



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

**LANGUAGE USE AND ATTITUDE OF THE GAMO
COMMUNITY LIVING IN ADDIS ABABA**

BY
ADANE FELEKE

MAY, 2010
ADDIS ABABA

**LANGUAGE USE AND ATTITUDE OF THE GAMO
COMMUNITY LIVING IN ADDIS ABABA**

**A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
STUDIES ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN
LINGUISTICS**

**BY
ADANE FELEKE**

**MAY, 2010
ADDIS ABABA**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND
PHILOLOGY

LANGUAGE USE AND ATTITUDE OF THE GAMO
COMMUNITY LIVING IN ADDIS ABABA

BY
ADANE FELEKE

APPROVED BY: BOARD OF EXAMINERS

ADVISOR SIGNATURE

EXAMINER SIGNATURE

Acknowledgment

First of all, my thanks go to my advisor, Ato Bekkale Seyoum /assistant professor/. Your brotherly and fatherly approaches, more than anything else, encouraged me to finalize this research paper on time. Besides, your valuable suggestions and advice assisted me to break the way to a successful achievement and conduct of this research. Had it not been for you, I could never have accomplished this paper. I really thank you!

Next, I thank the Gullele and Kolfe city center office for their invaluable contribution in providing me with relevant information and recruiting influential members of the community to help me while I distributed and collected the questionnaires.

My thanks also go to my brothers, Ato Addisu Feleke and to Ato Wondim Feleke who were always with me materially and morally throughout my study. All the times you spent with me in my ups and downs were unforgettable to me.

I would also like to say a word of thanks to my best friends that supported me in one way or another financially, materially as well as morally. This includes Ato Dirshaye H/Eyesus, Ato Mulualem Bezabih and Ato Ayalew Teshome. Furthermore, W/t Melkamsew Bezuayehu and W/t Muluemebet Tessema consistently and continuously wrote my research paper and edited it with patience and diligence.

Last but not the least, all of my friends who were with me morally, I would like to say thank you very much even if your name is not mentioned.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER ONE

Acknowledgement	i
Abstract	ii
1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. Statement of the problem	2
1.3. Research Questions.....	3
1.4. Objective of the study	3
1.5. Significance of the study.....	4
1.6. Scope of the study.....	4
1.7. Methodology	5
1.7.1. Research Methodology	5
1.7.2. Data source	5
1.7.3. Sampling Techniques.....	5
1.7.4. Data gathering instruments	6
1.7.4.1. Questionnaire	6
1.7.4.2. Interview	6
1.7.4.3. Observation.....	6
1.7.5. Method of data analysis	6

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of the literature and related works	7
2.1. Literature Review	7
2.1.1. Language contact and bilingualism	7
2.1.2. Language shift.....	8
2.1.3. Language Maintenance	8
2.1.4. Variables affecting language shift and maintenance	9
2.1.5 Ways of measuring language shift and maintenance	11
2.1.5.1. Language use	11

2.1.5.2. Language attitude.....	13
2.1.5.3. Language proficiency	14
2.1.5.4. Effort in language transmission	14
2.1.5.5. Demographic Variables	15
2.1.6. Concept of Ethnicity	17
2.2. Review of related works	19

CHAPTER THREE

3. Data presentation and analysis.....	20
3.1 Respondent's demography	22
3.2. Language use	24
3.2.1. Language use at the home level.....	25
3.2.1.1. Language at the home level by respondents' age	29
3.2.1.2. Respondent's Language use at home level by sex.....	32
3.2.1.3.. Language use at home by education status.....	35
3.2.2. Respondents' dominant language at home	39
3.2.3. Language use with Gamo friends	39
3.2.4. Language use with Gamo neighbors.....	40
3.2.5. Language use at religious places	40
3.2.6. Language use at Community's organizations.....	41
3.2.7. Home language and interethnic marriage	43
3.2.8. Rate of visit to the homeland	44
3.3. Respondents' language maintenance effort	45
3.3.1. Language maintenance effort by respondents'	48
3.3.2. Language maintenance effort by respondents sex	51
3.3.3. Language maintenance effort by educational status.....	53
3.4. Respondents' Proficiency in both Gamo and Amharic	55
3.4.1. Respondents' Gamo proficiency by age	57
3.4.2. Respondents' Gamo proficiency by sex	60
3.4.3. Respondents' Gamo proficiency by educational status.....	62
3.5. Respondents' attitude towards Gamo and Amharic	64
3.5.1. Respondents' attitude by age	68

3.5.2. Respondents' attitude by sex	70
3.5.3. Respondents' language attitude by educational level	72
3.6. Respondents' ethnic identity.....	74

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Summary, conclusion and recommendation	75
4.1. Summary	75
4.2. Conclusion	76
4.3. Recommendation	80
Bibliography	
Appendix	

Language use and attitude research on Gamo community living in Addis Ababa.

To this end, the participation of members of the Gamo community is decisive. Thus, requesting you to partake in this study, first of all, I cordially thank you for your active participation thereof.

For the following questions, show your answer by circling the letter you choose among the given alternatives. If your choice is the letter with 'other' or no choice is given at all, write your answer at the blank space in front of the question.

1. Age:
2. Sex: a/ Male b/ Female
3. Marital status: a/ married b/ unmarried
4. educational status: a/ illiterate b/ elementary level
 c/ secondary level d/ diploma level e/ degree and above
5. your nationality: a/ Gamo b/ Amhara c/ Oromo d/ other
6. your spouse nationality: a/ Gamo b/Amhara c/ Oromo d/other
7. Which language is dominantly used at your home?

 a/ Amharic b/ Gamo c/ Others-----

LANGUAGE USE

I. Which language do you use with the following persons?

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|------------|---------|----------|
| 1. with your Father: | a/ Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/both | d/other |
| 2. with your Mother: | a/ Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/both | d/other |
| 3. with your Grandfather: | a/ Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/both | d/other |
| 4. with your Grandmother: | a/Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/ both | d/ other |
| 5. with your children: | a/ Gamo | b/Amharic | c/ both | d/ other |
| 6. with your Gamo neighbor: | a/ Gamo | b/Amharic | c/ both | d/ other |
| 7. with your spouse: | a/ Gamo | b/Amharic | c/ both | d/ other |
| 8. with your Grandchild: | a/ Gamo | b/Amharic | c/ both | d/ other |
| 9. with your brother: | a/ Gamo | b/Amharic | c/ both | d/ other |
| 10. with your sister: | a/ Gamo | b/Amharic | c/ both | d/ other |
| 11. with your Gamo friends: | a/ Gamo | b/Amharic | c/ both | d/ other |

II. Which language do you use in the following Gamo community's institution?

- | | | | | |
|--|---------|------------|--------|--------------|
| 1. at wedding ceremony: | a/ Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/both | d/other----- |
| 2. at funeral ceremony: | a/ Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/both | d/other----- |
| 3. at religious place: | a/ Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/both | d/other----- |
| 4. at permanent fund raising association (Idir): | | | | |
| | a/ Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/both | d/other----- |
| 5. at Gamo Credit association (Iqub): | | | | |
| | a/ Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/both | d/other----- |
| 6. At weekly gathering 'Säñño mariam' | | | | |
| | a/ Gamo | b/ Amharic | c/both | d/other----- |

LANGUAGE ATTITUDE

1. It is important to use Gamo as medium of instruction more than Amharic?
a/ yes b/ no c/ I do not know
2. Is it necessary for you to use Gamo in your daily activities more than Amharic?
a/ yes b/ no c/ I do not know

3. Do you think that your children should better know Gamo more than Amharic?
4. Is speaking Amharic a sign of being modern /civilized/?
5. Do you think Gamo helps for communication with other people in Addis Ababa?

ETHNIC IDENTITY

1. Do you think that you have to necessarily know Gamo to be a member of Gamo community?

a/ yes b/ no c/ I do not know

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1. How do you measure your listening and understanding skill in Gamo?

a/ excellent b/ very good c/ good d/ poor e/ unable

2. How do you measure your speaking skill in Gamo?

a/ excellent b/ very good c/ good d/ poor e/ unable

3. How do you measure your listening and understanding skill in Amharic?

a/ excellent b/ very good c/ good d/ poor e/ unable

4. How do you measure your speaking skill Amharic?

a/ excellent b/ very good c/ good d/ poor e/ unable

LANGUAGE TRANSMISSION EFFORT

1. How often do you encourage your children to use Gamo at home?

a/ always b/ frequently c/ sometimes d/ rarely e/ never

2. How often do you tell your children folklores in Gamo?

a/ always b/frequently c/sometimes d/ rarely e/ never

3. How often do you speak in Gamo with your children at home?

a/ always b/ frequently c/ sometimes d/ rarely e/never

4. State the efforts you have made to upgrade the Gamo language proficiency of your children

Interview Questions for parents

Language attitude

1. Do you feel comfort when you talk in Gamo in the street? Why?
2. Do you worry if Gamo is lost in Addis Ababa? Why?

Language proficiency

1. Which language your children are more proficient in? Why?

1. ዕድሜ-----
2. ጾታ ሀ/ወንድ ለ/ ሴት
3. የጋብቻ ሁኔታ:- ሀ/ ያገባለ/ ያላገባ
4. የትምህርት ደረጃ:- ሀ/ ያልተማረ ለ/ አንደኛ ደረጃ ሐ/ ሁለተኛ ደረጃ
 መ/ ዲፕሎማ መ/ ዲግሪ እና ከዚያ በላይ
5. የእርስዎ ብሄረሰብ:- ሀ/ ጋሞ ለ/ አማራ ሐ/ ኦሮሞ መ/ ሌላ-----
6. የባለቤትዎ ብሄረሰብ:- ሀ/ ጋሞ ለ/ አማራ ሐ/ ኦሮሞ መ/ ሌላ----
7. አብዛኛውን ጊዜ ቤት ውስጥ የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ የትኛውን ነው?
 ሀ/ አማርኛ ለ/ ጋሞኛ ሐ/ ሌላ-----
8. ወደ ጋሞ ዞን ምን ያህል ጊዜ ይሄዳሉ? ሀ/ ሁል ጊዜ ለ/ በተደጋጋሚ
 ሐ/ አንዳንድ ጊዜ መ/ አልፎ አልፎ ሠ/ በፍጹም

የቋንቋ አጠቃቀም

I. ከሚከተሉት ሰዎች ጋር በየትኛው ቋንቋ ይጠቀማሉ?

1. ከአባትዎ ጋር፡- ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ----
2. ከእናትዎ ጋር፡- ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ-----
3. ከአባትዎ ወላጆች /አያቶችዎ/ ጋር፡-
 ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ-----
4. ከእናትዎ ወላጆች /አያቶችዎ/ ጋር፡-
 ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱ መ/ በሌላ-----
5. ከልጅዎ /ከልጆችዎ/ ጋር፡-
 ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ-----
6. ከጋሞ ጎረቤትዎ /ጎረቤቶችዎ/ ጋር፡-
 ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ-----
7. ከባለቤትዎ ጋር፡- ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ-----
8. ከልጅ ልጅዎ /ከልጅ ልጆችዎ/ ጋር፡-
 ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ-----
9. ከወንድመዎ /ከወንድሞችዎ/ ጋር፡-
 ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ
10. ከእህትዎ /ከእህቶችዎ/ ጋር፡ ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ
11. ከጋሞ ጓደኛዎ /ጓደኞችዎ/ ጋር፡-
 ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ

I. በሚከተሉት ማህበራዊ ተቋማት ውስጥ በየትኛው ቋንቋ ይጠቀማሉ?

1. በጋሞ የሠርግ ቦታ ላይ፡- ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ
2. በጋሞ የለቅሶ ቦታ፡- ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ
3. በጋሞ የአምልኮ ስፍራ፡- ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ
4. በጋሞ የዕድር ቤት ውስጥ፡- ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ
5. በጋሞ የዕቁብ ቤት ውስጥ፡- ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ
6. በሰኞ ማርያም ቀን የእርቅ እና የግብዣ ስርዓት በሚከናወንበት ቦታ ላይ፡-
 ሀ/ በጋሞኛ ለ/ በአማርኛ ሐ/ በሁለቱም መ/ በሌላ

የቋንቋ አመለካከት

1. ለትምህርት ማስተማሪያነት ከአማርኛ ቋንቋ የበለጠ ጋሞኛ ቋንቋን የበለጠ ጋሞኛ ቋንቋን መጠቀም አስፈላጊ ነው ብለው ያምናሉ?

ሀ/ አዎ ለ/ አይደለም ሐ/ አላውቅም

2. በእለት ተዕለት የሥራ እንቅስቃሴዎ ከአማርኛ የበለጠ ጋሞኛ ቋንቋን መጠቀም አስፈላጊ ነው ብለው ያስባሉ?

3. ልጆች ከአማርኛ ቋንቋ ይልቅ ጋሞኛ ቋንቋን በጣም ማወቅ አለባቸው ብለው ያስባሉ?

ሀ/ አዎ ለ/ አይደለም ሐ/ አላውቅም

4. ከጋሞኛ ቋንቋ ይልቅ አማርኛ ቋንቋን መናገር ዘመናዊ /የሰለጠነ/ መሆንን ያሳያል ብለው ያስባሉ? ሀ/ አዎ ለ/ አይደለም ሐ/ አላውቅም

5. ጋሞኛ ቋንቋ ከአማርኛ ቋንቋ የበለጠ ከሌላው የአዲስ አበባ ህዝብ ጋር ለመግባባት ይረዳል ብለው ያስባሉ? ሀ/ አዎ ለ/ አይደለም ሐ/ አላውቅም

የብሄረሰብ ማንነት

1. የጋሞ ብሄረሰብ ለመሆን የግድ ጋሞኛ ቋንቋን መናገር መቻል አለብኝ ብለው ያምናሉ?

ሀ/ አዎ ለ/ አይደለም ሐ/ አላውቅም

የቋንቋ ብቃት

1. ጋሞኛ ቋንቋን በማዳመጥ እና በመረዳት ደረጃ ያለዎት ብቃት ምን ያህል ነው?

ሀ/ እጅግ ከፍተኛ ለ/ ከፍተኛ ሐ/ መካከለኛ መ/ ዝቅተኛ ሠ/ ምንም

2. በጋሞኛ ቋንቋ ሃሳብዎን በመግለጽ ደረጃ ያለዎት ብቃት ምን ያህል ነው?

ሀ/ እጅግ ከፍተኛ ለ/ ከፍተኛ ሐ/ መካከለኛ መ/ ዝቅተኛ ሠ/ ምንም

3. አማርኛን በማዳመጥ እና በመረዳት ደረጃ ያለዎት ብቃት ምን ያህል ነው?

ሀ/ እጅግ ከፍተኛ ለ/ ከፍተኛ ሐ/ መካከለኛ መ/ ዝቅተኛ ሠ/ ምንም

4. በአማርኛ ቋንቋ ሃሳብዎን በመግለጽ ደረጃ ያለዎት ብቃት ምን ያህል ነው?

ሀ/ እጅግ ከፍተኛ ለ/ ከፍተኛ ሐ/ መካከለኛ መ/ ዝቅተኛ ሠ/ ምንም

ጋሞኛ ቋንቋ ቀጣይነት እንዲኖረው ስለሚደረግ ጥረት

1. ልጆቼዎ ጋሞኛ ቋንቋ በቤት ውስጥ እንዲጠቀሙ ምን ያህል ያበረታቷቸዋል?

ሀ/ ሁልጊዜ ለ/ በተደጋጋሚ ሐ/ አንዳንድ ጊዜ መ/ አልፎ አልፎ ሠ/ በፍጹም

2. ለልጆቼዎ ተረቶችን በጋሞኛ ቋንቋ ምን ያህል ይነግሯቸዋል?

ሀ/ ሁልጊዜ ለ/ በተደጋጋሚ ሐ/ አንዳንድ ጊዜ መ/ አልፎ አልፎ ሠ/ በፍጹም

3. ቤት ውስጥ ከልጆቼዎ ጋር በጋሞኛ ቋንቋ ምን ያህል ያወራሉ?

ሀ/ ሁልጊዜ ለ/ በተደጋጋሚ ሐ/ አንዳንድ ጊዜ መ/ አልፎ አልፎ ሠ/ በፍጹም

4. የልጆቼዎ የጋሞኛ ቋንቋ ችሎታ እንዲያድግ /እንዲጎለብት/ የሚያደርጉት ጥረት ካለ ይግለጹ፡፡-----

የቃለምልልስ ጥያቄ (ከወላጆች ጋር)

የቋንቋ አመለካከት

1. መንገድ ላይ በጋሞኛ ሲነጋገሩ ደስ ይልዎታል? ለምን?
2. ጋሞ አዲስ አበባ ውስጥ ቢጠፋ ያስጨንቆታል? ለምን?

የቋንቋ ብቃት

3. በየትኛው ቋንቋ ነው ልጆቼዎ ይበልጥ ችሎታ ያላቸው? ለምን?

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study is to investigate the state of Gamo language maintenance among the specific community in Addis Ababa. The study examines whether members of the community are using their ethnic language in the various domains such as families, ethnic in-group associations, friendship circles and in the neighborhood. It also examines their language maintenance efforts, language attitudes and proficiency as well as the sense of ethnic identities of members of the community. The study has employed questionnaire, interviews and observation to gather the data required for the study. A total of 119 subjects were used for a self-reported questionnaire and other 20 subjects were interviewed.

Accordingly, the study has revealed that most of the members of the community are shifting to the use of Amharic in the aforementioned domains of language use. The study has also revealed that most of the members of the community have negative attitudes towards their ethnic language, but are almost equally proficient in both Gamo and the dominant language-Amharic. This shows the bilingual characteristics of the community. In this study, it has also been found that parents in the community do not very much contribute their effort to transmit their language to their children for the language to be maintained. The study has also shown that members of the community have no strong link with their ethnic group. Generally, even though the case may be different at the homeland, measured by Fishman's graded intergenerational disruptive scale, the language falls at the level of extinction next to stage 8 which is the worst stage for language extinction.

DECLARATION

I here declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Adane Feleke

Signature: _____

Date: _____

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

Name: Bekale Seyum (Associate professor)

Signature: _____

Date: _____

CHAPTER ONE

1.1. Introduction

Like in other countries in the world, migration is a common phenomenon in Ethiopia. One of the possible causes of migration, as cited by scholars, is urbanization. Cooper and Hovarth (1971) said that in Ethiopia, like in other countries, urbanization led various ethnic groups to migrate from country sides to cities. Most research work show that as small-scale minority groups migrate and settle in an area where another dominant language is spoken, they usually lose their linguistic behavior, and their language attitude and linguistic identity changes in favor of the dominant language. This research focuses on the Gamo immigrant community living in Addis Ababa around Shiro Meda and Kolfe where the majority of the speakers reside.

The homeland of the Gamo community is the highlands of Gamo which is surrounded by a lowland area, the center of which is about 500Kms south of Addis Ababa. Freeman (2001) describe the Gamo people as scattered throughout the Gamo highlands living organized into many different communities called “Dere .”

According to some scholars (e.g. Fleming 1976), Gamo is considered as a single dialect which is a member of the Ometo cluster along with Wolayita, Oyda, Malo, Gafo, etc. However, a recent work by Hirut (2005) showed that Gamo is a single dialect, but should be considered as a group consisting of Varieties such as Zola, Daac’e, Dorze, Ocholo and Bonke. She added that with regard to their ethnolinguistic identity most of the speakers of these varieties identify themselves as Gamo. Wondimu (2006) further stated that though scholars commonly refer to the community’s language and their ethnic group as Gamo, the people call themselves as Gamo and their language as Gamotsso.

As to the migration of the community, it is believed that they started settling in Addis Ababa during the reign of Minelik II. Burley describes it in the following statements:

The Shiro Meda community was established after Minilik’s conquest of the Gamo highland in 1889. The war captives were brought to Addis Ababa by

General Habte Giorgis and settled in Shoro Meda. Many of the residents of Shoro Meda claim that their grandfathers and great grandfathers were slaves who worked as farmers, household servants and foot-soldiers for Habte Giorgis (Burley 1978:145).

Similarly, Bekale (1979) remarked that Burley's statement as to the community's settlement in Addis Ababa is more acceptable than Cooper and Ronald's (1976:265) who stated that the number of the Dorze community born in Addis Ababa is very small and that, the community started migrating to this city very recently. So, the Gamo community might have started migrating to Addis Ababa since about a century ago.

According to the central statistics agency (1999), 45,946 Gamos live in Addis Ababa with their language in constant contact with other Ethiopian languages, and particularly more with Amharic which is the lingua franca in the city. Thus, the language will obviously interact with Amharic, followed by maintenance or loss, depending on the level of awareness and maintenance effort of the members of the community.

Traditionally, the Gamo community living in Addis Ababa is supposed to be from Dorze, which is one of the groups among the Gamo cluster. However, scholars do not agree with the reference to this community by the term Dorze (Bekale 1979, Burley 1978). Burley (ibid) adds that the Dorze makes up only one of the communities in the Gamo highlands and the Shiro Meda community consists of not only Dorze but also other migrants of Gamo like Chenchä which forms the majority.

So, throughout this paper, the researcher prefers to use the name Gamo to Dorze to refer to the community and its language under study.

1.2. Statement of the problem

It is the sociolinguistic assumption that a minority linguistic group living with another dominant language group usually tends to linguistically assimilate and change its linguistic identity and language attitude in favor of the dominant language for some socioeconomic reasons. However, according to Fasold (1984:240), there are groups who maintain their language and ethnic identity under the very same social and economic conditions that induce

another group to shift to another language and identity. Thus, in line with the above sociolinguistic assumptions, the researcher tries to investigate whether the trend in regard to the Gamo is in the direction of language loss or maintenance among the community living in Addis Ababa. Furthermore, it must be interesting to learn the pattern of language use such migrants reveal, the attitude they manifest towards the different languages and the manner in which they identify themselves.

1.3 Research Questions

The study will, in particular, try to answer the following questions:

- a. How proficient are members of the community in Gamo and Amharic in Addis Ababa?
- b. What is the pattern of use of Gamo by the members of the community?
- c. How do members of the community identify themselves in terms of language and ethnicity?
- d. What are the attitudes of the community members towards their native language and Amharic?
- e. Do the community members show any tendency towards maintaining or shifting their native language?
- f. What is the state of Gamo language transmission among the target community?

1.4. Objectives of the study

General objective

- To examine the state of language use, language attitude, language maintenance and language shift among the Gamo community members and the state of intergenerational transference of the language.

Specific objectives

- To examine how the community members living in Addis Ababa use the Gamo language.

- To investigate the level of proficiency of the native language and Amharic, the dominant one.
- To compare and investigate the level of the ethno linguistic identity of the target community.
- To demonstrate the attitudes of the members of the community towards their native language and towards the dominant language-Amharic.
- To measure and identify the level of intergenerational transference of their native language within their community.

1.5. Significance of the study

- The findings of this study can give some insight into the linguistic behaviors of the community members to those who may intervene in some community development activities.
- It will create awareness among the community members about the objective reality in which the Gamo language exists in the Addis Ababa context.
- It may also assist other researchers who may be working in related areas by way of supplying some useful data.

1.6. Scope of the study

- This research is limited to some sample members from Shiro Meda and Kolfe areas where the majority of the members of the target community are living.
- Some linguistic data should have been included in this research. However, due to time and financial constraints, the researcher has focused only on the social dimension of the target community.

1.7. Methodology

1.7.1. Research Methodology

Since the purpose of this research paper is to describe the current speech behavior of the target community, the researcher mainly employs descriptive research, which, according to Abiy, et al. (2009:30), sets out to describe and interpret the state of affairs as it exists. Accordingly, the current research describes the speech behaviors of the community as it exists and tries to account for that.

1.7.2. Data Sources

The sources of the data are members of the Gamo community living in Shiro Meda and Kolfe. Since the research focuses on the speech behaviors of the young and the adult, members of the community who are 15 years old and above are the subjects of this study.

1.7.3. Sampling Techniques

Since the Gamo speakers live in Addis Ababa at a community level, the researcher identified two places where the majority of the target community's members are living through purposeful sampling technique. Accordingly, Shiro Meda and Kolfe were selected.

In Shiro Meda, members of the community live in 5 zones, of which, Zone 3 where larger members of the community live was selected through purposeful sampling technique.

Then, sample households were selected through cluster sampling technique. This was done by taking lists from the 'kebele' office of households where members of the community live. Of the total 1019 households, every 20th house was selected as a sample through systematic random sampling technique and 51 households were identified. Then, units within each house hold (cluster) whose ages are 15 and above were identified through purposeful sampling method. Finally, 199 subjects were identified as the total sample size. Some literate members of the community were selected to help the researcher in distributing the questionnaires and to assist those illiterate respondents in reading & filling the questionnaire. With regard to Kolfe area; only 20 parents were selected for interview through accidental / conducive sampling technique.

1.7.4. Data Gathering instruments

1.7.4.1. Questionnaire

A structured self-reporting questionnaire was prepared in Amharic and administered to the subjects. The questionnaire asked subjects to respond to their personal profile (age, sex, education, marital status and ethnic group of spouses), frequency of visit to the homeland, language proficiency, language use in different domains, linguistic identity, language attitudes towards the ethnic language and Amharic and efforts of the subjects to maintain their ethnic language.

1.7.4.2. Interview

I interviewed 20 parents regarding their attitude towards their ethnic language and the rationale for their responses. I also asked the subjects about their children's language proficiency and the reasons behind their answers. This was done as a supplement to the data gathered through the questionnaire and interview.

1.7.4.3. Observation

While gathering the data, the researcher has been conducting observation on the language use of small children as a supplement to the data gathered through questionnaire.

1.7.5. Method of data analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were employed in this research. Statistical instruments such as frequencies and percentages were employed for all items and the Likert scaled items were utilized. Then, the obtained and the expected mean scores have been computed for Likert scale items. Finally, conclusions were drawn based on the analysis which were properly interpreted and explained.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Literature Review and Related Works

2.1. Literature Review

In this section, relevant review literatures related to the current study are briefly discussed. These include issues like language contact and bilingualism, language shift, language maintenance, variables affecting language shift and maintenance, ways of measuring language shift and maintenance, and ethnicity and its link with language.

2.1.1. Language Contact and Bilingualism

Nowadays, it is believed by different scholars that the world is facing unprecedented loss of linguistic diversity. The contact between the dominant languages and the less powerful ones is, primarily, thought to be the cause of linguistic threat. In multilingual countries, where two or more languages co-exist, one of the situations that inevitably occurs is language contact. According to Spolsky (1998:123) language contact is defined as a situation where two or more languages are brought into contact by virtue of bilingualism. Here, it should be clear that a language doesn't come into contact with another language by itself. A precondition for language contact is the contact of communities of different linguistic background. There are various reasons for peoples to come into contact. Appel and Muysken (1987:56) listed the most important causes for language contact such as colonial expansion, ethno-linguistic enclaves, linguistic border and post colonial migration, and Lieberman (1988:11) added internal migration as a cause of language contact. Even though the social settings of the contact situation affect the types of the outcomes of language contact, scholars have identified the different linguistic and sociolinguistic outcomes of language contact such as borrowing, bilingualism, code-switching, code-mixing, pidginization, creolization, language shift and language death.

2.1.2. Language Shift

Bilingualism, of the aforementioned outcomes of language contact, is frequently stated to set fertile grounds for language shift. Bilingualism and language contact are prerequisites for language shift (Holms, 1992:65, Fasold, 1984:213 & Brenzinger, 1999:282).

However, language shift is not a case in stable diglossic bilingual community, where two or more languages are preserved for different functions. Language shift occurs when a language intrudes into the domains already preserved for another (Fasold 1984:211). In language contact situation, the minority language speakers become bilinguals. However, the direction of language shift may not always be from the subordinate language to the dominant one. There are cases where the dominant language shifts to the subordinate one. The Normans in the 11th century conquered England and they became politically powerful and dominant group. However, they became linguistically assimilated to the subordinate group (Fasold 1984:251). Besides, specific language attitude accompanies a bilingual language situation. In line with this, Grosjean (1982:119) says, “In a community where different language groups co-exist, language attitude plays an important role in the lives of these languages.”

Weinreich (1963:68) defines language shift as “the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another.” Day (1985:163) defines language shift as “a switch from one language to another by the people in a given culture.” Other scholars also define it similarly. Hoffman (1991:186) views it as a gradual adaptation of another language by a community instead of maintaining its language. Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003:26-27, 30) define it as the change that occurs when communities of different ethnic background come into contact, especially when they have to co-exist in a multilingual setting. When a speech community collectively decides to use the newly coming language in favor of the one they traditionally use, language shift occurs (Fasold 1984:213). All the aforementioned definitions are similar in that they all view language shift as a speech community’s adoption of another language at the expense of their first language.

2.1.3. Language Maintenance

Language maintenance is the opposite of language shift. When there is language shift, language maintenance is unlikely to exist. “Language shift and maintenance are the two sides

of a coin” (Fasold1984:213). Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003:30) and Hoffman (1992:186) argue that language maintenance refers to a state where the community continues to use the language it has been traditionally using.

In a bilingual community, languages are maintained when they function in their respective domains. In other words, maintaining bilingualism is maintaining languages. According to this point, MaC Convell (1991:16) cited in Chrisp (2005:115) says that the aim of indigenous language maintenance is better conceived as maintaining bilingualism than simply maintaining a language. This implies that if bilingualism is stable, then languages are more likely to be maintained.

2.1.4. Variables Affecting Language Shift and Maintenance

The state of bilingualism may be either preserved or changed into monolingualism under different factors (Grosjean, 1982:36-37). Socio-economic and socio-psychological factors are important for a community to transform to a state of bilingualism or monolingualism. Accordingly, Downs (1998:61) suggests that a bilingual community becomes monolingual in the dominant language due to power differences. Scholars have identified various socio-economic factors that influence language shift and maintenance. According to William (1992:207), the vitality of an ethno-linguistic group is the ingredient that makes a group behave collectively. So, he states that structural variables affect ethno-linguistic vitality. Accordingly, status which includes economic, social, socio-historical, and language status; demography which includes the distribution and number of speakers; and institutional support which include the roles of the mass-media, education, government services, and religion are the most important variables. In line with this, May (2007:257-8) identifies that political power, privilege and social prestige are important factors for language shift and maintenance, while Conklin and Lourie (1983) cited in Baker (1993) adds rate of return to homeland, and distance from homeland, as the main factors. Appel and Muysken (1987:33-37) listed demographic factors like number of speakers, sex, age, etc, and institutional support like mass-media, religion, etc as variables that influence language shift among the minority language speakers and as determining the ethno-linguistic vitality of a speech community.

In multilingual communities, the idea of using a national language erodes the ethno-linguistic vitality of, especially, minority ethno-linguistic groups. Grosjean (1982:26) marks nationalism as one factor of language shift. Simply put, while a government strives to create a unified nation by the name of a single language, the unifying language becomes dominant and politically powerful that leads to linguistic power differences which enables the dominant language to put pressure and attract the minority linguistic group. This is confirmed by Mackey (1973) cited in Dorian (1980:86) who says that language power, language attraction, and language pressure lead to language shift.

Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003:26) point out that a close-kin social network, which Milroy (1987) cited in Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003:26) defines as the informal social relationship contracted by an individual within his family or neighborhood, is a significant device for language maintenance. Chances are better that a language will be maintained in a community in which the majority has heavy population density, and closed social-networks than in the one that has low density and is open (ibid: 27). Holms (1992:70) claim that language use pattern, demography, and minority language attitudes are important factors for language shift. Kipp et al (1995) cited in Yagmur and Akinchi (2003:108) say:

Factors for language shift or maintenance are divided into two: those affecting a speech community and those affecting individuals within speech community. Group factors include size and distribution of an ethnic group, the policy of the host community towards minority language, the position of the language within the cultural value system of the group approximate or distance of the minority language to or from majority language while birth places, age, period of residence, gender, education/ qualification, marriage patterns ... are individual factors.

Here, it should be noted that all the aforementioned factors do not influence language shift and maintenance separately. In line with this, Yagmur and Akinchi (2003:72) say, “These factors, I argue, do not operate independently of one another, but they interact in complex ways in determining language maintenance and shift.”

In spite of all these, it is not always the case that these socio-economic factors influence language shift and maintenance. Fasold (1984:238) points out that there are groups that

maintain their language and ethnic identity under the very same socio-economic conditions that induce another group to shift. Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987:45) state that the minority group, on the basis of their experience that giving away their language without socio-economic advantage may develop strategies to foster and use the minority language and improve proficiency in their language, which is then revitalized.

2.1.5. Ways of Measuring Language Shift and Maintenance

There are different ways of measuring the extent of language shift and maintenance. In what follows, we shall take the key factors, which various scholars have been using in their research, to measure the state of language maintenance and shift. Language use, language attitude, language proficiency and efforts of language transmission in relation to demographic factors such as gender, age, intermarriage, education, rate of return (visit) to homeland are factors under investigation in this research. In addition, we shall examine Fishman's model (Fishman's graded inter generational desruptive scale of a minority language) used to determine the level of intergenerational transmission of the language of a minority group to examine the level of the maintenance of Gamo language in Addis Ababa.

2.1.5.1. Language Use

In a multilingual setting, language use refers to the distribution of the functions of language into various domains. Fasold (1984:211) stated that in a stable bilingual community language shift occurs when a dominant language intrudes into the domains already preserved for the minority language. Here domain is a key term in language use. Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003:30) defined domain as institutional context such as family, work place, friendship, etc, in which one language variety is deemed to be more appropriate than another. Similarly, according to Cooper (1967) cited in Clyne (1997:308), domain is explained as the contextualized sphere of communication such as home, work, school, religion, leisure or friendship, community group. Clark (1996:4) also views domain in terms of the setting of language use from written and spoken aspects. He argues that face to face communication is very significant in language use. Wolf (2000: 298) views domain in terms of patterns of language use which refers to who says what, to whom, when, where and why. In the current

research, domain is considered as the institutional context or as a contextualized sphere of communication.

Fishman (2001/a: 68) categorized two levels of domains of language use: less powerful domain which includes family, friends, neighborhood, community institution, and pre-school or elementary education and the powerful domain which includes employment, higher education, mass-media and government institution. He remarked that the less powerful domain is very important for language maintenance. Similarly, Fishman (1971:248) argues that family, neighborhood, and low work spheres are preserved for subordinate languages.

So, different scholars argue that if a subordinate language loses the low level domains, the bilingual speakers gradually become monolinguals. Therefore, the current research depends on the less powerful domains which the researcher believes will test the language maintenance of the Gamo speakers in Addis Ababa. The home/family, friendship, neighborhood, community institutions and religion, are, then, selected for this research.

According to Dorian (1981:105), cited in Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003: 30), “The home is the last bastion of a subordinate language in competition with a dominant language at wider currency.” In line with this, Downs (1998:63) confirms that the intrusion of the dominant language into the home domain is the worst situation. Similarly, it is argued that the home domain is often the last that survives in a minority language (Clyne 1997:308). The same author adds that not using the minority language in the home domain distracts from its liveliness and endangers its transmission to the future generation. Dittmar (1976:178) emphasizes this by saying “usually a language (variety) that is not used in the family has less chance of being retained than one which is used.” Therefore, it is most convincing to say that the home/family domain is the most important institution in the domain analysis of a language.

Religion and community institutions are also considered as important domains by some scholars. According to Giles et al (1977) cited in Appel and Muysken (1987:37), the use of minority languages in institutions such as religion, community and cultural organizations, etc., have a very strong impact on their maintenance. Making minority languages a language of religion is crucial for its maintenance (Apple and Muysken 1987:37). Religion and community groups are, sometimes, the last domains that survive in a minority language

(Clyne 1997:308). Fishman (1964) cited in David (1998) also says that religion has often been one of the domains in which a language is maintained longest.

The friendship domain is considered important due to its affinity in the social system, (Govindasamy and Nambiar 2003:30). According to Edward (1996:10), the strong link in family-neighborhood-community institutions increases intra-communication which in turn enhances language transmission and maintenance.

2.1.5.2. Language Attitude

Language attitude is another important factor that measures the state of language shift or maintenance. Various Scholars view language attitude as people's feelings towards their own language and others'. Haugen (1969:95) cited in Zelalem (2003:85) states, "Whenever languages are in contact, one is likely to find certain prevalent attitudes of favor or disfavor toward the languages involved." So, the attitude of speakers towards their own languages and others' has a great impact on the maintenance or shift of their language. Grosjean (1982:119) says, "In a community where different languages co-exist, language attitude plays an important role in the lives of these languages." The negative or positive attitude the speakers hold influences language shift or the maintenance of a language. In line with this Baker(2006:213) states that negative attitude affects language transmission from parents to their children and Holmes (1992:69) adds that positive attitude promotes language maintenance. Similarly, Harlow (2005:35) says, "If ... a large proportion of the target population sees no value in the maintenance of its language... this has a major effect on the language's future."

In sociolinguistics, there are two approaches to investigate language attitude: the mentalist and the behaviorist. With regard to the mentalist approach Fishman and Agheyisi 1970:138 cited in Dittmar (1976:151) state that attitudes are a mental and neutral state of readiness. They can not be observed directly but must be inferred from behavior or self – reported data.

In contrast to this, the behaviorist notion regards attitude (or 'dispositions') as a dependent variable. They can be determined statistically by observing actual behavior in social situation (Fishman and Agheyisi 1970:138 cited in Dittmar 1976: *ibid*).

The two standpoints have their own merits and demerits as to measuring language attitude. Since the mentalist approach is simple to gather and quantify data and does not take much time, the current researcher employed this approach.

2.1.5.3. Language proficiency

Language proficiency refers to language knowledge of an individual in speaking, understanding, writing and reading. Language proficiency determines the state of language maintenance and shift. David et al (2003:10) says, “Language proficiency assessment could best predict the level of language maintenance and shift.” According to Fishman (1990) cited in Cheng (2003:88), in studying language shift and maintenance, it is necessary to examine all four skills, i.e., speaking, writing and understanding and reading as one of the determinants of language loss.

Similarly, Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003:31) say, “... the extent of language shift and maintenance would also depend on the language proficiency of the members of the community. If they increasingly become incompetent in their ethnic language... this would signal a potential for language shift...”

2.1.5.4. Effort in Language Transmission

Language transmission is the transference of a language from one generation to the next. This process of passing on a language from parents to their children ensures the maintenance of the language. Intergeneration language transmission is the ongoing process whereby a language is transferred from generation to generation through the normal familial interaction of parents and children (and grand parents, grand children, etc.) (Horomia 2001:1 cited in Chrisp, 2005:150). Since language transmission happens within a family, parents should exert their efforts (through various mechanisms) to pass on their language to their children. Gupta and Yeok (1995:302) cited in Kamwangamalu (2003:72) argue that the ability and desire of parents to transmit the ancestral language to their children constitute the litmus test for language maintenance and shift.

Training children by their language for social environment ensures language transmission and consequently its maintenance. “... if children are socialized through their language by

their most significant care givers and role models ... the continuity of the process across generations ensures that the language is maintained among the population of the speakers” (Chrisp 2005:150).

Factors that hinder or encourage language transmission from parents to children according to Chrisp (2005:149) are lack of language knowledge and lack of confidence of parents in their language. Similarly community’s participation in the political and administrative infrastructure to support the target language is important factors for language transmission (Tollofsen, 1991 cited in Kamwangamalu 203-72). So, community’s participation is also significant for language transmission.

2.1.5.5. Demographic Variables

As stated above demographic factors like age, sex, education, etc., are important factors in the analysis of language shift and maintenance.

Age is claimed to be a significant measurement for language shift and maintenance. Appel and Muysken (1987:41) stated that generation is an important notion in the analysis of language maintenance and shift. They add that younger people choose another language as their regular medium of communication and they claim social status different from that of their parents’ generation. Similarly, Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003:30) argued that one method of studying whether language shift is taking place is to look at age distribution trends in the data and if genuine shift is taking place, a large proportion of older speakers would be using the declining language than the younger speakers. Fasold (1984:215) argues that language shift is taking place when younger people report to speak language different from their old counterparts. So, these statements explain that the different linguistic behaviors that may be revealed across age groups are signals of language shift.

The language proficiency difference across age groups is also a sign of language shift. Accordingly, Clyne (1976) and Demos (1988) cited in Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003:30) have pointed out that age difference in language proficiency has a significant impact on language maintenance or shift in immigrant community. Further more, Zelalem (2003:5-6) remarked in his study of Kemantyne language that language proficiency continuum across age groups shows the extent of language endangerment.

Education is another factor that determines language shift and maintenance. Hoffmann (1994:191 cited in Cheng 2003:84) points out that the most powerful case of language shift can be seen in areas where the school language is that of the high status group. He added that where there is no provision made for the children of the low-status group to learn to read and write the languages of their ancestors, language shift is bound to occur. So, a minority language which is not given in schools is vulnerable to shift. Holms (1992:69) said that educated people with positive attitude towards their mother tongue have more opportunity to maintain the language than those who are not educated. In line with this, Clyne (1997:310) argues that people with a high educational attainment can learn the majority language more easily for communication purpose. This scholar, further, argues that because they do not have to devote so much time to acquire the dominant language and culture, they have more opportunity to maintain the first language.

Mixed marriage in a family has influence on language shift and maintenance. Kloss (1966) cited in Clyne (1997:310) said that exogamy is usually a clear cut factor for promoting language shift. Holms (1992:86) argues that the dominant language becomes more often used between parents and children in families where the parents are from different linguistic groups.

Sex is another important factor that measures the extent to which a language undergoes shift or maintenance. It is claimed that women are the catalysts for language change and this is perhaps because the new language they shift to is seen as a language of power (Gal 1979 and Milroy 1982 cited in Naji and David 2003:95). Similarly, Wardaugh (1987) cited in Zelalem (2003:72) claims that women are less proficient in declining language than men. So, these statements show that when women show less use and proficiency in their language than men, it is convincing to say that the language is shifting.

It is also argued that women are responsible to transmit and maintain the mother tongue (Law, 1995 cited in Burk 2005:20). Similarly, Gal and Klimn (2000:26) cited in Bilaniuk (2003:54), state that women are responsible for maintaining linguistic and cultural traditions. Cheng (2003:87) said that in bilingual family's language choice is determined by the mother and the choice, in turn, is determined by attitude to a language and by the socio-economic considerations.

2.1.5.6. Fishman's graded intergenerational disruptive scale

Fishman (1991) cited in Baker (2001:67) has proposed a model to evaluate the degree to which a specific language is influenced by the pressure from a dominant language. He has listed sequential scales that measure how far a minority language is threatened or disrupted. According to Fishman, the higher the number of the scale is the higher the threat or disruption of a language. So, the scale at number 8 which is the highest scale is an index where the language is at the worst condition to become extinct, because it has fewer surviving speakers living isolated. The scale at number 7 is an index where a language is used in daily communication, but it is used more by the older speakers than the younger ones. This stage shows that there is no intergenerational communication between grandparents or parents and children. Generally, at this stage, the use of language at home/family at community levels is very low. So, it is the highest stage of language threat and disruption next to stage 8. Stage 6 indicates that the language is used at home and community level, but it lacks institutional support (like schools). This stage is the most important one for a language to revive. At stage 5, a language is reviving, but needs a transition from being a language of oracy to a language of literacy.

2.1.6. Concept of Ethnicity

Different scholars define ethnicity more or less similarly. Appel and Muysken (1987:12) define group identity as everything that differentiates a group from another group, and this is often called cultural or ethnic identity or its ethnicity. Accordingly, Nash (1989:115) defines ethnicity as an awareness of belonging to a large or small, socially dominant or subordinate group. Further, Newman (1978: 105) puts ethnicity as how people define themselves in relation to others and how distinctions are made between "us" and "them". However, there is a controversy on what ethnicity constitutes. William (1992:215) clearly states the two controversial ideas thereof. Accordingly, the first concept of ethnicity involves cultural features, be it language, behavior, norm or belief. This concept of ethnicity bases itself on the non-material (Cultural mobilization of interests). The second concept of ethnicity is the materialist or Marxist conception of ethnicity which defines a group in terms of its location in the economic system. So, this concept of ethnicity constitutes economy for the mobilization of interests. In other words, ethnicity is socially constructed.

However, the aim of this research is not to deal with the different controversial ideas on ethnicity. The Gamo can be taken as an ethnic group. We are concerned, here, with investigation about whether there is a necessary link between the language and ethnic identity with particular reference to the Gamo community in Addis Ababa.

Language has various functions. The most important uses of language are its communicative and identifying functions. According to Kembo-Sure (2000:73) cited in Webb, V and Kembo-Sure (2000) one of the basic uses of language is its informative (communicative) function. These scholars, further, state that language as a symbol of individual or group identity is also its most important feature in a multilingual society (ibid: 77).

Even though most scholars argue that language serves as a marker of individual or group identity, there is a controversy over the view that the link between language and ethnicity is inevitable or not. According to Edward (1985:105), language is one of the indicators of identity among others, and the loss of a language doesn't necessarily mean the loss of its ethnic identity. Similarly, Lopez (1978:275), after his investigation on the relationship between home language and ethnic identity, concluded that maintaining language has nothing to do with maintaining ethnic identity. So, according to these scholars, language and ethnic identity have no necessary (inherent) link.

On the other hand, Kroskrity (2000:101) argues that above all other non-linguistic criterion, language is the most important in identifying a person or group identity. He proposed this by defining identity as "the construction of membership in one or more special groups or categories". Baker (2001:69) also states language as an important marker of individual to belong to a particular ethnic group. Similarly, Desvries (1990:235) emphasizes that maintaining a language is a necessary condition for maintaining ethnic identity.

Of the above two opposed views regarding the link between language and ethnic identity, the argument that language as no inherent link seems to overweigh the other one. This is because of the fact that there are other symbols such as religion, food, clothes, customs, etc, that can maintain ethnic identity.

So, in the current study, the researcher follows the argument that there is no necessary link between language and ethnic identity. This implies that the maintenance or shift of a language does not necessarily mean the maintenance or loss of ethnic identity.

2.2. Review of Related Works

In this section, important related works, conducted both on the Ethiopian sociolinguistic context and on contexts outside Ethiopia, will be briefly discussed. The discussion focuses on the results of the studies.

Research on the “Dorze” community in Shiro Meda in Addis Ababa was conducted by Bekale (1979). The study examined the language use of the “Dorze” community shows that all the sample children used Amharic in all domains and that all claimed that Amharic is their mother tongue. The findings also showed that the community is bilingual in Amharic and “Dorze”. The study concluded indicating that in the future, the community will be monolingual in Amharic. However, the size of the research population was limited to a very small size, i.e., only to the language use of the community in one “Kebele”. Besides, the study was conducted twenty two years back which covers almost a generation’s gap. As to the size of the population, the researcher himself said that as his research depends on a small size, it is not possible to say that the research is conclusive. However, it will serve as a stepping-stone to other researchers who may conduct extensive research on the community (p. 4). So, the current research on the language shift and maintenance of the community in Addis Ababa can be considered appropriate. This study tries to investigate it extensively by using a larger sample size, covering large areas which include Shiro Meda and Kolfe, and investigates broader aspects than its predecessor including the language use, proficiency, attitudes and linguistic identity of the community.

Gebre Hishe (2008) conducted a research on the language use and identity of children born to Tigrigna speaking community living in Addis Ababa. His findings show that the children did not use Tigrigna and the language is shifting in favor of Amharic among the Addis Ababa Tigrigna speaking community. Gebre’s work is similar with the current research in the issues investigated and the methodology employed. However, the difference is in the research areas where Gebre’s work focuses on Tigrigna speech community while the current research is on

Gamo speech community. In addition Gebre has used SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) to analyze his data, but the current research has not.

Mesfin (2009) has also conducted a similar research on Oromo language maintenance in Addis Ababa. In his research, he has tested the language use, attitude and proficiency of the Oromo speakers in Addis Ababa. His research shows that the speakers use the language in various domains, have positive attitude towards their own language, and have higher proficiency in the language. Finally, he has concluded that the Oromo language is a safe language in Addis Ababa. The present research follows similar investigation to that of Mesfin. Of course, in the current research the ethno linguistic identity of the speakers is included which was not the concern of Mesfin's research.

Garcia, et al (1988) has contrasted two Hispanic speech communities made up of five Hispanic national origin groups with regard to language proficiency, use and attitude. The result showed that communities with differences in social class and ethnic composition, as well as different Hispanic national origin groups, have great interest in speaking English well, showing greater loyalty towards Spanish as a means of communication with others in the country of origin and within the family in the United States and as a source for ethnic identity, and greater desire to have the schools teach Spanish to their children.

The current study is similar with the above study regarding the issues investigated. However, the sociolinguistic context is different in that Garcia research was conducted in the USA while the present study is in Ethiopia. Besides, Garcia research focuses on the differences in the language use proficiency and attitude of two speech communities, while the current research is concerned with the language use, attitude and proficiency of one speech community. The current research investigates the ethno-linguistic identity of the target community which Garcia did not consider.

David et al (2003) has studied the Punjabi Sikh community in Petaling Jaya to determine language choice and the dominant language of the community at home and in religious domains with different interlocutors. The findings show that the community is shifting to English and/or using a mixed code that consists of three languages. Even though the sociolinguistic context is different, the above study is similar with the present one except that David has considered only language choice and the dominant language at two domains and

didn't try to see the ethnic identity of the community. The current study, however, investigates language attitude, language proficiency and examines language use in various domains and also focuses on the community's ethnic identity.

Variables	Categories	Number	%
-----------	------------	--------	---

CHAPTER THREE

3. Data Presentation and analyses

The migration of the Gamo speakers to Addis Ababa, which is typically an internal migration, seems to be the sole factor for the Gamo–Amhara contact in Addis Ababa. The Gamo community in Addis Ababa is a stable bilingual community (Bekale 1979:13). However, as there exists linguistic power difference and other socio-economic factors, language plays different roles. It might be the case that either Amharic is replacing Gamo in Addis Ababa or the community members have been able to maintain their language.

In this chapter, the gathered data will be presented and analyzed. The respondents' language use, language attitudes and identity, linguistic proficiency and language maintenance effort will be discussed in detail. The resulting findings will also be disclosed.

3.1 .Respondents' Demography

The socio-linguistic information in this paper was gathered from 219 respondents, of which the larger proportion is from Shiro Meda, as it is the place where the majority of the ethnic group under discussion resides. The remaining is from Kolfe. Of the total 219 sample population, 199 were subjects to fill the questionnaires while the rest 20 were subjects for interview questions. The general profile of the respondents will be presented in the following table.

Sex	Female	96	48.2
	Male	103	51.8
	Total	199	100
Age	15-29	108	54.3
	30+	91	45.7
	Total	199	100
Educational Status	Illiterate	79	39.7
	Elementary	23	11.6
	Secondary	41	20.6
	Diploma	42	21.1
	Degree+	14	7.0
	Total	199	100
Parents Ethnic Composition	Both Gamos	65	59.1
	Gamo& Amhara	21	19.1
	Gamo & Oromo	24	21.8
	Total	110	100
Marital Status	Married and with Children	86	43.2
	Married and without children	24	12.1
	Unmarried	89	44.7
	Total	199	100

Table -1- Demographic information

With regard to the age of the respondents, it is categorized into two groups: the young and adult groups. The young group ranges from 15-29 while the adult ≥ 30 . This categorization is based on the national youth policy (2004:4) which states, "...this youth policy defines youth as to include part of the society who are between 15-29 years."

As to the respondents' educational level, it is grouped, for convenience, as higher and lower educational status. Higher educational group consists of respondents having a diploma and above while lower educational status includes respondents who are between illiterate level through primary to secondary educational levels.

Generally, the above table shows the general profile of the 199 respondents, who were asked to fill in the questionnaire. As the table depicts, the respondents are categorized according to their sex, age, educational status, marital status and interethnic composition. With regard to the respondents' proportion, as regards sex we have nearly equal proportion while in respect to the two age groups; the young are greater by 8.6% than the adult. As to their educational status, those who are grouped under low level education status including illiteracy, primary & secondary levels (71.9%) are much greater than those under high level education status which includes diploma and degree holders (28.1%). The marital status of the respondents shows that those who are married are greater by 21% than those who are unmarried. Among those who are married, the greater proportions (43.2%) have children. With regard to the ethnic compositions of the married respondents, those who have intra-ethnic marriages (59.1%) are greater than those who have inter-ethnic marriages which are (40.9%).

On the other hand, those 20 parents who were interviewed were drawn from different sexes, age groups and education background while all have intra-ethnic marriages.

3.2. Language use

In this subsection, the subjects' language use at different domains are described and analyzed in detail. As pointed out above, Apple and Muysken (1987) say that domain analysis is one of the ways of studying the maintenance or shift of a language, and Fishman (2001) listed the two levels of domains: less powerful low domain and powerful domain. However, in this paper, the researcher did not consider the powerful domain for the investigation of the speech behaviors of the target community. In Addis Ababa, the powerful high domains such as higher education, government employments (courts, police offices, 'kebele' offices, etc.), Mass-media, political discourses, etc., are preserved for the dominant language, Amharic, which is the lingua franca in Ethiopia, and the official language in Addis Ababa. So, the less powerful domain was focused on by the researcher, as it is preserved for the minority languages.

Consequently, the language use question in the questionnaire are intended to investigate the speech behaviors of the respondents at the home level, with their friends and neighbors, at community institutions such as local credit association "Iqub", permanent fund raising associations "Idir", at wedding ceremonies and at funeral ceremonies. In addition, the

respondents' language uses at "Sännö mariam", which is a weekly gathering, held on Mondays on which those quarreled members of the Gamo community happen to reconcile by elders and at this day some members of the community will be invited to attend the event, and at religious places were parts of the language use items. Each item will be presented and analyzed in the following section.

3.2.1. Language use at the home level

The data on language use at the home level has been gathered through questions about the respondents' language use with their parents, grand parents, children, spouses, grand children and siblings.

As it can be seen from table 2 below, 102(51.3%) and 106 (53.3%) respondents use Gamo with their fathers and mothers, respectively. A relatively significant number of respondents 65 (36.7%) and 62(31.2%) indicated that they use a mixture of Gamo and Amharic with their fathers and mothers, respectively. On the contrary, an insignificant number of respondents 32(16.1%) and 31(15.6%) reported that they use Amharic with their fathers and mothers, respectively. This suggests that Gamo is relatively dominantly used by respondents with their fathers and mothers. However, as the number of respondents who use both languages is relatively significant, it is the case that shift is taking place reflected by the use of a mixture of Gamo and Amharic.

Of the 181 respondents who claim to have grand fathers, 119(65.7%) reported that they use Gamo with their grandfathers. Relatively, an insignificant number of respondents 38(21%) and 24 (13.3%) use a mixture of Gamo and Amharic, respectively. This indicates that Gamo is dominantly used by respondents with their grandfathers.

The table also shows that, of those who have grandmothers, 122(65.2%) respondents use Gamo with their grand mothers. A relatively insignificant number of respondents 27(14.4%) and 38(20.3%) use Amharic and a mixture of Gamo and Amharic with their grand mothers, respectively. Therefore, Gamo is a widely used language of communication by respondents with their grand mothers.

40(46.5%) respondents who have children use Amharic with their children and 25(29.1%) and 21(24.4%) use Gamo and both with their children, respectively. These figures show that Amharic is a wider means of communication among parents with their children.

The table also shows that 43(39.1%) of 110 respondents use Gamo with their spouses while almost an equal number of respondents, 34(30.9%) and 33(30%), use Amharic and both with their spouses, respectively. This implies that even though Gamo is relatively dominantly used by the subjects with their spouses, the use of Amharic and a mix of Gamo and Amharic is also considerable.

With regard to those who have grand children, 33(53.2%) respondents use Amharic while 19(30.6%) use both. On the contrary, 10(16.1%) respondents reported to use Gamo with their grandchildren. This tells us that Amharic is a dominant language of communication between grand parents and grand children.

Of the total subjects, 198 claim to have brothers of which, 83(41.9%) claim that they use both languages with their brothers and a relatively significant number of respondents, 62(31.3) use Amharic with their brothers. On the other hand, a relatively smaller number of respondents 53(26.8) use Gamo with their brothers. This shows that the respondents use a mixture of Gamo and Amharic dominantly to communicate with their brothers.

Finally, 84(43.1%) and 59 (30.3%) respondents reported that they use both languages and Gamo with their sisters, respectively. 52(26.7%) respondents use Amharic with their sisters. So, a mix of Gamo and Amharic is a dominant language between the respondents and their sisters.

The data also reveals the declining trend of the use of Gamo across generations. The data shows that there is a greater use of Gamo with elders (being greater with grandparents and relatively lesser with parents), and the bilingual behavior coming to a considerable number. The degree of use of Gamo is lesser when respondents speak with youths compared with elders in which case the use of both languages and that of Amharic is greater. The use of Amharic is further greater when speaking with children.

So, this implies there is the tendency of language shift from Gamo to Amharic, gradually increasing from elder generation, manifesting relatively smaller rate of bilingualism in both

languages with more Gamo monolinguals, to Children with largely becoming monolinguals in Amharic.

While collecting the data, the researcher also observed the speech behavior of small children with their parents and siblings. He also observed the language use of children with their Gamo friends and at their play grounds. Surprisingly, all use Amharic with their families at home and with their friends at play grounds. So, Amharic seems a dominant language for children to communicate with their families and friends.

The presentation in the above table shows that Amharic is predominantly used by respondents with their children and grand children. A mixture of Gamo and Amharic is a dominant language of communication between respondents and their spouses and siblings. Even though Gamo is largely used by respondents with their parents and grand parents, the use of a mixture of Gamo and Amharic is very significant. According to Downs (1998:63) the intrusion of the dominant language into the home domain is the worst situation. Baker (2001:69) states that as an institution, the family creates and maintains boundaries from the outside that may prevent the majority language from over – intrusion. In this study it can be said that Amharic is highly intruding into the home domain where it is preserved for Gamo and the family doesn't create boundary to prevent it. So, Gamo is not effectively used by respondents at the home level.

When measured by Fishman's graded intergenerational disruptive scale of language threat and disruption, the language use of the Gamos at home falls at stage 7 where older speakers use Gamo more than the younger ones. This is the worst stage close to the level of language extinction after the last stage 8, unless the language is maintained in Addis Ababa.

Language used with	Responses									
	Gamo		Amharic		Gamo and Amharic		Other		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Father	102	51.3	32	16.1	65	32.7	-	-	199	100
Mother	106	53.3	31	15.6	62	31.2	-	-	199	100
Grandfather	119	65.7	24	13.3	38	21	-	-	181	100
Grand mother	122	65.7	27	14.4	38	20.3	-	-	187	100
Children	25	29.1	40	46.5	21	24.4	-	-	86	100
Spouses	43	39.1	34	30.9	33	30	-	-	110	100
Grand children	10	16.1	33	53.2	19	30.6	-	-	62	100
Brother	53	26.8	62	31.3	83	41.9	-	-	198	100
Sister	59	30.3	52	26.7	84	43.1	-	-	195	100

Table 2. Language use at home level

N.B. F = Frequency

3.2.1.1.. Language use at the home level by respondents' age

Table 3 shows that 45.4% of the respondents of the 15-29 age level and 58.2% respondents of the ≥ 30 age group have reported to use Gamo with their fathers. 16.7% of the 15-29 age level and 15.4% of the ≥ 30 age level have reported to use Amharic with their fathers. 38.0% of the 15-29 age level respondents and 26.4% of the ≥ 30 age level have reported to use both languages with their fathers. So, here, age is not a factor on the language use of respondents with their fathers.

The table also presents that 57.6% respondents of the 15-29 age level and 74.2% respondents of the ≥ 30 age level use Gamo with their grand fathers and 15.2% respondents of the 15-29 age level and 11.2% respondents of the ≥ 30 age group use Amharic with their grand fathers. 27.2% of the 15-29 age level and 24.2% of the ≥ 30 age level respondents use Amharic with their grand fathers. 27.2% respondents of the 15-29 age level and 24.2% respondents of the ≥ 30 age level use both languages with their grand fathers. The figures show that there is no great age difference on the language use of respondents with their grand fathers.

With regard to the language use of respondents with their children, 16.1% of the 15-29 age level and 30.9% of the ≥ 30 age level respondents have reported to use Gamo with their children while 83.9% of the 15-29 age level and 18.2% of the ≥ 30 age level respondents use Amharic with their children. 51.0% respondents of the ≥ 30 age level use both languages with their children. Here, the figures show that younger group use Amharic with their children than adult group. So, age is a factor on the language use of respondents with their children.

24.4% of the 15-29 age level and 47.7% of the ≥ 30 age level respondents use Gamo with their spouses while 53.3% of the 15-29 age level and 15.4% of the ≥ 30 age level respondents use Amharic with their spouses. 15.4% of the 15-29 age level and 39.9% of the ≥ 30 age level respondents use both languages with their spouses. So, age is a factor on the language use of respondents with their spouses.

As to the language use with their brothers, 17.3% of the 15-29 age level and 37.2% of the ≥ 30 age level respondents reported to use Gamo with their brothers and 35.6% of the 15-29 age level and 26.6% of the ≥ 30 age level respondents claimed to use Amharic with their brothers. 47.1% and 36.2% of the 15-29 and ≥ 30 age levels use both languages with their

brothers, respectively. The figures show that more young respondents use Amharic and both languages with their brothers so that age has impact on the language uses of the respondents with their brothers.

21.4% of the 15-29 age level and 40.2% of the ≥ 30 age level respondents use Gamo with their sisters while 43.7% and 42.4% of the 15-29 and the ≥ 30 age levels use Amharic, respectively, with their sisters. 43.7% and 42.4% respondents of the 15-29 and ≥ 30 age levels, respectively, use both languages when communicating with their sisters. The figures indicate that more youths use Amharic and both languages with their sisters. This implies that age is a factor on the language use of respondents with their sisters.

Generally, in the above discussion, the use of language by respondents with their parents and grandparents show no great difference across the two age groups. But there is a relatively greater age difference on the language use of respondents with their children, siblings and spouses. In this case, it is found that more adults use Gamo than the young group with their spouses, siblings and children. According to Fasold (1987), one sign of language shift is when the older group largely uses their native (mother tongue) language more than the young group. So, age is a factor on the language use of respondents at home.

Responses																		
Language used with	Gamo				Amharic				Amharic and Gamo				Other					
	15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Father	49	45.4	53	58.2	18	16.7	14	15.4	41	38.0	24	26.4	-	-	-	-	199	100
Mother	49	45.4	57	62.6	19	17.6	12	13.2	40	37.0	22	24.2	-	-	-	-	199	100
Grandfather	53	57.6	66	74.2	14	15.2	10	11.2	25	27.2	13	24.2	-	-	-	-	181	100
Grand mother	60	63.1	62	67.4	16	16.8	11	12.0	19	20.0	19	20.7	-	-	-	-	187	100
Children	5	16.1	17	30.9	26	83.9	10	18.2	-	-	28	51.0	-	-	-	-	86	100
Spouses	11	24.4	31	47.7	24	53.3	10	15.4	10	22.2	31	36.9	-	-	-	-	110	100
Brother	18	17.3	35	37.2	32	35.6	25	26.6	49	47.1	34	36.2	-	-	-	-	198	100
Sister	22	21.4	37	40.2	36	35.0	16	17.4	45	43.7	39	42.4	-	-	-	-	195	100

Table-3 Language use by age level

3.2.1.2. Respondents language use at home level by sex

The presentation in the table 4 shows that 52.4% and 50% male and female respondents use Gamo, respectively, with their fathers. 16.5% male and 15.6% female subjects responded to use both languages with their fathers. Here, the figures show that both sex groups equally use their mother tongue with their fathers. So, sex difference does not make any difference on the language use of respondents with their fathers.

58.2% male and 47.9% female respondents use Gamo with their mothers while 11.7% male and 19.8% female respondents use Amharic with their mothers. 30.1% male and 32.3% female respondents reported to use both languages with their mothers. Here, it is clear that there is no great difference on the language use of respondents with their mothers. This indicates that sex difference is not a factor on respondents' language use with their mothers.

The table also presents that 65% male and 66.7% female respondents use Gamo with their grandfathers while 13.4% and 13.1% male and female subjects use Amharic with their grandfathers, respectively. 21.6% Male and 20.2% female respondents use both languages with their grandfathers. So, sex does not affect the language use of the respondents with their grandfathers.

With regard to the language use of the subjects with their grandmothers, 63.1% male and 67.9% female subjects responded to use Gamo while 12.6% male and 16.7% female respondents reported to use Amharic with their grandmothers. 24.3% male and 15.5% female subjects responded to use both languages with their grandmothers. Here, language use by respondents with their grandmothers is not affected by sex differences.

As to the language use of the respondents with their children, 32.4% male and 20.4% female respondents use Gamo with their children while 18.9% male and 59.2% female respondents answered to use both languages with their children. These figures show that more females use Amharic with their children than males. So, it is the case that sex is a factor on the language use of respondents with their children.

With regard to the language use of the respondents with their spouses, 47.2% male and 29.8% female respondents reported to use Gamo with their spouses while 24.5% male and 36.8%

female respondents have reported to use Amharic with their spouses. 28.3% male and 33.3% female subjects have responded to use both languages with their spouses. This shows that more females favor the use of Amharic than males. So, sex is not a factor for the language use of the subjects with their spouses.

35.5% male and 22.6% female respondents use Gamo with their grand children while 25.8% male and 58.1% female respondents use Amharic with their grandchildren. 38.7% male and 19.4% female respondents reported to use both languages with their grand children. The figures show that more female subjects have reported to use Amharic with their grand children than male respondents. So, sex has a role on the language use of respondents with their grandchildren.

As to the respondents language use with their brothers, 28.7% male and 24.7% female respondents use Gamo with their brothers while 27.7% male and 35.1% female respondents use Amharic with their brothers. 43.6% male and 40.2% female subjects have reported to use both languages with their brothers. This shows that more females favor the use of Amharic with their brothers than males. So, sex is a factor on the language use by the respondents with their brothers.

Finally, with regard to the language use of respondents with their sisters, 30.3% male and 30.2% female subjects have reported to use Gamo with their sisters while 27.3% male and 26% female subjects use Amharic with their sisters. And 42.4% male and 43.8 females use both languages with their sisters. Here, the figures show that sex difference has no role on the language use of respondents with their sisters.

The table generally presents that sex is not a factor on the respondents language use with their parents, grandparents, and male siblings. However, as to the language use of respondents with their children and grandchildren, spouses, male siblings and grandchildren, there is a sex difference. In this case, more female respondents use Amharic with their children, grandchildren, spouses and male siblings than male respondents. The reason seems to be the fact that Amharic is a language of power and generating economy in Addis Ababa so that females prefer their children and grand children to use Amharic to Gamo. According to Gal (1978) and Milroy (1982) women are the catalysts for language change and this is perhaps because the new language they shift to is seen as a language of power.

Language used with	Responses																	
	Gamo				Amharic				Amharic and Gamo				Other				Total	
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F			
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Father	54	52.4	48	50	17	16.5	15	15.6	32	31.1	33	34.4	-	-	-	-	199	100
Mother	60	58.2	46	47.9	12	11.7	19	19.8	31	30.1	31	32.3	-	-	-	-	199	100
Grandfather	63	65.0	56	66.7	13	13.4	11	13.1	21	21.6	17	20.2	-	-	-	-	181	100
Grand mother	65	63.1	57	67.9	13	12.4	14	16.7	25	24.3	13	15.5	-	-	-	-	187	100
Children	12	32.4	10	20.4	7	18.9	29	59.2	18	48.6	10	20.4	-	-	-	-	86	100
Spouses	25	47.2	17	29.8	13	24.5	21	36.8	15	28.3	19	33.3	-	-	-	-	110	100
Grand children	11	35.5	7	22.6	8	25.8	18	58.1	12	38.7	6	19.4	-	-	-	-	62	100
Brother	29	28.7	24	24.7	28	27.7	34	35.1	44	43.6	39	40.2	-	-	-	-	198	100
Sister	30	30.3	29	30.2	27	27.3	25	26.0	42	42.4	42	43.8	-	-	-	-	195	100

Table -4. Language use at home level by sex

3.2.1.3. Language use at home by education status

From table 5, we can see that 26.8% high level education group and 60.8% low level education group use Gamo with their fathers, while 19.6% and 14.7% highly educated and low level education respondents communicate with their fathers in Gamo, respectively. 53.6% high level education group and 24.5% low level education group respondents use both languages to communicate with their fathers. The figure shows high level education group favors the use of Amharic more than the low level education subjects. So, the educational level of respondents has influence on the language use of respondents with their fathers.

The table also presents 21.4% high level education group and 65.7% low level education respondents communicate in Gamo with their mothers while 12.5% and 16.8% of high level education group and low level education groups use Amharic with their mothers. 66.1% and 17.5% of high level education group and low level education group communicate with their mothers on both languages. Since the figures show that high level education groups widely use a mix of Amharic and Gamo to communicate with their mothers, educational level is a factor on respondents' language use with their mothers.

50% and 72.8% high level education and low level education groups widely use Gamo, respectively, to communicate with their grand fathers, while 8.9% highly educated and 15.2% low level education respondents use Amharic and 41.1%, high and 12.0% low educational status respondents communicate in both languages. Both education level groups largely use Gamo with their grandfathers. However, there a great use of both languages by High education level group more than the low level education group. So, education level as a factor on the language use of respondents with their grandfather.

58.9% highly educated and 67.9% low level education group use Gamo with their grand mothers. 5.5% high level education group and 18.3% low level education respondent communicates in Amharic with their grand mothers. Similarly, 35.7% and 13.7%, high level education group and low level education groups, respectively use both languages with their grandmothers. These figures show that even though educational groups use Gamo widely, the use of a mix of Gamo and Amharic is greater by high level education group respondents. So, educational background is a factor on the language use of respondents with grandmothers.

With regard to the language use of respondents with their children, 11.5% high level education group and 36.7% low level education respondents communicate in Gamo with their children while 65.4% highly educated and 38.3% low level education respondents use Amharic with their children. 23.1% and 25.0% highly educated and low level education groups use both languages with their children. This shows that more highly educated respondents widely use Amharic with their children than low level education respondents. So, educational background is an influential factor on the language use of respondents with their children.

With regard to the respondents language use with their spouses, 28.9% highly educated and 44.4% low level education respondents use Gamo with their spouses while 23.7% highly educated and 34.7% low level education groups use Amharic with their spouses. 47.5% and 20.8% highly educated and low level education respondents use both languages, respectively, with their spouses. The figures show there is difference on the language use of respondents with their spouses. So, education is a factor on respondents' language use with their spouses.

As to the language use of respondents with their brothers, 16.1% highly educated and 31.0% low level education respondents use Gamo with their brothers while 48.2% and 24.6% highly educated and low level education respondents, respectively, communicate in Amharic with their brothers. 35.7 % highly educated and 44.4% low level education respondents use both languages with their brothers. The figures indicate that relatively more highly educated respondents widely communicate in Amharic with their brothers than low level education group. This implies that educational background is an influencing factor on the language use of respondents with their brothers.

With regard to the language use of respondents with their sisters, 21.4% highly educated and 33.8% low level education respondents communicate in Gamo with their sisters while 53.8% and 15.8% highly educated and low level education respondents use Amharic with their sisters, respectively. 25.0% high education level and 50.4% low level education respondents communicate in both languages with their sisters, respectively. This implies that highly educated respondents use Amharic with their sisters more than the low level education respondents. So, educational level is a factor on the language use of respondents with their sisters.

Generally, the table tells us that education level is a factor on the language use of the respondents with their parents, grandparent, children, spouses and siblings. That means that high level

education respondents communicate with their grandparents, parents, spouses, siblings and children in Amharic more than that of the low level education respondents. In the second chapter of this paper, it has been argued that highly educated people have more opportunity to maintain their language than uneducated ones. However, the case is different in the Gamo community where more highly educated respondents have claimed to use Amharic than the uneducated respondents.

Language used with	Responses																		
	Gamo				Amharic					Amharic and Gamo				Other				Total	
	High		Low		High		Low			High		Low		High		Low			
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Father	15	26.8	87	60.8	11	19.6	21	14.7	30	53.6	35	24.5	-	-	-	-	199	100	
Mother	12	21.4	94	65.7	7	12.5	24	16.8	37	66.1	25	17.5	-	-	-		199	100	
Grandfather	28	50	91	72.8	5	8.9	19	15.2	23	41.1	15	12.0	-	-	-		181	100	
Grand mother	33	58.9	89	67.9	3	5.5	24	18.3	20	35.7	18	13.7	-	-	-		187	100	
Children	3	11.5	22	36.7	17	65.4	23	38.3	6	23.1	15	25.0	-	-	-		86	100	
Spouses	11	28.9	32	44.4	9	23.7	25	34.7	18	47.5	15	20.8	-	-	-		110	100	
Brother	9	16.1	44	31.0	27	48.2	35	24.6	20	35.7	63	44.4	-	-	-		198	100	
Sister	12	21.4	47	33.8	30	53.6	22	15.8	14	25.0	70	50.4	-	-	-		195	100	

Table -5 Language use at home level by educational level

3.2.2. Respondents' dominant language at home

Here, the respondents' dominant language at their home has been examined and the result is presented in the following table.

Language	F	%
Amharic	84	42.2
Gamo	94	47.2
Both	21	10.6
Other	-	-
Total	199	100

Table -6. Respondents' dominant language at home

As can be seen from the above table, 84(42.2%), 94(47.2%) and 21 (10.6%) respondents answered that they use Amharic, Gamo and both languages, respectively. These figures show that both Gamo and Amharic are equally dominant languages at the home. This point coincides with what Dorian (1981:105) cited in Govindasamy and Nambiar (2003:30) state that the home is the last bastion of a subordinate language in competition with a dominant language at wider currency and with Clyne (1997:38) who says that not using the minority language in the home domain distracts from its liveliness and endangers its transmission to the future generation. Therefore, as the above table presents, the dominant language which is Amharic is in strong competition with the minority language which is Gamo to be the dominant language at home.

3.2.3. Language use with Gamo friends

Language used with	Responses									
	Amharic		Gamo		Amharic and Gamo		Other		Total No and % of Respondents	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Friends	66	33.2	37	18.6	96	48.2	-	-	199	100

Table -7. Language use with friends

The above table shows that 66(33.2%), 37(18.6%), 96(48.2%) respondents have reported to use Amharic, Gamo and a mixture of Gamo and Amharic, respectively, with their Gamo friends. These figures show that a mix of Gamo and Amharic is dominantly used by respondents with their Gamo friends. This implies that the intrusion of Amharic into friends' domain is very strong. According to Fishman (2001/a: 68), friends domain is one of the less powerful domains which is very important for language maintenance. The presentation in the above data reveals that Gamo is shifting in favor of the use of Amharic in friendship domain.

3.2.4. Language use with Gamo Neighbors

Language used with	Responses									
	Amharic		Gamo		Amharic and Gamo		Other		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Neighbours	82	41.2	34	17.1	83	47.7	-	-	199	100

Table -8. Language use with Gamo neighbors

As it can be seen from the above table 84(41.2%), 34(17.1%) and 83(41.7%) of the subject responded that they use Amharic, Gamo and both languages, respectively, with their neighbors. This implies that Gamo and a mix of Amharic and Gamo are equally predominantly used among respondents with their neighbors. So, the intrusion of Amharic into the neighborhood domain is real sign of shift in favor of Amharic. Fishman (1971:248) argues that neighborhood domain is preserved for subordinate language. So, it can be deduced from the above table that Gamo is loosing its neighborhood domain in favor of Amharic.

3.2.5. Language use at religious places

Language used at	Responses									
	Gamo		Amharic		Amharic and Gamo		Other		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Religious place	12	6	156	78.4	31	15.6	-	-	199	100

Table 9: Language used at religious place

The above table presents that 12(6%), 156(78.4%) and 31(15.6%) of the respondents use Gamo, Amharic and a mixture of Gamo and Amharic at religious places, respectively. This suggests that Amharic is by far the largest medium of communication used by respondents at religious places. According to Giles et al (1977) cited in Appel and Muyskey (1987), the use of minority languages in a religious institution is very important for their maintenance. Fishman (1964) also argues that religion has often been one of the domains in which a language is maintained longest. But, in this case Gamo is not used at religious places and is not used for religious services. It seems to be the fact in this case study that Amharic is used dominantly in religious places.

3.2.6. Language use at community's organizations

Since the Gamos are living in Addis Ababa as a community, they have formed their own ethnic in-group local associations that would increase their social interactions. The use of ethnic language in such associations is very important for the languages' maintenance. So the tendency of Gamo to shift to Amharic in these domains indicates a real threat to extinction.

Thus, the current research investigates the language use of the community at their social organizations such as funeral ceremonies, credit associations 'Iqub', permanent fund raising associations 'Idir', wedding ceremonies and at the community's weekly gatherings 'Säñño mariam'. The responses are presented in the following table:

Responses										
Language used at	Gamo		Amharic		Amharic and Gamo		Other		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Funeral place	95	47.7	32	16.1	72	36.2	-	-	199	100
Credit association (Iqub)	77	38.7	40	20.1	82	41.2	-	-	199	100
Fund raising association (Idir)	94	47.2	29	14.6	78	38.2	-	-	199	100
Wedding Ceremony	80	40.2	41	20.6	78	39.2	-	-	199	100
Sääño mariam “weekly gathering”	90	45.2	25	12.6	84	42.2	-	-	199	100

Table - 10. Language use at community associations

As can be seen from the above table, 95(47.7%), 32(16.1%) and 72(36.2%) respondents reported to use Gamo, Amharic and both languages at funeral ceremony, respectively. This figure suggests that Gamo is dominantly used at this domain. However, a relatively significant number of respondents have claimed to use a mix of Gamo and Amharic.

The table also shows that 77(38.7%), 40(21.1%) and 82(41.2%) respondents have reported to use Gamo, Amharic and both languages, respectively, at credit association ‘Iqub’. This figure tells us that the use of Gamo and a mix of Amharic and Gamo is relatively equally used by respondents at credit associations.

With regard to the language use of respondents at permanent fund raising associations ‘Idir’, 94(47.2%), 29 (14.6%) and 76 (38.2%) subjects use Gamo, Amharic and both languages, respectively. Here, Gamo and a mix of Gamo and Amharic are equally used by the respondents at the domain of credit association ‘Idir’.

Finally, the table presents that 90(42.2%), 25(12.6%) and 84(42.2%) respondents have reported to use Gamo, Amharic and both languages at the community's weekly gatherings 'Säñño mariam', respectively. The figures show that Gamo and both languages are equally dominantly used at weekly gathering "Säñño mariam"

The presentation in the above table shows that in all community's organizations Gamo and a mix of Gamo and Amharic are equally used as medium of communication. This implies that Amharic is strongly intruding into these domains. According to Edward (1996:10) community institutions increase intra-communication which in turn enhances language maintenance. Similarly, Baker (2001:68) says that performances and publications, ceremonies and cultural meetings are important to the extent to which they encourage everyday activity, at family and community level, in that language and valuable to the extent they foster the passing of a language across generation. Fishman (1991) cited in Baker (2001:69) also argued that if a minority language is used in the family, it may be also be used in the street, in shops with neighbors and friends and it will more probably be spoken in the neighborhood and in community life, in religious and cultural events.

So, according to Fishman's scale of language threat and disruption, the Gamo in Addis Ababa falls on the 7th stage/step which shows the highest scale of language threat and disruption next to the 8th stage which is the worst case for a language.

However, in this regard, even though the Gamos are living in Addis Ababa as a community, it is not the case that the Gamo language is effectively used in their institutions. Rather, as the above table shows, their language seems to loose these domains in favor of the dominant language. These seem to be the fact that these local in-group institutions play lesser roles to secure the language

3.2.7. Home language and interethnic marriage

As it is already stated in the demography section, there exists interethnic marriage between Gamos and Amharas and Gamos and Oromos, of which 21 (46.7%) respondents claimed to have Gamo and Amhara ethnic marriage while 24(53.3%) having Gamo and Oromo ethnic marriage. The following table presents their language use.

Interethnic marriage						
Language	Gamo & Amhara		Gamo and Oromo		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Gamo	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amharic	21	100	24	100	45	100
Both	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 11: Language use and interethnic marriage

As it can be seen from the above table, all (100%) Gamo and Amhara ethnic families use Amharic at their households, and similarly all (100%) Gamo and Oromo ethnic families use Amharic as a dominant language of communication in their households. The statement by Kloss (1966) cited in Clyne (1997) which says that exogamy is usually a clear cut factor for promoting language shift is also true in the Gamo community of Addis Ababa. So, it can be said that interethnic marriage is a factor for language shift from Gamo to Amharic in families of different ethnic backgrounds.

3.2.8. Rate of visit to the homeland

As discussed above, the frequency of visits to the homeland by community members is another important measure of the degree of language maintenance regarding minority groups. An attempt has been made to examine it in this section.

Respondents were asked to rate themselves using a five point Likert scale.

Q. How often do you go to Gamo Zone?

μ = expected mean score=2.5

Key: 5=Always, 4=Frequently, 3=Sometimes, 2=Rarely, 1= Never.

Responses													
	Always		Frequently		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Total		Mean
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Q₁	20	10.0	27	13.6	50	25.1	59	29.6	43	21.6	199	100	2.61

Table12: Rate of visit to homeland

Their responses are presented in the following table.

As it can be seen from the above table, out of 199 respondents, 20(10%), 27(13.6%), 50(25.1%), 59(29.6%) and 43 (21.6%) respondents reported to return to their homeland always, frequently, sometimes, rarely and never, respectively. The obtained mean score value, 2.61 is almost equal with the expected mean score, which is 2.50. The responses rarely (29.6%) and never (21.6%) together are greater than the responses always (10.0%) and frequently (13.6%). This shows that members of the community exhibit very poor rate of return to their home land. This point does not fit with the statement of Conklin and Lourie (1983) cited in Baker (1993) that high return to homeland is important for the maintenance of a language.

In general, the poor rate of return of the community's member shows that Gamo is not maintained in Addis Ababa.

3.3. Respondents' Language maintenance effort

In this research paper, the five point Likert scales and one open-ended question were used in the questionnaire to investigate the subjects' language maintenance effort.

Items posed in the question are:

1. How often do you encourage your children to use Gamo at the home?
2. How often do you tell your children folktales in Gamo?
3. How often do you talk Gamo with your children at the home?

And the respondents' answers are organized in the following table.

The mean score values of each questions:

Q1=2.66

Q2=2.41

Q3=2.95

The expected mean score (μ) =2.50

Key: 5=Always, 4= Frequently, 3=Sometimes, 2=Rarely, 1=Never

Responses												
Item	5		4		3		2		1			
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	Total	%
1	13	15.1	10	11.6	19	22.1	23	26.7	21	24.4	86	100
2	7	8.1	11	12.8	19	22.1	23	26.7	26	30.2	86	100
3	18	20.9	13	15.1	17	19.8	23	26.7	15	17.4	86	100

Table 13: Respondents' Language maintenance effort

As it can be read from the above table, 13 (15.1%), 10(11.6%), 19(22.1%), 23(26.7%) and 21(24.45) respondents create opportunities for their children to speak Gamo at home always, frequently, sometimes, rarely and never, respectively. The obtained mean score value for the first item, 2.66, is almost equal with the expected mean score which is 2.50. The table also show that the responses, always (15.1%) and frequently (11.6%) together, are less than the responses rarely (26.7%) and never (24.4%) The table also shows that the responses always (15.1%) and frequently (16.6%) together are lesser than the responses rarely (26.7%) and never (24.4). This shows that the respondents' children do not get encouragement from their parents to speak Gamo at home. Generally parents do not make efforts to encourage their children to use Gamo at home, do not tell folktales, and do not speak in Gamo with their children at home.

As depicted in the same table, 7(8.1%), 11 (12.8%), 19(21.1%), 23 (26.7%) and 26(30.2%) respondents have reported that they tell their children stories in Gamo always, frequently, sometimes, rarely, and never respectively. The obtained mean score, 2.41, is less than the expected mean score which is 2.50. The responses, always (8.1%) and frequently (12.8%) together, is much less than the responses, rarely (26.7%) and never (30.2%) This also shows that the respondents' children do not have access to stories being told in Gamo.

With regard to question 3, 18(20.9), 13 (15.1) 17(19.8), 23 (26.7), 15(17.4) respondents answered that they talk with their children In Gamo at home always, frequently, sometimes, rarely and never, respectively. The deviation of the obtained mean score, 2.95,

is not significant with the expected mean score which is 2.50. The responses, always (20.9%) and frequently (15.1%) together, is less than the responses, rarely (26.7%) and never (17.4%). This suggests that children have no opportunity to talk with their parents in Gamo at home.

The researcher also asked the respondents the following open ended question in the questionnaire.

Q4: State any effort you have made to transmit your ethnic language to your children.

With regard to the above question, of the 86 parents 62(72.0%) claimed that they have not made any effort to transmit their language to their children. Some of the responses of the four respondents are:

- I have not made any effort to teach my children Gamo
- It is up to the children to know the language. I only give them freedom to choose either Gamo or Amharic.
- I do not let my children know Gamo, because it is not used across the country.
- So far, I have never made effort to pass on my ethnic language to my children.

However, in the future, I will try to do so.

On the other hand, those who have claimed to have made effort to transmit their ethnic language to their children, 24(27.9%) stated as follows:

(5 respondents)

- I order my children to do things in Gamo
- I tell my child Gamo proverbs in Gamo
- I communicate with them only in Gamo even though I can do so in Amharic.
- I sing songs to them in Gamo

As can be seen from the above responses by parents, the majority of them responded that they make no effort to transmit their ethnic language to their children. Only insignificant number of respondents claimed to make their best to pass on their ethnic language to their children.

The above analysis on parents language maintenance effort tells us that children of the target community do not get encouragement to use Gamo at home, are not told stories in Gamo by their parents and, do not get opportunity to talk with their parents in Gamo at home. These findings do not meet with Chrisp's (2005:150) statement that if children are socialized through their language by their significant care givers and role models, the continuity of the process across generation ensures that the language is maintained among the population of the speakers. In this case, it can be generalized that children are not socialized by their language and Gamo is not transferred to the young generation.

3.3.1. Language maintenance effort by respondents' age

The mean score values of the respondents' according to their age category have been calculated for the three language maintenance effort questions as indicated in the table 14. Accordingly, the following analysis is made.

The mean score value of the respondents of the 15-29 age group which is 1.57 is very much less than that of the ≥ 30 age group which is 2.97 for the first question. This indicates that encouraging children to use their mother tongue at home is very low among younger parents as compared to the adult parents. The responses, rarely (26.3%) and never (57.9%), together by 15-29 age group respondents is much greater than the responses, rarely (26.9%) and never (14.9%), by ≥ 30 age group. So age is a factor on the respondents' effort to encourage their children to use Gamo at home.

For Q2, the mean score value of the respondents of the 15-29 age group is 1.15 while of the ≥ 30 age group is 2.77. These figures also show that the mean score of the 15-29 age respondents is very small compared to that of the ≥ 30 age group respondents. The responses, rarely (15.8%), and never (84.2%) together, by 15-29 age group is greater than the responses, rarely (29.9%) and never (14.9%), by ≥ 30 age group. This implies that the 15-29 age group respondents do not tell their children stories in Gamo while more of the ≥ 30 age group respondents tell them. So age is an important factor affecting respondents efforts telling the children stories.

With regard to Q3, the mean score values of the respondents of the 15-29 and the ≥ 30 age level groups are 2.94 and 2.95, respectively. The response, rarely (47.4%), by the 15-29 age

groups is much greater than the response, rarely (20.9%), by the 30 age group. The figures show that both age groups equally communicate with their children in Gamo at home. So age is not a factor on the communication of parents with their children in Gamo.

No of respondents:

15-29= 19

≥ 30= 67

mean scores of the two age groups:

Q1. M1 (15-29) = 1.57 M1 (≥ 30) 2.97

Q2. M2 (15-29) = 1.15 M2 (≥ 30) 2.77

Q3. M3 (15-29) = 2.94 M2 (≥ 30) 2.95

Responses																						
	5				4				3				2				1				Total	
	15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30			
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	-	-	13	19.4	-	-	10	14.9	3	15.8	16	23.9	5	26.3	18	26.9	11	57.9	10	14.9	86	100
2	-	-	7	10.5	-	-	11	16.4	-	-	19	28.3	3	15.8	20	29.9	16	84.2	10	14.9	86	100
3	3	15.8	15	22.4	2	10.5	11	16.4	5	26.3	12	17.9	9	47.4	14	20.9	-	-	15	22.4	86	100

Table 14 maintenance effort by age

3.3.2. Language maintenance effort by respondent's sex

As it is shown in table15, the mean score value of the male respondents which is 2.90 is larger than the mean score of female respondents which is 2.46 for Q1. The response, rarely (28.3%) and never (30.4%), by females is greater than the responses, rarely (25.0%) and never (17.5%), by males. This implies that male respondents create opportunities for their children to use their language at home more than that of females. So, sex has influence on the effort of respondents to encourage their children to use Gamo at home.

Similarly, for Q2, the mean score value of male respondents which is 2.68 is larger than the mean score of the female respondents which is 2.20. The response, rarely (21.7%) and never (41.3%), by females is greater than the response, rarely (32.5%) and never (17.5%), by males. The figures show that the mean score of female respondents is less than that of males'. Here also, the male respondents tell their children stories more than that of female respondents. Here, also sex influences respondents' effort to tell stories to their children.

With regard to Q3, the mean score of male respondents which is 3.45 is much larger than the mean score of female respondents which is 2.52. The response, always (15.3%) and frequently (8.7%), by females is less than the response, always (27.5%) and frequently (22.5%), by males. This implies that more male respondents speak with their children in Gamo at home than their female counterparts. So, sex is a factor on respondents' effort to use Gamo with their children at home.

Generally, male parents encourage their children to use Gamo at home, tell stories to their children and speak with them in Gamo at home more than that of female parents. This point contradicts to the idea of Gal and Klimn (2000:26) cited in Bilaniuk (2003:54) that women are responsible for maintaining linguistic and cultural traditions. So, it seems that Gamo is not transmitted from parents to their children, especially, from their female parents.

No. of respondents:

Male= 40

Female = 46

mean scores of the two sex groups:

Q1. M1 (M) = 2.90 M1 (f) 2.46

Q2. M2 (M) = 2.68 M2 (f) 2.20

Q3. M3 (M) = 3.45 M3 (f) 2.52

Items	5				4				3				2				1			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	7	17.5	6	13.0	6	15	4	8.7	10	25.0	9	19.6	10	25.0	13	28.3	7	17.5	14	30.4
2	5	12.5	2	4.4	4	10	7	15.2	11	27.5	8	17.4	13	32.5	10	21.7	7	17.5	19	41.3
3	11	27.5	7	15.3	9	22.5	4	8.7	7	17.5	10	21.7	13	32.5	10	21.7	-	-	15	32.6

Table 15. Maintenance effort by sex

3.3.3. Language maintenance effort by education status

Table 16 presents that the high educational status group's mean score which is 1.68 is much smaller than that of low educational status group which is 2.94, Q1. The response, rarely (47.4%) and never (42.1%), by high education group is greater than the response, rarely (20.9%) and never (19.4%), by low level education group. This implies that highly educated respondents don't encourage their children to use Gamo at their home more than low educational level respondents. So, education level is a factor on respondents' effort to encourage their children to use Gamo at their home.

Similarly, the mean score of the low educational status group, 2.55, is larger than the high educational status group's which is 1.94, for Q2. The response, rarely (21.1%) and never (42.1%), by high level education group is greater than the response, rarely (28.4%) and never (26.9%), by low level education group. This shows that lower educational status groups tell their children stories in Gamo more than that of the high educational status group. So, education level affects the respondents' effort to tell stories to their children.

With regard to the third item, the mean score value of the low educational status group, 3.13, is larger than the mean score value of the highly educated respondents, which is 2.31. The response, rarely (47.4%) and never (21.1%) by high level education group is greater than the response, rarely (20.9%) and never (16.4%), by low level education group. This implies that lower educational group respondents speak with their children in Gamo at their home more than higher educational group respondents speak with their children in Gamo at their home.

Generally, the low educational status groups have reported that they encourage their children to use Gamo at home, tell stories to their children in Gamo, and talk with their children in Gamo at home. This point doesn't fit with the idea stated by Holms (1992:69) that educated people with positive attitude towards their mother tongue have more opportunity to maintain their language than those who are not educated. However, as to the Gamo language, the highly educated respondents do not make effort to transmit it to their children. So, Gamo is not a safe language in Addis Ababa.

No of respondents:

High = 19

Low = 67

mean scores of the two educational categories:

Q1. M1 (high) = 1.68 M1 (low) 2.94

Q2. M2 (high) = 1.94 M2 (low) 2.55

Q3. M3 (high)) = 2.31 M3 (low)) 3.13

Items	5				4				3				2				1			
	High		Low		High		Low		High		Low		High		Low		High		Low	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q ₁	-	-	13	19.4	-	-	10	14.9	2	10.5	17	25.4	9	47.4	14	20.9	8	42.1	13	19.4
Q ₂	-	-	7	10.4	-	-	11	16.4	7	36.8	12	17.9	4	21.1	19	28.4	8	42.1	18	26.9
Q ₃	-	-	18	26.9	4	21.1	9	13.4	2	10.5	15	22.4	9	47.4	14	20.9	4	21.1	11	16.4

Table -16- Effort by education

3.4. Respondents Proficiency in Gamo and Amharic

In this section, the current researcher investigates the proficiency of the respondents in Gamo and Amharic languages. Since Gamo is not a literary language, at least in Addis Ababa, the researcher considered only the Gamo –Amharic oral (Listening and Speaking) skills of the respondents for comparative analysis.

So, the five point Likert scale is included in the questionnaire to investigate the respondents' oral skills in Gamo and Amharic.

Respondent's means of the two language skills for Amharic and Gamo, respectively: Listening (3.33 \$ 3.83), speaking (3.47 \$ 3.81).

The obtained mean scores for the respondents' listening proficiency in Amharic and Gamo, 3.33 \$ 3.83, respectively, shows no great differences. These obtained mean scores are also bigger than the expected mean score which is 2.50. The table also shows that the response in Gamo listening proficiency, excellent (34.7%) and very good (28.1%) together, is also most equal with the responses in Amharic listening proficiency, excellent (30.2%) and very good (20.6%). So, the respondents have relatively similar listening proficiency of both languages.

The obtained mean scores for the speaking skill in Amharic and Gamo, 3.47 \$ 3.81, respectively, do not show great difference and they exceed the expected mean score, which is 2.50. The table also show that the response in Gamo listen speaking skill, excellent (34.2%) and very good (27.1%), is almost equal with the response in Amharic speaking proficiency, excellent (30.2%) and very good (21.6%). This shows that the respondents have a relatively similar proficiency in speaking proficiency in both languages. This implies the bilingual nature of the respondents. Since bilingualism is an asset it should be encouraged. According to Baker (2001) bilinguals have access to job opportunity, and can have different cultural experiences. So, Gamos are in an advantageous position in this regard.

Expected mean score (μ) = 2.5

Key: 5= Excellent, 4= Very good, 3= good, 2= Poor, 1= Unable

Skills	Responses										Responses									
	Gamo										Amharic									
	5		4		3		2		1		5		4		3		2		1	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Listening	69	34.7	56	28.1	50	25.1	20	10.1	4	2.0	60	30.2	41	20.6	39	19.6	24	21.1	35	17.6
Speaking	68	34.2	54	27.1	56	28.1	14	7.0	7	3.5	60	30.2	43	21.6	48	24.1	28	14.1	20	10.1

Table 17: Respondents language proficiency in Gamo and Amharic

3.4.1. Respondents Gamo Proficiency by age

Table 18 presents that the 15-29 age group's mean score is 3.49, and the ≥ 30 age group's is 4.24 for listening skill. Those of the ≥ 30 age group's mean score is slightly bigger than the 15-29 age group respondents. The response, excellent (46.2%) and very good (33.0%), by ≥ 30 age group's is greater than the response, excellent (25.0%) and very good (24.1%), by the 15-29 age group. This implies that adults are more proficient in Gamo than youths in listening skill. So, age has been a factor that can influence the respondents' listening proficiency in Gamo.

As to the speaking skill of the two age groups, the mean score value of the 15-29 age group is 3.52 while the ≥ 30 age group's mean score value is 4.15. The response, excellent (41.7%) and very good (34.1%), by ≥ 30 age group is greater than the response, excellent (27.7%) and very good (21.3%), by 15-29 age group. This also indicates that the mean score value of the ≥ 30 age group is slightly bigger than the mean score value of the 15-29 age group respondents. This implies that adults are more proficient in Gamo than youths in speaking skill. This shows that age influences the respondents' speaking proficiency in Gamo too.

According to Clyne (1976) and Demos (1988) cited in Govindasamy and Numbiar (2003:30) language proficiency difference across age groups has impact on language maintenance or shift in immigrant community. So, since the ≥ 30 age group is more proficient in the two skills than youths, it implies that age influences language proficiency of respondents in Gamo, too.

The researcher also conducted interview with 20 parents about their children's language proficiency and the reasons behind their answers. Their responses to the following question will be presented below.

Q1. Which language are your children more proficient in? And why?

Almost all, 18(90%) respondents answered 'Amharic' while only 2(10%) of the respondents answered 'Gamo'. This shows that almost all respondents' children are more proficient in Amharic than in Gamo. Some of the rationales the respondents of those who claimed that children are more proficient in Amharic forwarded include the following:

- One respondent said that his wife is an Amharic native speaker and she wants her child to know Amharic more than Gamo.
- One educated parent, surprisingly, said, “I do not let my children know Gamo. It doesn’t help them get a good job-opportunity. Rather, I teach my children to be proficient in English and Amharic.”
- One respondent said that Gamo doesn’t help mobility; literally he observed, “Gamo will not enable his children cross a river”. And, hence, that he is teaching and even advising my children to be more proficient in Amharic.
- Another subject replied that since his child stays outside the home every day to generate income, he becomes acquainted more with Amharic than with Gamo.

The rationale presented by respondents who answered that their children are more proficient in Gamo is:-

- That they teach their child Gamo every day
- They let their children communicate only in Gamo at home and advise them to use it with their friends and neighbors.

So, according to the above responses, we learn that there are a large number of children who are not proficient in Gamo.

No. of respondents:

15-29 = 108

≥ 30 = 91

Respondents' means score by age group:

ML (15-29) = 3.49

ML (≥ 30) = 4.24

MS (15-29) = 3.53

MS (≥ 30) = 4.15

Key: L = Listening, S = Speaking, M = Mean

Skills	5				4				3				2				1			
	15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Listening	27	25	42	46.2	26	24.1	30	33.0	32	29.6	18	20.0	19	17.3	1	1.1	4	3.7	-	-
Speaking	30	27.7	38	41.7	23	21.3	31	34.1	35	32.4	21	23.1	14	13	-	-	6	5.6	1	1.1

Table 18- Proficiency by age

3.4.2. Respondents' Gamo Proficiency by sex

The mean score value of male respondents, 3.98, is bigger than the mean score value of female respondents which is 3.66 for the listening skill of Gamo. The response, excellent (39.9%) and very good (29.1%) by male is nearly equal with the response, excellent (32.2%) and very good (25.0%), by females. This indicates that there is no great difference on the listening skill of both sexes. So, sex difference doesn't affect the listening proficiency of respondents in Gamo.

There is no great difference between the male respondents' mean score value which is 3.96 and the female respondents' which is 3.98. Besides, the response, excellent (37.9%) and very good (29.1%), by males is nearly equal with the response, excellent (32.2%) and very good (25.2%), by females. This implies that sex is not a factor on the respondents' speaking skill in Gamo.

As it was discussed in chapter two of this paper, Wardaugh (1987) cited in Zelalem (2003:72) claims that women are less proficient in declining language than men. This statement of Wardaugh does not coincide with the above gender proficiency analysis of Gamo in that there is no sex difference in Gamo proficiency.

No of respondents: Respondents mean score values by sex.

Male = 103 ML (m) 3.98 ML (f) 3.66

Female = 96 MS (m) 3.96 MS (f) 3.65

Key: m = male f= female

Skills	Responses																			
	5				4				3				2				1			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Listening	38	39.9	31	32.3	30	29.1	26	27.1	30	29.1	20	20.8	5	4.9	15	15.6	-	-	4	4.2
Speaking	39	37.9	29	32.2	30	29.1	24	25.0	26	25.2	30	31.3	7	6.8	7	7.2	1	1.0	6	6.3

Table -19. Proficiency by sex

3.4.3. Respondents' Gamo proficiency by education status

The mean score value of high educational level respondents in listening skill, 3.33, is much less than the mean score value of the low educational level respondents which is 4.02. The response, excellent (39.2%) and very good (30.8%), by low educational group is greater than the response, excellent (23.2%) and very good (21.24%), by high level education group. This implies that the low educational level group is much more proficient than the high level group this show that educational level as impact on the listening proficiency of respondents in Gamo.

With regard to the speaking proficiency of the respondents, the low educational level respondents are also much more proficient than the high educational level respondents with their mean scores, 3.18 and 4.06, respectively. The response, excellent (38.4%) and very good (30.8%), by low level education group is greater than the response, excellent (23.2%) and very good (17.9%), by low level education group. This indicated that educational level has impact on the speaking proficiency of respondents in Gamo. So, the above discussions imply that educational level has impact on language proficiency of respondents.

In chapter two of this paper, it is argued that educated people have more opportunity to maintain their mother tongue more than those who are not educated (Clyne 1997:310). However, this statement of Clyne applies in the contrary in regard to the Gamo language as high education level respondents are found to be less proficient than the low educational level respondents in this data.

The researcher has also taken into account the fact that Gamo is neither a language of instruction nor a subject in schools for the Gamo community in Addis Ababa. This point has something to do with what was discussed in chapter two of this paper that where there is no provision made for the children of the low status group to learn, to read and write in the language of their ancestors, language shift is bound to occur (Hoffmann 1994:191 cited in Cheng 2003:84). Generally, the educated people are not proficient in Gamo and Gamo is not a school language in Addis Ababa, which could attribute for the difference fro findings in other literature.

No. of respondents:

High level = 56

Low level = 143

Respondents mean score values by sex.

ML (h) 3.33

ML (l) 4.02

MS (h) 3.18

MS (l) 4.06

Key: - L= Listening S= Speaking

h= high level l=low level

M= mean

Skills	Responses																			
	5				4				3				2				1			
	H		L		H		L		H		L		H		L		H		L	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
L	13	23.2	56	39.2	12	21.4	44	30.8	16	28.6	34	23.8	11	19.6	9	6.3	4	7.1	-	-
S	10	23.2	58	38.4	10	17.9	44	30.8	13	23.2	43	30.1	14	25.0	-	-	6	10.7	1	0.7

Table 20. Proficiency by education

3.5. Respondents' Attitudes towards Gamo and Amharic

The research questionnaire, in this paper, also consists of questions about the respondents' attitudes towards their own language and Amharic. Five language attitude questions were included which the respondents are expected to answer in terms of 'Yes', 'No' or 'I don't know' to each item. Their responses are organized in the following table.

Table-21 Responses on language attitude

Items	Yes		No		I don't know		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q ₁	79	39.7	83	41.7	37	18.6	199	100
Q ₂	71	35.7	81	40.7	47	23.6	199	100
Q ₃	90	45.2	73	36.7	36	18.1	199	100
Q ₄	64	32.1	95	47.7	40	20.1	199	100
Q ₅	45	22.61	120	60.3	34	17.1	199	100

Q1. Is it important to use Gamo as a medium of instruction in Addis Ababa more than Amharic?

For the above question, 79 (39.7%), 83 (41.7%) and 37 (18.6%) respondents answered Yes, No, and I don't know, respectively. This shows that a slightly bigger number of respondents do not like the use of Gamo as a medium of instruction in Addis Ababa. Similarly, a considerable number of respondents favor the use of Gamo as a medium of instruction in Addis Ababa. An in significant number of respondents have answered 'I don't know', which indicates their indifference to the questions. So, the figures show that most respondents have negative attitudes towards their mother tongue.

Q2. Do you think that Gamo is more important than Amharic for you to use in your daily activities?

To the above question, a slightly bigger number of respondents, 81 (40.7%), answered “no” while a significant number of respondents, 71(35.7%), reported ‘Yes’. 47 (23.6%) respondents answered I don’t know. This implies that a slightly bigger number of respondents have a negative attitude towards their own mother tongue.

Q3 Do you think that Gamo children should better know Gamo than Amharic?

With regard to the above question, 90 (45.2%), 73 (36.7%) and 36 (18.1%) respondents answered ‘yes’, ‘no’ and ‘I don’t know’, respectively. This shows that the majority of the respondents thought that the Gamo children should better know Gamo than Amharic, which indicates that most have a positive attitude towards maintaining their mother tongue.

Q4. Do you think that speaking Amharic is a sign of being more modern than speaking Gamo?

64 (32.1%), 95 (47.7%) and 40 (20.1 %) of the respondents answered ‘Yes’, ‘no’ and I don’t know, respectively. The figure shows that the majority of the respondents have reported that speaking Amharic is not a sign of being modern or civilized. A relatively smaller number of respondents answered that speaking Amharic is a sign of being modern. Insignificant number of respondents reported they don not know. This shows that the majority of the respondents manifest positive attitude towards their own mother tongue.

Q5. Do you think that Gamo is more important to communicate with the Addis Ababa people than Amharic?

With regard to Q5, 45(22.61%), 120(60.3%) and 34(17.1%) respondents reported ‘yes’, ‘no’ and ‘I don not know’, respectively. As the figures show, the majority of the respondents reveal negative attitude towards Q5. A relatively smaller number of respondents show positive attitudes.

The data, in the above table, reveals that the respondents show negative attitude towards the use of Gamo as a medium of instruction in Addis Ababa, towards the importance of Gamo in their daily activities, and towards the importance of Gamo to communicate with Addis Ababa’s People. They only show positive attitude towards the necessity of Gamo to be

known by the Gamo children and showing negative attitude towards speaking Amharic as a sign of being modern. Those findings are generalized in the following table.

Languages		
Questions	Gamo Valued	Amharic Valued
1	-	+
2	-	+
3	+	-
4	+	-
5	-	+

Table 22: Respondents' valuing of the languages

The researcher also conducted an interview with 20 parents asking them about their attitude towards Gamo and their rationale. Their responses to the following questions will be discussed below.

Q1. Do you feel comfortable when you talk in Gamo in the street? Why?

Q2. Do you worry if Gamo is lost in Addis Ababa? Why?

For Q1 above, 17(85%) of the respondents answered 'no' while 3(15%) of the subjects responded 'yes'. This indicates that the great majority of the respondents have negative attitude towards their language. The reasons of 4 respondents who said 'no' are shown below:

- I fear to be laughed at by non- Gamo speakers.
- I feel discomfort since others may not understand the language
- I do not want to talk in Gamo since I can't speak it fluently as I was born in Addis Ababa
- Since Gamo communities in Addis Ababa have been seen as a despised group, I don't want to be seen in the street speaking the Gamo language.

Those who answered ‘yes’ also gave their reasons:

- I consider Gamo equally good with other languages and should be used every where.
- I use Gamo in the street to let others know it.

With regard to Q2, 14(70%) and 6(30%) respondents answered ‘no’ and ‘yes’, respectively. This figure shows that here, too, the majority has negative attitude towards Gamo. The reasons of 4 respondents who answered ‘no’ are:

- I don’t worry if Gamo is lost in Addis Ababa as long as it exists in my homeland.
- Since Gamo doesn’t have much function in Addis Ababa, one need not worry if it is lost in Addis Ababa.
- Since there is another alternative language, i.e., Amharic for communication, I don’t worry if it is lost.
- A 34 - Year old respondent said he doesn’t speak or listen to Gamo, but can communicate in Amharic even with his family. So, he does not worry if Gamo is lost. On the other hand, those who answered ‘yes’ gave the following reasons:
- A 58 - Year old respondent said ‘Gamo is my identity marker, and if it is lost and I no longer speak it, how can I be identified as a member of the Gamo community? So, Gamo should be maintained.’
- One elderly respondent also replied that the loss of Gamo in Addis Ababa worries him. He said, “When our relatives come from the home- land to visit us, our children and grandchildren can not communicate with them. Laughing he added, “We old aged groups serve them as translators.”

As it was discussed in chapter two of this paper, Holms (1992:69) says that positive attitude to a language promotes language maintenance. In this community, too, the majority of the respondents have revealed a negative attitude towards their mother tongue, they are consequently undergoing gradual shift to Amharic in Addis Ababa.

3.5.1. Respondents' attitude by age

Items	Responses													
	Yes				No				I don't know					
	15-29		≥40		15-29		≥30		15-29		≥30		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q ₁	36	33.3	43	43.3	53	49.1	30	33.0	19	17.6	18	19.8	199	100
Q ₂	38	35.2	33	36.3	48	44.4	33	36.2	22	20.4	25	27.5	199	100
Q ₄	33	30.6	57	62.6	52	48.1	21	23.1	23	21.3	13	14.3	199	100
Q ₅	28	25.9	36	39.5	58	53.7	37	40.7	22	20.4	18	19.1	199	100
Q ₆	22	20.4	23	25.2	68	63.0	52	57.1	18	16.7	16	17.6	199	100

Table-23: Language attitude by age

Q1. Is it important to use Gamo as a medium of instruction in Addis Ababa more than Amharic?

As it can be seen from the above table, 33.3% of the 15-29 age level and the 47.3% of the ≥40 age level answered 'Yes' while 49.1% and 33.0% of the 15-29 and ≥ 30 age levels answered 'no', respectively. These figures show that the youth have more negative attitude towards their mother tongue than the elderly members of the community.

Q2. Do you think that Gamo is more important than Amharic for you to use in your daily activities?

The above table presents that 35.2% of the 15-29 age level and the ≥30 age level which is 33.3% answered 'yes' while 44.4% of the 15-29 level and 36.2% of the ≥30 age level respondents answered 'no'. This shows that the youth members of the community have more negative attitude towards their mother tongue than the elderly members.

Q3. Do you think that Gamo children should better know Gamo than Amharic?

30.6% of the 15-29 age group and 62.6% of the ≥ 30 age group respondents answered 'yes' while 48.1% of the 15-29 age group and 23.1% of the ≥ 30 age group respondents reported 'no'. This shows that more of the youth respondents have negative attitude towards Gamo than the elderly respondents.

Q4. Do you think that speaking Amharic is a sign of being modern?

As to the above question, 25.9% of the 15-29 age group and 39.5% of the ≥ 30 age group respondents answered 'yes' while 53.7% of the 15-29 age group and 40.7% of the ≥ 30 age group respondents answered 'no'. Again, the figures, here, also show that the youth respondents have negative attitude towards Gamo more than the elderly respondents.

Q5 Do you think that Gamo is more important to communicate with Addis Ababa's people than Amharic?

With regard to the above question, 20.4% and 25.2% of the 15-29 and the ≥ 30 age levels respondents, respectively, answered 'yes' while 63% and 57.1% of the 15-29 and the ≥ 30 age levels respondents respectively, answered 'no'. This implies that most of the youth respondents have negative attitude compared to that of the elderly respondents.

The above analysis reveals that there is a clear age difference on the attitude towards Gamo and Amharic. The findings show that the younger group has more negative attitude towards Gamo than the elderly group. This point agrees with what Apple and Muysken (1987:41) say that younger people choose the dominant language as their regular medium of communication and claim social status different from that of their parents' generation.

3.5.2. Respondents' attitude by sex

Items	Responses													
	Yes				No				I don't know					
	M		F		M		F		M		F		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q ₁	54	52.4	25	26.0	30	29.1	53	55.2	19	18.4	18	18.8	199	100
Q ₂	44	42.7	27	28.1	31	30.0	50	52.1	28	27.2	19	19.8	199	100
Q ₃	51	49.5	39	40.6	30	29.1	43	44.8	22	21.4	14	14.6	199	100
Q ₄	41	39.8	23	24.0	40	38.8	55	57.3	22	21.4	18	18.8	199	100
Q ₅	31	30.0	14	14.6	53	51.5	67	69.8	19	18.4	15	15.6	199	100

Table-24. Language attitude by sex

Q1. Is it important to use Gamo as a medium of instruction in Addis Ababa more than Amharic?

For the above question, 52.4% male and 26.0% female respondents answered 'yes' while 29.1% male and 55.2% female respondents answered 'no'. This implies that more females than males have negative attitude towards Gamo.

Q2. Do you think that Gamo is more important than Amharic for you to use in your daily activities?

42.7% of male and 28.1% female respondents answered 'yes' while 30.0% and 52.1% male and female respondents respectively, answered 'no'. This implies that here, too, more female respondents have negative attitude towards Gamo than male respondents.

Q3. Do you think that Gamo children should better know Gamo than Amharic?

With regard to the above question, 49.5% and 40.6% male and female respondents, respectively, answered 'yes' while 29.1% male and 44.8% female respondents answered

‘no’. So, more female respondents showed negative attitude towards Gamo than male respondents.

Q4. Do you think that speaking Amharic is a sign of being modern more than speaking Gamo?

39.8% male and 24.0% female subjects responded ‘yes’ while 38.8% male and 57.3% female respondents answered ‘no’. Manifest negative attitude towards Gamo than male respondents.

Q5 Do you think that Gamo is more important to communicate with Addis Ababa’s people than Amharic?

Finally, 30.6% male and 14.6% female respondents claimed ‘yes’ while 51.5% male and 69.8% female subjects responded ‘no’. So, more female respondents claimed to have negative attitude towards Gamo than males.

The above sex analysis of language attitude of Gamo respondents agrees with what Gal (1979) and Milroy (1982) cited in Naji and David (2003:95) say that women are the catalyst of language change, assuming that negative attitude inevitably leads to language change. Since Gamo women in Addis Ababa show more negative attitude towards Gamo than the males do, sex is a factor for language attitude.

3.5.3. Respondents' language attitude by education level

Items	Responses													
	Yes				No				I don't know					
	High		Low		High		Low		High		Low		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q ₁	12	21.4	67	46.9	32	57.1	51	35.7	12	21.4	25	17.5	199	100
Q ₂	11	19.6	60	42.0	30	53.6	51	35.7	15	26.8	32	22.4	199	100
Q ₃	13	23.2	77	53.8	20	35.7	43	30.1	13	23.2	23	16.1	199	100
Q ₄	36	64.3	28	19.6	10	17.9	45	31.5	10	17.9	30	21.0	199	100
Q ₅	10	17.9	35	24.5	36	64.3	84	58.7	10	17.9	24	16.8	199	100

Table-25: Attitude by educational status

The figures for Q1 show that 21.4% highly educated and 46.9% low level educated respondents think that using Gamo as a medium of instruction in Addis Ababa has importance while 57.1% highly educated and 35.7% low education level respondents think that Gamo is not important to be a medium of instruction. This shows that respondents of low education status are more inclined to the use of Gamo as a medium of instruction in Addis Ababa and the reverse is true for highly educated respondents.

For Q2 19.6% highly educated and 42.0% low education level respondents think that it is important to use Gamo more than Amharic in their daily activities. 53.6% and 55.7% of the highly educated and low level education group, respectively, reported that Amharic is not more useful in their daily activities than Gamo. This implies respondents of low education level have positive attitude to Gamo while the reverse is true for highly educated subjects.

The percentage of respondents claiming that Gamo children should know Gamo better than Amharic is 23.2% and 53.8% of highly educated and low level education group, respectively while 35.7% of highly educated and 30.1% low level education respondents, respectively, claim the opposite. These figure show that more highly educated respondents have negative attitude towards Gamo while more low level education respondents have manifested positive attitude.

With regard to Q4, 64.3% highly educated and 19.6% low level education status respondents claim that speaking Amharic is a sign of being modern while 17.9% and 31.5% highly educated and low level education respondents, respectively, think that speaking Amharic is not a sign of being modern. This implies more highly educated respondents have negative attitude towards Gamo, while the reverse is true for low level education group.

With regard to Q5, 17.9% highly educated and 24.5% low level education respondents claim that Gamo helps to communicate with Addis Ababa people more than Amharic while 64.3% highly educated and 58.7% low level education respondents think that Gamo doesn't help them more than Amharic to communicate with Addis Ababa people. This clearly indicates that highly educated respondents have negative attitude to Gamo while those who are low level education respondents has positive attitude thereof.

The above analysis, generally, indicates that a greater number of subjects of higher educational status have a lower attitude towards Gamo than the member of respondents of the lower educational status which showed more positive attitude towards it. According to Clyne (1997:201) educated people have a chance of maintaining their ethnic language more than uneducated groups. However, the above statement of Clyne does not apply in regard to the Gamo Community. As these findings show, most of the highly educated people manifest negative attitude towards their ethnic language than the uneducated ones. Therefore, compared to the low level education group members, higher education level group members are not likely to contribute much in Gamo maintenance.

3.6. Respondents' Ethnic Identity

This section is intended to investigate whether language is inherently linked with ethnic identity among members of the community under study. The following question was posed to the respondents with 'yes' 'no' and 'I don't know' alternative answers.

Responses								
Items	Yes		No		I don't know		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q ₁	63	31.7	111	55.8	25	12.6	199	100

Table-26: Responses on ethnic identity

Q1 Do you necessarily have to know Gamo to be a member of Gamo community?

31.7% of the respondents answered 'yes' while 55.8% and 12.6% of them responded 'no' and I don't know, respectively. This indicates that the majority of the respondents claim that speaking (knowing) Gamo has nothing to do with their ethnic identity as Gamo. Generally, the members of community do not seem to consider language as a sole indicator of their ethnic identity.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

4.1. Summary

The primary aim of this paper has been to examine the extent of language shift and maintenance among the Gamo community members living in Addis Ababa. To this end, 219 subjects were identified from Shiro Meda and Kolfe areas where the respondents were selected. The raw data was gathered through questionnaire, an interview and observation to come to the findings. Both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analyses were employed.

The relevant literature reviews and 5 related works were briefly reviewed in the second chapter. The literature reviews were believed to offer the ground for the discussions of the finding. They have dealt with key points regarding language use, language attitude, linguistic proficiency, language maintenance effort and factors affecting language maintenance and shift.

The presentations and analyses of the gathered data were made in chapter three. The results obtained from the questionnaires were tabulated and the percentages and frequencies for each question were calculated, and presented in tables. The five-point-Likert scale was used to rate the language maintenance efforts, the language proficiency and the rate of return to the homeland. The expected and the obtained mean score values were calculated and the percentages and frequencies were computed to determine the language use, language attitude and ethnic identity of the community members.

Finally, the analyses and interpretation of the data have been made and to see how far demographic factors like age, sex and educational status affect the language use, language proficiency, language maintenance effort & language attitude of respondents, including the respondents rate of return to homeland as well as to see to what extent these influence language maintenance or shift. And the findings were generalized in each section. Besides,

the data on respondents' ethnic identity was discussed and analyzed to see to what extent language and ethnic identity are linked.

Finally, the researcher has reached the following facts:

1. Gamo is relatively dominantly used between respondents and their parents and grandparents. However, Amharic is dominantly used between respondents and their children and grandchildren while the use of both Gamo and Amharic is significant between respondents and their spouses and siblings. Besides, it is found that the degree of Gamo language use at home declines from adults to youths, and, then, to children (infants).
 - 1.1. Age difference does not affect the respondents' language use with their parents and grandparents. However, the youth use Amharic to a greater degree with their spouses, children and siblings than with adults.
 - 1.2. Sex difference is not a factor on respondents' language use with parents, grandparents and male siblings. However, the use of Amharic by the female with their children, spouses, grandchildren and male siblings is greater than the male'.
 - 1.3. Highly educated respondents use Amharic at a greater rate with their parents, grandparents, children, spouses and siblings than respondents of lower education level.
2. Amharic and Gamo are almost equally dominant languages at home
3. A mixture of Amharic and Gamo is dominantly used between respondents and their Gamo friends.
4. Respondents use Amharic dominantly at a religious place.
5. A mixture of Amharic and Gamo is the language of communication between respondents and their Gamo neighbors.
6. Gamo and a mixture of Gamo and Amharic are equally used by respondents at ethnic in-group associations.
7. Amharic dominates in interethnic households.
8. The respondents manifest extremely low rate of return to visit their homeland.

9. Parents do not make efforts to socialize their children in their ethnic language and to transmit it to the next generation.
 - 9.1. The younger respondents do not show a strong effort to encourage their children to use Gamo at home, and to tell them folklores. However, both adult and young age groups relatively equally communicate (speak) with their children in Gamo at home.
 - 9.2. Female respondents have a low contribution in encouraging their children to use Gamo at home, to tell those folklores and to speak with them in Gamo at home as compared with males.
 - 9.3. Highly educated respondents do not make any effort to encourage their children to use Gamo at home as compared with a low educational level of respondents.
10. The subjects have nearly equal proficiency in Amharic and Gamo as far as their oral (listening and speaking) skills are concerned; so, bilingualism is a characteristic feature of the subjects.
 - 10.1. The Youth are less proficient in their ethnic language speaking skill than adults.
 - 10.2. Youths show less proficiency in their ethnic language listening skill.
 - 10.3. Children are also found to be less proficient in their ethnic language.
11. Respondents revealed a more negative attitude towards their ethnic language than Amharic.
 - 11.1. Younger respondents showed a more negative attitude than their counter parts and their Gamo language use practice, Gamo proficiency, and Gamo maintenance efforts are also insignificant.
 - 11.2. Females have negative attitude towards Gamo more than males. They have also less Gamo language use practice, Gamo proficiency and Gamo maintenance effort as compared to males.
 - 11.3. Highly educated respondents show low attitude towards their ethnic language. They have also a low degree of Gamo language use and less contribution in transmitting

their ethnic language to their children. Similarly, they manifest less Gamo proficiency as compared with the low education level respondents.

12. The respondents claim that there is no inherent link between language and ethnic identity.
13. Generally, when measured by Fishman's graded intergenerational disruptive scale of language threat and disruption, the Gamo language is found to fall on the 7th stage which is an index of a high threat and disruption next to the last stage of extinction indexed at stage 8.

4.2. Conclusion

Generally from the above findings, the following conclusion is made

The Gamo community is largely Amharic Gamo bilinguals. Both Amharic and Gamo are used by the larger proportion of the members of the community.

The language is undergoing shift from Gamo, the mother tongue, towards Amharic, the dominant lingua franca of Addis Ababa. This has been measured in Fishman's graded intergenerational disruptive scale, and the result shows that it is at level seven which indicates that it is at the verge of extinction in Addis Ababa. (Fortunately, this may not manifest the reality at the homeland).

Language use in this community is influenced by the different demographic factors such as age, sex, educational background. More adults than the youth communicate in Gamo with children, their spouses and siblings, showing more maintenance of the mother tongue more females use Amharic with their children, grandchildren, and male siblings, than males, which make women tending to shift the mother tongue more to Amharic.

More members of a higher educational background group communicate in Amharic with their grand parents, parent, spouses, siblings and children than the low level educational group members showing more shift from the mother tongue to Amharic.

As far as the domains of language use are concerned, the home domain is faced with a very strong competition of Amharic, which is very nearly equally used with Gamo. In the neighborhood, Amharic has become dominant and Gamo has become subordinate. The same

is true of the religious places and social organizations like fund raising association (Idir), credit association (Iqub), weekly gathering ('Sännö mariyam), wedding and funeral ceremonies. Similarly, in families of inter-ethnic marriage, Amharic is an entirely dominant language and there is a total shift from Gamo. In addition, the limited rate of return to visit the homeland enhances the shift from the mother tongue.

As to the language maintenance effort, the community members make very limited effort to encourage the maintenance of the mother tongue. Sex, age and educational background influence the rate of effort to encourage the maintenance of the mother tongue. Accordingly, elderly members of the community make more effort to encourage mother tongue maintenance than the youths. Male members of the community make more effort for mother tongue maintenance than the female. Similarly, lower educational groups make more effort to encourage mother tongue maintenance than higher level educational groups.

The members of the target community generally manifest more or less equal level of proficiency in both Amharic and their mother tongue. Age and educational background may influence language proficiency to influence language shift or maintenance. Adult age group members show more proficiency in Gamo than the young group members thereby supporting more mother tongue maintenance. In addition, low educational background group members show more proficiency in the mother tongue than the higher educational group members thereby tending to maintain the mother tongue.

Members of the Gamo community in Addis Ababa generally tend to show more negative attitude to the mother tongue in some respects and more positive attitude in others. Thus, there is a mixed feeling. Their attitude towards Amharic is positive. But their language attitude towards the mother tongue is affected by age, sex, and educational background. Hence, the young age group members have more negative attitude to Gamo than the elderly. The female also have a more negative attitude to Gamo than the male. The higher educational level groups have more negative attitude towards Gamo than the low level educational group members.

Finally, the community members show that language is not a sole marker of their ethnic identity.

Generally, the Gamo community is shifting in favor of Amharic and the language is not maintained and transferred to the younger generation in Addis Ababa. So, it is not a safe language in the city. The current language policy might not have contributed for the language maintenance among members of the target community living in Addis Ababa as the current research shows. Even though the Ethiopian language policy allows every community to use and develop its language, as far as the knowledge of the current researcher goes, there is no concerned, governmental or non-governmental bodies that support the maintenance of Gamo in Addis Ababa.

4.3. Recommendation

As stated in the findings of this research paper, the Gamo language in Addis Ababa is under the very influence of the dominant language-Amharic and is found to be at the 7th stage of Fishman's Graded intergenerational disruptive scale. This may not be true of the language at the homeland. However, the extinction of Gamo in Addis Ababa may affect the maintenance and continuity of the language at the homeland as the language is losing members of Gamo speakers in Addis Ababa. So, the revival of Gamo in Addis Ababa means the maintenance and continuity of the language in the homeland. Therefore, according to Fishman (1991,92) cited in Baker (2001:68-69), the following measures should be taken to make the language revive and reach the 6th stage of Fishman's graded intergenerational disruptive scale of language threat and disruption where the language will be revived before other measures of reversing language shift are taken.

- Each family should use the language with their children at home, since a language used at home maybe used in streets, neighbor hoods, in community life, in religious and other cultural events that may lead to the revival of the language in Addis Ababa.
- Educated members of the community should take the lead in maintaining the language by using it at home and at community levels.
- Cultural gatherings, ceremonies and other social events should be held with missionary aims to secure the language among the community.

- Members of the community had better develop positive attitude with positive action towards the language.
- In addition to the above measures, those responsible and interested bodies shall intervene in the development of the community so as to make an effort to maintain the language. Such intervention can be done by increasing the awareness of the community through mass media, by producing publication in Gamo and by enforcing mother tongue education.
- Researchers are also advised to test the current research in other cities and towns where the Gamos are living. This would help as an input for the community's cultural and language development activities in the country.

Bibliography

- Abiy Zegeye et al (2009) *Introduction to Research Methods: Preparatory Module for Addis Ababa University Graduate Programs*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Appel, R and P. Muysken (1987) *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Arnold.
- Baker, C (1993). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* Philadelphia: _____ (2001) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. (3rd ed, Clevedon: multilingual Matters.
- _____ (2006) “ Psycho-Sociological Analysis in Language Policy.” In: Ricento, T (ed): *An introduction to language policy: theory and method*. Black well publishing, PP(210-228)
- Bender, M. L (1976) *The Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Bilaniuk, L (2003) “ Domains of Language use and mother tongue shift in Nairobi”. In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol 164, pp (17-39).
- Brenzeinger, M (1999) “ Language Contact and Language displacement.” In: Coulmas, F (ed): *The hand book of sociolinguistics*. Uk: Blackwell Publisher. PP (273-285).
- Burck, C (2005) *Multilingual Living: Exploration of Language and Subjectivity*. Great Britain: pal Grave Macmillan.
- Burley, D (1978) “ The Dispersed Weavers of Addis Ababa”. In: The proceeding of the fifth International Conference of Ethiopia Studies. Session B. Apr. 13-16, 1978. Chicago.
- Cheng, K. K (2003) “Language Shift and Language Maintenance in a mixed marriage: A case study of a Malaysian Chinese family”. In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol. 172, pp (81-90).
- Chrisp, S (2005) “Maori Intergenerational Language Transmission”. In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol. 172 ,pp (149-181)Berlin: Mount De Grutyer.
- Clark, H (1996) *Using Language*. Uk: Cambridge University Press

- Clyne, M (1997) "Multilingualism." In: Florian Coulmas (ed): *The Hand Book of Sociolinguistics*. UK: Blackwell Publishers. pp (308-310).
- Cooper, R and Hovarth, R (1971) "Language, Migration, and Urbanization" In: *Language Survey of Ethiopia*. Survey Monograph. Part II.
- CSA (1999) "Ethiopia, Central Statistical Agency". Addis Ababa.
- David, M.K (1998) " Language Shift, Cultural Maintenance and Ethnic identity of Sindhis of Malaysia". In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol 130, pp (67-76).
- David, M. K et al (2003) "Language Maintenance and Shift among the Punjabi Sikh community in Malaysia,". In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol. 161, pp (1-24) .Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Day, R (1985) "The Ultimate Inequality: Linguistic Genocide." In: Neolfson, N and Manes, J (eds): *Language of Inequality*. UK: Cambridge pp (86-91)
- Demos, V (1988). "Ethnic Mother Tongue Maintenance among Greek Orthodox Americans." In: *International Journal of the sociology of language*. vol 79 pp.(59-71). Amesterdoun: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Desevries, J. (1990) "Language and Ethnicity: Canadian aspects". In: P.S L(ed): *Race and Ethnic relation in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Dittmar, M (1976) *Sociolinguistics: A Critical Survey of Theory and Application*." USA: White Hall Company.
- Dorian, N (1980) "Language Shift in Community and Individual: The Phenomena of the Laggard Semi Speaker". In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. New York: Mounton Publisher. Vol. 25, pp (85-94).
- Downs, W (1998). *Language and Society*. (2nd ed) UK: Cambridge
- Edward, J. (1985), *Language Society and Identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- _____. (1996) " Symbolic Ethnicity and Language". In: J Hutchinson and A, Smith (eds). *Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistic of Society*. Basil Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. A. (1971) "The Sociology of Language: Aninter disciplinary social approach to language in society". In: J. Fishman (ed): *Advance in the Sociology of Language*. Paris: Mouton- the Hague, pp (217-404)

- _____ (1999). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundation of Assistance to threatening Language*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- _____. (2001) "Why is it so hard to save a threatened language?" In: J. A. Fishman (ed), *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing Language shift, Revised: 21st century perspective*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters
- Fleming, H.C. (1976) "Omotic Overview". In: M.L Bender (ed): *The non Semitic languages of Ethiopia*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Freeman, D (2001) " Gamo." In: *Living the edge: Marginalized Minorities Craft worker and Hunter*. London: Oxford.
- Garcia, O. et al (1988). "Spanish Language use and Attitude: A study of two New York City communities." In: *Language in Society*. Vol, 17, pp (37-53). Cambridge University Press.
- Gebre Hishe (2008)" Language use and identity of children born to the Tgringa speaking community living in Addis Ababa." Unpublished M.A thesis, Addis Ababa.
- Govindasami, S and Nambiar, M.K (2003) "Social Network: Applicability to Minority Communities in Multilingual Setting." In: J. Fishman (ed), *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Berlin: Mouton De Grutyer. Vol 116, pp (25-45).
- Grosjean, F (1982) *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. England: Harvard University Press.
- Harlow, R (2005) "Convert attitudes to Maori." In: *International Journal of the Sociology of language. vol 101*, pp (133-147)
- Hirut W/Mariam. (2005)" Gamo: a dialect variant or a group with its own Dialects?". In: Tsuge, Yoichi (ed): *Cushitic and Omotic studies*. Kanzawa: Kanzawa University
- Hoffman, C (1992). *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. London. Longman.
- Holms, J, (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Kamwangamalu, M (2003) "Globalization of English and Language Maintenance and Shift in South Africa." In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 18, vol 164, pp (65-81).
- Kroskrity, P. (2000) "Identity ". In: *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 9 (1-2)
- Lieberson, S (1988) "Procedures of Improving Sociolinguistic Survey of Language Maintenance and Language Shift". In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. New York: Mouton Publisher, Vol 151, pp (11-27).

- Lopez, D.E (1978) “ Chicago Language Loyalty in an Urban Setting”. In: *Sociology and Social Research*, 62 (2).
- May, S (2006) “ Language Policy and Minority Rights”. In: Ricento, T (ed): *An Introduction to Language policy: theory and Method*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture (2004) “Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia: National Youth Policy.” Addis Ababa: Berehanina Selam Printing Enterprise
- Mesfin Wodajo (2009) “Language Maintenance Among Afan Oromo Speakers in Addis Ababa” M.A thesis. Unpublished.
- Naji, M.H and David, M.K (2003) “Markers of Ethnic Identity: Focus on the Malasian Tamil Community.” In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol 161, pp (91-102)
- Nash, J. A (1989) “What is Malay? Situational Selection of Ethnic Identity in Plural Society. *American Ethno Linguist*”. pp (331-350).
- Newman, J. L (1978) “Place and Ethnicity among the Sandawe of Tanzania.” In: Brian, M (ed): *Ethnicity in modern Africa*. Boulder, Co: West View, pp (105-121)
- Spolsky, B (1998) *Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University press.
- Web, V and Kembo-Sure (2000) *African Voice: An Introduction to the languages and linguistics of Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Weinreich, U (1963). *Language in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton
- William, G. (1992) *Sociolinguistics: A Sociological Critique*. London: Routledge.
- Wolf, H. E. (2000) “Language and Society.” In: Heine, B and Nurse, D (eds): *African Languages: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp (288-347)
- Wondimu Gaga (2006) “Some Aspects of Sociolinguistics, Phonological and Morphological Descriptions of Gamo (Gamotstso) Dialects: A Comparative Approach.” Unpublished M.A thesis, AAU
- Yagmur, K and Akinchi, M.A (2003) “Language use, Choice, Maintenance and Ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish Speakers in France: Intergenerational Difference”. In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Vol 164, pp (107-128).
- Zelalem Leyew (2003) *The Kemantney language: A Sociolinguistic and Gramatical Study of Language Replacement*. Riidiger Koppe Verlag Koln.