

## **Identity and Borrowing among Sierra Leonean Refugees in Oru Camp, Nigeria**

**Nwagbo, Osita G.**

Department of Linguistics, African and Asian Studies,  
University of Lagos, Nigeria.  
E-mail: osynwagbo@gmail.com  
Phone: 08027925545

### **Abstract**

*The concern of this study is to examine the manifestations of identity through borrowings among Liberian refugees in Oru camp, in the course of interaction. This is with a view to delineating the identities they projected in relation to their indigenous languages, Yoruba (the host community language), Pidgin, and English. The Ethno linguistic Identity Theory was used as guide while participant observation was adopted to elicit data from 30 adult respondents. The result revealed several socio-cultural borrowings mainly from Yoruba, as well as from the indigenous languages of the respondents (Menda, Temne, Limba). These borrowings involved lexical items related to food, medicine, drinks, socio-cultural relationships, etc. The study also revealed that code borrowing among the respondents was motivated by lack of vocabulary, the need to use a more fitting word, and the quest for comparison among cultural elements between two cultures. The trajectory of the borrowings was mainly from pidgin and English to indigenous languages. Despite the momentary nature of these borrowings, the result revealed that the*

*respondents identified with Yoruba to a little degree. Additionally, the use of cultural words from their indigenous languages showed that they were still emotionally connected to their culture, despite the number of years they had spent in the camp. Generally, the result indicates that Liberian refugees in Oru camp were bilinguals and manifest multiple linguistic identities and in this way underlined their psychological belonging to multiple spheres and groups in the camp. However, the pattern or trajectory of their borrowing revealed that they identified more with English and Pidgin, and less with their indigenous languages, and least with Yoruba, the language of the host community. It is recommended that refugees should identify more with their indigenous languages and the host community language for reasons of language vitality, inclusion and the benefits of diversity.*

**Keywords:** *refugees, linguistic identity, code switching, Face, ethno linguistics.*

## **Introduction**

This study is an empirical examination of the place of language in the construction of multifarious identities during interaction among Sierra Leonean refugees in Oru refugee camp, Ogun State. It is acknowledged that refugees are confronted with numerous challenges, ranging from food, healthcare, shelter, resettlement, etc. However, this study is specifically on the language and identity question in the experience of refugees. The reason for opting to study the language proposition, among all other inconveniences encountered by refugees is because language is central in the lives of individuals as a veritable means of identification and solidarity within and across cultures (Kim, 2001; Berry, 2008). This is especially so as the refugees in this study have emerged from a

hostile situation where survival partly depended on the language or identity one expressed (Ed-zar-zar, 2002). Of course, this is not a submission that inter-ethnic hostilities are provoked by linguistic disparities; instead, it is other socio-political paroxysms which dislocate the equilibrium of society (Fishman 1968; Romaine 2003). However, irrespective of the remoteness of language factors from the socio-political antecedents which precipitate some of these cataclysmic conditions, one of the consequences is that the citizens of the affected countries, like the ones in this study, are often conscious of the primacy of ethnolinguistic identity in their daily lives; that is, their own language and culture in contrast to the language and culture of others.

However, refugees who live among a different ethnolinguistic group often find themselves in a cultural dilemma. According to Albrecht (2001) life as a refugee is problematic as it adversely affects one's sense of identity. Apart from material challenges, language barriers also frequently pose a difficulty as refugees struggle with issues of identity and belonging in a completely different ethnolinguistic environment (UNHCR 2008). They are usually presented with a bouquet of linguistic alternatives which often persuade them to re-negotiate their identities. The question is, should they retain their heritage linguistic identity or should they adjust and identify with their host's culture. Whichever option they adopt has benefits and challenges; if they choose to maintain their indigenous languages they benefit from perpetuating their language and culture through transmission to subsequent generations, and also a maintenance of ethnic identity, but they might lose face with the host community. On the other hand, if they opt to acculturate by adopting the language of their hosts, they enjoy some instrumental benefits, depending on the utilitarian values of

the host's language, but risk losing their ethnic culture depending on the degree and pattern of acculturation.

### **The Concept of Borrowing**

In this section, attention is focused on how respondents manifested various identities in the camp in the course of interaction. Interaction, in this module is limited to verbal exchanges between or among participants. Franceschini (1998 cited in Guerini 2005) defines interaction as a hyperonym designating all the verbal activities normally carried out by human beings; one of these activities is conversation, that is to say, face-to-face interaction taking place at the simultaneous (physical) presence of all the participants. Taylor (1994) posits that it is not just language but also discourse which is important in the formation and shaping of identity, which arises out of interaction. The purpose of interaction, among other things, is to give and receive information and also to project a face or image; to show other participants who you are and how you want to be seen.

This paper precisely focuses on one means through which identities were manifested in the sample in the course of conversation between or among participants. This strategy is borrowing which is examined in this study as a linguistic device through which identity is constructed. Through the system of borrowing speakers identify with a culture or cultures and by this means construct their own identities, and/or other identities. Unlike code switching and code mixing which involve a shift from one language to the other, borrowing is a system whereby an item from one language is borrowed to become part of the other language (Hudson 2001). Hudson (2008: 55) further states that 'the same can be true, to a more limited extent, of languages that we do not use

regularly and which we may hardly know at all'. This is to suggest that the speaker may not have any considerable level of fluency in the borrowed language. Borrowing therefore represents a common and secondary means of manifesting other identities. Hudson highlights two reasons for borrowing; one, to pretend just for a moment to be a native speaker in the borrowed language; two, unavailability of a word in a speaker's language. This position is further clarified by Holmes (2008; 42) who states that:

When speaking a second language, for instance, people will often use a term from their mother tongue or first language because they didn't know the appropriate word in their second language. These switches are triggered by lack of vocabulary.

It is a fact that many lexical items mainly involving African tradition like cuisine and fashion do not have equivalents in English. A third reason for borrowing is that a speaker may have an equivalent word in his own language but he nevertheless uses an item from another language because it is more fitting or more aptly captures a situation.

### **Objectives**

The general aim of this study is the investigation of borrowing as an interactional strategy to index identity, adopted by Sierra Leonean refugees in Oru camp. Specifically, the study aims at evaluating the motivations for borrowing among the sampled participants in Oru camp. Additionally, the study aims at examining the sources and nature of the borrowings, and their implications for identity projection.

### **Ethnolinguistic Identity Theory (ELIT)**

Ethnolinguistic identity theory is a social psychological approach proposed by Giles and Johnson in 1981 as an extension of Social Identity Theory (SIT), (Oakes 2001). Giles and Johnson (1987) hold that as people grow up they also learn to group themselves and other people into social categories which usually use language as a marker for ethnic distinctiveness. Korth (2005) stresses that social categorization often employs language as a marker for ethnic distinctiveness. Additionally she stresses the demand of ELIT that individuals may feel a sense of belonging to a group because they feel that they share the same system of symbols and meanings (language) which implies an Us-feeling; and also the fact that those who identify themselves with a particular group are more likely to use the language of that group.

Masaki et al (2010) posit that ELIT is one of the theories which provide explanation for the conceptual link between an individual's language use and cultural adaptation, including ethnic identity. This indicates that as far as ELIT is concerned, language represents a core or primary aspect of an individual's social group identity and to an extent worldview (Giles and Johnson 1987). Contingent with this position, an individual's view of his or her heritage culture against the other cultures is found to correlate with language preference, knowledge and actual use (Phinney, 2001). One of the vital revisions made in the ELIT theory is the introduction of the concept of convergence and divergence. Convergence and divergence are methods whereby individuals adapt to the communication patterns of each other during interaction (Giles and Coupland 1991). In this instance, individuals from minority groups adopt patterns of the dominant group speech for the purpose of social approval (Hudson 2000). On the other hand, divergence is a communicative device used to emphasise the language of the minority group for the purpose of marking

differences between the in-group and the dominant out-group. It follows that whereas convergence enhances solidarity with the out-group, divergence accentuates difference with the out-group. This relationship does not necessarily imply total assimilation as in the original formulation of ELIT but recognises intermediate states of acculturation where both dominant and minority identities are retained (Oakes 2001).

### **Methodology**

The approach used in this study is the qualitative method. The approach aims at gaining understanding of people's attitudes, behaviours, value systems, concerns, motivations, objectives, culture or lifestyle. The sample for this study is the Oru refugee camp in Ogun State Nigeria. The population of the sample was about 2000 going by the opinion of the leaders of the Sierra Leonean group in the camp. However, 30 respondents were purposively sampled for this study. The reason for the limited number is that this is a qualitative investigation.

### **Research Instrument**

The research instrument employed to collect information in this study is participant observation. According to Krulfeld (1998) participant observation proves to be highly essential for refugee research due to the fact that refugees often do not trust researchers who usually come from stable dominant groups. However, the fact that refugees are reachable, due to their peculiar circumstances, offer researchers the opportunity to relate with them in everyday life and by so doing build up trust which is necessary to obtain reliable data. In the course of this research, the researcher became very familiar and involved with some of the residents in Oru camp, with respect to their socio-economic condition. The factors that were

observed were mainly aspects of identity projection in interactions exemplified in borrowing of lexical items from different languages. The observation of these linguistic norms entails total concentration and alertness; some of the observations were collected as field notes, while some were secretly recorded. However, in keeping with the ethics of research, the respondents willingly gave their oral permission to use the recorded information in the research.

### **Language information**

The indigenous languages identified among the sampled Liberian refugees were mainly Mende, Temne, Limba, English, and Krio. Others are Susu, Krio, Fula, Kono, Shabro, Kru, Mandingo, Bassa. However, among these languages, Krio is considered a national lingua franca owing to its wide use throughout the country. However, it is native to the Sierra Leonean Krio people or Krios who number about 100,000 presently and probably the most widely spoken of all Sierra Leonean languages (Sengova 1987). Fyle (1994: 47) states that Krio has assumed recognition as ‘the main vehicle of communication’ in Sierra Leone, and used in the market place and in political speeches in making policy statements by heads of states. In the education sector, Krio is used to introduce pupils to English; thus, Krio is the window through which students gain entrance into modern education. It is also used in entertainment and enlightenment programmes.

The respondents claimed an indigenous language as their first language. On the other hand, all the respondents claimed English as their second language. This is expected because English is the official language in Liberia (Ngovo, 1988). In addition to these, the language of the host community is Yoruba. It is therefore obvious that the refugees were domiciled within one of the three dominant ethno linguistic groups in Nigeria.



## **Results, Analysis and Discussion**

In this section, the results of the study are presented, analysed and discussed.

### **Borrowing samples**

There are several borrowing samples observed in the course of the research. These borrowings comprise loan words from Yoruba, and the indigenous languages of the refugees. The data are presented below.

### **Socio-cultural Borrowings from Yoruba**

The Borrowing of social words from Yoruba is a similar strategy adopted by the respondents to manifest identity with the host community in the course of a conversation. These borrowings, by their nature, could be termed social borrowings because they involved referents to individuals' social relationships, positions and transactions. Some of the borrowings observed in the data are *oga*(master), *fissi* (extra benefit after buying a product), *olopa* (police) *oyibo* (white man), *ogogoro* (local hot drink) *ashawo* (prostitute). The occurrences of these loan words are shown in the data below. The borrowed words are in italics.

Examples 1: Interactions between Sule (SU) a Sierra Leonean and a Yoruba bread supplier (BS)

1. SU: O you don come *oga mi*  
(*Have you come, my master?*)
2. BS: Yes – o, you de wait for me?  
(*Yes, were you waiting for me?*)
3. SU: Since morning

Example 2: An extract of a narration to the researcher (RES) by Mr. Lebbie (LB) about the fate of three Liberians who raped a Yoruba woman at the camp gate.

1. LB: You no know dat Yoruba woman wey stay for gate de cook, wash cloth?  
*(Don't you know that Yoruba woman who stays at the gate washing and cooking)*
2. RES: Ok but you say de woman no well.  
*(Alright, but you told me the woman is not well)*
3. LB: Yes, dat is why people feel bad. Can you imagine, three men raping dat woman
4. *(Yes, that is why people are not happy. Can you imagine three men raping that woman).*
5. RES: Oh no
6. LB: I sorry for dem, since *olopa* come and arrest dem, we never see den. Den go suffer.  
*(I am sorry for them, since the police arrested them we have not seen them. They will suffer)*

Example 3: Interaction between a Yoruba palm wine seller (PS) and a Sierra Leone buyer (SB)

1. PS: How much own you want?  
*(How much palm wine do you want?)*
2. SB: Jus one cup... but you go gimme*fissi* – o  
*(only one cup, but you will give me extra)*
3. PS: No problem  
*(it is alright)*

Example 4: Interaction between prince (PC) a Sierra Leonean young man and the Researcher (RES)

1. PC: I hear say den kidnap some school children for Aba.  
*(I heard that they kidnapped some school children in Aba)*
2. RES: Yes, na last week.  
*(Yes, that was last week)*
3. PC: I think say na only Oyibo den de kidnap.  
*(I thought they kidnap only white people).*
4. RES: No, dey don turn am to business  
*(No they have turned it to business)*

Example 5: Conversation between Sally (SA) from and Hawa (HA) from Mende while watching a Nigerian home video showing a pastor consulting a native doctor.

1. FA: Den own power, den no get am from God, den get juju from babalawo jus to
2. deceive people.  
*(Their own power is not from God. They use juju from witch doctor to deceive people)*
3. HA: See, na *ogoro* den de drink and den say den be pastor.  
*(Look they are drinking alcohol and they say they are pastors)*

Example 6: Interaction between the researcher (RES) and Saffiatu (SU)

1. SU: You no hear wetin den do dat mad woman for gate?

*(Did you not hear what they did to that mad woman at the gate?)*

2. RES: Yes, chairman tell me.  
*(Yes, chairman told me)*
3. SU: Can you imagine, three young men run dat old woman, hey God... anyway 4. e no surprise me, den de smoke de drink ogogoro, de tif...  
*(canyu imagine three young men raped that old woman, God! Anyway I am not surprise, they take hot drinks and they are thieves).*
5. RES: But why woman wey dey craze?  
*(But why a mad woman?)*
6. SU: Me I no know, may be den don taya to sleep with *ashawo* dem or den no get
7. money for meet *ashawo* again...  
*(I don't know, may be they are tired of sleeping with prostitutes, or they have run out of money to visit prostitutes)*

The use of the loan word 'oga' in example 1 signalled solidarity with the addressee, for reasons of ego boosting and distance. SU referred to the bread dealer as 'oga mi' (my master) and in so doing projected a polite face which made the referent feel important, especially in relation to a refugee. Also by opting for the term 'oga mi' SU suggested that it is a master-servant relationship and on that ground, the word distanced both men from each other. The use of 'olopa' in example 2 is not for lack of an equivalent word in English. Of course the equivalent word in English is 'police' but LB used 'olopa' probably to show the researcher (with whom he was conversing) that he is familiar with the Yoruba term. Similarly in example 3, SB borrowed 'fissi' to signal solidarity and show off his knowledge of

Yoruba to a Yoruba palm wine seller; it seems that apart from advertising his knowledge, his chief intention is to win some favour from the palm wine dealer. By expressing solidarity with the palm wine dealer SB projected an ethnolinguistic face in order to win himself some favour. In example 4 PC used the term ‘oyibo’ which is a Yoruba word for ‘white people’. Definitely PC used the term to show the researcher with whom he was interacting, that, at least, he knew some aspects of the Yoruba language. This also seems to be the reason for the use of ‘ogogoro’ in example 5, and ‘ashawo’ in example 6. The respondents knew the right English lexemes to use but preferred the local terms because they thought they were more fitting.

These examples represent what Bloomfield (1996:444 cited in Guerini 2006:219) termed ‘cultural borrowings’. By cultural borrowings Bloomfield meant those lexemes which enter a linguistic system for the purpose of filling the gaps formulated by the introduction of new referents, which are extraneous to the traditional culture of the community which speaks it. These borrowings from Yoruba, irrespective of the purpose or intention served to show that the refugees represented here, who are among the young and full adults have, to a very little extent, adapted to the linguistic situation in their host community. Also these borrowings are cases of upward convergence to Yoruba for reasons of social approval. Although they may not be proficient in Yoruba, they, nevertheless employed some Yoruba terms in interaction, just to pretend for a moment that they are Yoruba (Hudson 2008). Attention will now be paid to instances of borrowings from the immigrants’ indigenous languages.

### **Socio-cultural borrowings from the refugees’ languages**

The borrowing of socio-cultural words from the refugees' indigenous languages represents a strategy to show solidarity with their indigenous cultures in the course of conversation. In the course of natural conversations with the researcher, the refugees made several nostalgic citations to their home land in Sierra Leone. Such citations were replete with lexical items from their indigenous languages which represent the link between the refugees and their home land. Generally, the borrowings in the sample were motivated by a comparison of systems or objects in Nigeria with the same or similar systems or objects in the refugees' homeland. Attention will now be paid to the instances of such borrowings expressed by the respondents.

### **Borrowings from Sierra Leonean languages**

The borrowings represented in the data were from Mende, Temne and Limba. All the samples are cultural borrowings containing words for local drinks, animals and food. Some of such words are *Towowawa* (bean soup); *Gawui* (bush yam), *Bolongi* (garden egg sauce); *Glogboi and Masankie* (palm oil); *Omole, Kenju and Gbofue* (local hot drinks); *Halenyawu* (charm), *Malomboo* (local fruit), *Bawalelei* and *Kondibawa* (local soaps). The occurrences of these borrowings are shown in the examples below. The borrowed words are in italics.

Example 7: A conversation with Mamee (MM) Mende, about their native products.

1. RES: You get the kind red oil we get here?  
(*do you have our kind of red oil?*)
2. MM: Yes now, see, Nigerian oil no good like our own; de worse is de Yoruba oil

3. wey de smell. We get two type. *Glogboi* and *Masankie*.  
*Glogboi* na the bush
4. type, e de red but e no get flesh. *Masankie* na the agric type  
wey get flesh but
5. e no red like *Glogboi*. Both of dem no de smell at all at all.  
We only use
6. Nigerian oil for make *Bawalelei* or *Kondibawa*.  
(*of course yes, Nigerian palm oil is not as good as our own. The worst is the Yoruba oil which stinks. We have two varieties: Glogboi and Masankie. Glogboi is the bush type which is red in colour but without much flesh. Masankie is the agric variety which has a lot of flesh but deficient in red colour. None of them smells. We can only Nigerian oil to make Bawalelei or Kondibawa*)
7. RES: Wetin be that?  
(*What is that?*)
8. MM: *Bawaleleinawi* black soap. *Kondibawa* na wikontri  
soap.  
(*Bawalelei is our black soap. Kondibawa is our country soap*)

Example 8: A conversation involving the researcher (RES), Prince (PC) Mende, and Samson (SS) Gbandi, about social life in Sierra Leone.

1. PC: Ya own naogogoro but our own na *Omole*. *Omole* strong well well, if you no
2. dilute am take am like dat, your own don finish kpatatakata.  
E be like Sapele
3. water, if you put matches e go catch faya.

*(Your own is ogogoro but our own is omole. Omole is very strong, if you fail to dilute it and drink it like that you are finished completely. It is like Sapele water, if you strike a match, it will go up in flame).*

4. RES: Yu don go Delta before?  
*(have you been to Delta before?)*
5. PC: Yes, I go for Warri, I stay dere four years.  
*(Yes, I have been to Warri and I spent four years there)*
6. SS: We dey call am *Kenju*. Dis one be like fuel, e de burn ouse (house), *kenju*. If
7. you put am ere (here) now, go put faya for dat side, e go catch faya. A say e don
8. burn many ouse for Salone.  
*(we call it Kenju. This one is like fuel, it can burn a house. If you keep it and light a match over there it will catch the flame. I say it has burnt many houses in Sierra Leone).*
9. PC: Anoda one na *Gbofue*, but e no strong like *Omole*.  
*(Another one is Gbofue, but it is not strong like Omole).*

Example 9: A conversation with Hawa Sally (SA) Limba while watching a Nigerian home video over a scene involving a witch doctor.

1. SA: Hm, nawaa, everything na juju, juju  
*(Hm, it is terrible, everything is juju, juju).*
2. RES: Your people no de do juju?  
*(Don't you people do juju?)*



3. HA: Den de do-o, everywhere for Africa na juju. Wi de call am *Halenyawu* for
4. wi place, both man and uman. All dem de do am na wicked people.  
*(They do it all over Africa, we call it Halenyanwu in our people in our place, both men and women. All those involved are wicked people)*

Example 10: Conversation with Saffiatu (SU) Temne, over a local fruit.

1. RES: So you people deyeat dis fruit  
*(So you also eat this fruit?)*
2. SU: Wetin?  
*(What?)*
3. RES: Agbalumo
4. SU: Yes, we eat agbalumo. E dey for our place, we de call am *malomboo*.  
*(Yes, we eat agbalumo, it is in our place and we call it malomboo).*
5. RES: Na de same thing with dis one?  
*(Is it the same with this one?)*
6. SU: Na de sen tin, but some *malomboo* de big well well, pass dis one here.  
*(It is the same thing, although some malomboo are very big, bigger than the ones here).*

Example 11: A conversation with Massaquolei (MQ) Mende and Fatumata (FT) about styles of cooking.

1. MQ: A no like de way yu people cook here. Like beans, yu jus boil and put oil and

2. pepper. Our own is *Towowawa*, big big beans. We put am na soup with
3. cassava leaf and potato green and *sakpa* or *satui*.  
(*I don't like the way you people cook here. For example, beans, you merely boil it and add oil and pepper. Our own variety is Towowawa and they are very big beans. We add it to soup along side cassava leaves and potato green and sakpa or satui*)
4. RES: Wetin be *sakpa*?  
(What is *sakpa*?)
5. MQ: Na soup, e be like zobo, but wi get de white one and de red one. E good and
6. e get more protein dan de beans here.  
(*it is soup, it is like zobo, but we have the white and red variety. It is very tasty and has more protein than your own variety*).
7. FT: Not only beans, even garden egg. Den eat am like dat, but wi cook *bolongi*.
8. Inside, e dey dry but their own inside get water. Wi cook *bolongi* like soup and
9. eat am with ... rice.  
(*it is not only beans, even garden egg. They eat it like that but we cook bolongi. It is dry on the inside but their own is watery on the inside. We cook bolongi like food and eat it with rice*).

In example 7, MM displayed undiluted passion for the palm oil used in Sierra Leone (*Glogboi and Masankie*) and out rightly condemned the palm oil used in Nigeria, especially the Yoruba variety because of the bad odour. She recommended that Nigerian palm oil is only

fit for making their black soap. In making this comparison MM assumed pride and the superiority of their cultural products over the Nigerian varieties. The implication of this comparison is that the Sierra Leonean respondents were proud of their culture and to some extent looked with condescension on Nigerian culture. In example 8, PC compared their hot drink '*Omole*' with '*Sapele water*' while SS compared it with '*Kenju*'. In the comparison, while PC stated that '*Omole*' and '*Sapele water*' had equal potency, SS suggested that '*Kenju*' is the strongest of the lot.

The implication of this comparison is that in matters of hot drinks, Sierra Leoneans have what Nigerians have, if not better. In example 9 and 10, HA cited '*Halenyawu*' as their own equivalence of 'juju' in Nigeria, while SU made reference to '*malomboo*' as the Temne equivalence of Yoruba's '*agbalumo*'. In example 11MQ out rightly condemned the way Nigerians cooked beans and stated that the Mende not only have a superior variety in terms of size and nutritional value, but also have a better way of preparing it, in that they used '*sakpa*' (white sauce) and '*satui*' (red sauce). The examples above reflect the emotional attachment the refugees had towards their own culture expressed in language. The borrowings here are typical cases of divergence from Yoruba for reasons of cultural expediency. The cultural borrowings also indexed the distinction between the host community and the refugees' native home. The 'our', 'we' and 'your' expressions used in the comparisons of foods served to suggest the consciousness of the refugees that they are aliens; that they did not belong to the host community and that they were still conscious of their ethnic identity. These social comparisons, in no little way, registered their psychological distinctiveness as a people belonging to a different and unique social group and through this means, they enhanced their self-esteem. That this consciousness still lingered after two decades

spent in the camp is a testimony of their oneness with their culture and indigenous languages. On the whole, these cultural comparisons represent impulsive and illogical conclusions, borne out of cultural egotism, which were desperately constructed by the refugees for the purpose of enhancing their dignity and self-esteem. The notion of cultural equality or superiority also indexed the attempt made by the refugees to (re)construct their identity, against the background of the refugee identity often used to delineate them.

#### **4.0 Conclusion**

The borrowings identified in the data involved mainly nominals or lexemes referring to some concrete social and cultural items. The borrowings were from Yoruba, the refugees' ethnic languages and English. These borrowings were occasioned by either a lack of an equivalent word in the language of interaction or in the case of the availability of an equivalent word, the need to use a more fitting lexeme. These borrowings represent linguistic devices used by the refugees to signal multiple linguistic identities. Through this means they showed to some degree that they belonged to other groups, even on a temporary basis other than their heritage groups. Additionally, the cultural comparisons represent impulsive and illogical conclusions, borne out of cultural egotism, which were desperately constructed by the refugees for the purpose of enhancing their dignity and self-esteem. The notion of cultural equality or superiority also indexed the attempt made by the refugees to (re)construct their identity, against the background of the identity imposed on them by the host community as we shall see in a later section.

#### **References**

- Adegbija, E. (2004). "Language Policy and Planning in Nigeria" in *Current Issues in Language Planning*, Vol. 5, No. 3 pp. 58-61.
- Albrecht, S. (2001). 'Preventing the Flight of Refugees' *PeaceReview* 13, No. 1, pp.109-120.
- Berry, J.W. (2008). "Globalisation and Acculturation". *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* Vol. 32 pp. 328 – 336.
- Carson, L (ed.) (2005). *Multilingualism in Europe Settings*. Berlin: Peter Langue.
- Ed. Zar-zar, B. (2002). Conspiracy to Eliminate the Krahn Group, in *The Perspectives*, [www.theperspective.org/campjohnsonroad.html](http://www.theperspective.org/campjohnsonroad.html)
- Fishman J.A. (1968). "Sociolinguistic Perspective in the Study of Bilingualism", in *Linguistics*, 39: 21-49.
- Fyle, M.C (1994). 'Official and Unofficial Attitudes and Policy Towards Krio as the Main Lingua Franca in Sierra Leone', in *African Languages, Development and the State*, Fardon, R and Furniss, G( eds.), London: Routledge.
- Gibson, K. (2004). 'English Only Court cases Involving the U.S. Courtplace – The Myths of Language Use and the Homogenisation of Bilingual Workers' Identities'. [www.pdf.con/k.39531html/www.hawaii.edu/sis/uhalpest/22121/gibson](http://www.pdf.con/k.39531html/www.hawaii.edu/sis/uhalpest/22121/gibson).
- Giles, H. and Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Buckingham: Oxford University Press.
- Giles, H. and Johnson, P (1987). "Ethnolinguistic Identity Theory: a Social Psychological Approach to Language Maintenance". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 63, 69 – 99.
- Guerini F. (2006). *Language Alternation Strategies in Multilingual Settings*, Bern: Peter Langue.

- Holmes J. (2008). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, UK: Longman.
- Igboanusi, H and Peter L (2005). *Languages in Competition: The Struggle for Supremacy among Nigeria's Major Languages, English and Pidgin*. Frankfurt and Mari: Peter Langue.
- Kim, Y.Y. (2001) *Becoming Intercultural: An Integrative Theory of Communication and Cross –Cultural Adaptation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kruffeld, R.M. (1998) “Exploring New Methods for Collaboration in Ethnographic Research: An Attempt at Overcoming exploitation and Violation of Human Rights”, in R.M. Krulfeld & J.C. MacDonald (eds.) *Power, Ethics and Human Rights: Anthropological Studies of Refugees Research and Action*. New York.
- Masaki, M; Michael, L.H; Elvira, E; Khadiaton, N. (2010) “Ethnic Identity Development and acculturation: A Longitudinal Analysis of Mexican-Heritage Youth in the Southwest United States”. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* vol15.41/314 10-42.
- Ngovo, B L. (1998). ‘English in Liberia’ in *English Today* 54 vol. 14, No. 2, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Oakes, L. (2001). *Language and National Identity: Comparing France and Sweden*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Romaine, S. (2003). “Multilingualism” in *The Handbook of Linguistics*, Mark Arnoff & Janie Rees – Miller (eds.), U.K: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sengova, J. (1987). ‘The National Languages of Sierra Leone: A Decade of Policy Experimentation’ in *Africa, Journal of the International African Institutes*. Vol. 57 No. 4, pp. 7-12 U.K: Edinburgh University Press.

- Taylor, C.H. (1994). "The Politics of Recognition" In A. Gutman (ed.). *Multilingualism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- UNHCR (2008) *The 1951 Refugee Convention*, <http://www.unhcr/pages/49dao466.html>.