerment of a language.

2. Materials and Methods

The present research was focused to find out, “Obliterating Lingual Heir of Migrants: A Case Study of AJK Nationals in Rawalpindi and Islamabad.” Objective of the study was to explore the lingual variation and domination among the migrants at destination for which a hypothesis was developed, migrants’ form AJK prefer to speak mother tongue at home, public places and also with natives. A qualitative and quantitative study was conducted with a sample size 95

households from Rawalpindi and Islamabad by using non-probability, convenient sampling technique. In-depth interviews were conducted along with a structured close ended questionnaire designed and data collected from the respondents. SPSS version 16.00 was used for the analysis of data and Chi-Square test was applied to check the association among the variables.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Hypothesis

1. Migrants form AJK Prefer to Speak Mother tongue at Home, Public Places and also with Natives

Table 1: Distribution of Preference of Language and Other Variables

Language Preference	Speaking Mother Tongue			Total
	Never	Off and on	Frequently	
Urdu	15 (14.25%)	9 (8.55%)	22 (20.9%)	46 (43.7%)
Hindko	2 (1.9%)	7 (6.65%)	26 (24.7%)	35 (33.25%)
Punjab	2 (1.9%)	1(0.95%)	2 (1.9%)	5 (4.75%)
Pahare	0	1(0.95%)	8 (7.5%)	9 (8.55%)
Total	19 (18.05%)	18 (17.1%)	58 (55.1%)	95 (100%)

Chi-Square = 14.179 df = 6 p-Value = 0.028

	Prefer Language at Public Places				Total
	Urdu	Hindko	Punjab	Pahare	
Urdu	45 (42.75%)	0	1(0.95%)	0	46 (43.7%)
Hindko	25 (23.75%)	10 (9.5%)	0	0	35 (33.25%)
Punjab	4 (3.8%)	0	0	1(0.95%)	5 (4.75%)
Pahare	7 (6.65%)	1(0.95%)	0	1(0.95%)	9 (8.55%)
Total	81 (76.95%)	11 (10.45%)	1(0.95%)	2 (1.9%)	95 (100%)

Chi-Square = 30.190 df = 9 p-Value = 0.000

Reaction of Children to Seek Mother Tongue				Total
--	--	--	--	-------

	Encouraging	Supportive	Discouraging	Humiliating	
Urdu	9 (8.55%)	13	21 (19.95%)	3 (2.85%)	46 (43.7%)
Hindko		(12.35%)			
Punjab	8 (7.5%)	21	4 (3.8%)	2 (1.9%)	35 (33.25%)
Pahare		(19.95%)			
	3 (2.85%)	1(0.95%)	1(0.95%)	0	5 (4.75%)
	2 (1.9%)	5 (4.75%)	1(0.95%)	1(0.95%)	9 (8.55%)
Total	22 (20.9%)	40 (38%)	27 (25.65%)	6 (5.7%)	95 (100%)

Chi-Square = 19.016 df = 9 p-Value = 0.025

	Speak Mother Tongue with Native People				Total
	Never	Off and On	Frequently	Often	
Urdu					
Hindko	5 (4.75%)	1(0.95%)	0	40 (38%)	46 (43.7%)
Punjab	1(0.95%)	0	0	34 (32.3%)	35 (33.25%)
Pahare	0	0	3 (2.85%)	2 (1.9%)	5 (4.75%)
	0	0	0	9 (8.55%)	9 (8.55%)
Total	6 (5.7%)	1(0.95%)	3 (2.85%)	85	95 (100%)
				(80.75%)	

Chi-Square = 59.865df =9 p-Value= 0.000

Table 1 shows that among the 95 households, 18.5% never preferred to speak their mother tongue in which 14.2% speak urdu, 4% speak Punjabi and hindko whereas Pahare language has not been spoken even by a single respondent. 17.1% respondents said that they speak mother tongue off and on when encounter with friends and close people whereas 55% respondents said that they speak their mother tongue frequently in which 24% speak Hinko their native language and only 7% speak Pahare language. Pahare language is diminishing with the passage of time and people prefer other languages to speak as their native language Hindko which is now spoken as pothohari here in Rawalpindi and Islamabad. The chi-square analysis shows significant values which sanctions the results and approves the association.

The respondents prefer to speak Urdu at public places a larger ration of respondents answered that they usually interact in Urdu language and it is almost spoken and understood everywhere. They said their children are also speaking their Urdu at school and elsewhere while interacting

and even at home they prefer to speak Urdu. 42.75% respondents speak Urdu, 23.75% prefer to speak hindko at public places with a low proportion of Punjabi as well but the Pahare language is spoken only by 6.65% people at public places. They said that Urdu is spoken at large that's why they have had to speak it and Pahare has a little utilization and only spoken at homes and with the native people and relatives. The chi-square value endorses the results and demonstrates high significance.

The respondents were asked about the reaction of their children towards the mother tongue and it was interesting that 38% respondents showed a supportive attitude towards their mother tongue in which 19.95% respondents were reluctant about their children that they have had positive attitude to their mother tongue and speak it but the real problem lies with pothohari which is the typical form of hindko, again the low ration among respondents and their children prefer to speak Pahare language. The encouraging ration is also low as 8.55% children of respondents prefer to speak Urdu, 7.5% prefer to speak hindko and Pahare language is again discouraged by the children of respondents as well. The discouraging attitude towards Urdu, as per respondents, was evaluated with a small proportion to the native languages and especially to Pahare. The chi-square value sanctions the results as significantly associated.

Among the 95 households 5.7% respondents said that they never speak their mother tongue at native place because they have less opportunity to visit their native place but when they meet their native people or relatives they often speak Urdu instead of mother tongue. 2.85% respondents speak their mother tongue with their native people frequently and get involve in speaking it more satisfactorily where as a larger proportion of respondents 80.75% respondents speak their mother with the native people in which 38% respondents who prefer speaking Urdu in normal routine speak their mother tongue with natives, relatives and friends while 34% also prefer to speak mother tongue with natives but the proportion of people who prefer to speak Pahare is very low as only 8.55% respondents speak Pahare language with their native people. The discouraging attitude towards the Pahare has different reasons as their migration is concerned. The people migrated earlier when their parents were speaking Pahare language but either their parents did not intend that their children speak their mother tongue or the cultural constraints have had been a hindrance in seeking and speaking their mother tongue. Respondents said that they understand the language but cannot reply in Pahare language but fault

lie either on the parent's side or acculturation responsible for the diminishing of Pahare language.

4.2 Cultural Perspective

Human beings are born with the ability to learn languages but the manner in which a language is acquired and used is culturally mediated. For studying the significance of language on its natives and survival of the language, it is pertinent to see the multifarious aspects associated with it. The present study aims to explore the implications of migration on the native languages of Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJ&K) along with other factors i.e. globalization and urbanization. Magnifying the root causes of demolishing languages of AJ&K, one comes to understand that how migration plays over whelming role in its devouring. The institution of family also plays the most vital role in it. It was observed that for majority of the migrant from AJ&K have critical trajectories due to utilitarian approach associated with it due to the transfer of culture through socialization and language.

A comparison showed that majority of the grandparents and parents proudly speak their native languages where as their children are rapidly getting alienated from the language of their forefathers. Majority of the parents do not speak their native language with their children rather they prefer to communicate with them in Urdu language. Among the permanently settled migrant families, the trend of communication between the children and their parents is majorly Urdu. Respondents were of the view that they prefer to speak Urdu with their children so that they learn command over Urdu language even before going to the school which would then connect them with the required market and also assures better future and secured career. One of the respondent highlighted that only she and her husband speak Pahari (Dialect of Hindko) at home whereas their children never speak it and prefer to speak Urdu because they do not like it and also feel humiliated or backward while speaking it. While in another interview respondent was of the view that there is no utility of teaching the native language to the children because it is worthless except communicating with their own native community members. On the other hand, it was also shared that in the new settings after migration there is no incentive in reinforcing the native language as it is not part of any curriculum, job requirements or not even substantial and routine interaction with non-speakers. Children need to strengthen their faculties in Urdu and English that can positively influence their future. Moseley (2010) clearly stated that language is a very important symbol of culture. Language conveys the traditions and cultures and also records

the history but many languages are becoming extinct. A language is considered extinct when the last person who learned it as his or her primary tongue (or first language) dies and no one else in the world can speak or write in that language. Nowadays, one language goes extinct about every two weeks, more frequently than bird species become extinct.

Discussion

It was witnessed that majority of the migrants from AJ&K, the relocation of culture through socialization and language has critical trajectories due to utilitarian approach associated with it. A comparison of three generations showed that majority of the grandparents and parents proudly speak their native language(s) where as their children are rapidly getting alienated from the language of their forefathers. One major significant reason behind this dilemma is that first two generations are more closely associated with their native land and they used to speak their own local language(s) but in case of third generation the situation is quite different, it is also observed that the third generation is normally settled abroad. On the other hand, they also live in different communities of Pakistan for education or earning purposes, thus they speak English or Urdu to get fitted in the area. Majority of the parents do not speak their native language with their children rather they prefer to communicate in Urdu language. It is commonly considered that whosoever communicates in their local language is either illiterate or less educated. It is also observed that people speaking native language are usually attached with the term known as backward.

Among the permanently settled migrant families, trend of communication between the children and their parents is Urdu. Families mostly converse in Urdu with their siblings and relatives and also promote to Urdu with others as well. There is less association found in permanent migrant residents and their language.

Respondents were of the view that they prefer to speak Urdu with their children so that their children have some command over the Urdu language even before going to the school. Most of the respondents also mentioned that the schooling is becoming the major reason in diminishing of the native language(s) where the Government schools in Pakistan usually teach in Urdu or English and the home assignments are also practiced in the same language(s). The migrants thus try to develop the foundation of Urdu language so their children may find fewer hindrances in schooling and even less in their respective career

It was observed that the children of the Migrants understand the language but cannot reply in their mother tongue. The child's parents communicate with each other in their local language, but when they speak with their children they either avoid communicating or unable to speak their mother tongue. So as a result, their children at least understand the meaning associated with particular local word but are not able to converse in response in the same language. The reason as observed was children were discouraged to speak their forefather's language in their childhood due to which they completely forget to speak their own language in the latter part of their lives. It is difficult to decide whether this breaking linkage between mother tongue and newly learned language is created by the parents only or the need of time to adjust in completely new different cultural setups. Sana Nawaz et al., (2012) expressed her view similar to James (1995) and stated that the speakers determine the future of a native language. Owing to the genesis of speakers' outlook and value system, the main determinant of language shift, the attitude towards the mother or native tongue, is evolved. This attitude speaks of speakers' choice of, and their attitude towards their own native tongue, ultimately paves the future of the language. Language-shifting is a complex and affected phenomenon, motivated and stimulated by accumulative force of historical, socio-cultural, psychological and economic factors.

Kerswill (1994) argued that the migration has profound sociolinguistic consequences, as the demographic balance of the sending and receiving populations is changed (migrants are typically young and economically active), and as the migrants are uprooted from familiar social and sociolinguistic set-ups, perhaps forming an ethno-linguistic minority which has to relate sociolinguistically to a new, 'host' speech community which in its turn becomes transformed by their arrival.

Socialization and enculturation is a cultural process that is largely responsible for acquiring the traits to become a 'cultural being'. These processes are not only there for lingual traits but also for adopting the established world views, values, norms and customs. It is known for making a person carry the cultural heritage according to the age, gender, ethnic classes, etc. According to the empiricist understandings of John Locke the human mind is like a blank tablet upon which the enculturation process imprints its learning and also help bestowing upon its practitioners the 'cultural mind'. These migrant families though attempting to preserve their native cultural belongings but their off-springs are exposed to a social milieu where they learn their 'host-language' more than their 'native language' in spite of the parental expectations, directions and

aspirations. The peer group influence was found to be one of the forceful factors for adopting the 'host-language' as their first language as compared to their mother-tongue. The children when enter their formal schooling years are supposed to communicate among their peers in a language already spoken by the majority group due to which the kids prefer to speak the language that is understood and uttered by their class and age fellows and friends both in and outside the school. This is also done to ensure the social approval on behalf of the age and class fellows to win the membership and association for the age and class fellows for socialization. Being deficient in the lingual abilities makes the kid unappealing for the rest of the class fellows and may be dropped from the all education and entertainment opportunities.

Conclusion

The relationship between migration and practice of native language is inversely proportional which is likely to lead to language death under the impact and influence of dominating languages of the area such as Urdu, Punjabi and English due to utilitarian approach. On the other hand, the migrant families have been adversely involved in disseminating the situation which is quite alarming and needs immediate concerns to preserve the local languages. If the family institution promotes their local language at least within the boundary wall of their home, it will be beneficial not only for next generation but also for the survival of the language and knowledge embedded in local words, terms and practices. Language ownership is to develop their local language in next generation. Off-springs use local area languages frequently to become an operational part of the culture and society to avoid the alien feelings. The parents feel this language abandonment as a threat of identity crisis. The Grandparents usually feel concerned about the grand children that they are getting away from their indigenous cultural roots due to less affection towards their local language, their cultural values and norms. It is also shared that if they do not know their local language how could they be able to practice the values and rituals of their forefathers, especially when they do not understand the meanings of their language. Hence such situations do not only diminish the local language but also contributes in fading away a complete set of knowledge, information and deep rooted domestic and social practices. Aurolyn (2005) stated that Languages in Pakistan are losing their large reservoir on account of less transfer of this knowledge to the new generation. Language maintenance occurs at two inter linked level; where Parents adapt their own language use in order to promote desired linguistic competencies in their children and secondly Parents learn new language varieties, or elements

thereof, from their children, who have greater access to the new varieties and eventually start to use them at home.

References

- Aurolyn, L. (2005). *Children as Socializing Agents: Family Language Policy in Situations of Language Shift*, University of Miami.
- Bramsen, P. M. Escobar, A. Patel, R. Alonso. Extracting social power relationships from natural language. ACL HLT, 2011
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1989), What is the logical problem of foreign language learning? In S. Gass & J. Schachter (eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 41–68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyle, P. et al., (1998) *Exploring contemporary migration*, London.
- Cargile, A. C., Giles, H., Ryan, E. B., & Bradac, J. J. (1994). Language attitudes as a social process: a conceptual model and new directions. *Language and Communication*, 14, 211–36
- Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2004). *The language revolution*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Rehman, T. (2002). *Language, Ideology and Power, Language Learning among the Muslims of Pakistan and North India* Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Rehman, T. (2007). *Language Policy, Multilingualism and Language Vitality in Pakistan*. Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan
- Edwards, J. (1985) *Language, society and identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R., & Taylor, D. (1977) Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307–48). London: Academic Press.
- Gordon, R. G. Jr (ed.). (2005). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, 15th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>.
- Grenoble, L. A. and Whaley, L. J. (eds.) (1998). Preface. In *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response*, L. A. Grenoble and L. J. Whaley (eds.), vii- xvi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Harrison, K. D. (2007). *When languages die: the extinction of the world's languages and the erosion of human knowledge*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- James C. (1995). *Endangered Native American Languages: What Is To Be Done, And Why?* The Bilingual Research Journal Winter, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 17-38
- Joan L.G. B. (2003). *Sustainable development and the maintenance of Pakistan's indigenous languages*. Conference On The State Of The Social Sciences And Humanities: Current Scenario And Emerging Trends Islamabad, September 26-27, 2003
- Joseph B. (1995). *Language choice and cultural imperialism: A Nigerian perspective* ELT. Journal Volume 49/2 April 1995 © Oxford University Press 1995
- Kachru, B. B.(1985). 'Standards. Codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle' in Quirk and Widdowson 1985.
- Kerswill, P. (1994). *Dialects converging: rural speech in urban Norway*, Oxford.
- Khemlani-David, M. (1998) *Language shift, cultural maintenance, and ethnic identity: a study of a minority community: the Sindhis of Malaysia*. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 130, 67–76.
- Krauss, M. (1992). *The world's languages in crisis*. Language 68. 4-10.
- Lewis, G. (1982a). *Human migration: A geographical perspective*, London/Canberra.
- Mangalam, J.J. (1968). *Human migration: A guide to migration literature in English*, Lexington.
- Miroslav Č. (2008). *Lakota Language Revitalization: Past, Present, and Future Prospects*. In Globalization and Its Impact on Localities. Ostrava: University of Ostrava. pp. 255– 261.
- Miroslav, C. (2010). "Language Death versus Language Survival: A Global Perspective." In Beyond Globalization: Exploring the Limits of Globalization in the Regional Context (conference proceedings), 51-56. Ostrava: University of Ostrava Czech Republic, 2010.<http://conference.osu.eu/globalization/publ/06-cerny.pdf>.
- Mitchell, R. & Myles, F. (2004). *Second language learning theories (2nd ed.)*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Moseley, C. (ed.) (2010). *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3rd ed. Paris, UNESCO Publishing. Online version: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/endangeredlanguages/atlas>
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sana N. et al., (2012). *Language Shift An Analysis of Factors Involved in Language Shift*. Global Journal of Human Social Science Linguistics & Education. 12(10) Version 1.0

Selinker, L. (1972) Inter language. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209– 31.

Soyinka, W. (1988). *Art, Dialogue and Outrage: Essays on Literature and Culture*. Ibadan: New Horn Press.

Tseng, V. & Fuligni, A. J. (2000). Parent-adolescent language use and relationships among immigrant families with East Asian, Filipino, and Latin American backgrounds. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 465–476

UNESCO. *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* 3rd edition 2010. Published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization with the support of the Government of Norway

Vago, R. M. (1991) Paradigmatic regularity in first language attrition. In H. W. Seliger & R. M. Vago (eds.), *First language attrition* (pp. 241–51). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Veltman, C. (1983). *Language shift in the United States*. Berlin: Mouton.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Yang, C. (2006). *The Infinite Gift - How Children Learn and Unlearn the Languages of the World*, Scribner, New York

Zaheer, H. (1994). *The separation of East Pakistan: The rise and realization of Bengali Muslim nationalism*. Karachi: Oxford University Press