HERITAGE LANGUAGE USE AND ATTITUDE AMONG EFIK MIGRANTS IN LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA

NWAGBO, OSITA GERALD
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS, AFRICAN AND ASIAN STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF LAGOS, LAGOS, NIGERIA,
osynwagbo@gmail.com

OYEKA, CHIAMAKA NGOZI
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS, AFRICAN AND ASIAN STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF LAGOS, LAGOS, NIGERIA,
coyeka@unilag.edu.ng

KEYWORDS
Language use, language attitude, Efik, language maintenance, Migration

ABSTRACT
Maintenance of minority languages in an urban cosmopolis is a huge challenge given the multiplicity of ethnic groups some of which are numerically dominant. Several studies have been carried out on maintenance of native languages in urban centers, but none has been undertaken on Efik in Lagos, Nigeria. Consequently, this study examines the state of Efik language in Lagos where the Efik are a minority group with a view to estimating language use and attitude toward native and host community languages. Through purposive and snow-ball sampling, a total of 176 families were selected for the study, and the questionnaire was used to elicit information from respondents. The result shows that parents who had high proficiency in Efik (Efik major) were more inclined to inter-generational transmission of Efik than parents with less proficiency in Efik (Efik minor). However, exogamous marriages played a significant role in the linguistic experience of Efik minor respondents, as ethnic disparities evinced the need for a neutral code (English) among spouses. In the case of attitude, there was symmetry in result as the two groups avowed positive inclination towards their native language and host community language. However, whereas the Efik minor reflected their attitude in practice with reference to Yoruba, the Efik Major did not. And, whereas the Efik Major reflected their attitude towards Efik in practice, the Efik Minor did not. The result provides the need for systematic and sustained effort towards reviving Efik, especially in multilingual spaces where its existence is precarious.

Introduction

In many urban centers in Nigeria, and most of Africa, there is hardly anyone who speaks one language only; the norm is to speak one's mother tongue or another indigenous language and the official language or a language of wider communication. A city such as Lagos, the former capital of Nigeria boasts of having within it, the highest concentration of different ethnic groups in Nigeria. As a matter of fact, there is scarcely any ethnic group that is not represented in Lagos. Aside the major ethnic groups (Hausa, Igbo, Yoruba) who are dominant, there are hundreds of other minority groups that share the geographical space. Although the Yoruba is the host community by virtue of ancestry, Lagos is seen as a home for all Nigerians and beyond. Due mainly to economic and commercial factors, and not least by the hospitable and accommodating nature of the Yoruba, the host community, many Nigerians from both rural, semi-urban and other urban centers have flocked to Lagos to live. This has resulted in the linguistic landscape of Lagos simulating that of Nigeria coupled with a motley amalgam of ethnic voices resonating in both external and nuclear domains.

However, the voices that are mainly heard in Lagos are the voices of the dominant Yoruba, Igbo and Hausa due to numeric. Consequent upon the same incidence of numbers, minority voices are less heard. It could be said that the voices of the majority groups have, over the years, silenced or drowned the voices of the minority groups in Lagos. Given the fact that in urban centers, minority groups encounter mainly people of the major ethnic groups, the use of their languages is grossly limited. In the neighborhoods, markets, schools, hospitals, buses and other transit modes, which represent common contact points in the city, minority groups are condemned to use a neutral language or the indigenous language of the host community, if they have facility in it. It is mainly in insider or nuclear interactions that these groups are opportune to use their indigenous tongues. However, even in the home, which is the best setting to use and transmit the ethnic tongue, there is still a battle for the survival of the heritage language. The external environment, in the form of the neighborhood, and school, for instance exert pressures on the home which affect language choice and use. It is easier for immigrant parents to maintain their heritage language, due mainly to history of using the language, coupled with the fact that, they may have been raised in a community where the heritage language is dominant. But such privilege is not enjoyed by immigrant children who found themselves in a multilingual space where their heritage language is not dominant, and whose history of heritage language use is restricted to limited interactions at home with parents.

There are two major blocks of ethnic and linguistic minorities in Nigeria; the Niger Delta and the Middle Belt areas of Nigeria. Adegbija (2004) categorises minority languages in Nigeria into three groups: those which have more than one million speakers like Fulfulde, Efik, Kanuri, Tiv, Ijo, Edo, Nupe, Igala, Idoma, Ebira, Ibibio; those which have about 100,000 speakers and the rest with less than 100,000 speakers. Thus, Efik is one of the major minority languages in Nigeria. Generally, such major minority languages are dominant in some states and local government levels where they function as unofficial official languages while the non-dominant ones are restricted to informal settings. It is based on this condition that this study examines language use among migrant Efik minorities in Lagos State; this is with a view to estimating the languages they used at home and the attitudes they evinced towards their native language and the language of the host community.

Hypotheses

Three hypotheses were developed and tested for this study as follows:

Ho1: There is no significance effect of demographics of age and other spoken languages on the choice of language used at home

Ho2: There is no significant effect of attitude towards indigenous language and attitude towards host community language on language use at home

Ho3: There is no significant difference between Efik with high proficiency and Efik with low proficiency on Attitude towards Indigenous Language, and Attitude towards Host Community Language

The Efik

The Efik are one of the minority ethnic groups in Nigeria, going by numeric. In political segmentation they are domiciled in Cross River

State and Akwa Ibom State, two of the six states in the South-South geo-political groups in Nigeria. The Efiks live along the basins of the lower Cross River, the Calabar River, the Kwa River, Akpa Ikang River, Eniong Creek, and the Bakassi Peninsular (Encyclopedia Britanicca, 2008). Efik is the native language of the Efik people. According to Offiong and Ansa (2013), Efik is classified under the Benue-Congo branch of the Niger-Congo language family going by Greenberg (1963), while Faraclass (1989) classified Efik under the Lower Cross sub-group of the Delta-Cross, an off-shoot of the enlarged Cross River group which is a major component of the Benue-Congo sub family. It is the official language of Cross-River State and widely spoken as a lingua franca throughout the Cross-River region. According to Noah (2004), Efik is one of the first indigenous languages to be reduced to writing. However, despite this early written tradition, the vitality of the language is still undermined due to attitude of the speakers. Offiong and Ansa (2013) posit that the speakers are not interested in studying it as a course in school, coupled with the fact that the history, literature and orthography of the language remain undeveloped.

Heritage Language Use

In the view of the Canadian Legal Information Institute (1991), Heritage language (HL) is seen as "a language other than one of the official languages of Canada that contributes to the linguistic heritage of Canada". It is used in reference to languages, brought to host societies by immigrants except aboriginal languages such as English and French (Cummins and Danesi, 1990). In terms of status in a multilingual setting, Yearwood (2008: 62) conceives the term as a "non-majority language spoken by an individual or group considered to be a linguistic minority". Similarly, Montru, (2010: 4) defines heritage language speakers as people "of a linguistic minority who grew up exposed to their home language and the majority language". This view is also shared by Valdes (2001) who avers that, it is a language used by people who grew up in families where a language that is not the dominant language is spoken. Later, Valdes (2005) expanded this earlier definition by including endangered indigenous languages in the fold of heritage languages. While acknowledging the status-based definitions, Polinsky and Kagan (2007) state that usually heritage language speakers arrive in their host community with competence in their indigenous language, but later, due to influence of social environment, develop a high level of proficiency in the dominant language. With respect to acquisition, HL speakers normally acquire their indigenous language via daily interactions with members of the family and kinsfolk in addition to some formal instructions, in some cases (Schwartz, 2010). As a result, the term heritage language may comprise the first languages of immigrants in different host communities and also indigenous languages of the native population. Other names used to depict heritage languages include "ethnic language, native language, ancestral language (Cummins & Danesi, 1990).

Research in the field of heritage language use has gained much traction among scholars (Fishman 1991; Guardado, 2002; Cummins & Schecter, 2003; Garcia, 2003; Cavallaro, 2005; Park, 2011). Heritage Language Maintenance (HLM) is a term used to delineate the efforts heritage language speakers make to maintain their ethnic or indigenous languages, in the immigration context. Maintenance of such language is deemed needful due to the minority status of the language amidst dominant languages in the host community. Generally, Mesthrie, 1999:42) defined Language maintenance as "the continuing use of a language in the face of competition from a regionally and socially powerful or numerically stronger language". Underlying this view is the fact that immigrants intentionally and deliberately use their heritage language, as a means of forestalling the encroachment and intrusion of the dominant societal languages. In the view of Kelleher, (2010), HLM refers to perceptions and behaviors related to the maintenance of a particular heritage language used by immigrants who hold cultural ties with this language, aside the dominant language in the host community. A major factor responsible for the conscious efforts in maintaining the heritage language is to avert the tendency of shift to the dominant language; a term known as language shift, which is concomitant to language maintenance.

The phenomenon of language shift is seen as the result of failure to maintain a language. In simple terms, when a community or individuals fail to use their language, shift to another language is possible. Language shift, the converse of language maintenance technically involves a drift from the use of the home language to the use of a more dominant community language, as a consequence of pressures from the dominant group (Fishman

1966; Rumbaut, 2009). The causes of language shift have been identified by several researches; in most instances, parents attach more premium to the utilitarian values of the dominant language, in relation to their children's educational success and upward social mobility (Holmes, 2008; Guardado, 2006; Lanza & Svendsen, 2007); many children are more interested in being accepted in the new society by their peers from the dominant language group, and therefore tend to prefer and favour the dominant language (Gogonas, 2009; Baker, 2011); the lack of institutional and community support of the heritage language in the immigrant setting is considered a major setback for maintenance and a catalyst for shift to the mainstream language (Guardado, 2006; Kopeliovich, 2011); the negative attitude of immigrant children who are so overwhelmed by the mainstream language they think their heritage language is not needful (Kopeliovich, 2011; Hasbun, 2005), as well as absence or inadequate instruction in the heritage language in school, despite a willingness to maintain the heritage language (Lee (2002).

However, language shift does not occur instantaneously; it is seen as an incremental and gradational process that takes some generations. In his three-generation model of immigrant language shift, Fishman (1970) maintains that the first generation of immigrants arrive with the new language and use it in the home with kin; the second generation are influenced by the dominant societal language and therefore are bilingual in the heritage and mainstream language, while the third generation have insufficient knowledge of their heritage language, having shifted to the dominant societal language. In support of this position, Churchill (2003: 32) opines that "the vast majority of immigrants and their descendants appear destined to continue the pattern of their predecessors where most lose the heritage language within three generations". Other researchers, however, are of the view that a shift or actual heritage language loss can take place over two generations (Brown, 2011; Fillmore, 2000). Incidentally, language shift or loss is detrimental to immigrants due to limited and constrained means of accessing and understanding their indigenous culture (Portes and Hao, 2002), loss of ethnic identity and self-determination (Moses, 2001), and constrained chance of developing self-esteem and positive self-image (Hinton, 1999).

The method

The mixed method (quantitative and qualitative) was adopted in this study for the purpose of collecting both numeric and subjective data. The population and locale of the Efik in Lagos is indeterminate, and consequently, three clusters representing the domains for most minority groups in Lagos were purposively selected, and they include Orile, Oshodi and Ajegunle. Through purposive and snow-ball sampling, a total of 176 respondents comprising 46 from Orile, 59 from Oshodi, and 71 from Ajegunle participated in the study. Data was elicited from respondents with the aid of a 2-page questionnaire. The focus of the inquiry was in the areas of language use in the home and language attitudes towards indigenous and host community languages. Additionally, unstructured interview was carried out with the aim of eliciting subjective opinion of respondents on areas which the questionnaire could not ascertain, and also to validate the quantitative data.

Data and Analysis

The analysis is undertaken by distinguishing between two groups of Efik in the sample; the first group is Efik with high frequency in speaking Efik, henceforth EHFQ; these are respondents who claimed in the questionnaire to have a native-like proficiency in Efik and who spoke Efik frequently, while the second group is Efik with low frequency in speaking Efik, henceforth ELFQ; these represent respondents with a low proficiency in Efik and who did not speak Efik frequently. In this study, it is reasoned that these two groups may not use their native language in the same way, and also may not have the same attitudes towards the languages in their repertoire. The Chi-Square test and T-test were used in the statistical analyses of data.

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

		EHFQ (N = 136)		ELFQ (N = 40)		Total (N = 176)	
Variable	**Characteristics**	**Num.**	**%**	**Num.**	**%**	**Num.**	**%**
Age Group (years)	20-30 years	42	30.9	12	30.0	54	30.7
	31-40 years	32	23.5	22	55.0	54	30.7
	41 years +	62	45.6	6	15.0	68	38.6
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0
Sex	Male	58	42.6	6	15.0	64	36.4
	Female	78	57.4	34	85.0	112	63.6
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0
Occupation	Trading	46	33.8	16	40.0	62	35.2
	Schooling	32	23.5	2	5.0	34	19.3
	Working	58	42.6	22	55.0	80	45.5
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0
Marital Status	Single	50	36.8	6	15.0	56	31.8
	Married	76	55.9	32	80.0	108	61.4
	Divorced	10	7.4	2	5.0	12	6.8
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2017.

The demographic data reveals that, out of the total number of respondents, those who were 41 years + accounted for the majority among the EHFQ, while respondents who were 31-40 years were the majority in the ELFQ group. In terms of sex, the females were more in number for both EHFQ and ELFQ groups. The data on occupation shows that workers and traders were more in number than students, while married respondents accounted for the majority in both groups. The discrepancy in the numbers with respect to age, sex, occupation and marital status was the result of the sampling method used in data collection which restricted study population to only those who were available at the time. There was no pre-determined plan to achieve symmetry in the number of respondents across the demographic variables.

Table 2: Language background

		EHFQ (N = 136)		ELFQ (N = 40)		Total (N = 176)	
Variable	**Characteristics**	**Num.**	**%**	**Num.**	**%**	**Num.**	**%**
First language/Mother tongue	Efik	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0
Second language	English	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0
	Others	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0
Other language(s)	Efik	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Yoruba	26	19.1	22	55.0	48	27.2
	Igbo	12	8.9	2	5.0	14	8.0
	Missing	98	72.0	16	40.0	114	64.8
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2017.

The data above indicates that Efik is the first language and mother tongue of all the respondents, and English is their second language. Other languages spoken are Yoruba and Igbo; a majority of the ELFQ reported speaking Yoruba in addition to Efik and English, while a minority of EHFQ reported speaking Yoruba. Yoruba is the language of the host community, Lagos. Although Lagos is home to all ethnic groups in the country, the Yoruba are the hosts with a dominant population. A minimal number of respondents from both EHFQ and ELFQ reported speaking Igbo in addition to Efik and English. Though Igbo are an internal migrant group in Lagos like the Efik, they represent the most dominant group in population apart from the host community. It is either that the Efik picked Igbo as a result of constant interaction with the Igbo in Lagos where they are ubiquitous, or they learnt Igbo due to constant contact with the Igbo in the South East where the Efik and Igbo share some boundaries. On the whole, this data shows that all the respondents are bilinguals mainly in their indigenous language and English which is a second language to majority of Nigerians.

Table 3: Language Use at Home

The data on language use at home shows the languages used by respondents at home in different role relations such as spouses, siblings and children. The data is presented below

		EHFQ (N = 136)		ELFQ (N = 40)		Total (N = 176)	
Variable	**Characteristics**	**Num.**	**%**	**Num.**	**%**	**Num.**	**%**
Language used with spouse	Efik	6	4.4	0	0.0	6	3.4
	Yoruba/English	0	0.0	3	7.5	3	1.7
	Efik/English	70	51.4	10	25.0	80	45.4
	English	0	0.0	19	47.5	19	10.8
	Missing	60	44.1	8	20.0	68	38.7
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0
Language used with children	Efik	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Yoruba/English	0	0.0	6	15.0	6	3.4
	Efik/English	56	41.1	0	0.0	56	31.8
	English	30	22.0	28	70.0	58	32.9
	Missing	50	36.8	6	15.0	56	31.9
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0
Language used with sibling(s)	Efik	10	7.3	0	0.0	10	5.7
	Yoruba/English	26	19.1	10	25.0	36	20.4
	Efik/English	100	73.6	10	25.0	110	62.5
	English	0	0.0	20	50.0	20	11.4
	Total	136	100.0	40	100.0	176	100.0

Source: Field Survey 2017

The data on language use at home reveals some discrepancies in the number of respondents that use a particular language among the two groups. In spousal interaction, 76 respondents for EHFQ out of 136, and 32 respondents for ELFQ out of 40 which corresponds with the number of those married in the two groups, responded to the inquiry on language used with spouse in the home setting. Among EHFQ, a significant majority 51.4% used a combination of Efik and English, while an insignificant minority 4.4% used only Efik in interaction between spouses. Among the ELFQ, an insignificant majority 47.5% used English only,

while a minority 25.5% used a combination of Efik and English, and Yoruba and English 7.5%. It is understandable that bilingual interaction accounted for a higher proportion of exchanges among the entire respondents (45.4%), and also that Efik was used solely by a minimal number of the EHFQ respondents, but it seemed odd that a number of ELFQ respondents used only English and also Yoruba/English. An inquiry to ascertain the reasons yielded the following results:

> ***ELFQ 1*** *(female): My husband na Yoruba so we no use Efik…I know small Yoruba and sometime I speak Yoruba to him and he is happy. But he no dey speak Efik, so no Efik for our talk.*
>
> ***ELFQ 2*** *(female): I married a Yoruba man, yknow, and we live in Lagos which is Yoruba land, and… I meet a lot of Yoruba people…my husband's friends, relations and some time we travel to his home town, Ilesha. So, it is natural, I mean, I have been able to pick some Yoruba, but not much. I speak a little Yoruba with him and we go back to English, but English is the main language when we talk…Yes, English is dominant.*
>
> ***ELFQ 3*** *(male): We no speak Efik for house because my wife is Yoruba woman, from Oyo. Na me dey try to speak small small Yoruba with her sometime…but she no dey speak Efik at all…she say Efik too hard.*
>
> ***ELFQ 4*** *(male): Me and my wife come from different places, so that is why we don't use Efik to talk in the house. I am Efik but my wife is Ibo. She is from Anambra State. Sometime if I speak Efik she laugh at me…she say my language is funny. So we don't use Efik.*
>
> ***ELFQ 5*** *(female): Yes, my husband is Efik and I am also Efik. But y'see, he does not speak Efik…He was born in Kano and he grew up there. His father was Efik but his mother was Idoma, that is Benue state. According to him, his father was a driver, driving all these big haulage truck from East to North. It was in one of the trips that he met his mother in Gboko and they married. So his parents were speaking only Pidgin…Yes his father was not educated and his mother too. Because of that he doesn't speak Efik but he understands small. When I speak it to him, he responds in English.*
>
> ***ELFQ 6*** *(female): We no fit speak my language (Efik) because my husband is Edo, Bini. I no understand his own and he no understand my own. So na Pidgin we dey take talk, or sometime he use English, but my own na Pidgin all the time.*

The interview result shows two reasons why the ELFQ used mainly English or a combination of Yoruba and English instead of Efik in their interactions. The major reason is exogamous marriage, that is, marriage between people from two distinct ethnic groups, as seen in the responses of ELFQ. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6, and the second reason is language loss which is also an outcome of mixed marriage as evidenced in the response of ELFQ. 5. In the instance of mixed marriages, the Efik respondents were proficient in their languages but did not use it for the sake of their partners, but in the case of language loss, the Efik respondent did not have facility in the Efik language due to history of language abandonment.

The data on language used with children revealed that more parents used a combination of Efik and English or English only in interacting with their children. In parent-child interaction, 86 respondents for EHFQ out of 136, and 34 respondents for ELFQ out of 40 which corresponds with the number of those married and divorced in the two groups, responded to the inquiry on language used with children in the home setting. Among EHFQ, a simple majority 41.1% used a combination of Efik and English, while a minority 22.0% used only English in interacting with their children. In the case of ELFQ, a different result was obtained; a significant majority 70.0% used only English, while an insignificant minority 15.0% used a combination of Yoruba and English. The implication of this result is that, a good number of the EHFQ were consciously transmitting their ethnic language to the subsequent generation while reasonable number were not. In the instance of ELFQ, non-transmission of the heritage language is the case; rather English is generically transmitted on account of exogamy, and a minimal number transmitted Yoruba, instead of their heritage language. What this translates to is that most of the children among the ELFQ will be proficient in a foreign language, while a little number will grow up speaking an

ethnic language that is not their own, with the attendant implications on ethnic identity.

The data on language used with siblings reveals a dominance of the use of Efik/English in such fraternal interactions. Among EHFQ, a significant majority 73.6% used a combination of Efik and English, while a minority 7.3% used only Efik. Non reported using only English in sibling interactions. This result is consistent with the fact of being pro-Efik in use of language. Incidentally, an insignificant minority 19.1% used a combination of Yoruba and English in sibling interaction. In contrast, a majority 50.0% among the ELFQ used only English, while a minority 25.0% used Efik/English and Yoruba/English in such interactions. This is a marked result indicating a subtle gap in social relationship among siblings. The use of a formal and foreign language in nuclear interactions is an exception to the rule, but largely, it is indicative of a weak or weakened foundation in the heritage language.

Language attitudes

The presentation of data on language attitude comprises attitude of respondents to their indigenous language and attitude of respondents to host community language.

Attitude towards indigenous language

The inquiry on attitude towards Efik is premised on three propositions as follows: ethnic identity, value of Efik and inter-generational transmission of Efik. The three propositions were used to evaluate respondents' opinion on language and ethnic identity, the prestige and intrinsic value of their mother tongue and their ability to transmit their indigenous tongue to their children. The data is presented below.

Table 4: Attitude towards indigenous language (Efik)

Items		EHFQ (N = 136)					ELFQ (N = 40)					Total (N = 176)				
	Characteristics	Descriptive Statistics					Descriptive Statistics					Descriptive Statistics				
		Num.	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Category**	**Num.**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Category**	**Num.**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Category**
Efik is my ethnic identity	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	3.60	0.575	4	0	0.0	3.55	0.749	4	0	0.0	3.59	0.617	4
	Disagree	0	0.0				6	15.0				6	3.4			
	Agree	48	35.2				6	15.0				54	30.7			
	Strongly Agree	88	64.8				28	70.0				116	65.9			
	Total	136	100.0				40	100.0				176	100.0			
Efik is very prestigious	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	3.69	0.464	4	0	0.0	3.60	0.591	4	0	0.0	3.67	0.495	4
	Disagree	0	0.0				2	5.0				2	1.1			
	Agree	42	30.9				12	30.0				54	30.7			
	Strongly Agree	94	69.1				26	65.0				120	68.2			
	Total	136	100.0				40	100.0				176	100.0			
It is important for my children to speak Efik	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	3.68	0.470	4	2	5.0	3.40	0.928	3	2	1.1	3.61	0.613	4
	Disagree	0	0.0				6	15.0				6	3.4			

	Agree	44	32.4				6	15.0				50	28.4			
	Strongly Agree	92	67.6				26	65.0				118	67.0			
	Total	136	100.0				40	100.0				176	100.0			
Pooled Mean Response				3.66	0.339	4			3.52	0.608	4			3.63	0.418	4

Source: Field Survey 2017. SD = Standard Deviation. Category: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3,Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1.

The measurement of language attitude revealed a great symmetry and slight discrepancy in the result of EHFQ and ELFQ. All the EHFQ were positive in the inquiry on Efik and ethnic identity as 64.8% strongly agreed and 35.2% simply agreed. In contrast, while a majority of ELFQ 70.0% strongly agreed and 15.0% simply agreed, an insignificant minority 15.0% disagreed with the proposition. The implication of this result is that the attitude of the respondents towards Efik in relation to ethnic identity was positive. The difference between the two results, however, is that, while EHFQ reflected their belief in practice by using Efik mainly in different role relationships, the ELFQ did not act according to their belief, thereby yielding a covert prestige. On the question of Efik and prestige, all the EHFQ were positive in their estimation; out of the total number, 69.1% strongly agreed and 30.9% simply agreed with the proposition. On the contrary, 65.0% of the total number of ELFQ strongly agreed and 30.0% simply agreed with the proposition, while an insignificant minority 5.0% disagreed. The evaluation of prestige is their response to the value of Efik. Given the positive inclination, there is no doubt that they had a high regard for Efik as a language. The fact that some of them did not reflect this positive evaluation in their behavior towards Efik is one of the sensitive realities of attitude measurement.

The respondents' belief about transmitting Efik to their children shows the same pattern as the earlier inquiries. Among the EHFQ, a majority strongly agreed to the proposition that it is important for their children to speak Efik, while a minority simply agreed, and none disagreed. In contrast, among the ELFQ, while a majority strongly agreed 65.0% and a minority simply agreed, 15.0%, an insignificant minority disagreed 15.0% and also strongly disagreed 5.0%. This result is correlated and consistent with the result of the inquiry on language used with children; while a majority of the EHFQ used a combination of Efik and English, a majority of the ELFQ used only English in interactions with their children, and none reported using Efik with their children. It is noteworthy that whereas no EHFQ respondent reported negative response to the inquiries on attitude, a minority of the ELFQ did. This result suggests that while many of the ELFQ respondents did not match their belief with action, some of them did. However, due to the mercurial and amenable nature of attitude, it is expected that, in future positive attitude may correspond with positive behavior among the ELFQ respondents. A statistical summary of the result showed symmetry in attitude of both groups of respondents to their indigenous language. This is shown below.

Table 5: Summary of attitude towards Indigenous Language (Efik)

Items	EHFQ (N = 136)				ELFQ (N = 40)				Total (N = 176)			
	Mean Response Rating				Mean Response Rating				Mean Response Rating			
	Mean	SD	Category	RI	Mean	SD	Category	RI	Mean	SD	Category	RI
Efik is my ethnic identity	3.60	0.575	4	Low	3.55	0.749	4	High	3.59	0.617	4	Low
Efik is very prestigious	3.69	0.464	4	High	3.60	0.591	4	High	3.67	0.495	4	High
It is important for my children to speak Efik	3.68	0.470	4	High	3.40	0.928	3	Low	3.61	0.613	4	High
Pooled Mean Response	3.66	0.339	4		3.52	0.608	4		3.63	0.418	4	

Source: Field Survey 2017. SD = Standard Deviation. RI = Relative Index. Category: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1.

Attitude towards host community language

The inquiry on attitude towards Yoruba is hinged on three propositions as follows: acquisition of Yoruba by parents, the value of Yoruba, and acquisition of Yoruba by their children. The three propositions were used to gauge respondents' opinion on assumption of another ethnic identity, the prestige and intrinsic value of Yoruba and perception of children acquiring another ethnic identity. The data is presented below.

Table 6: Attitude towards host community language (Yoruba)

Items		EHFQ (N = 136)					ELFQ (N = 40)					Total (N = 176)				
	Characteristics	Descriptive Statistics					Descriptive Statistics					Descriptive Statistics				
		Num	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Category**	**Num**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Category**	**Num**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Category**
It is important for me to speak Yoruba	Strongly Disagree	10	7.4	2.84	0.800	3	2	5.0	3.00	0.641	3	12	6.8	2.88	0.768	3
	Disagree	26	19.1				2	5.0				28	15.9			
	Agree	76	55.9				30	75.0				106	60.2			
	Strongly Agree	24	17.6				6	15.0				30	17.0			
	Total	136	100.0				40	100.0				176	100.0			
Yoruba language is prestigious	Strongly Disagree	6	4.4	2.81	0.735	3	0	0.0	2.90	0.545	3	6	3.4	2.83	0.696	3
	Disagree	34	25.0				8	20.0				42	23.9			
	Agree	76	55.9				28	70.0				104	59.1			
	Strongly Agree	20	14.7				4	10.0				24	13.6			
	Total	136	100.0				40	100.0				176	100.0			
It is important for my children	Strongly Disagree	4	2.9	2.76	0.691	3	0	0.0	3.00	0.555	3	4	2.3	2.82	0.668	3
	Disagree	30	22.0				4	10.0				34	19.3			

to speak Yoruba	Agree	92	67.7				30	75.0				122	69.3			
	Strongly Agree	10	7.4				6	15.0				16	9.1			
	Total	136	100.0				40	100.0				176	100.0			
Pooled Mean Response				2.80	0.583	3			2.97	0.476	3			2.84	0.563	3

Source: Field Survey 2017. SD = Standard Deviation. Category: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1.

There is semblance in the attitude of both groups of respondents towards the host community language; both EHFQ and ELFQ expressed a similar psychological disposition towards Yoruba. On the question of relevance, a majority of the two groups thought that it was important for them to speak Yoruba. Whereas 55.9% and 17.6% of EHFQ simply agreed and strongly agreed with the proposition, respectively, 19.1% and 7.4% simply disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively to the statement. In the same manner, 75.9% and 15.0% of ELFQ simply agreed and strongly agreed with the statement, while 5.0% simply disagreed and strongly disagreed with the proposition. The implication of this result is that the respondents positively evaluated Yoruba, the language of their hosts. In reality though, going by the language practice evidenced in home language use, there is little validation for this consideration among the respondents. It was only the ELFQ group that showed an inkling of gravitation towards Yoruba, as seen in the result of language use in the home. The EHFQ, who were more in number, did not report any use of Yoruba in any of the role relations. This is an indication that, although the group did not use Yoruba in their home practically, they thought that it was important for them to do so due to the facts of host-migrant relationship.

On account of value of Yoruba as an indigenous language, a majority of respondents in both groups thought that Yoruba is prestigious. Out of the total, 55.9% and 14.7% of the EHFQ simply agreed and strongly agreed to the proposition respectively, while 25.0% and 4.4% simply disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement respectively. Following the same trend, a significant majority, 70.0% and 4.0% of ELFQ simply agreed and strongly agreed with the statement respectively, while a minority, 20.0% simply disagreed and none strongly disagreed with the proposition about the prestige of Yoruba. The implication of this result is that, the respondents understood the clout of Yoruba as one of the three most dominant languages in Nigeria, with respect to numeric, but also the language of their hosts. However, in comparison with Efik, it seems that, the respondents thought that their indigenous language is more prestigious than Yoruba. No respondent among EHFQ either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that Efik is prestigious, while a paltry 2 respondents (5.0%) among ELFQ simply disagreed with the statement that Efik is prestigious. In contrast, 34 respondents (25.0%) and 6 respondents (4.4%) of EHFQ disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the proposition that Yoruba is prestigious, while 8 respondents (20.0%) among ELFQ also disagreed with the statement on value of Yoruba. Given the apparent status of Yoruba as one of the national languages in Nigeria due to spread and number of speakers, it is obvious that the respondents' evaluation which subtly places Efik above Yoruba may be an outcome of ethnocentrism or ethnic bias.

The inquiry on the imperative for the children of respondents to speak Yoruba yielded an analogous result from the two groups. It is noteworthy that, all the respondents submitted reports on this question, irrespective of marital status. This means that while the married respondents reported on the basis of their children, the unmarried responded to the question prospectively, in anticipation of their future children. Among EHFQ, a majority 67.7% simply agreed and 7.4% strongly agreed with the statement, while a minority 22.0% simply disagreed and 2.9% strongly disagreed with the proposition on the importance of their children speaking Yoruba. In the case of ELFQ, a majority 75.0% simply agreed and 15.0% strongly agreed with the proposition, while a minority 10.0% simply disagreed and none strongly disagreed. The implication of this result is that majority of respondents were comfortable with their children being bilinguals in two indigenous tongues, Efik and Yoruba. This is to suggest that they wanted their children to either integrate or assimilate into Yoruba society. For the EHFQ who are favourably disposed to bequeathing Efik to their children, integration is the preferred strategy whereby the children learn the host community language while maintaining their own. For ELFQ who were not so keen in transmitting their mother tongue to their offspring, assimilation is the preferred strategy whereby the children are expected to adopt the host community language at the expense of their own.

On the whole, it is notable that, despite varying dispositions toward Efik expressed by the two groups, they avowed identical sentiments with respect to host community language. This position is statistically demonstrated below.

Table 7: Summary of attitude towards Host Community Language (Yoruba)

Items	EHFQ (N = 136)				ELFQ (N = 40)				Total (N = 176)			
	Mean Response Rating				Mean Response Rating				Mean Response Rating			
	Mean	SD	Category	RI	Mean	SD	Category	RI	Mean	SD	Category	RI
It is important for me to speak Yoruba	2.84	0.800	3	High	3.00	0.641	3	High	2.88	0.768	3	High
Yoruba language is prestigious	2.81	0.735	3	High	2.90	0.545	3	Low	2.83	0.696	3	Low
It is important for my children to speak Yoruba	2.76	0.691	3	Low	3.00	0.555	3	High	2.82	0.668	3	Low
Pooled Mean Response	2.80	0.583	3		2.97	0.476	3		2.84	0.563	3	

Source: Field Survey 2017. SD = Standard Deviation. RI = Relative Index. Category: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1.

On the strength of the foregoing findings, it is pertinent, at this stage to evaluate the three hypotheses developed for this study. The hypotheses were conditioned on language use and attitude, as shown below

Hypotheses 1: There is no significance effect of demographics of age and other spoken languages on the choice of language used at home

Table 8: Association between Socio-demographic profiles and Efik Language Use at Home

Socio-Demographic Factors	Characteristics	Language Use at Home		Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
		EHFQ (N = 136)	ELFQ (N = 40)			
Age (in years)	20-30 years	77.8%	22.2%	17.470	2	.000
	31-40 years	59.3%	40.7%			
	41 years +	91.2%	8.8%			
Other language(s) used	Efik	75.0%	25.0%	8.980	3	.030
	Yoruba	58.8%	41.2%			
	English	82.3%	17.7%			
	Others	100.0%	0.0%			
Total		77.3%	22.7%			

Source: Field Survey 2017. Sample size (N) = 176. Methodology: Chi-square test of Association

The Pearson Chi-Square test results revealed that age and other spoken language(s) have significant effect on language use at home at Chi-Square value = 17.470 and 8.980, since p<0.05 respectively. The implication of this result is that such socio-demographic factor as age and other spoken language(s) influenced language use at home among the Efik respondents in the sample. In other words, different age groups' choice of language in the home differed from the choice of other age groups, and choice of language at home between those who spoke other languages apart from Efik/English and those who spoke only Efik/English also differed. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected

Hypotheses 2: There is no significance effect of attitude towards indigenous language and attitude towards host community language on language use at home

Table 9: Association between Attitude towards Indigenous Language (Efik), Attitude towards Host Community Language (Yoruba), on Language (Efik) Use at Home

Socio-Demographic Factors	Characteristics	Language Use at Home		Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
		EHFQ (N = 136)	ELFQ (N = 40)			
Attitude towards Indigenous Language (Efik)	Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0.0%	7.140	2	.028
	Disagree	0.0%	100.0%			
	Agree	75.9%	24.1%			
	Strongly Agree	79.3%	20.7%			
Attitude towards Host Community Language (Yoruba)	Strongly Disagree	100.0%	0.0%	10.135	3	.017
	Disagree	94.7%	5.3%			
	Agree	70.7%	29.3%			
	Strongly Agree	80.0%	20.0%			
Total		77.3%	22.7%			

Source: Field Survey 2017. Sample size (N) = 176. Methodology: Chi-square test of Association

The Pearson Chi-Square test results revealed that attitude towards indigenous language (Efik) and attitude towards host community language (Yoruba) have significant effect on language use at home at Chi-Square value = 7.140 and 10.135 (p<0.05) respectively. The results imply that attitude towards indigenous language (Efik) and attitude towards host community language (Yoruba) strongly influenced language use at home. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected as language use at home is affected by attitudes towards Efik and attitudes towards Yoruba.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between EHFQ and ELFQ respondents on Attitude towards Indigenous Language, and Attitude towards Host Community Language (Yoruba)

Table 10: Group Statistics and Independent Samples t-test

	Language Use at Home	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	T	Df	Sig.
Attitude towards Indigenous Language	EHFQ	136	3.6569	.33931	.14020	1.878	174	.062
	ELFQ	40	3.5167	.60835				
Attitude towards Host Community Language	EHFQ	136	2.8039	.58298	.14020	-1.613	174	.108
	ELFQ	40	2.9667	.47621				

Source: Field Survey 2017. Sample size (N) = 176. Methodology: Independent Samples t-test

The test, assuming equal variances, shows that there is no significant difference between respondents who used Efik and who did not on attitude towards indigenous language, and similarly on attitude towards host community language. The result implies that the hypothesis is accepted. Hence, respondents who used Efik and who did not share similar attitude towards indigenous language and attitude towards host community language.

Discussion

The discussion of results follows the trajectory of marked findings. First is the issue of non-transmission of Efik as a consequence of exogamy, followed by the dominance and sole transmission of English, and lastly the intrusion of the host community language in the migrants' homes.

In every multilingual and multiethnic city such as Lagos, one of the central interactional issues that usually arise is the choice of language both in public and home domain. Language choice is a major concern, especially in exogamous marriages, where the parents come from different ethnic groups. In mixed marriages, one of the major challenges that confront parents or couples is a common language to adopt for inter-personal interaction, in addition to the need to transmit the parents' indigenous languages to the children. Such decisions are complex and sensitive due to considerations of identity projection. Even in patriarchal African societies, men do not always have their way as language matters are not resolved by fiat but by conscious and deliberate practice. Holmes (2008) posits that mixed marriages lead to two critical state of affairs, language shift to a dominant language in the vicinity, and displacement of mother tongue of either the husband or the wife. In many circumstances, one parents' language is abdicated by the children. In rare cases, which is becoming common in contemporary times, both parents' indigenous languages are relinquished by the children due to the tendency to use a neutral language as a compromise. The shift from an indigenous language to a neutral language is a process of marginalisation that eventually leads to language endangerment if not checked. It is posited in this paper that, in mixed marriages, language choice is determined by the parents, to a great degree. Depending on cultural considerations, parents are in pole position to influence either the adoption of one of the parents' language or both. In most African societies, especially Nigeria, east of the Niger, children are expected to speak the language of their father because that is the language of the clan; the language that confers on the child membership of his/her ethnic group. Incidentally, depending on the occupation of the father, mothers spend more time with the children and usually exploit the opportunity to transmit their own tongues to the children. But both parents can consciously transmit their languages to their children if they desire, because children posses an innate capacity to acquire as many languages as possible (Baker, 2006; Montrul & Potowski, 2007). The One-Parent-One-Language (OPOL) strategy has been used by many parents to pass their languages to their children. The strategy involves each parent speaking their own language to the children, who eventually grow up with facility in both languages. In support of this position, De Groot (2011) evaluates the age effects of early exposure to two languages or more, and claims that early in life humans have a superior capacity to acquire languages in their environment. Thus, exogamy is not a deterrent or impediment in impartation of ethnic tongues but a stimulus that drives onward conveyance of dual heritage languages to future generations.

Non maintenance of Efik and consequently language shift to English at home among the sample is evident. As shown in the analysis, in both groups, quite a considerable number of parents spoke only English to their children; not to add the number of Efik/English interactions across role relations. The dominance of English in this context is not in doubt, given the official status of English in Nigeria coupled with its utilitarian benefits. It is noted by Romaine (2003: 528) that 'the inability of minorities to maintain the home as an intact domain for the use of their language has often been decisive for language shift'. This view is confirmed by Oller, Jarmulowicz, Gibson, & Toff, (2007) that minority children often experience a progressive shift from the home-language to the dominant language in the community, in this case, English. It is understandable that parents want to, from the onset, equip their children with the language which would facilitate their education, since English is the official medium of instruction in schools in Nigeria, irrespective of subject. This translates to the fact that English is their first language, though not their mother tongue, and in this transitory period, they are monolinguals in English. They will have to learn their mother tongue later as a second language, if they are opportune. Undeniably, the sequence of acquisition of the first (L1) and second (L2)

languages shows the language preferred by parents. Prioritizing English over Efik due to socio-economic factors pits the children in a precarious state with respect to learning their mother tongue. The usual sequence of acquiring the mother tongue at home, which is the traditional domain for the mother tongue, and the second language later in school, is a more acceptable norm for achieving compound bilingualism. The reverse, as evidenced in this study is problematic because it enhances and promotes monolingualism which is anachronistic. Exposing children to English at home, and further formally educating them in English at school leaves them no room to encounter and learn the mother tongue. When they eventually come in contact with the mother tongue later in life, it may either be too difficult or too late for them to learn, due to certain natural caprices and vagaries. De Groot (2011) submits that early in life humans have a better capacity for learning languages which declines with maturation. Initial exposure of children in their mother tongue has been found to be beneficial to the child, parents, and society, as it is related to promotion of self-esteem, learning of another language later, social control, traditional relationships and attitudes, cohesion and solidarity within minority groups (Edwards, 1984; Adegbija, 1994). It may seem attractive to have children who speak English only, but such exposure is detrimental to their ethnic identity and to the global quest for diversity. It is injurious to raise children in a language that expresses a foreign culture and world view. Since language is a vehicle used to transmit cultural resources, as posited by Fishman (1966), those children may not be rooted in the Efik culture, and they are bereft of that all important symbol which qualifies an individual as a member of Efik speech and cultural community. Without their ethnic language, such children are like outsiders, and may be treated so by other Efiks. The natural tendency of children to acquire languages implies that immigrant children exposed to a cocktail of languages are in prime position to acquire, at least two languages at the same time (Simultaneous bilingualism) or at different times. These two languages may include either the heritage language or host community language or may not include any of them. Thus, the ability of immigrant children to acquire their indigenous language rests squarely on the shoulders of parents. If parents grant their children sufficient exposure to the heritage language, they will acquire it in addition to the school language otherwise, children will acquire the school language at the expense of the heritage language. A major dimension in heritage language transmission is the lifestyle of city dwellers. The hustle and bustle associated with existential challenges leaves parents with little or no time to attend to their children's linguistic needs. Consequently children are left at the mercy of the linguistic environment.

The entrance of the host community language in the migrants' homes is a natural consequence of language contact. The first generation which represents parents may hold on tenaciously to their heritage language, but their children or second generation usually acculturate by picking the language of their host society. Hoff (1968) states that migrants who use the host's language are usually children, and they eventually bring the language into their homes and also serve as interpreters to their parents when the need arise. It is easy for children to acquire the host community language as a result of frequent associations and interactions, especially in the neighborhoods and schools. The language policy in Nigeria, as contained in the National Policy in Education (2004) prioritizes the child's L1 and the Language of the Immediate Community (LIC), but is silent on internal migrants' languages. This deficiency means that migrants who are students but far removed from their states like the Efik, have no option than to learn the language of their immediate community, in this instance, Yoruba, instead of their mother tongue. This scenario gives rise to two sets of bilinguals in the sample; those who speak two indigenous languages (Efik and Yoruba) as found among Efik Major, and those who speak only one indigenous language (Yoruba) which is not their own, as seen among Efik Minor. The grave implications of proficiency in Yoruba is identity dilemma, whereby the person sees him/herself as more a Yoruba and less an Efik or sees him/herself as both Yoruba and Efik. Additionally, given that identity is not limited to Self-perception but also to Other perception, when the person speaks Yoruba he/she may be mistaken by others as Yoruba.

Conclusion

Migration is a major factor in language maintenance as it reduces migrants' languages to a minority status, thus making it vulnerable to extinction in that setting. More impacting is the fact that, the children born in the new country/city or locale are more predisposed to adapting or adjusting to the linguistic pattern to suit life in the new place. If these second generation are not granted opportunity for

frequent contact with their home land, in addition to sustained practical use of the native language at home, they are bound to shift loyalty to the language of the host community or language of wider communication, with all its implications for identity projection. Irrespective of positive attitude towards a heritage language, reflecting that attitude in strategic domains such as the home is a major factor in language maintenance. Children do not just adapt to any language in their environment, but to that language that is systematically projected to them. Since, in Lagos State, regional languages such as Efik is not used in the education system, either as a subject or instructional tool, it behoves the parents and other concerned parties to re-strategise by first becoming purveyors and ambassadors of Efik, and by extension models of Efik identity and culture that the future generation will find irresistible.

References

Adegbija, E. (1994). "Language Policy and Planning in Nigeria" in *Current Issues in Language Planning*, Vol. 5, No. 3 pp. 58-61.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. (5th ed.). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism (4th edition).* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Brown, C.L. (2011).Maintaining Heritage Language Perspectives of Korean Parents. *Multicultural Education,* Vol. 12, (3), 46 – 58

Canadian Legal Information Institute. (1991, February 01). *Canadian heritage languages institute act*. Retrieved December 15, 2010, from http://www.canlii.org/en/ca/laws/stat/sc-1991-c-7/latest/sc-1991-c-7.html

Cavallaro, F. (2005). Language maintenance revisited: An Australian perspective. *Bilingual Research Journal,* 29(3), 561-582.

Churchill, S. (2003). *Language education, Canadian civic identity and the identities of Canadians.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Cummins, J. & Danesi, M. (1990). *Heritage languages: The development and denial of Canada's linguistic resources,* Montreal: Our Selves Education Foundation.

Cummins, J., & Schecter, S. R. (2003). Situating learning in home, school, and community. In J. Cummins, & S. R. Schecter (Eds), *Multilingual education in education: Using diversity as a resource* (pp. 1-16). Portsmouth: Heinemann

De Groot A.M.B. (2011). *Language and Cognition in Bilinguals and Multilinguals: An introduction.* New York: Psychology Press

Edwards J. (1995). *Multilingualism*, London: Routledge.

Faraclass, N. (1989). The Cross River Languages, in J. Bender Samuel (Ed), *The Concept and its Evolution*, Calabar: University of Calabar Press.

Fillmore, W. L. (2000). Loss of family languages: Should educators be concerned? *Theory into Practice*, 39(4), 203-210.

Fishman J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. (1966). "Language Maintenance and Language shift as a field of inquiry". In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Language Loyalty in the United States* (pp. 424 – 458). London, UK: Mouton and Co.

Garcia, M. E. (2003). Recent research on language maintenance. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 23, (1) 22-43.

Gogonas, N. (2009). Language shift in second generation Albanian immigrants in Greece. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 30(2), 95-110, doi: 10.1080/01434630802307908

Greenberg, J.H. (1963). *The Languages of Africa*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Guardado, M. (2002). Loss and maintenance of first language skills: Case studies of Hispanic families in Vancouver. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(3), 341-363.

Hasbun, L.H. (2005). Why a preference for English as a foreign language over a heritage language. *Filologia Linguistica*, 2,(1) 107-118

Hinton, L. (1999). *Involuntary language loss among immigrants: Asian-American linguistic autobiographies* (Report No. EDO-FL-99-10). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED436982).

Hoff, H. (1968) "The Young Refugee" in *Growing up in a Changing World*. London: World Federation for Mental Health.

Holmes, J. (2008). *An introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

Kelleher, A. (2010). *Who is a heritage language learner?* Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/heritage/pdfs/briefs/Who-is-a-Heritage-Langua ge-Learner.pdf

Kopeliovich, S. (2011). How long is 'the Russian street' in Israel? Prospects of maintaining the

Russian language. *Israel Affairs*, 17 (1), 108-124.doi: 10.1080/13537121.2011.522073.

Lanza, E. & Svendsen, B.A. (2007). Tell me who your friends are and I might be able to tell you what language(s) you speak: Social network analysis, multilingualism, and identity. *International Journal of Bilingualism,* 11(3), 275-300.

Lee, J. S. (2002). The Korean language in America: The role of cultural identity in HL learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum,* 15(2), 117-133.

Mesthrie, R. (1999). Fifty ways to say 'I do': tracing the origins of unstressed do in Cape Flats English, South Africa. *South African Journal of Linguistics,* 17(1), 58-71.

Montrul, S. (2010). Current issues in heritage language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 3-23.

Montrul, S., & Potowski, K. (2007). Command of gender agreement in school-age SpanishEnglish bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 11(3), 301–328.

Moses, M. S. (2000). Why bilingual education policy is needed: A philosophical response to the critics. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 333-354.

Noah, P. (2004). Toward a more phonemic Efik orthorgraphy, In O. Ndimele (Ed), *Language and Culture in Nigeria. A Festschrift for Okon Essien* (pp, 587-594), Port Harcourt: Emhai Press.

Offiong, A.O. & Ansa, S. (2013). The Efik Language: A Historical Profile. *Research in Humanities and Social Sciences,* Vol. 3, (21)

Oller, K., Jarmulowicz, L., Gibson, T., & Toff, E. (2007). First language vocabulary loss in early bilinguals during language immersion: A possible role for suppression. *Proceedings of the 31st Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 474–484.

Park, S. M. (2011). The role of ethnic religious community institutions in the intergenerational transmission of Korean among immigrant students in Montreal. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 24(2), 195-206.

Polinsky, M., & Kagan, O. (2007). Heritage languages: In the 'wild' and in the classroom. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(5), 368–395.

Portes, A., & Hao, L. (2002). The price of uniformity: Language, family and personality adjustment in the immigrant second generation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25(6), 889- 912.

Romaine, S. (2003)."Multilingualism" in *The Handbook of Linguistics*, Mark Arnoff& Janie Rees – Miller (eds.), U.K: Blackwell Publishers.

Rumbaut, R. G. (2009). A language graveyard? The evolution of language competencies, preferences and use among young adult children of immigrants. In T. G. Wiley, J. S. Lee, & R. W. Rumberger (Eds.), *The education of language minority immigrants in the United States* (pp. 35-71). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters. Russian language. Israel Affairs, 17 (1), 108-124.doi: 10.1080/13537121.2011.522073.

Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. K. Peyton, D. A.

Ranard & S. Mc Ginnis (Eds), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 37-77). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Valdes, G. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(3), 410-426.doi: 10.1111/j.15404781.2005.00314.x.

Yearwood, E. (2008). Psychosocial implications for heritage language maintenance. *JCAPN*, 21, (1), 62-63.