

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS**

**LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AMONG AFAN OROMO  
SPEAKERS IN ADDIS ABABA**

**BY  
Mesfin Wodajo**

**June 2009  
Addis Ababa**

**LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AMONG AFAN OROMO  
SPEAKERS IN ADDIS ABABA**

**A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis  
Ababa University in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of  
Degree of Masters in Linguistics**

**BY  
Mesfin Wodajo**

**June 2009  
Addis Ababa**

**LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AMONG AFAN OROMO  
SPEAKERS IN ADDIS ABABA**

**A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa  
University in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of Degree of  
Masters in Linguistics**

**BY  
Mesfin Wodajo**

-----  
**Chairperson, Head of Graduate Committee**

-----  
**Signature**

-----  
**Advisor**

-----  
**Signature**

-----  
**Examiner**

-----  
**Signature**

-----  
**Examiner**

-----  
**Signature**

## **Acknowledgements**

First of all, I would like to present my heart felt gratitude to my thesis advisor Ato Bekale Seyoum, Assistant Professor in Addis Ababa University, who has been providing me with his unreserved, critical, and scholarly comments on this work from the beginning to the end. His multidirectional insights into the research topic have been the most important solutions to the most difficult challenges I have been facing. In deed, he has been more than an advisor to me throughout this work.

My appreciation also goes to Ato Girma Mamo and Ato Worku Dechasa, employees at OCTB (Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau), for their wonderful cooperation while I was collecting the data. I would also like to express my thanks to my brother Ato Assefa Wodajo who has provided me with the necessary materials in the realization of this work. I am also very much indebted to Dinagde Y., Abebe T., Nemei H. and Getahun M. for encouraging me through out this work and helping me in distributing the questionnaire. All the participants of this research deserve to be appreciated for their contribution.

My last but never the least appreciation goes to my best friends Wolayte Bogale and Samuel Handamo who have always been so wonderful to me. Their encouragements and critical comments to this work were extremely invaluable.

*Dedicated to  
the Memory of the Late  
Dr. Guracha Gobena*

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Pages</b>
Acknowledgements.....	i
Dedication.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Acronyms.....	vii
Abstract.....	viii
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b>	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.1.1. The Language.....	1
1.1.2. Research Setting.....	2
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Research Objectives.....	4
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	5
1.5. The Scope of the Study.....	5
1.6. Methodology.....	6
1.6.1. Sampling Technique.....	6
1.6.2. Data Gathering Techniques.....	7
1.6.2.1. Questionnaire.....	7
1.6.2.2. Interview.....	7
1.6.2.3. Observation.....	8
1.6.3. Data Analysis Technique.....	8
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b>	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED WORKS.....	10
2.1. Review of Literature.....	10
2.1.1. Language Contact.....	10
2.1.2. Language Maintenance (LM).....	12
2.1.3. Language Shift (LS).....	12
2.1.4. Factors in LM and LS.....	13

2.1.5. LM Efforts.....	15
2.1.6. Language Use.....	17
2.1.6.1. Borrowing.....	18
2.1.6.2. Code Switching.....	20
2.1.7. Language Attitude.....	22
2.2. Review of Related Literature.....	23
CHAPTER THREE	
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS.....	26
3.1. Respondents' Demography.....	26
3.2. Language Use.....	27
3.2.1. Language Use at Home Level.....	28
3.2.1.1. Language Use at Home by Respondents' Age Level.....	31
3.2.1.2. Language Use at Home by Respondents' Gender.....	34
3.2.1.3. Language Use at Home by Respondents' Educational Level.....	37
3.2.2. Respondents' Dominant Language of Home.....	40
3.2.2.1. Home Language vs. Interethnic Marriage.....	41
3.2.3. Language Use in Religious Affairs.....	40
3.2.4. Language Use during Expressions of Emotion, Force and Authority.....	43
3.2.5. Language Use with Neighbors.....	45
3.2.6. Language Use at Work Place.....	46
3.2.7. Borrowing and Code-Switching.....	47
3.3. Language Attitude.....	52
3.3.1. Language Attitude by Respondents' Age Level.....	57
3.3.2. Language Attitude by Respondents' Gender.....	61
3.3.3. Language Attitude by Respondents' Educational Level.....	65
3.4. LM Effort.....	69

3.4.1. LM Effort by Respondents' Age Level.....	71
3.4.2. LM effort by Respondents' Gender.....	74
3.4.3. LM effort by Respondents' Educational Level.....	76
3.4.4. OCTB's Role in Afan Oromo LM.....	78
3.5. Language Proficiency.....	79
3.5.1. Respondents' Language Proficiency.....	80
3.5.1.1. Respondents' Afan Oromo Proficiency by Age.....	8
3.5.1.2. Respondents' Afan Oromo Proficiency by Gender.....	84
3.5.1.3. Respondents' Afan Oromo Proficiency by Educational Level.....	86
3.5.2 Respondents' Report on their Children's Language Proficiency.....	88
3.5.2.1. First Born Children's Language Proficiency.....	88
3.5.2.2. Second Born Children's Language Proficiency.....	91
CHAPTER FOUR: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	94
4.1. Summary.....	94
4.2. Conclusion.....	98
References.....	100
Appendices	
APPENDIX-A.....	i
APPENDIX-B.....	viii
APPENDIX-C.....	xiv
APPENDIX-D.....	xx

## List of Tables

Table.1. Educational Status of the Respondents.....	27
Table.2. Respondents' Language Use at Home Level.....	28
Table.2.1. Language Use at Home vs. Respondents' Age Level.....	31
Table.2.2. Language Use at Home vs. Respondents' Gender.....	34
Table.2.3. Language Use at Home vs. Respondents' Educational Level.....	37
Table.3. Respondents' Dominant Language of the Home.....	40
Table.3.1. Respondents' Dominant Language of the home vs. Interethnic Marriage.....	41
Table.4. Responses on Language Use During Personal Prayers and in Worship Places.....	42
Table.5. Respondents' Language Use during Emotional Feelings.....	44
Table.6. Respondents' Language Use with Neighbor.....	45
Table.7. Respondents' Language Use at Work Places.....	46
Table.8. Responses on Language Attitude.....	53
Table.8.1. Language Attitude Vs. Age.....	57
Table.8.2. Language Attitude Vs. Gender.....	61
Table.8.3. Language Attitude Vs. Education.....	65
Table.9. Degree of LM Effort among the Respondents.....	69
Table.9.1. LM Efforts Vs. Age.....	71
Table.9.2. LM Efforts Vs. Gender.....	74
Table.9.3. LM Efforts Vs. Education.....	76
Table.10. Respondents Self Report of Language Proficiency.....	80
Table.10.1. Respondents' Afan Oromo Proficiency Vs. Age.....	82
Table.10.2. Respondents' Amharic Language Proficiency Vs. Gender.....	84
Table.10.3. Respondents' Afan Oromo Language Proficiency Vs. Education.....	86
Table.11. Responses on First Children Language Proficiency.....	88
Table.12. Responses on Second Born Children's Language Proficiency.....	91

## **List of Acronyms**

LM- Language Maintenance

LS- Language Shift

OCTB- Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau

LWC- Language of Wider Communication

## **Abstract**

*The objective of this thesis is to study language maintenance among Afan Oromo speakers in Addis Ababa. Because Afan Oromo speakers in Addis Ababa are scattered through out the city, it was hardly possible to find a community quarter. Therefore, the researcher was obliged to screen out places where the speakers could be found in a good number. Accordingly, two protestant churches and three organizations where Afan Oromo is used as an official language were randomly selected.*

*Out of these places 145 sample speakers of which 15 were children were randomly selected. A questionnaire, an interview and observation were conducted in order to come up with the required data. The collected data were analyzed through quantitative and qualitative methods. Frequencies and percentages as well as mean score values were calculated for each item on the questionnaire based on its nature.*

*The findings show that Afan Oromo is dominantly used at home. However, the old, female and low educational level respondent' Afan Oromo use is very important. It was also found to be the dominant language of the expressions of emotion, force and authority as well as religious practices among the target groups. The language is also considerably used by respondents with their neighbours and at their work places. Bilingualism was also found to be visible among the speakers while communicating with people at their work places and in the neighbourhood.*

*The sample linguistic data collected from the speakers does not show a significant symptom of Afan Oromo language shift. The speakers were found to have a positive attitude towards the language. The old, highly educated and female respondents generally manifest stronger positive attitude towards the language compared to the young, low educational level and male respondents.*

*The findings also show that the language is being transferred to the children by the respondents and the young, highly educated and male respondents contribute much in this respect. In addition, the maintenance of the language has been found to be supported by OCTB (Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau).*

*The respondents were found to be equally proficient both in Amharic and Afan Oromo. The first born and the second born children of the target groups have a good proficiency in Afan Oromo. However, their proficiency in Amharic is lesser for the second born children than the first born ones which show that the younger children are more inclined to Afan Oromo.*

*Generally, Afan Oromo was found be a safe language which is normally used among the research participants and is being maintained and transferred to the younger generation in Addis Ababa.*

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. Background of the Study**

##### **1.1.1. The Language**

Afan Oromo<sup>1</sup>, also known as Oromiffa (Gadaa Melba, 1985:16) belongs to the eastern cushitic language groups of the Afro-asiatic phylum (Bender, 1976:14), and it is among the most widely spoken languages in Africa. Afan Oromo is a cross-border language which is spoken in Kenya and Somalia, in addition to Ethiopia (Kebede Hordofa, 2005:135).

The language is currently functioning as the official language of the Oromia National Regional State and the Oromia zone in Amhara region. It is also being used as a medium of instruction both at first and second cycles of primary level in the education of the region and the Oromia zone in Amhara region. The language is also being used in the mass media, in literature, in ecclesiastical practices etc., and it is even being offered as a program of study at a post graduate level in some of the universities of the country including Addis Ababa University.

A considerable number of Afan Oromo speakers reside in Addis Ababa. According to the 1994 Census as cited on <http://www.gol.ethiopiatravel.com.et>, the city comprises about 19.2% Oromo, 48.3% Amhara, and 17.5% Gurage, 7.6% Tigre ethnic groups; and the remaining 7.4% belong to other ethnic groups. Since Addis Ababa is surrounded by Oromo linguistic groups, it is likely that Afan Oromo speakers are constantly on the move to the capital in search of a better life, and employment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this paper, the researcher will use the term Oromo to refer to the Oromo people and the term Afan Oromo to their language.

### **1.1.2. Research Setting**

It was in 1886 E.C. that Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia and the setting of this research, was established by Emperor Menelik II (Addis Ababa, 1986). The specific area where the city started was formerly known as *Finfinne* or *Hora Finfinnee* which signifies its possession of a magnificent number of hot springs (Addis Ababa Municipality, 1956). The place is the current Fil Woha literally 'boiling water' area.

The then Empress, Tayetu, wife of Emperor Menilik II, being impressed with the beauty and climate of the place, named it Addis Ababa which literally means 'new flower'. Since then, *Finfinne* continued to be called Addis Ababa, and it flourished as a significant and unprecedented cultural, economic and governmental capital of the country, and it is constitutionally recognized by the name Addis Ababa (Addis Ababa city council, 1989).

Addis Ababa is geographically situated at about the centre of the country and has an altitude of 8000 ft (about 2,500mt.) above sea level. It is located at approximately  $9^{\frac{3}{8}}$  °N latitude and  $38^{\frac{3}{4}}$  °E longitude. (<http://www.gol.ethiopiatravel.com.et/addis.htm>). The city comprises of different ethno-linguistic groups that peacefully co-exist. The Oromo ethnic group is numerically the second largest ethnic group population in Addis Ababa, next to the Amhara.

### **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

A language has both instrumental and symbolic role (Webb and Kembo-Sure, 2000:2). The instrumental role refers to the communicative function of a language. It facilitates mutual comprehensibility among members of a speech group in the process of communication. The symbolic role is quite different, however; it dictates that a language plays

a pivotal role of identifying a speaker or a speech group vis-à-vis the other (Tabouret- Keller, 1997:315). A language could symbolically inform about the economic, political, ideological, linguistic, etc. background of a speaker or a speech group. Symbolic function of a language, in most cases, is accountable for various linguistic conflicts and disagreements especially in linguistically diversified countries where language contact is pervasive (Webb and Kembo-Sure, 2000: 2).

Various socioeconomic, political, and historical reasons inevitably bring people of different ethnic, cultural, linguistic, etc. backgrounds into contact. In such cases languages are at the front line of the convergence. In the context of language contact, minority languages, in most cases, are subject to linguistic pressure from the dominant languages. The pressure could be caused by materialistic or prestigious factors. Therefore, a minority speech group may forcefully or willingly shift to a dominant language (Brenzinger, 1997:275). It is also possible that a speech group within the sociolinguistic context of another language may continually use its ethnic language (Spolsky, 1998:55). According to the scholar this phenomenon is said to be language maintenance (hereafter LM).

According to Takkele (2004:132), the fact that Amharic was the language of the imperial leaders of the country as well as its rich literary tradition is the primary reasons for its political and historical prestige. Meyer (2006:120-121) also states that the imperial and the socialist language policies of the country have been the most important factors for the spread of Amharic as a lingua franca. This historical opportunity of the language made it the most powerful language of wider communication in Ethiopia.

Majority-minority distinction between languages is mostly context dependent (May, 2006:260). For example “Spanish is a majority language in Spain and many Latin American states, but a minority language in the United States” (ibid: 260). Similarly, Afan Oromo is a viable, dominant and an official language in the Oromia region while it is a minority language in Addis Ababa’s sociolinguistic context. Therefore, every reference to Afan Oromo as a minority or subordinate language in this research can not be generalized for the overall Ethiopian context.

The issue of LM in places like Addis Ababa where many different linguistic groups co-exist in an environment of dominant languages like Amharic demands Attention. Besides, the fact that there is no any research in regard to Afan Oromo LM in the city has been an additional motivation to take on a research on Afan Oromo LM in Addis Ababa.

Generally, the researcher is interested to answer the following questions:

1. What are the domains of use of Afan Oromo among the ethnic language speakers?
2. What is the attitude of the speakers towards Afan Oromo?
3. To what degree do the Afan Oromo speakers attempt to maintain their ethnic language?
4. What is the role of demographic factors like age, gender, educational status and interethnic marriage in the target groups’ language use, language attitude, LM effort and language proficiency?

### **1.3. Research Objectives**

The study has the following four objectives:

- To identify the domains of use of Afan Oromo among the speakers.

- To identify the attitude of the speakers towards their ethnic language (Afan Oromo)
- To find out the degree of LM or LS of the ethnic Oromos in Addis Ababa.
- To uncover how much demographic factors like age, gender, educational status and interethnic marriage affect the target group's language use, language attitude, LM effort and language proficiency.

#### **1.4. Significance of the Study**

The researcher strongly believes that this study will have the following significances. Firstly, it may serve as a springboard for sociolinguistic researchers who are interested in LM by providing them with pertinent information on language use, language attitude, LM efforts and language proficiency, especially with regard to Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa. Secondly, the study may provide necessary information for practitioners who are going to intervene in language related activities such as: curriculum development, educational planning, text book preparation, etc. with regard to Afan Oromo. Thirdly, since language attitude and patterns of language use are essential components of language planning, the study will have a contribution for every language planning activity regarding Afan Oromo, specifically in Addis Ababa.

#### **1.5. The Scope of the Study**

The study is limited to Oromo urban residents of Addis Ababa. The selection of the subjects of the study is limited to Afan Oromo medium protestant churches and Oromia offices in Addis Ababa. Because of financial and time constraints, the study has put only 145 subjects into consideration.

## **1.6. Methodology**

### **1.6.1. Sampling Technique**

Since Afan Oromo speakers in Addis Ababa do not exist at community level, the researcher was obliged to screen out places where the speakers could be found in a good number. Accordingly, the researcher has identified a few protestant churches, and different government Administrative offices in the city which use Afan Oromo as a medium.

The researcher used random sampling technique. Two of the Afan Oromo medium churches in the city were randomly selected, and by using further systematic random sampling method, the researcher screened out seventy people (35 from each church) from the registered regular members of the church.

Samples from the Afan Oromo medium offices in the city were selected similarly through random sampling technique. Hence, the researcher randomly selected three of the identified offices, and 60 people (20 from each office) were selected through systematic random sampling technique.

From the randomly selected churches, ten children (five from each) were randomly selected and interviewed about their Afan Oromo language use and attitude. In addition, five children of voluntary parents from the two offices were also interviewed in a similar manner.

Constrained by limitations of time and finance, the total number of subjects used in this research, therefore, was only 145 people.

## **1.6.2. Data Gathering Techniques**

### **1.6.2.1. Questionnaire**

In order to get the required information from the samples, a questionnaire was prepared and administered to the subjects. The questions have touched up on the following specific thematic areas:

- Demographic information: age, gender, educational status, and interethnic marriage
- Language use in different domains by the subjects
- Attitude of the subjects towards their ethnic language (Afan Oromo)
- Efforts of the subjects in maintaining their ethnic language (Afan Oromo)
- Language proficiency self report

The questionnaire was prepared in English and translated into Afan Oromo and Amharic. The requirement of the translation of the questionnaire into Amharic was due to the fact that the language's reduction into written form in the Latin-based script, the Qube, is a very recent phenomenon. Hence, it was inevitable to come up with respondents who can not read and write in the Qube orthography. Hence, the questionnaire was distributed according to the need of the respondents.

### **1.6.2.2. Interview**

The researcher interviewed fifteen randomly selected children regarding their attitude towards Afan Oromo as well as their language use behavior. The researcher has also interviewed two persons from the Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau (Hereafter OTCB) concerning the office's institutional role in Afan Oromo LM in Addis Ababa.

### **1.6.2.3. Observation**

The researcher has also conducted observations (sometimes participant observation) in the randomly selected churches and offices for the language use of the speakers. This was to supplement the data acquired through questionnaire and interview.

With regard to the gathered linguistic data of borrowing and code-switching, the researcher participated in discussions on diverse issues with some members of the research target. The researcher attended two Bible study programs by members of the two churches (one from each). Concerning data from the offices, the researcher has participated in some discussion held in Afan Oromo among the employees in the offices. In cases where the researcher had no any opportunity of participation, he simply used observation to collect the linguistic data.

While collecting the linguistic data, an indirect method was utilized and the researcher did not use any recording material. This was to help the extraction of a relatively genuine data. However, the conversants were informed that the strange guy, the researcher, would attend the discussion to develop his horizon of knowledge about the point under discussion. Therefore, the target groups were not aware that their language uses were being focused on. While the discussions were carried out, the researcher was taking down the most important data.

### **1.6.3. Data Analysis Technique**

Since this researcher used questionnaire, interview and observation as data gathering instruments, it is the case that qualitative and quantitative methods were employed in the data analysis. Frequencies and percentages are calculated for all items and depending on the nature of the items on the questionnaire, expected mean score and obtained

mean score values have also been calculated for comparative judgment. The conclusion, then, was drawn based on the analysis.

Concerning the linguistic data on borrowing and code-switching, the question about how to really indicate whether a lexical item is borrowed or code-switched is verified by checking if they belong to the lexicon of monolinguals. So, the researcher screened out all suspicious candidate lexical items and asked for some genuine monolingual countryside informants whether the words are normally used among the speech group or not.

The code-switched linguistic items and their frequencies in the given speech extracts were examined to see whether code-switching manifest LS or not. Regarding borrowing, the degree of borrowed lexical items was identified to examine whether borrowing in the target language can be considered a symptom of LS or not. Based on these analyses, the study has come to determine how far these two processes have affected the degree of LM or LS in Afan Oromo of the target group.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED WORKS**

#### **2.1. Review of Literature**

In this section, the contemporary scholarly thoughts concerning LM and language shift (hereafter LS) will be addressed. Since language contact is the prerequisite of LM, the researcher will also touch up on some basic concepts of language contact. However, much of the discussion will be devoted to language attitude, language use, and LM efforts since these have a clear and direct relevance to the topic under focus.

##### **2.1.1. Language Contact**

The decline of the world's treasure of linguistic diversity is incredibly prevalent (Downs, 1998: 47). The most responsible cause of this linguistic loss is language contact. There are different driving forces that cause language contact. According to Appel and Muysken (1989:5, 6), linguistic boarder, colonial expansion, ethno-linguistic enclaves, post-colonial migration to the developed world are the most accountable situations of language contact.

Internal migration could result in a societal change with possible linguistic outcomes (Liberson, 1988:11). It could be accountable for language contact within a geopolitical boundary. Therefore, internal migration is the most convincingly responsible factor for Afan Oromo-Amharic contact in Addis Ababa than the aforementioned factors.

Different linguistic and sociolinguistic outcomes can be attributed to language contact. And the commonly recognized ones are borrowing, bilingualism, code-switching and code-mixing, pidigenization, creolization, LM and LS. However, the outcome of language contact varies in various contexts, i.e. it is context specific. "Sociolinguistics is not like

chemistry, and when you put two languages together the same thing does not always happen.” Appel and Muysken (1989:5). The point is that the outcome is very sensitive to the socio-psychological context of the setting.

According to Grinberg and Grinberg (1989) cited in Burck (2005:20), it was found out that people’s attachment to their mother tongue changes as the sociolinguistic context changes. A minority speech group subjected to linguistic contact might be transformed to the state of bilingualism both in the contact language (in most case the dominant language) and the subordinate language. The newly attained state of bilingualism, however, could either be maintained, under favorable conditions, or result in transformation to the state of monolingualism (Grosjean, 1982:36-37). Here it should be made clear that the transformation might be either to the dominant language or to the subordinate one. More clearly, bilingualism is often a prerequisite of LS (Holmes, 1992:65) as well as an appropriate context in which the issue of LM could be addressed (Fasold, 1984:213).

Downs (1998:61) claims that power relationship between languages is an important factor of transformation of the state of bilingualism to monolingualism in the dominant language. Even though most of the ethnic Oromos in Addis Ababa are bilinguals both in their ethnic language as well as the dominant language (Amharic), it is the case that Amharic is a more powerful language as it is the official language of the city as well as the working language of the Federal government. Hence, the possibility that Afan Oromo is subject to replacement by Amharic in Addis Ababa due to linguistic power relationship seems to be high.

### **2.1.2. Language Maintenance (LM)**

LM is defined as intergenerational mother-tongue retention (Winford, 2003:11), or the continuation of the use of a certain language in different domains (Clyne, 1997:309). These definitions focus on the transition of ethnic languages down generations and their uses in different social settings, respectively. The definitions do not give a clear account of the notion of LM within the context of bilingualism. The researcher therefore best prefers the following definitions of LM since it could effectively entertain the sociolinguistic situation of the research setting.

*The term language maintenance describes a stable situation where a group of speakers of one language living with the speakers of another continue to use their own language at least some of the time in some domains (Slavic, 2001:132).*

This definition views LM within the context of linguistic diversity in which a speech community is meant to assure the continuation of the use of its ethnic language in certain domains. In line with this fact, the intention of this researcher is to investigate how well Afan Oromo speakers in Addis Ababa are maintaining their ethnic language in different formal and informal domains.

### **2.1.3. Language Shift (LS)**

LS is a process by which a speech community gives up its language and is transformed to the use of another language (Fasold, 1984:213), Holmes, 1992:64). It is defined as a partial or total shift to the use of a language other than one's own language (Clyne, 1997:309). Severe LS process may result in language death which according to Day (1985:163) is "...the switch from one language to another by the people in a given culture."

Nationalism (Grosjean, 1982:26), "...language power, language attraction, language pressure..." (Mackey 1973 cited in Dorian 1980:86) and "political power, privilege, and social prestige" (May, 2007:257-258) are among the most critical factors causing LS. The ideology of one language one nation political leadership is the most obvious cause of LS. It brings the notion of a national language which gradually drives out powerless minority languages in the name of national unity. Power differences between languages pave the way for dominant languages to replace the subordinate ones either through pressure or attraction of the speakers.

#### **2.1.4. Factors in LM and LS**

There are different factors that are attributable to LM and LS which in isolation are not significantly influential but in combination could produce a sound effect (Clyne, 1985:201). Differently put, not a single factor could effectively lead to LM or LS. The factors are extremely interrelated in such a way that the presence of one presupposes the prevalence of another.

Status, demography and institutional support are key factors that can make up an ethno-linguistic vitality of a speech group which could become a safe zone of minority LM (Appel and Muysken, 1987:33). Status of a speech group comprises the ethno-linguistic group's social, economic, political, historical and linguistic stand vis-à-vis the other. These factors could powerfully determine the linguistic fate of a speech group. Simply put, a more prestigious speech group in the stated status factors is more likely to preserve its language.

Demographic factors like number of speakers [*and possibly age, sex, etc.*] and institutional supports like mass media, religion, etc. have their own role in determining the linguistic fates of subordinate language speakers, too (Appel and Muysken, 1987:35,37). A language blessed with

numerous speakers is less vulnerable to shift than a language spoken by few speakers. Age and sex are also inescapable demographic variables in affecting LM/LS (we will return to these factors in the following section).

According to Holmes (1992:70) language use pattern, demography and minority language attitudes are very important factors of LM. Putting this concept into consideration, the current researcher has decided to take a look into language attitude, language use, language proficiency and LM efforts vis-à-vis different demographic variables like gender, age, interethnic marriage, visit to home town, and education in this research.

Gender difference is one of the most considerable factors in LM and LS. As a certain speech community changes, its sociolinguistic setting is subjected to a different and perhaps a dominant language, women are frequently considered to be the guardians and the transmitters of their ethnic mother tongue (Law, 1995 cited in Burk, 2005:20). Consequently, they are the first to be blamed for language death (Constantinidou, 1994 cited in Burck, 2005:20).

However, the outdoor social interaction opportunities and their impact on language use at home level, socioeconomic status of the speech group, and attitude towards one's mother tongue decides which language the mother has to choose for her child (Cheng, 2003:87). More generally, psychological (attitudinal) and socioeconomic factors are responsible for mother-to-child language transmission.

A speaker's age level and educational status also matter in LM and LS. Age distribution in language use could indicate LM (Clyne, 1985:201) and LS (Fasold, 1984:215). More use of a language by older speakers than younger speakers is a good symptom of LS (Fasold, 1984:215). According to Clyne (1997:310) educated people have a chance to easily

learn the dominant language or maintaining their ethnic language. According to the scholar their opportunity of maintaining their ethnic language is higher.

Marriage pattern is another important variable worth considering in LM and LS research. When members of different linguistic background form a marriage bond, the majority language frequently dominates as a parent-child language of communication (Holmes, 1992: 86). According to the scholar, this phenomenon inevitably could result in minority language replacement.

How much minority languages are represented in institutions like religion, community, and cultural organizations, etc. has a strong effect on LM (Giles et al. 1977 cited in Appel and Muysken, 1987:37). Different TV and Radio broadcasts as well as preparations of magazines in minority languages have also a big contribution (Appel and Muysken, 1987:37). Making minority languages a language of religion is also crucial (ibid). Generally, the role that different government and private institutions play is of paramount significance in LM.

#### **2.1.5. LM Efforts**

“...people can best participate, create, and innovate through the use of their languages.” Mutasa (2006:63). Citizens could actively take part in their country’s socioeconomic and political activities and could contribute much in this respect if they could use the language that could let them best express their ideas. So, LM effort is an issue of big importance in sociolinguistics since it is highly intertwined with national development.

However, in multilingual African countries like Ethiopia, the empowerment of each and every minority language is hardly possible

putting the economic reality into consideration. And it is also equally difficult to promote western philosophy of language policy which according to Cohen (2006:167) does not encourage the use of minority languages. Hence, in such a context, according to Mulugeta (1998:533), more attention should be given to a language of higher functional significance. Prah (1995) cited in Mutasa (2006:64) similarly states that the majority's language could be used for socioeconomic and cultural empowerment of citizens in a sociolinguistic context of multiple languages.

Generally, in linguistically diversified countries, the issue of LM seems to be a subject of controversy. Meanwhile the question about what must be done to maintain a language is more significant to deal with in this research than the philosophical ground behind the controversy.

“To maintain a language you must have people you can use it with,” Holmes (1992:67). This idea stresses that a language must be used if it is meant to be preserved. Therefore, the use of minority ethnic languages especially within family members at home is very important for their maintenance.

Most importantly the transmission of linguistic identity to the young generation is unquestionably crucial. “Young upwardly mobile people are likely to shift faster” Holmes (1992:66). Therefore, attention must be given to the younger generation's language use if a language is to be maintained. This may include creating opportunities for ethnic language use, helping develop positive attitude towards one's mother tongue, etc. Here, it does not mean that the children should give up the use of the dominant language. And it should also be noted that bilingualism is more advantageous than monolingualism in many aspects.

### **2.1.6. Language Use**

Inseparably intricately with human existence, a language has a range of multifaceted and complex uses. Language use extends from daily ordinary instrumental functions to the more abstract and imaginary ones (Wardhaugh, 1976).

Different linguists have classified language use into different categories. Clark (1996:4), for example, views language use from the perspective of spoken and written settings. The scholar claims that face-to-face interaction is very central to language use.

Fishman (1971:248) views language use from the perspective of domain allocation. Domains like "...school, church, professional work sphere and government" are where prestigious languages are meant to be used whereas domains like "family, neighborhood, and low work spheres..." are reserved for non-prestigious languages/ varieties (Ibid: 248).

Patterns of language use in a bilingual speech community have a significant role in LM and LS. The more a minority language is limited in its use the more it is subjected to shift (Downs, 1998:62). The situation gets worse when the intrusion of the dominant language extends to the home domain (Ibid: 63). Dittmar (1976:178) best expresses this phenomenon as "Usually a language (variety) that is not used in the family has less chance of being retained than one which is". Therefore, language use at home domain has a determinant role in LM.

Power difference between languages has a strong influence on minority language use (Burck, 2005:19). Dominant languages are more likely to extend their networks to the extent of highly informal domains pushing out minority languages. Simply put, the more the use of a dominant languages move down the informal domains, the more it replaces

minority languages. According to May (2007:257-258), when socio-politically prestigious languages happen to take over the different ranges of functions of less prestigious minority languages, it is exactly the starting point of language loss.

Functional reduction of a certain language could inevitably result in poor proficiency of the speakers of the language (Appel and Muysken, 1987:42 and Holmes, 1992:62). In other words, as the use of the language in different domains decreases, language proficiency also decreases. The proficiency of children in such a condition becomes even lesser than their parents' (ibid). According to David, et al. (2003:10), language proficiency self assessment could best predict the levels of LM and LS.

#### **2.1.6.1. Borrowing**

Borrowing as a linguistic outcome of language contact is a process by which a speech group takes a linguistic element from another language (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988 cited in Winford, 2003:12). It is a common phenomenon to occur between languages (Campbell, 2004:62). English, for example, has 75% of its lexical items borrowed from different languages in one way or another (Winford, 2003: 29).

The type of borrowing between languages, whether structural or lexical, is determined by the degree of contact. Intense contact may enhance structural borrowing while casual contact is limited to lexical borrowing (Winford, 2003:29). This paper however, deals only with lexical borrowing since it goes beyond the scope of the thesis to consider structural borrowing.

In the process of linguistic borrowing, the language that donates a linguistic item is known as source language whereas the one that receives a linguistic item is referred to be a recipient language (Campbell,

2004:62). In this paper, Afan Oromo is assumed to be the recipient language and Amharic as the source language.

Borrowed lexical items could fall into different categories. Loan words, for example, have two subcategories: pure loans and loan blends (Winford, 2003:45). A pure loan word is a totally received lexical item with some phonemic modification (Campbell, 2004: 63) whereas loan blend refers to “Combination of native and imported morphemes” (Winford, 2003:45).

Loan blends are further classified into derivational and compound blends (Winford, 2003; 45). Derivational blend involves “imported stem + native affix” or vice versa while compound blend involves the process of combination of imported and native stems (ibid: 45).

Loan shift comprises semantic extensions of loans as well as loan translation (Winford, 2003:45). According to the scholar, semantic extension refers to the development of a semantic scope of a native word due to the intrusion of a foreign concept. Loan translation is a native word replacement by an imported foreign structure (ibid: 45). Native creations are also aspects of borrowing where concepts from a source language enter the recipient language (ibid: 45).

“Loyalty to one’s native language and pride in its autonomy may encourage resistance to a foreign incursion” (Winford, 2003:40-41). This idea has a notion that the degree of borrowing in a language is inversely proportional to the degree of loyalty of the speaker towards the language. Simply put, speech groups that are loyal to their mother tongue are less frequently exposed to borrowing than the ones which are not loyal.

Necessary lexical borrowing fills a lexical gap in the borrowing language while unnecessary borrowing shows the borrowing language speakers’

ignorance of their language (Hougen, 1969 cited in Grosjean, 1982:312). The ignorance may expose the language to massive lexical borrowing leading to low esteem to the recipient language which on the other hand causes language loss (Appel and Muysken, 1987:174). Aitchison (1981:221) explains the phenomenon like the following as language suicide:

*In language suicide, the language with less prestige borrows massively from the more socially acceptable one, and ends up obliterating itself. Borrowing in this circumstance is in all respect similar to other types of borrowing. It occurs... or where the borrower is cumbersome and lacks adequate terminology.*

The point is that unnecessary and massive lexical borrowings gradually fade up the identity of the recipient language and result in its shift to the prestigious language. In line with this, therefore, the intension of the researcher is to figure out the nature of borrowing in Afan Oromo based on the gathered linguistic data and come up with a possible linguistic symptom regarding whether Afan Oromo is shifting or not in Addis Ababa.

#### **2.1.6.2. Code Switching**

Code-switching is a normal phenomenon of a bilingual speech community (Grosjean, 1982:145). It is one of the most controversially defined concepts among different linguists. One of the controversy results from the difficulty of clearly demarking the boundary between code-switching and borrowing, i.e. when to say a certain linguistic feature is borrowed or code-switched. However, according to Winford (2003:107) “degree of use by monolingual speakers” and “degree of morphophonemic integration” are important yardsticks in identifying code switching from borrowing.

Code-switching is defined as an alternative use of two languages (Gumperz, 1971 cited in Zelealem, 1998:198). It could be inter-sentential or intra-sentential in its type. Intra-sentential code switching is mostly referred to as code-mixing. However, the phrase code-switching is used as an umbrella term for the two. In this paper, the researcher will use code-switching to refer to both code-mixing and code-switching.

Researches in code-switching could be approached from three perspectives: psychological (attitudinal), linguistic and communicative (Mekacha, 1993). However, the intention of this researcher is to deal with the communicative function of code-switching in order to supplement the sociological side of this study. Hence, the central focus here will be conversational code-switching.

According to Meyers-Scotton(1992) cited in Mekacha (1993:23) structural and interactional code-switching may be an evidence for language shift. Structural code-switching may undergo even to the extent of exchanging matrix and embedded languages. In this research, however, structural evidence will not be dealt with. Interactional code-switching could also be an evidence for language shift when there is functional redistribution of communication (Gal, 1979 cited in Mekacha, 1993:23),i.e. when communicative functions of “emotion”, “force” and “authority” are transferred from a subordinate language to prestigious ones (ibid: 23).

The intention of the current researcher is to find out whether there is a transfer of the three communicative functions stated above (emotion, force and authority) from Afan Oromo to Amharic in the research setting. This is meant to provide some linguistic evidence for the topic under investigation.

### **2.1.7. Language Attitude**

People could have feelings of different types about their own or others' languages, and this phenomenon according to Crystal (1992) is referred to as language attitude. Different sorts of opinion can be given to a language, a language variety, language use, LM, etc. These opinions are expressions of people's attitude towards languages.

According to Backer (2006:210), attitudes towards languages are crucial in their revitalization, decay or death. Speakers with a positive attitude towards their mother-tongue are likely to maintain it than those with negative attitude. It is also possible that a speech group may willingly let their ethnic language to decay.

Attitudes towards languages give us information about the "status, value, and importance of a language..." (Backer, 2006:211). Languages of higher socioeconomic and political status could easily win attitudes of the majority. And languages of lower prestige do not have the majority's appreciation.

Downs (1998:65) and Holmes (1992:69) suggest that a positive attitude towards a language encourages its maintenance and Backer (2006:213), on the other hand claims that "Negative attitude to a minority language may be a prime cause of parents' not passing on the heritage language to a child." Therefore, it can be understood here that attitude towards a language determines its fate.

In sociolinguistics, there are two theoretical orientations of language attitude research: the mentalist and the behaviorist (Appel and Muysken, 1987:16). The proponents of the behaviorist approach claim attitude is studied through "... observing the response to certain languages, i.e. to their use in actual interaction." (Appel and Muysken, 1987:16). The

mentalist proponents view attitude as “...a state of readiness; an intervening variable between a stimulus affecting a person and that person’s response.” (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970; Cooper and Fishman, 1974 cited in Fasold (1984:147).

Both approaches have their own advantages and disadvantages with regard to measurability. However, the mentalist approach is the most commonly used method of language attitude research. Therefore, the current researcher will also employ this approach.

## **2.2. Review of Related Works**

Researches on LM and LS are very common in USA where migration of a myriad of linguistic groups is very common. In Ethiopia, researches on this issue are extremely rare. In this section, the researcher will explore one iconic research on LM from USA. Since LM research in the Ethiopian context especially with regard to Afan Oromo is not common, the researcher will consider a possible exemplary work on Tigrinya language.

In USA, Demos (1988) has conducted a research on LM among Greek Orthodox Americans. Focusing on old churches in Minneapolis, Minnesota, Baltimore and Maryland, he distributed 603 questionnaires putting variables like generation, parish, and visit to Greece, heritage of spouse, sex, education, and birth cohort into consideration. The finding shows that ethnic mother tongue is maintained among the speech group with visit to Greece, parish effect, generation and intermarriage playing the key role in the language’s maintenance.

The current researcher is strongly aware that the sociolinguistic context of USA is not identical to that of Ethiopia. Ethiopia is a multilingual country with currently a multilingual language policy whereas USA is

more inclined to the use of English as a de facto official language. But since factors of LM are more or less similar within different sociolinguistic contexts, the researcher believes that it is worth considering this related LM research from the USA.

Gebre's (2008) thesis entitled "Language Use and Identity of Children Born to the Tigrinya Speaking Community in Addis Ababa" has the objective to describe the status of Tigrinya language among children born to Tigrinya speaking families and to uncover how well their language competence correlates with their ethnic identity. To attain this objective, he focused on proficiency, language use, identity and attitude, and distributed 126 questionnaires to the target children, and interviewed the parents of the children.

The finding shows that proficiency in Tigrinya is directly proportional to language use and the target children were found to be more proficient in the listening skill than the other language skills. Concerning language use, it was found out that down the chain of grand parents, parents and siblings, Tigrinya language use of the respondents was found to be decreasing and it was also the case that Amharic was found to be increasingly widely used in the family. In addition, Tigrinya language use is highly affected by the variables called ethnic composition of the parents and visit to Tigray. The identity of the children is highly affected by the parents' ethnic composition. Attitude of the children, on the other hand, is highly affected by visit to Tigray and parents' ethnic composition. And finally, a strong correlation between proficiency and language use and identity and attitude has been revealed.

Even though there is similarity between Gebre's work and this research, the difference outweighs. One main difference has to do with research objectives. Gebre is interested to investigate the relationship between

language use and identity while this researcher focuses on the speech behavior of the target linguistic group so as to find out whether Afan Oromo is being maintained or not in Addis Ababa. The second major difference is the ethno-linguistic group under examination. The subjects of the study are two entirely different groups with different linguistic, cultural, geographical, demographic, etc. contexts. Thirdly, unlike Gebre, who considers the social dimension, this researcher considers the linguistic dimension of LM in the specific ethno-linguistic group.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of the acquired data. The sociolinguistic information on language use, language attitude, LM efforts as well as language proficiency will be presented and analyzed. In addition, the linguistic data on borrowing and code-switching will be dealt with in order to supplement the sociolinguistic evidence for the title under treatment.

#### **3.1. Respondents' Demography**

This study is based on data collected from 140 respondents of which 125 were ethnic Oromos of age 20 and above living in Addis Ababa. The remaining 15 subjects were children of the selected target groups. Ten of these children were from Sunday schools of the two churches while five of them were from voluntary parents from the target offices.

The demographic data on age distribution of the respondents shows that 29 (23.2%) respondents rest between the age interval of 20-30, 27(21.6%) of 31-40, 31 (24.8%) of 41-50, 26 (20.8%) of 51-60, and 12 (9.6%) lie beyond 60. However, this age category was reduced in to two as: 20-39 and  $\geq 40$  for convenience.

Gender wise, 60 (48%) respondents were male while the remaining 65 (52%) were female. In terms of marital status, 65 (52%) respondents were married while 60 (48%) were not. The information on ethnic composition of this marriage shows that 14 (21.5%) respondents were married to non-Oromos. Of this 5(35.7%) were Oromo wives having Amhara husbands, 9(64.2%) were Oromo husbands with Amhara wives. The remaining 51 (78.4%) have reported to have identical ethnic composition of marriage.

Concerning the respondents' birth place, it has been identified that all respondents were born in Oromia out side of Addis Ababa.

The respondents' educational status is indicated in the following table.

Educational status	Responses		
	No	%	Remark
<b>Primary education</b>	16	12.8	
<b>Secondary education</b>	14	11.2	
<b>Diploma</b>	21	16.8	
<b>First degree</b>	43	34.4	
<b>Second degree and above</b>	31	24.8	
<b>Total</b>	125	100	

Table.1. Educational Status of the Respondents

The demographic information given in the above table was categorized into two as: higher education group and lower education group for convenience. Higher educational status group consists of respondents who have diploma and above while lower educational status group consists of respondents with primary and secondary educational level.

### **3.2. Language Use**

The items on the questionnaire that are concerned with language use were meant to extract information on language use of the respondents at the home level. The items further investigate language use in religious affairs (during prayers and worshipping), and language use during expressions of emotion, force and authority. Responses on language use at the work places and with neighbours were also part of the data. Each will be dealt with in the following section.

### 3.2.1. Language Use at the Home Level

The data on language use at the home level has been collected through questions about the subjects' language use with their parents, grand parents, children, spouse, grand children, and siblings. The frequencies and percentages of the given responses are presented in the following table.

Language used with	Responses									
	Amharic		Afan Oromo		Amharic and Afan Oromo		Other languages		Total no. and percentage of respondents for each item	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>father</b>	17	17.7	98	85.3					115	100
<b>mother</b>	8	6.7	107	89.2	5	4.1			120	100
<b>grand father</b>			70	100					70	100
<b>grand mother</b>			75	100					75	100
<b>children</b>	8	22.8	24	68.5	3	8.5			35	100
<b>spouse</b>	9	13.8	54	83	2	3			65	100
<b>grand children</b>	3	15	17	85					20	100
<b>brothers</b>			95	100					95	100
<b>Sisters</b>			100	100					100	100

Table.2. Respondents' Language Use at Home Level

**NB. F=frequency**

As it can be seen from the above table, 98 (85.3%) and 107 (89.2%) respondents indicated that they use Afan Oromo with their fathers and mothers, respectively. On the contrary, a relatively insignificant number of respondents 17 (17.7%) of the 115 and 8(6.7%) reported that they use Amharic with their fathers and mothers, respectively. This shows that Afan Oromo is dominantly used by respondents with their fathers and mothers.

The table also shows that all respondents (100%) who reported to have grand parents stated that they entirely use Afan Oromo with their grand

parents. Here, Afan Oromo is a sole language that communicates respondents with their grand parents.

Among the 35 respondents having children, in the above table, 8 (22.8%), 24 (68.5%), and 3 (8.5%) have informed that they use Amharic, Afan Oromo and both languages, respectively, with their children. The majority's language of parent-to-child communication is therefore Afan Oromo.

The table also shows that 54 (83%) out of the 65 respondents have answered that they use Afan Oromo with their spouses while 9 (13.8%) and 2 (3%) use Amharic and the mixed language of the two, respectively. Hence, Afan Oromo dominates as a language communicating respondents with their spouses.

Similarly, 17 (85%) of the 20 respondents among those who have grand children have indicated to use Afan Oromo with their grand children whereas the rest, 3 (15%) use Amharic. Afan Oromo is predominantly used between respondents and their grand children.

Finally, all respondents having brothers and sisters, 95 and 100 ,answered that they totally use Afan Oromo with their brothers and sisters, respectively. This figure also implies that Afan Oromo is the sole language of communication among siblings in the target group.

An interview is made with the 15 children regarding which language they use with their family at home, friends in school, friends in the neighborhood and in play grounds. All the children have stated that they use Afan Oromo at home with their family while the majority of the children, 13 (86.6%) claimed that they use Amharic with friends in school 11(73%), with friends in the neighborhood, and 14(93.3%) in play grounds. So, Afan Oromo is a very important language among the

children only at home level. The data also suggests that bilingualism is the most important feature among the children.

Afan Oromo, here, is found to be the main language at home. The intrusion of Amharic to the home domain is very insignificant. The figures above show that the language is being effectively used between respondents and their parents, grand parents, children, spouses, grand children, and brothers and sisters. The language is also free from an anxiety expressed by Dittmar (1976:178) that a language which is not used at home is subject to shift. In this respect, it can be generalized that Afan Oromo is a safe language at home. It is the most dominantly used language among respondents at home.

### 3.2.1.1. Language Use at the Home by Respondents' Age level

Language use with	Responses															
	Amharic				Afan Oromo				Afan Oromo and Amharic				Total			
	20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>Father</b>	11	19.6	6	10.1	45	80.3	53	89.8					56	100	59	100
<b>mother</b>	7	11.8	1	1.5	49	87.5	63	98.4					56	100	64	100
<b>grand father</b>					54	100	16	100					54	100	16	100
<b>grand mother</b>					49	100	26	100					49	100	26	100
<b>Children</b>	6	35.2	2	11.1	9	52.9	15	83.3	2	11.7	1	5.5	17	100	18	100
<b>Spouse</b>	7	21.8	2	6	23	71.8	31	93.9	2	6.2			32	100	33	100
<b>grand children</b>	1	100	2	10.5			17	89.4					1	100	19	100
<b>Brothers</b>					43	100	52	100					43	100	52	100
<b>Sisters</b>					49	100	51	100					49	100	51	100

Table.2.1. Language Use at Home vs. Respondents' Age Level

The above table shows that 19.6% of the respondents of the age group 20-39 and 10.1% of respondents of the  $\geq 40$  age group have reported to use Amharic with their fathers. 80.3% of the 20-39 age level and 89.8% of the  $\geq 40$  age level respondents have reported to use Afan Oromo with their fathers. Meanwhile, 11.8% of the 20-39 age group respondents and 1.5% of the  $\geq 40$  age level respondents were found to use Amharic with their mother. And 87.5% of the 20-39 and 98.4% of the  $\geq 40$  respondents of age level use Afan Oromo with their mothers. The data suggests that age categories of respondents do not affect their language use with their fathers and mothers.

The table also conveys that entirely all respondents of both age groups having grand fathers and grand mothers have reported to use Afan Oromo with their grand fathers and grand mothers. Respondents' age level does not affect their language use with their grand fathers and grand mothers.

32.5% of the respondents of 20-39 age group and 11.1% of the respondents of  $\geq 40$  have reported to use Amharic with their children while 52.9% of 20-39 age group respondents and 83.3%  $\geq 40$  age level respondents have reported to use Afan Oromo with their children. Those respondents who have indicated to use both languages comprise 11.7% for 20-39 age group respondents and 5.5% for  $\geq 40$  age group respondents. The figures indicate that the older age group significantly uses Afan Oromo with their children more than the younger age group.

With regard to respondents' language use with their spouses, 21.8% of 20-39 age group respondents and 6% of the  $\geq 40$  age group respondents use Amharic with their spouses. On the other hand, 71.8% of the 20-39 age level respondents and 93.9 % of the  $\geq 40$  age group respondents have reported to use Afan Oromo with their spouses. The rest 6.2 % of the

20-39 age group respondents have claimed to use both languages. Even though Afan Oromo is significantly used by respondents of both age groups and their spouses, the older age group relatively takes the lead in using the language with their spouses.

100% (only one individual) of the 20-39 age level of respondents and 10.5% of the  $\geq 40$  age group of respondents have claimed to use Amharic with their grand children. 89.4% of the  $\geq 40$  age level respondents claimed to use Afan Oromo with their grand children. The majority of the older age group of respondents uses Afan Oromo with their grand children.

In the above table, all respondents of both age groups have reported to entirely (100%) use Afan Oromo with their brothers and sisters. So, Afan Oromo as a language of communication among siblings in the target group is not determined by the respondents' age level.

In the above presentation, age distribution of respondents does not show language use difference among respondents at home level with the exception of respondents' language use with their children, spouses and grand children. During these cases the older age group of respondents was found to take the lead in using Afan Oromo. Since children and grand children are the main indicators of LM, the older age group respondents' contribution seems to be very significant.

According to Fasold (1984), when a language is more used by older age group speakers than younger age group speakers, it is a good symptom of LS. However, this case can not be taken as a symptom of LS since relatively the majority of the respondents of the younger age group use Afan Oromo with their children, spouses and grand children, even though not as predominantly as the older age group respondents.

### 3.2.1.2. Language Use at the Home by Respondents' Gender

Language use with	Responses															
	Amharic				Afan Oromo				Afan Oromo and Amharic				Total			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>Father</b>	7	12.2	10	17.2	50	87.7	48	82.7					57	100	58	100
<b>mother</b>	3	4.7	5	8.7	59	93.6	48	84.2	1	1.5	4	7	63	100	57	100
<b>grand father</b>					36	100	34	100					36	100	34	100
<b>grand mother</b>					35	100	40	100					35	100	40	100
<b>Children</b>	5	33.3	3	15	8	53.3	16	80	2	13.3	1	5	15	100	20	100
<b>Spouse</b>	6	20	3	8.5	23	76.6	31	88.5	1	3.3	1	2.8	30	100	35	100
<b>grand children</b>	2	25	1	8.3	6	75	11	91.6					8	100	12	100
<b>Brothers</b>					45	100	50	100					45	100	50	100
<b>Sisters</b>					60	100	40	100					60	100	40	100

Table.2.2. Language Use at Home vs. Respondents' Gender

According to the above table, 12.2% of the male respondents and 17.2% of the female respondents use Amharic with their fathers. 87.7% of male respondents and 82.7% of female respondents use Afan Oromo with their fathers while 1.5% of male respondents and 7% of female respondents were found to use both languages with their fathers. And 4.7% of male and 8.7% of female respondents use Amharic with their mothers. On the contrary, 93.6% of male respondents and 84.2% female respondents have reported to use Afan Oromo with their mothers. Nearly equal majority of both sexes use Afan Oromo with their fathers and mothers. Hence, sex difference does not show respondents' language use difference with their fathers and mothers.

All respondents of both sexes who have reported to have grand fathers and grand mothers have indicated that they use Afan Oromo with their grand fathers and grand mothers. Here, too, respondents' sex does not determine their language use with their grand fathers and grand mothers.

33.3% of the male respondents and 15% of the female respondents have reported to use Amharic with their children while 53.3% of the male respondents and 80 % of the female respondents have indicated to use Afan Oromo with their children. Meanwhile, 13.3% of male respondents' and 5% of female respondents have reported to use both languages. The implication is that females are the ones who use Afan Oromo with their children better than their male counter parts.

The table also shows that, 20% of male respondents and 8.5% of female respondents use Amharic with their spouses while 76% of male respondents and 88.5% of the female respondents have reported to use Afan Oromo with their spouses. The rest 3.3 % of the male and 2.8 % of female respondents have claimed to use both languages. Even though

the majority of both sexes use Afan Oromo with their spouses, relatively females use Afan Oromo dominantly than males.

25 % of the male respondents and 8.3 % of the female respondents have claimed to use Amharic with their grand children. 75 % of the male respondents and 96.6 % of the female respondents claimed that they use Afan Oromo with their grand children. Female respondents strongly use Afan Oromo with their grand children than the male respondents.

In the given table, all respondents of both sexes totally use Afan Oromo with their brothers and sisters. So, Afan Oromo language use among siblings in the target group is not determined by the speakers' sex.

Sex as a factor does not seem to affect the respondents' language use with their fathers, mothers, grandfathers, grandmothers and siblings. Here both sexes relatively equally use the Afan Oromo. However, with regard to language use with spouses, children and grand children, female respondents relatively use Afan Oromo better than male respondents. This point goes with the idea of Law (1995) cited in Burck (2005:20) that females are the most important guardians and transmitters of their mother tongue to their children.

Generally, even though Afan Oromo use among the respondents at home is very important for both sexes, females' contribution is the most important one for they better use the language with the most important members of the home for LM, children and grand children.

### 3.2.1.3. Language Use at the Home by Respondents' Educational Level

Language use with	Responses															
	Amharic				Afan Oromo				Afan Oromo and Amharic				Total			
	H		L		H		L		H		L		H		L	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>Father</b>	7	8.2	10	33.3	78	91.7	20	66.6					85	100	30	100
<b>mother</b>	4	4.4	4	13.3	86	95.5	21	70			5	16.6	90	100	30	100
<b>grand father</b>					51	100	19	100					51	100	19	100
<b>grand mother</b>					49	100	26	100					49	100	26	100
<b>Children</b>	6	22.2	2	25	18	66.6	6	75	3	11.1			27	100	8	100
<b>Spouse</b>	6	12.5	3	17.6	40	83.3	14	82.3	2	4.1			48	100	17	100
<b>grand children</b>	2	15.3	1	14.2	11	84.6	6	85.7					13	100	7	100
<b>Brothers</b>					75	100	20	100					75	100	20	100
<b>Sisters</b>					82	100	18	100					82	100	18	100

Table.2.3. Language Use at Home vs. Respondents' Educational Level

**Key H=higher education level**

**L= lower education level**

According to the above table, 8.2% of the respondents of higher educational status and 33.3% of the respondents of the lower educational status use Amharic with their fathers. 91.7% of the respondents of higher educational status and 66.6% of the respondents of lower educational status use Afan Oromo with their fathers. 4.4% of the highly educated respondents and 13.3% of the respondents of lower educational status were found to use Amharic with their fathers while 95.5% of higher educational level and 70% of lower educational level respondents use Afan Oromo with their mothers. Respondents using both languages comprises of 16.6% of the respondents of lower educational status. This shows that respondents of higher educational status dominantly use Afan Oromo with their fathers and mothers than respondents of lower educational status.

Respondents of the two educational statuses who have reported to have grand fathers and grand mothers claimed that all of them use Afan Oromo with their grand fathers and grand mothers. Disparity in educational level does not determine the respondents' language use with their grand fathers and grand mothers. All respondents of the two educational status category use Afan Oromo.

22.2% of the respondents of higher educational status and 25% of the respondents of lower educational status have reported to use Amharic with their children while 66.6% of the highly educated respondents and 75 % of the respondents of lower educational have stated to use Afan Oromo with their children while, 11.5% of the highly educated respondents has reported to use both languages. The implication is that even though respondents of both educational levels use Afan Oromo with their children, lower educational status respondents better use Afan Oromo with their children than higher educational status respondents.

The table also indicates that, 12.5% of the respondents of higher educational status and 17.6% of respondents of lower educational status use Amharic with their spouses when 83.3% of respondents of higher educational status and 82.3% of respondents of lower educational status have reported to use Afan Oromo with their spouses. 4.1% of respondents of higher educational status have claimed to use both languages. The figures convey that educational status, whether higher or lower, does not affect respondents' language use with their spouses. Very near equal percent of the respondents of both categories of educational status use Afan Oromo with their spouses.

15.3% of respondents of higher educational and 14.2 % of respondents of lower educational status have claimed to use Amharic with their grand children while 84.6 % of respondents of higher educational status and 85.7% of respondents of lower educational status have claimed that they use Afan Oromo with their grand children. The implication is that educational status as a factor does not influence respondents' language use with their grand children. Almost equal majority of the respondents use Afan Oromo with their grand children.

The table also shows that all respondents of both educational statuses entirely use Afan Oromo with their brothers and sisters. Therefore, educational status is not an influencing factor of the respondents' language use with their siblings. All respondents of the two educational statuses use Afan Oromo with their brothers and sisters with insignificant difference.

From the above presentation, it can be deduced that educational status difference does not affect respondents' language use with their grand fathers/mothers, spouses, grand children, and siblings. Respondents of both educational statuses have a near equal use of Afan Oromo with the aforementioned people. Respondents of the higher educational status use

Afan Oromo more with their fathers and mothers than those of lower educational status while respondents of lower educational status use Afan Oromo with their children more than the respondents' higher educational status. Respondents of the lower educational status relatively have the most important contribution since they better use Afan Oromo with their children.

### 3.2.2. Respondents' Dominant Language at Home

The following responses have been obtained about the question concerning respondents' dominant language of the home

Language	F	%
<b>Afan Oromo</b>	84	67.2
<b>Amharic</b>	23	18.4
<b>Both</b>	18	14.4
<b>Other</b>		
<b>Total</b>	125	100

Table.3. Respondents' Dominant Language of the Home

As can be easily observed from the above table the majority of the respondents have indicated that the dominant language of their home is Afan Oromo which accounts about 67.2%. The claim for Amharic comprises 18.4% while 14.4% of the respondents have claimed to use both languages.

Afan Oromo seems to hold the dominant position as a language of the home in the majority of the Afan Oromo speaking urban community households. According to Dittmar (1976:178) a language not functioning at home is subject to shift. Here, Afan Oromo is functioning very well at home level and so this means that the language is not subject to shift.

### 3.2.2.1. Home Language vs. Interethnic Marriage

As it has been indicated in the second chapter of this study, under respondents' demography section, the gender category of the subjects of this research indicates that 60 (48%) are unmarried while 65 (52%) are married. Among the 65 (52%) married respondents of the item, 51 (78.4%) have intra-ethnic marriage while 14(21.5%) are spouses of different ethnic origin. Among the 14 spouses of different ethnic origin, 5 (35.7%) are Oromo wives having Amhara husbands while 9(64.2%) are Oromo husbands having Amhara wives. The following table presents data on their language use.

	Intra-ethnic union		Inter-ethnic Marriage			
			Oromo Wives		Oromo Husbands	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>Afan Oromo</b>	39	76.4			4	44.4
<b>Amharic</b>	4	7.8	5	100	1	11.1
<b>Mixed</b>	8	15.7			4	44.4
<b>Any other</b>						
<b>Total</b>	51	100	5	100	9	100

Table.3.1. Respondents' Dominant Language of the Home vs. Interethnic Marriage

As we can see from the above table, the majority, 39 (76.4%), of the intra-ethnically married couples have stated that they dominantly use Afan Oromo at home. Comparatively the minority, which amounts to 4(7.8%) and 8(15.7%) respondents have reported to have used Amharic and both languages, respectively. For respondents who have inter-ethnic marriage, two sub-categories are visible on the table. The first category consists of female respondents who are married to Amhara husbands. They have reported that Amharic is entirely the dominant language of their home. The other category consists of male respondents who have married Amhara wives. They claim the use of Afan Oromo and the use of both languages equally

dominantly by 44.4% (4 individuals each) while only a single individual (11.1%) has reported to use Amharic.

Therefore, it can be roughly deduced from the above figures that the type of marriage determines which language has to be the dominant language of the home among the speakers. Afan Oromo is the dominant language of the home among couples of identical ethnic origin. However, it seems to be dominantly used among couples in which the husband is Oromo.

According to Holmes (1992:86), the marriage of couples of separate ethnic background is an opportunity for the dominant language to be frequently used at home. The story seems to work here but slightly differently. Amharic dominates in interethnic marriage of which the husband is Amhara and the wife is an Oromo, but it is less likely to work the other way round. This could be attributed to the patriarchal nature of our society. Generally, even though interethnic marriage of which the wife is an Oromo seems to pave a way for Amharic to dominate Afan Oromo at home, the influence does not seem to be strong since marriage of such type among the respondents seems to be less common.

### 3.2.3. Language Use in Religious Affairs

Concerning language use in religious affairs, two items were included into the questionnaire. It is about language use in personal prayers and in worship places.

Language use in	Responses									
	Amharic		Afan Oromo		Amharic and Afan Oromo		Other languages		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
personal prayers	23	18.4	66	52.8	36	28	1	0.8	125	100
Worship places	9	7.2	70	56	46	36.8			125	100

Table.4. Responses on Language Use during Personal Prayers and in Worship Places

One can see from the table that 23 (18.4%), 66(52.8%), and 36 (28%) use Amharic, Afan Oromo, and both languages, respectively, during personal prayers. The remaining, 1(0.8%) has reported to use Arabic. The majority of the respondents use Afan Oromo during personal prayers.

The table also shows that 9 (7.2%), 70 (56%) and 46 (36.8%) respondents respectively use Amharic, Afan Oromo and the two languages in worship places. The figures indicate that Afan Oromo relatively dominates the religious affairs for the target groups. However, a considerable number of respondents, 46 (36.8%), were found to use the two languages. The figures also suggest that bilingualism seems to be the most important feature among the respondents in religious affairs.

The above data witnesses that Afan Oromo is a viable language of religion among the respondents in Addis Ababa, i.e. it is relatively dominantly used during personal prayers and in worships. The degree of subordinate languages' representation in religious sectors has an impact on their maintenance (Giles et al. 1977 cited in Appeal and Muysken, 1987:37). This means that using subordinate languages in religious affairs contributes to their maintenance. The language also has a good status in the church which Fishman (1971:248) claimed to be one of the most important domains of language use. In light of these views, Afan Oromo is a well used language among the respondents as far as religion is concerned.

#### **3.2.4. Language Use during Expressions of Emotion, Force and Authority**

On the questionnaire, respondents' language use was asked in emotional contexts like: when being angry, when speaking forcefully, when giving order, when cursing and blessing. The responses are organized as follows:

Language used when	Response									
	Amharic		Afan Oromo		Amharic and Afan Oromo		Other languages		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
<b>angry</b>	25	20	60	48	40	32			125	100
<b>speaking forcefully</b>	25	20	84	67.2	26	20.8			125	100
<b>cursing</b>	19	15.2	71	56.8	35	28			125	100
<b>blessing</b>	21	16.8	67	53.6	37	29.6			125	100
<b>giving order</b>	42	33.6	53	42.4	30	24			125	100

Table.5. Respondents' Language Use during Emotional Feelings

The table shows that respondents use Amharic 25(20%), Afan Oromo 60(48%) and the two languages 40 (32%), respectively, when they are angry. During forceful speech respondents who have reported to use Amharic are 25 (20%), Afan Oromo are 84 (67.2%), the majority, and both languages are 26 (20.8%), respectively. The majority of the respondents, 71 (56.8%), use Afan Oromo while cursing, and those who use both language while cursing are 37(29.6%). Amharic was found to be the list used language during cursing. With regard to blessing, the majority, 67 (53.6%) use Afan Oromo while 30 (29%) use the two languages, and 21(16.8) use Amharic. Among the respondents, 42 (33.6%), 53(42.4%) and 30(24%) use Amharic, Afan Oromo, and both languages respectively while giving order.

According to Gal, 1979 cited in Mekacha,(1993: 23), as explained in the second chapter of this paper, the transfer of communicative functions of “emotion”, “force” and “authority” from the subordinate languages to prestigious ones is a symptom of language shift. As opposed to this, the above figures indicate that Afan Oromo has remained to be the dominant language in all contexts of the given expressions. Therefore, language use during expressions of emotion, force and authrity provides a clue about Afan Oromo LM among the respondents in Addis Ababa.

### 3.2.5. Language Use with Neighbors

An item on the questionnaire was asked about respondents' language use with neighbors. The following table presents the responses.

Language used with	Responses									
	Amharic		Afan Oromo		Amharic and Afan Oromo		Other languages		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
neighbor	55	44	60	48	10	8			125	100

Table.6. Respondents Language Use with Neighbor

The above table conveys that 60 (48%) use Afan Oromo and 55 (44%) use Amharic with their neighbors while only 10 (8%) respondents reported that they use both languages.

The implication is that Afan Oromo and Amharic are almost equally utilized by the respondents. This might depend on the linguistic behavior of the respondents' neighbors. Hence, this shows the importance of bilingualism. Since Afan Oromo speakers in Addis Ababa are scattered around the city, which language they use with their neighbors depends on who their neighbors are.

Meanwhile, the respondents' Afan Oromo usage with their neighbors, even though it is not that much different from the use of Amharic, conveys the message that it is relatively a living language as far as communication in neighborhood is concerned. Neighborhood, an informal domain of language use according to Fishman (1971:248), seems to be one of the domains of Afan Oromo use among the respondents in Addis Ababa regardless of the scattered nature of the speech group in the city.

### 3.2.6. Language Use at Work Place

A question about which language the respondents use at work place was also posed on the questionnaire. And the response is presented in the following table.

Language used at	Responses									
	Amharic		Afan Oromo		Amharic and Afan Oromo		Other languages		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>work places</b>	45	36	50	40	30	24			125	100

Table.7. Respondents Language Use at Work Place

Responses on language use at work places, in the above table, shows that 45 (36%) respondents use Amharic, 50 (40%) use Afan Oromo and 30 (24%) use both languages at their work places. The two languages are relatively equally used by the respondents at work place and the use of both languages is also considerable in number.

This phenomenon could be attributed to the sociolinguistic contexts of the workplaces. Respondents working in Oromia offices normally use Afan Oromo as a working language, while respondents working in other offices like in federal government may use Amharic or both languages.

The researcher has also personally observed in the target offices and churches that the speakers use Afan Oromo in formal situations but they use Amharic alternatively to Afan Oromo speakers in informal occasions. This phenomenon is very common especially in the target offices that are under Oromia Regional Administration.

According to Fishman (1971:248), work places are formal domains of language use. Afan Oromo is found to be a considerable language of the working place of the respondents. Therefore, the language is relatively a

lively language at work places of the respondents. The figures also suggest that Amharic plays a key role as a LWC among the respondents and generally bilingualism is a visible feature among the speakers at work places.

### 3.2.7. Borrowing and Code-Switching

In the following section, Afan Oromo extracts of conversation collected from the research targets in different ways at different times will be presented and analyzed. Items that are presumed to be from Amharic are written in italics and the ones from English are written in upper case letters for convenience.

1. *The following text is obtained from the discussion made between the researcher and an employee in OCTB.*

?afa:n ?oromo: finfinne: ke:ssatti guddisu:daf BUREAU-n kun gahe: hammami: k'aba:da ga:ffitji... THIS NEEDS A SORT OF LANGUAGE POLICY...CHALLENG-i: gudda:tu dzira...?afa:n ?oromo:rra...?u:mmanni ?amma LANGUAGE-CONCIOUS-i: da... SO, nuti EVERYWHERE nide:mna ?afa:n isa: baratfju:f DEMAND ni goda... HOW MUCH THIS IS PRACTICAL kan dzedu garu: ga:ffi: gudda: da... BUREAU-n kun hammam guma:tjfa: dzira da:?immani:f giddu gale:ssi tokko hindziru ... FOR EXAMPLE...SO wa:n kana ta?e:f LANGUAGE PRESERVATION gotfju:da:f rakkisa:... ?amma RADIO fi TV ?afa:n ?oromo: gafa bantu namo:tni z*igawu* dzedu

#### **Gloss**

What the role of this office would be in promoting Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa is the question! This needs a sort of language policy. There is a big challenge on Afan Oromo. The people now days are language-conscious. We go every where (in Oromia) and see that the people demand to learn their language. But the biggest question is how much this is practical. How much is this office contributing? There is no any centre for Oromo children in Addis Ababa, for example. So, language preservation is very

difficult. These days when one opens Oromo radio and TV some people say “close it!”

In the above extracts of conversation, the following words are identified as foreign linguistic elements to Afan Oromo (1) BUREAU, (2) THIS NEEDS A SORT OF LANGUAGE POLICY, (3) CHALLENGE, (4) LANGUAGE-CONCIOUS, (5) SO, (6) EVERYWHERE, (7) DEMAND, (8) HOW MUCH THIS IS PRACTICAL, (9) FOR EXAMPLE, (10)LANGUAGE PRESERVATION,(11) RADIO, (12) TV, (13) *zīgawu* ‘close it!’.

Among these linguistic items, (1), (11), and (12) are reported to be normally used in Afan Oromo by monolingual Afan Oromo speakers in the countryside. All the remaining items are code-switched from English with the exception of *zīgawu* ‘close it!’ which is from Amharic.

2. *The following portion of conversation is obtained from the members of the two target churches<sup>2</sup>*

*bə* *ɨyəsus* *sɨm* *ma:lif* *nama* *na:sis-ta:*  
by *jesus* *name* *why* *man* *scare-2S*  
‘In the name of Jesus, why do you scare me?’

*bə* *sɨmə* *ʔab* *məki:na:-tu* *galagal-e-n* *seʔ-e*  
by *name* *father* *car-a* *crush-ed- 1S* *think-ed*  
‘In the name of God, I thought the car crashed’

*WOW* *ba:yʔee* *nama* *gammad-tʃʃ-i:sa*  
*wow* *much* *man* *happy-OBJ- 3MS*  
‘Wow! It makes me happy’

---

<sup>2</sup> Symbols representing markers and their meanings

1. 1MS-first person masculine singular
2. 3MS- third person masculine singular
3. 1S- first person singular
4. 2S- second person singular
5. NEG- negative marker
6. OBJ- object marker

*t'ila:hun #mma as-irra-tti hin-ba?-u geta yi-gəsis'-əw #ndzi:*  
 tilahun oh here-on- NOM NEG- appear-inf. Lord 1MS-rebuke – OBJ however  
*ta:mira:t isa t'ənk'wua:yi-tu as-irra-tti ba?-e*  
 tamirat that magician-the here-on- NOM appear-ed-3MS  
 'Tilahun does not appear here, Tamirat, the magician, appeared  
 here may God rebuke him, however'

*məlsi: ke:ssan wəɾək'ətə ʔirra-tti barre:ss-a:*  
 answer yours paper on-NOM write-2P  
 'Write your answer on a paper'

*wənge:lli keenya POWERi: k'ab-a*  
 gospel ours power has-NOM.  
 'Our gospel has a power'

*bək'əl-ih-#n lə-igzɪab#her sɪt'əw dzed-a wənge:lli<sup>3</sup>*  
 revenge-your-ACC. for-God give-OBJ say-3MS gospel  
 'The gospel says "Revenge is of God"

*di:s-i bə #nna:t-#h ʔakkas taʔa dzed-e hin-ya:d-ne*  
 leave by mom-POSS like this become say-ed-1S NEG-think-1S  
 'For God's sake, I never thought it becomes like this!'

*di:s-a: bək'k'a NOTEi:duma k'ab-afɪʔa: de:m-na*  
 leave-2P enough note-just take-PROG go-2P  
 'It is okay! We just keep going taking a note.'

*s'om s'əloti: k'ab-ann-e: kadan-na*  
 fast paryer catch-1P-ed beg-1P  
 'We beg God by fasting and Prayer'

*siʔana nam-o:ta yə-səra:wit geta igzɪab#her #ndəz-ih yi-lal dzed-an-i*  
 this days man-pl. of-worriers lord God like this 1S-say-2P-ed  
 'This days, people saying lord of humankind God says...'

From the second group of linguistic data (above), the following linguistic items were identified as foreign elements to Afan Oromo: (1) *bə iyəsus*

- 
4. NOM.- nominative case marker
  5. ACC.- accusative case marker
  6. PROG-progressive tense marker
  7. POSS- possessive marker
  8. Inf.- Infinitive

*s#m*, ‘In the name of Jesus’, (2) *bə s#mə ʔab* ‘by the name of God’, (3) *wow* (4) *#mma* ‘discourse marker’, (5) *geta yi gəsis’əw #ndzi*: ‘may the lord rebuke him, however’, (6) *#lahun* ‘ name of a person in Amharic’, (7) *tam#rat* ‘ name of a person in Amharic’, (8) *tənk’uway* ‘magician’, (9) *məls* ‘answer’, (10) *wərəkət* ‘paper’ (from Arabic to Amharic( Leslau,1990:22) and probably to Afan Oromo through Amharic),(11) *wəngel* ‘gospel’, (12) POWER, (13) *bək’əl yə #gzil’ab#her nəw* ‘ revenge is of God’, (14) *bə #nnat#h* lit.‘by your mom’, (15) *bək’k’a* ‘enough’, (16) NOTE, (17) *məkina* ‘car’, (18) *s’om s’əlot* ‘fasting and prayer’ (19) *yə səra:wit geta #gzil’ab#her #ndəz-ih y#l-lal* ‘lord of humankind God says’

This seems to be the richest data showing the pervasive contact between Afan Oromo and Amharic. Only three items in the data, (3), (12) and (16) are found to be English words. Items (6), (7), (8), (10), (11) and (17) were judged by monolinguals to be normally used in Afan Oromo. The rest, (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (9), (12), (13), (14),(15), (16), (18), are code-switched linguistic items of which (3), (12) and (16) are from English.

3. *The following extracts of conversations are gathered from people using Afan Oromo inside the compound of the target offices.*

*milikkita*      *na:*              *god-i.*  
*sign*              *for me*              *make-2S*  
‘Give me a missed call’

PROPOSALI:      *ke:*              *diye:ffa-t#tfu*      *k’abd-a*  
*proposal*              *your*              *present-ing*              *must-2M*  
‘You must present your proposal’

*təw*      *#bakk-#h*      *ma:l*      *fid-u*  
*leave*      *please-2MS*      *what*      *bring-2P*  
‘Forget them!’

INSTRUMENTi:      VALID      *ta?e:n*              MEASURE      *god-t#tfu:-n*      *barba:-t#tf-isa:*      *da*  
*instrument*              *valid*      *become-ed*      *measure*      *make- PROG*              *needed-3SM*

‘It is needed to measure with a valid instrument’

FIELDi:      bahu:-n-ko:      hin-ʔo:l-u  
field      out-ing-1S      NEG-absent  
‘It is inevitable that I will go for field work’

BEREAU      PRESIDENTi:-n      de: m-a  
office      president -1S      go-1S  
‘I go to the office of the president’

*məki:na:*      *fo:k'i:rra*      *da:bbat-u*      sana  
car      building-on      standing      that  
‘That car on the building’

MESSAG-i:      si:-erg-e:-ra  
message      foryou-send-ed-1S  
‘I already sent you a message’

In the third chunks of linguistic data, the following non-Afan Oromo linguistic elements that are from either Amharic or English were identified. (1) *milikkita* ‘sign’, (2) PROPOSAL, (3) *təw ibakkih* ‘please, stop that’ (4) *hawuzubillah* (Arabic), (5) INSTRUMENT, (6) VALID, (7) MEASURE, (8) FIELD, (9) BUREAU, (10) PRESIDENT, (11) *fo:k'i:* ‘upstairs’, (12) MESSAGE

Items (1), (8), (9), (10), (11) were found to be identified by monolingual Afan Oromo speakers to be usually used in Afan Oromo conversations. Items (3) is code-switching from Amharic, and (2), (5), (6), (7), and (12) are switched from English. The remaining item, (4), is switched from Arabic. The data shows that 4 of 12 (30%) items are borrowed from English. Out of the code-switched items, only two, (3) and (4), are related to expressions of authority and emotion, respectively.

It can be understood from the first chunk of linguistic data that there are few borrowed lexical items in general and almost negligible from Amharic. The code-switched lexical items are not related to statements of emotion, force or authority. In the second chunk of linguistic data,

however, approximately about one-third the lexical items are borrowed from Amharic and one-third the code-switched Amharic linguistic elements are related to expressions of emotion, force and authority. The third group of linguistic data does not convey anything more than the natural linguistic phenomena of borrowing and code-switching.

The transfer of the expressions of “emotion”, “force” and “authority” from minority languages to the dominant languages shows the linguistic symptom of minority language shift (Gal, 1979 cited in Mekacha, 1993). On the light of this fact, the above linguistic data shows that the observed code-switched items can not be taken as the linguistic symptoms of language shift. The linguistic data acquired from the target churches, regarding code-switching, however, shows that the nature of most of the code-switched items is related to expressions of emotion, force and authority

The nature of borrowing in the above linguistic data can not be taken as a symptom of language shift since the notion of massive and unnecessary borrowings explained in the second chapter, (see Aitchison,1992:221; Appel and Muysken,1987:174 and Haugen,1996 cited in Grosjean, 1982:312) is not real when it comes to the above data. Generally, the given sample data on borrowing and code-switching do not provide a linguistic symptom of Afan Oromo shift in Addis Ababa among the respondents.

### **3.3. Language Attitude**

Attempts were made to gather data in regard to the attitudes of the respondents towards their mother-tongue (Afan Oromo). The questions were designed in such a way that the respondents choose answers that best suit their choices among the three alternatives ‘yes’, ‘no’, and ‘I do not’ know and write down their rationales for their choices. In the following section the acquired data will be presented and analyzed.

Items	Responses							
	Yes		No		I don't know		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q1	28	22.4	97	77.6			125	100
Q2	31	24.8	94	75.2			125	100
Q3	10	8	115	92			125	100
Q4	105	84			20	16	125	100
Q5	110	88	10	8	5	4	125	100
Q6	20	16	93	74.4	12	9.6	125	100
Q7	110	88	15	12			125	100
Q8	8	6.4	117	94.6			125	100
Q9	25	20	100	80			125	100

Table.8. Responses on Language Attitude

*Q.1 Do you think that it is more useful to speak Amharic than Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa?*

The majority of the respondents, 97 (77.6%), for item Q.1 indicated that they do not think that Amharic is a more useful language to speak than Afan Oromo. They claimed that they think Afan Oromo is more useful as Addis Ababa is the centre of Oromia and Afan Oromo is the official language of the Oromia region. A relatively small number of respondents, 28 (22.4%) expressed their feelings that Amharic is a more useful language since it is the official language of the federal government. The implication is that the majority of the respondents do have less preference for Amharic but show positive attitude to Afan Oromo.

*Q.2 Is it more important to speak in Amharic than in Afan Oromo?*

In the above table a large number of respondents of Q.2, 94 (75.2%) have stated that Amharic is not more important to speak than Afan Oromo while relatively a small number of respondents, 31 (24.8%) have indicated that it is more important to speak Amharic than Afan Oromo. Most of the former group respondents reasoned out that no language is better than the other as long as it is used for communication while the later reasoned out that Amharic is more important to speak than Afan Oromo

since most people in Addis do not speak Afan Oromo. This shows that the majority of the respondents have a less preference to Amharic and a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

*Q.3. Is Afan Oromo a dying language at your home?*

115 (92%) respondents to this question, the majority, in the above table, reported that Afan Oromo is not dying at their home for the reason that they use it at their home and watch TV-Oromia and Radio-Oromia. And only insignificant number of the respondents, 10 (10%) expressed that it is dying at their home. The response generally shows that the respondents have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo maintenance.

*Q4. Is it necessary to speak Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa?*

Reponses to this item show that the largest number of the respondents, 105 (84%) believe that it is necessary to speak Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa while 20 (16%) do not know. The rationales for the former group were the link between Afan Oromo and Oromo identity while the rationale for the later was the fact that every language is equal in its use. The figures, however, imply that the majority of the target groups have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo identity.

*Q.5. Should Afan Oromo be preserved in Addis Ababa?*

In the above table, the majority, 105 (88%), of the respondents of Q.5 believe that Afan Ormo should be preserved in Addis Ababa while only 10 (8%) do not believe so. 5 (4%) do not know about it at all. This, therefore, implies that the respondents have a positive attitude towards the preservation of Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa.

*Q.6. Should you speak Amharic so as to have a successful life in Addis Ababa?*

The table shows that the majority of the respondents of item 6, 93 (74.4%), don't believe that Amharic is the language of successful life in Addis Ababa. The reason given by some of the respondents is that such idea does not work now days. Only 20(16%) respondents believe in the case in point while the remaining 12(9.6%) do not know. This shows positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

*Q.7. Does Afan Oromo give you a comfort in using than Amharic?*

The majority of the respondents of this item, 110 (88%), indicated that Afan Oromo is a comfortable language for using and only 15 (12%) responded that it is not comfortable to them. The most important rationale for the first group of respondents was that Afan Oromo could help them easily express their ideas than Amharic. Most respondents of the later group have stated that they have good word choice opportunities in Amharic than Afan Oromo. The implication, however, is that the majority of the respondents have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

*Q.8. Do you think that it is necessary to speak Amharic to be considered modern?*

A striking number of respondents of Q.9, 117 (94.6%), believe that speaking Amharic is not a sign of modernity. Most of the opponents of this statement reasoned out that 'what makes one modern is speaking one's own language'. Few number of respondents 8(6.4%) believe the other way round. Therefore, it can be learned that he majority has a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

*Q.9. Is Afan Oromo more effective to you to express your idea than Amharic?*

100 (80%) respondents of this question said that Afan Oromo is more effective while only 25 (20%) said it is not. The later group of respondents claimed that Amharic is more effective to let them express their ideas. The majority, hence, has a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

An interview is conducted to see the attitudes of the participant children of the study towards Amharic and Afan Oromo. The first item was which language the children like best, Afan Oromo or Amharic. 13 (86.6%) of the children said that they like Afan Oromo best while two children claimed Amharic. The second item was about which language, Afan Oromo or Amharic, is more important for the children to speak. 9(60%) children indicated Afan Oromo is more important while the remaining children 5(40%) stated that Amharic is more important to them. The reason of the later was that Amharic is an important language in their school. The children were also asked about which language, Afan Oromo or Amharic, they want to be very proficient in the future,. 12(80%) children said Afan Oromo while 3(20%) said Amharic. Hence, this shows that the children have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

Generally, the figures show that the respondents have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo. As stated in the conceptual framework section of this paper, a positive attitude towards a language is crucial for its maintenance (Downs, 1998:65). Afan Oromo speakers, as it is found out here, have a positive attitude towards their mother tongue. This shows that the speakers are more likely to maintain their mother tongue than to shift to Amharic.

### 3.3.1. Language Attitude by Respondents' Age Level

Items	Responses															
	Yes				No				I don't know				Total			
	20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>Q1</b>	17	30.3	11	15.9	39	69.6	58	84					56	100	69	100
<b>Q2</b>	19	33.9	12	17.3	37	66	57	82.6					56	100	69	100
<b>Q3</b>	6	10.7	4	5.7	50	89.2	65	94.2					56	100	69	100
<b>Q4</b>	45	80.3	60	86.9					11	19.6	9	13	56	100	69	100
<b>Q5</b>	50	89.2	60	86.9	6	10.7	4	5.7	5	8.9			56	100	69	100
<b>Q6</b>	10	17.8	10	14.4	46	82.1	47	68.1			12	17.3	56	100	69	100
<b>Q7</b>	47	83.9	63	91.3	9	16	6	8.6					56	100	69	100
<b>Q8</b>	5	8.9	3	4.3	51	91	66	95.6					56	100	69	100
<b>Q9</b>	17	30.3	8	11.5	39	69.4	61	88.4					56	100	69	100

Table.8.1. Language Attitude vs. Age

**Age category of the respondents**

**20-39=56, ≥40= 69**

Responses given to the first item show that 30.3% of 20-39 age group and 15.9 % of  $\geq 40$  age group think that Amharic is more useful than Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa. But 69.6% and 84% of the 20-39 and the  $\geq 40$  age groups respectively do not believe that Amharic is more useful than Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa. This implies that even though respondents of both age groups have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo, the older age group has a relatively stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo than the younger age group.

The data on the second item conveys that 33.9% of 20-39 age group and 17.3% of  $\geq 40$  age group believe that it is more important to speak Amharic than Afan Oromo; on the other hand, 66% of the 20-39 age group and 82.6 % of the  $\geq 40$  age group have reported to have a belief that Amharic is not more important to speak than Afan Oromo. This similarly implies that even though respondents of both age groups have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo, the older age group has a relatively stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo than the younger age group.

Nearly equal percentage of the two age groups 89.2% of 20-29, and 94.2% of  $\geq 40$  strongly believe that Afan Oromo is not dying at their home, while the minority and relatively insignificant proportion 10.7% and 5.7% of the 20-39 and the  $\geq 40$  age group respectively claimed that it is dying. The implication is that age category does not indicate attitude disparity for this item.

80.3% of 20-39 age group and 86.9 %  $\geq 40$  age group do strongly believe that it is necessary to speak Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa. 19.3% of the 20-39 age group and 13% of the  $\geq 40$  age group stated that they know

nothing about it at all. Here it is understood that age variation has almost nothing to do with this item.

An age wise response given to Q5 indicate that 89.2% of the respondents of age group 20-39, and 86.9% of the respondents of age group  $\geq 40$  claimed that Afan Oromo should be preserved in Addis Ababa While 10.7% and 5.7% of the 20-39 and the  $\geq 40$  respectively have claimed the opposite. 8.9% of the 20-39 age group respondents have also said that they do not know any thing about it at all. The implication is that age category has nothing to do here except that few 20-39 age group respondents have a slight doubt about their beliefs.

Responses given to Q6 show that 17.8% of the respondents of 20-39 age group and 14.4% of the respondents of  $\geq 40$  age group claimed that they should speak Amharic to have a successful life in Addis Ababa whereas 81.2% and 68.1% of the 20-39 and the  $\geq 40$  respectively have claimed that it is not the case. 17.3% of the latter age group has also said that they do not know any thing about it at all. This implies that even though both age groups of respondents have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo, the younger age group has a relatively stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo than the older age group.

Of the age group 20-39, 16%, and of the age group  $\geq 40$ , 8.6% of the respondents believe that Afan Oromo does not give a comfort in using while 83.9% and 91.3% of the 20-39 and the  $\geq 40$  age groups respectively indicated that Afan Oromo is their comfortable language to use. The implication is that age category does seem to indicate attitude disparity for this item. Respondents of both age groups nearly equally show positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

The figures for Q8 indicate that less significant number of 20-39, and  $\geq 40$  age group members, 8.9% and 4.3%, respectively believe that speaking Amharic is a sign of modernization while nearly equal majority of both sexes, 91% of the 20-39 and 95% of the  $\geq 40$  respectively do not believe that speaking Amharic is a sign of modernization. Hence, age role does not seem to be influential factor concerning this item.

30.3% and 11.5% of 20-39 and  $\geq 40$  respectively have responded that Amharic is effective to express their ideas whereas the rest, 69.4% of the 20-39 and 88.4% of the  $\geq 40$  age groups respectively belong to those who said it is not. The implication is that even though respondents of both age groups show a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo, the older age group's attitude is relatively stronger.

The analysis in the above section indicates that even though respondents of both age groups have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo, respondents of age group  $\geq 40$  were found to show a relatively stronger positive attitude towards the language than the ones belonging to the age group of 20-39. The elderly speakers are more likely to be stronger in maintaining their mother-tongue than the younger generation.

### 3.3.2. Language Attitude by Respondents' Gender

Items	Responses															
	Yes				No				I don't know				Total			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q1	15	25	15	23	45	75	50	76.9					65	100	60	100
Q2	18	30	13	20	42	70	52	80					65	100	60	100
Q3	7	11.6	3	4.6	53	88.3	62	95.3					65	100	60	100
Q4	46	76.6	59	90.7					14	23.3	6	9.2	65	100	60	100
Q5	52	86.6	58	89.2	6	10	4	6.1	2	3.3	3	4.6	65	100	60	100
Q6	8	13.3	12	18.4	46	76.6	47	72.3	6	10	6	9.2	65	100	60	100
Q7	51	85	59	90.7	9	15	6	9.2					65	100	60	100
Q8	5	8.3	3	4.6	55	91.6	62	95.3					65	100	60	100
Q9	12	20	13	20	48	80	52	80					65	100	60	100

Table.8.2. Language Attitude vs. Gender  
M= 65, F=60

Table 8.2 provides data frequencies and percentages of respondents' attitude towards Afan Oromo on the basis of gender.

Responses for the first item show that nearly equal percent of male, 25%, and female, 23%, respondents think that Amharic is more useful in Addis Ababa. On the other hand, 45% male and 50% female, nearly equal percentage do not think that Amharic is more useful than Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa. Therefore, responses given to the first item is not gender determined.

For the second item, 30% males and 20% females believe that speaking Amharic is more important than speaking Afan Oromo. Similarly, 70% males and 80% females do not believe that speaking Amharic is more important than Afan Oromo. Here, females are seen to have a relatively higher tendency towards the belief that Amharic is not more important to speak than Afan Oromo. Hence, females have a slightly stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

11.6% males and 4.6% females claimed that Afan Oromo is dying at their home while 88.3% males and 95% females claimed that Afan Oromo is not dying at their home. The difference between the two sexes regarding this item is insignificant. Therefore, response for this item seems to be less gender specific; even though females still have a relatively stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

The number of females who have said that it is necessary to speak Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa (90.7%) is greater than that of the male respondents (76.7 %). 23.3% of males and 9.2% of females do not know about it at all. These figures convey that even though both sexes have a

positive attitude towards Afan Oromo, females have a stronger positive attitude than the males.

The response given to Q5 shows that nearly equal number of both sexes of respondents, 86.6% and 89.2%, respectively, believes that Afan Oromo should be preserved in Addis Ababa. Both sexes have nearly equal strong positive attitude towards the preservation of Afan Oromo. Gender does not make difference in the speakers' attitude towards preserving their mother-tongue.

Nearly equal percent of male and female respondents, 76.6% and 72.3%, respectively, do not believe that Amharic is the language of successful life in Addis Ababa. The remaining percentage of respondents for each sex has reported to know nothing about it at all. Gender has an insignificant role here.

With regard to whether Afan Oromo is more comfortable than Amharic, 85% of males and 90.7% of females said 'yes' while 15% of males and of 9.2% females said 'no'. This implies that both sexes have relatively similar positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

Responses given to Q8 indicate that approximately equally insignificant number of male and female respondents, 8.3% and 4.6% respectively, believe that Amharic is a language of modernization while a nearly equal majority of both sexes, 91.6% of males and 95.3% of females do not believe that Amharic is a language of modernization. Gender role seems to be insignificant with regard to this item.

Perfectly equal percent of both sexes, 80% each, have claimed that Amharic is not effective to express their ideas. And a slight difference is

visible among those who said Amharic is more effective. Gender disparity is entirely insignificant for this item.

Generally, the above discussion indicates that respondents of both sexes have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo. However, female respondents were seen to have a stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo than their male counterparts. This phenomenon is very important for LM since females, According to Law, 1995 cited in Burck, (2005:20), are the most responsible agents of mother tongue protection and transmission. Afan Oromo, in this respect, seems to win a stronger positive attitude towards itself from females which assures its maintenance and transmission to the younger generation.

### 3.3.3. Language Attitude by Respondents' Educational Level

Items	Responses															
	Yes				No				I don't know				Total			
	H		L		H		L		H		L		H		L	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q1	9	9.4	19	63.3	86	90.5	11	36.6					95	100	30	100
Q2	13	13.6	18	60	82	86.3	12	40					95	100	30	100
Q3	4	4.2	6	20	91	95.7	24	80					95	100	30	100
Q4	85	89.4	20	66.6					10	10.5	10	33.3	95	100	30	100
Q5	92	96.8	18	60	3	3.1	7	40			5	16.6	95	100	30	100
Q6	5	5.2	15	50	80	84.2	13	43.3	10	10.52	2	6.6	95	100	30	100
Q7	91	95.7	19	63.3	4	4.2	11	36.6					95	100	30	100
Q8			8	26.6	95	100	22	73.3					95	100	30	100
Q9	13	13.6	12	40	83	87.3	17	56.6					95	100	30	100

Table.8.3. Language vs. Education

**Key H=higher education level = respondent with educational status of Diploma and above=95**

**L= lower education level = respondents with educational status inclusively below secondary school=30**

The first item in table 8.3 shows that 9.4% of the highly educated group and 63.3% of the low educated group of respondents think that Amharic is more useful than Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa when 90.5% and 36.6% of the highly educated group and the low educational status groups respectively do not think that Amharic is more useful than Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa. This shows that respondents of lower educational status group are more inclined towards Amharic than Afan Oromo as far as this item is concerned while the reverse is true for the respondents of the higher educational status group.

Responses given to the second item conveys that 13.6% of the highly educated group and 60% of the lower education group respondents believe that it is more important to speak Amharic than Afan Oromo; meanwhile, 86.3% of the highly educated group and 40 % of the low educational status group have stated to have a belief that Amharic is not more important to speak than Afan Oromo. This shows that respondents of lower educational status have a positive attitude towards the importance of speaking Amharic whereas the reverse is true for respondents of the higher educational status group

The percentage of the respondents claiming that Afan Oromo is dying at their home is 4.2% and 20% for members of high and low educational status group respectively. However, 95.7% and 80% of the high and the low groups have respectively claimed that it is not dying. This implies that respondents of both educational status groups have a positive attitude to wards Afan Oromo even though the respondents of the lower educational status group seem to be less confident to totally claim that Afan Oromo is not dying at their home.

89.4% of respondents of higher educational status group and 66.6 % of the lower ones believe that it is necessary to speak Afan Oromo in Addis Ababa. And 10.5% of the higher educational status group and 33.3% of the lower educational status group stated that they do not know. Respondents of both groups of educational status have a positive inclination towards the item. However, respondents of the higher educational status group have a stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo than respondents of the lower educational status group.

Responses given to Q5 indicate that 96.8% of the respondents of higher educational status group, and 60% of respondents of lower education group stated that Afan Oromo should be preserved in Addis Ababa while 3.1% and 40% of the higher educational status and the lower educational status respectively have claimed the opposite. 16.6% of higher educational status group has also said that they know nothing about it. This shows that, respondents of higher educational status group have a strong positive attitude towards Afan Oromo preservation in Addis Ababa when the ones with lower educational status have a lenient one.

Responses given to Q6 show that 5.2% of respondents of higher educational status group and 50% of respondents of the lower education group claimed that they should speak Amharic to have a successful life in Addis Ababa whereas 84.2% and 43.3% of the higher and the lower respectively have claimed that it is not the case. 10.5% of the higher educational status group has also said that they do not know any thing about it at all whereas 6.6% of the lower educational status group said the same. Respondents of the higher educational status group have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo whereas those of lower education status seemed to be more inclined towards Amharic.

Regarding Q7, 95.7% of respondents of the higher educational status group and 63.3% of respondents of lower educational status group believe that Afan Oromo gives comfort in using while 4.2% and 36.6% of the higher and the lower educational status groups respectively stated that Afan Oromo does not give them comfort in using. This implies the respondents of the higher educational status group have a strong positive attitude towards Afan Oromo.

Responses given to Q8 show that 26.6% of respondents of low educational status have a belief that speaking Amharic is a sign of modernization while 100% of the respondents of higher educational status, and 73.3% of the lower educational status group do not believe so. Therefore, it can be deduced that even though the majority of the respondents of the two categories have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo, it is the case that a considerable number of respondents of lower educational status consider speaking Amharic as a sign of modernization.

13.6% and 40% of respondents of respectively higher and lower educational status groups have responded that Amharic is effective to express their ideas whereas 87.3% of the higher and 56.6% of the lower educational status group respondents expressed that it is not. This also implies that the highly educated group has relatively a stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo than the lower educational status group respondents.

The presentation made above generally shows that respondents of the higher educational status have a stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo and respondents of the lower educational status have a positive attitude towards Amharic.

According to Clyne (1997:201) educated people have a chance of maintaining their ethnic language than uneducated ones. In fact, this is so when they have a positive attitude towards the language (Hlomes, 1992:69). The respondents of higher educational status group are found to have a stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo. Respondents of higher educational status are more likely to contribute in Afan Oromo maintenance.

### 3.4. LM Effort

Three five-point-likert-scale based items and one open-ended question were asked to assess respondents' LM effort. And the responses given are presented in the following table.

#### Items

1. How often do you create opportunities for your children to speak Afan Oromo at home?
2. How often do you tell your children stories in Afan Oromo?
3. How often do you teach your children to read and write in Afan Oromo?

Items	Responses											
	5		4		3		2		1		Total	Mean
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	22	62.8	4	11.4	9	25.7					35	4.37
2	24	68.5	8	22.8					3	8.5	35	4.42
3	20	57.1	6	17.1	6	17.1			3	8.5	35	4.14

Table.9. Degree of LM Effort among the Respondents

**5. Always    4. Frequently    3. Sometimes    2. Rarely    1.Never**  
**n= total number of respondents**  
 **$\mu$ =Expected Mean Score= 3.00**

As it can be seen from the above table, out of the 35 respondents having children, 22(62.8%), 4(11.4%), and 9(25.7%) respondents create opportunities for their children to speak Afan Oromo at home always, frequently, and sometimes respectively. The obtained mean score value, 4.37, for this item is also by far bigger than the expected mean score

which is 3.00. This shows that the children of the respondents do have a good opportunity of speaking in Afan Oromo at home.

24 (68.5%) and 8 (22.8%) parents have responded that they always and frequently, respectively, tell their children stories in Afan Oromo while only 3 (8.5%) reported never to do it. The gap between the obtained mean score and the expected mean score for this item is very large i.e. 4.42 by 3.00 respectively. This item also shows that the children of the target group have a good chance of hearing stories in Afan Oromo.

Regarding teaching children to read and write in Afan Oromo, 20 (57.1%), 6 (17%) and 6 (17%) reported to do it always, frequently and sometimes respectively, whereas only 3 (8.5%) reported never to do so. This means that the children of the parent respondents do have good opportunities of being taught to read and write in Afan Oromo at home. The big difference visible between the obtained mean score, 4.14, and the expected mean score, 3.00, proves the case.

The above analysis on the respondents' LM effort witnesses that children of the target groups are normally given opportunities to speak Afan Oromo at home, told stories in Afan Oromo and thought reading and writing in the language. This finding seems to be free from Holmes's (1992:66) statement that the young generation is highly exposed to shift. In this regard, Afan Oromo seems to be transferred to the younger generation and maintained through the aforementioned mechanisms.

### 3.4.1. LM Effort by Respondents' Age Level

Items	Responses																			
	Always (5)				Frequently(4)				Some times(3)				Rarely(2)				Never(1)			
	20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>1</b>	9	69.2	13	59	2	15.3	2	9	2	15.3	7	31.8								
<b>2</b>	7	53.8	17	77.2	3	23	5	22.7									3	23		
<b>3</b>	10	76.9	10	45.4	2	15.3	4	18.1	1	7.6	5	22.7			3	13.6				

Table.9.1. LM Effort vs. Age

**Parents of age 20-39=13**  
**Parents of age ≥40=22**

**Mean scores of the two age groups**

**$M_1$  (20-39) = 4.53,  $M_1$  (≥40) = 4.27**

**$M_2$  (20-39) = 3.53,  $M_2$  (≥40) = 4.77**

**$M_3$  (20-39) =4.69,  $M_3$  (≥40) = 3.95**

***Items***

1. How often do you create opportunities for your children to speak in Afan Oromo at home?
2. How often do you tell your children stories in Afan Oromo?
3. How often do you teach your children to read and write in Afan Oromo?

Mean score values of the respondents' according to their age category has been calculated for the three LM effort questions in the above table. Accordingly, the following analysis has been made.

The mean score value of respondents of age group 20-39 which is 4.53 is slightly bigger than that of respondents of age group  $\geq 40$  which is 4.27 for the first item. This implies that there seems to be a slight difference between the two age groups as far as creating opportunities for children to speak in Afan Oromo is concerned. The contribution of the younger age group seems to be relatively stronger.

For the second item, the mean score value of the respondents of age group  $\geq 40$  is 4.77 while that of the age group 20-30 is 3.53. The implication here is that respondents of age group  $\geq 40$  take the lead. This might be due to the fact that old age groups are frequently the ones to have the art of telling stories.

With regard to the third item, respondents of age group 20-39 have a record of the bigger mean score value, 4.69, than those of age group  $\geq 40$  that have 3.95. This implies that the former age groups of respondents are the ones who better teach their children to read and write in Afan Oromo.

Generally, the respondents of both age groups seem to play a relatively equal role in creating opportunities for their children to speak in Afan Oromo at home. And old age group respondents perform better in telling the children stories in Afan Oromo. There is also a difference when it comes to teaching the children to read and write in Afan Oromo. The younger age group performs best in this regard even though the role of the older age group can not be ignored. This might be attributed to the

fact that Afan Oromo is a language to be recently used in the written form and the younger age group has wider opportunities of learning to read and write in Afan Oromo. In sum, this finding shows that Afan Oromo is free from the anxiety that is stated by Holmes (1992:66) that “young upwardly mobile people are more likely to shift faster”. And it is being transmitted to the younger generation by both age groups.

### 3.4.2. LM effort by Respondents' Gender

Items	Responses																			
	Always(5)				Frequently(4)				Some times(3)				Rarely(2)				Never(1)			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>1</b>	7	43.7	15	78.9			4	21	9	56.2										
<b>2</b>	11	68.7	13	68.4	3	18.7	5	26.3									2	12.5	1	5.2
<b>3</b>	9	56.2	11	57.8	3	18.7	3	15.7	4	25	2	31.5							3	15.7

Table.9.2. LM Effort vs. Gender

M=16, F=19

**Mean scores of the two sexes**

**M<sub>1</sub> (M) = 3.87, M<sub>1</sub> (F) = 4.78**

**M<sub>2</sub> (M) = 4.31, M<sub>2</sub> (F) = 4.52**

**M<sub>3</sub> (M) = 4.31, M<sub>3</sub> (F) = 4.00**

***Items***

1. How often do you create opportunities for your children to speak Afan Oromo at home?
2. How often do you tell your children stories in Afan Oromo?
3. How often do you teach your children to read and write in Afan Orom?

The mean score value of male and female respondents for the first item is 3.87 and 4.78 respectively which shows that females are the ones who better create opportunities for their children to speak in Afan Oromo at home.

The mean score values of the respondents for the second item indicate that males recorded 4.31 and females 4.52. The slight difference reveals those females are still the ones to tell their children stories in Afan Oromo relatively better than their male counterparts.

With regard to the third item, males scored a mean value of 4.31 while females scored 4.00. This time, males are the one who better teach their children to read and write in Afan Oromo at home than females.

In sum females are found to take the lion's share of creating opportunities for their children to speak in Afan Oromo at home and telling them stories in Afan Oromo than males while males took the lead in teaching their children to read and write in Afan Oromo.

The contribution of females in guarding and transmitting an ethnic language is very important (Law, 1995 cited in Burck, 2005:20). The concept works here, too, since females' contribution in guarding and transferring Afan Oromo is considerable. However, the contribution of the males is more significant than females in teaching their children to read and write in Afan Oromo, even though the contribution of the females is also significant. This could be due to the fact that males are the ones to better get opportunities of learning to read and write in Afan Oromo than females who spend most of their time at home.

### 3.4.3. LM effort by Respondents' Educational Level

Items	Responses																			
	Always(5)				Frequently(4)				Some times(3)				Rarely(2)				Never(1)			
	H		L		H		L		H		L		H		L					
F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
<b>1</b>	14	66.6	8	57.1	3	14.2	1	7.1	4	19	5	35.7								
<b>2</b>	15	71.4	9	64.2	6	28.5	2	14.2							3	21.4				
<b>3</b>	17	80.9	3	21.4	4	19	2	14.2			6	42.8			3	21.4				

Table.9.3. LM Effort vs. Education

Key H= higher education level= 21  
L= lower education level=14

**Mean across educational status**

**M<sub>1</sub> (H) =4.47, M<sub>1</sub> (L) =4.21**

**M<sub>2</sub> (H) = 4.71, M<sub>2</sub> (L) = 4.21**

**M<sub>3</sub> (H) =4.80, M<sub>3</sub> (L) =3.35**

**Items**

1. How often do you create opportunities for your children to speak Afan Oromo at home?
2. How often do you tell your children stories in Afan Oromo?
3. How often do you teach your children to read and write in Afan Orom?

Respondents of higher educational status group have a mean value record of 4.47 for the first item while those of lower educational status group have 4.21. This indicates that highly educated respondents relatively create a better opportunity for their children to speak Afan Oromo at home.

Concerning the second item, the mean score value of the respondents of higher educational status group is 4.71 whereas those of lower educational status group is 4.21. The difference means that respondents of higher educational status group tell their children stories in Afan Oromo by far better than respondents of lower educational status group.

4.80, the bigger mean score value, has been recorded by highly educated respondents for the third item. Lower educational level respondents have a mean score of 3.35 which is very low for the same item. This implies that respondents of higher educational status best teach their children to read and write Afan Oromo at home.

Educational status has a role in LM effort. Respondents of higher educational status show a stronger LM effort.

The following responses were given for the open-ended items "*Is there any thing you do to preserve Afan Oromo at your home? Specify*"

- *I use it with my sisters and children ( 5 respondents)*
- *I teach it to my wife*
- *I speak in Afan Oromo with my children*
- *I invite Afan Oromo speakers to my home*
- *I read books in Afan Oromo.*

It can be understood from these lists of responses that Afan Oromo is being used between parents and children and among siblings. In addition, inviting Afan Oromo speakers and reading books written in Afan Oromo are LM efforts made by the respondents. It has also been discovered that some husbands make efforts to teach Afan Oromo to their wives. Therefore, the subjects of this research are making efforts of Afan Oromo preservation and its transmission to the young generation.

#### **3.4.4. OCTB's Role in LM Efforts**

The researcher has also interviewed two individuals from OCTB concerning the institutional role of the organization in Afan Oromo maintenance in Addis Ababa.

*Q. What is the role of OCTB in promoting Afan Oromo maintenance in Addis Ababa? What have you done so far? What are you doing now? What are your future plans?*

A result from the interview concerning the institutional role of OCTB in promoting Afan Oromo LM in Addis Ababa is presented in the following. Ato Girma Mamo and Ato Worku Dechasa, employees of the office, gave the researcher the following response representing their office, OCTB.

OCTB has a big contribution in Afan Oromo development in the region including Addis Ababa. The office publishes books that serve as resources in higher institutions. It provides assistance to people who are interested to work on Oromo language, culture and literature both at individual and organizational level.

So far the office has published 26 different books on Oromo language, and culture. Oral traditions of the society, children's stories, proverbs etc. are among the published. Currently, the office has an Oromo

language and culture board in which university scholars are also members. This board is dedicated to develop the language, culture and literature of the Oromo people. In addition, the office is currently running Oromo Language Standardization Committee which has members from various fields of specialization.

In the future, the office has a dream of developing the Language Standardization Committee to Oromia Language Academy so as to effectively realize Afan Oromo standardization effort.

The interviewees also informed the researcher that Afan Oromo maintenance and transmission has some challenges in Addis Ababa, however. There are no Oromo medium KGs in the city in which children are exposed to the language. They have also pointed out that Oromia National Regional State has much to do in this regard.

### **3.5. Language Proficiency**

Items on language proficiency are categorized into respondents' proficiency and children's language proficiency reported by their parents. Data on each is presented and analyzed in the following section.

### 3.5.1. Respondents' Language Proficiency

Skills	Responses																			
	Amharic										Afan Oromo									
	5		4		3		2		1		5		4		3		2		1	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>Listening</b>	85	68	18	14	12	10	3	2	7	7	87	70	18	14	9	7	6	5	5	4
<b>Speaking</b>	70	56	21	17	23	18	6	5	5	4	81	65	19	15	12	10	8	6	5	4
<b>Reading</b>	60	48	25	20	20	16	10	8	10	8	90	72	8	6	12	10	12	10	3	2
<b>Writing</b>	51	41	23	18	21	17	4	3	26	21	76	61	14	11	21	17	7	7	7	7

Table.10. Respondents Self Report of Language Proficiency

**5. Excellent 4. Very good 3. Good 2. Poor 1. Unable**  
 **$\mu$ =Expected Mean Score= 3**

*Respondents' means of the four language skills for Amharic and Afan Oromo respectively*  
**Listening (4.36 \$ 4.40), Speaking ( 4.16 \$ 4.30), Reading (3.92 \$ 4.34), Writing (3.55 \$4.16)**

The obtained mean scores calculated for the respondents' listening proficiency in Afan Oromo and Amharic, respectively 4.36 & 4.40, are nearly equal and significantly exceed the expected mean score, 3.00. The respondents do have relatively equal proficiency in listening skill of both languages.

The mean score 4.16 for Amharic and 4.30 for Afan Oromo speaking skill has been registered. This shows that the respondents are relatively equally proficient in both languages. Since the gaps between the two mean scores for both skills are not significant, it confirms the approximate equality of the speaking proficiency of the speakers in both languages.

Even though the obtained mean scores of the respondents are bigger than the respective expected mean scores (3.92 by 3.00 for Amharic and 4.34 by 3.00 for Afan Oromo), the obtained mean score for Afan Oromo reading proficiency is bigger than that of Amharic. This indicates that the respondents have a good reading proficiency both in Amharic and Afan Oromo; however they are more proficient in reading Afan Oromo than Amharic.

The deviation of the obtained mean score from the expected mean score for Amharic (3.55 by 3.00) is not significant; however it is bigger for Afan Oromo (4.16 by 3.00). This implies that the respondents are more proficient in writing Afan Oromo than Amharic.

The finding shows that respondents have relatively equal proficiencies in oracy skills in both languages. However, their literacy skill proficiencies are higher for Afan Oromo than Amharic. Generally, this finding does not prove the idea of Apeal and Muysken (1992) that poor language proficiency of a speech groups shows the functional reduction of the language. Therefore, respondents' language proficiency does not show that they are shifting to the use of Amharic.

### 3.5.1.1. Respondents' Afan Oromo Language Proficiency by Age

skills	Responses																			
	Excellent(5)				Very good(4)				Good(3)				Poor(2)				Unable(1)			
	20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40		20-39		≥40	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>L</b>	36	64.2	51	73.9	8	14.2	11	15.9	6	10.7	3	4.3	1	1.7	4	5.7	6	10.7		
<b>S</b>	34	60.7	47	68.1	9	16	10	14.4	4	7.1	8	11.5	4	7.1	4	5.7	5	8.9		
<b>R</b>	50	89.2	40	57.9	2	3.5	6	8.6	3	5.3	9	13	1	1.7	11	15.9			3	4.3
<b>W</b>	47	83.9	30	43.4	6	10.7	8	11.5	4	7.1	17	24.6			7	10.1			7	10.1

Table.10.1. Respondents' Afan Oromo Proficiency vs. Age

20-39=56, ≥40=69

**Key**  
**Listening = L**  
**Speaking=S**  
**Reading=R**  
**Writing=W**

**Respondents Mean Score by Age Group**  
**M<sub>L</sub> (20-39) = 4.25, M<sub>L</sub> (≥40) = 4.57**  
**M<sub>S</sub> (20-39) = 4.12, M<sub>S</sub> (≥40) = 4.44**  
**M<sub>R</sub> (20-39) = 4.80, M<sub>R</sub> (≥40) = 4.00**  
**M<sub>W</sub> (20-39) = 4.83 M<sub>W</sub> (≥40) = 3.68**

The mean score value of the respondents of age group 20-39 is 4.25 for listening skill of Afan Oromo while that of age group  $\geq 40$  is 4.57. This implies that the 20-39 age group respondents seem to be slightly less proficient in Afan Oromo listening skill than that of the  $\geq 40$  age group.

In speaking skill, the mean score value of the respondents of age group  $\geq 40$  is 4.44 whereas that of the age group 20-30 is 4.12. The implication is that older age group is relatively more proficient than the younger age group in speaking.

Respondents of age group 20-39 have registered a mean score value of 4.80, a bigger score than those of age group  $\geq 40$  which is 4.00 in reading. This implies that the 20-39 age group respondents seem to be more proficient in reading Afan Oromo than the  $\geq 40$  age group. This might be due to the fact the older age group is not exposed to the Afan Oromo medium schooling in which they could have acquired Afan Oromo reading skill.

With regard to writing skill, the bigger score, 4.80, belongs to the respondents of age group 20-39 while respondents of age group  $\geq 40$  have a record of 3.68, the smaller. This shows that the former age group has a better proficiency than that of the later age group. This could also possibly be due to the fact that Afan Oromo has less than two decades history of formal education.

Generally, even though the two age groups have good proficiency in both languages, the literacy skill generally is stronger for the younger generation than the older. This might be attributed to the fact that Afan Oromo is a recent language to be taught in its written form so the younger had a good chance of mastering it than the older age group.

### 3.5.1.2. Respondents' Afan Oromo Language Proficiency by Gender

Skill	Responses																			
	Excellent(5)				Very good(4)				Good(3)				Poor(2)				Unable(1)			
	M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F		M		F	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>L</b>	47	78.3	40	61.5	9	15	9	13.8	3	5	6	9.2	1	1.6	5	7.6			5	7.6
<b>S</b>	42	70	39	60	10	16.6	9	13.8	6	10	6	9.2	2	3.3	6	9.2			5	7.6
<b>R</b>	50	83.3	40	61.5	4	6.6	4	6.1	3	5	9	13.8	3	5	9	13.8			3	4.6
<b>W</b>	42	70	34	52.3	6	10	8	12.3	7	11.6	14	21.5	3	5	4	6.1	2	3.3	5	7.6

Table.10.2. Respondents Amharic Language Proficiency vs. Gender

M=60, F=65

#### Key

Listening = L

Speaking=S

Reading=R

Writing=W

#### Respondents Mean Score by Age Group

**M<sub>L</sub> (M) = 4.85, M<sub>L</sub> (F) = 4.00**

**M<sub>S</sub> (M) = 4.53, M<sub>S</sub> (F) = 4.09**

**M<sub>R</sub> (M) = 4.68, M<sub>R</sub> (F) = 3.80**

**M<sub>W</sub> (M) = 4.48, M<sub>W</sub> (F) = 3.95**

Male respondents have a mean score value of 4.85 while females have 4.00 for Afan Oromo listening skill. The figure shows that males are by far proficient in listening Afan Oromo than females.

4.53 mean score value is recorded by males while 4.09 is recorded by females for Afan Oromo speaking skill. The implication is that males are relatively more proficient in speaking Afan Oromo than Females.

The mean score value registered by males with regard to Afan Oromo reading skill is 4.68. This figure is by far bigger than what the female counterpart has registered which is 3.80. This again implies that males are more proficient in reading Afan Oromo than females.

Concerning the respondents' writing skill, 4.48 mean score value was registered for males while 3.95 is registered for females. These figures similarly witness that males are more proficient in writing Afan Oromo than the female counterparts.

Gender wise analysis of the respondents' language proficiency shows that males take the lead in all the four language skills. Here, gender disparity shows language proficiency difference and generally males are more proficient than females. The disparity is even more pronounced when it comes to literacy skill. This could be attributed to our male dominated society in which females have less access to education.

### 3.5.1.3. Respondents Afan Oromo Proficiency by Educational Level

SPTS	Responses																			
	Excellent(5)				Very good(4)				Good(3)				Poor(2)				Unable(1)			
	H		L		H		L		H		L		H		L		H		L	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>L</b>	69	72.6	18	60	13	13.6	5	16.6	6	6.3	3	10	4	4.2	2	6.6	3	3.1	2	
<b>S</b>	65	68.4	16	53.3	12	12.6	7	23.3	8	8.4	4	13.3	5	5.2	3	10	5	5.2		
<b>R</b>	73	76.8	17	56.6	6	6.3	2	6.6	10	10.5	2	6.6	6	6.3	6	20			3	10
<b>W</b>	67	70.5	9	30	9	9.4	5	16.6	15	15.7	6	20	3	3.1	4	13.3	1	1	6	20

Table.10.3. Respondents' Afan Oromo Language Proficiency vs. Education

**Key H= higher education level= 95**  
**L= lower education level=30**

**Key**  
**Listening = L**  
**Speaking=S**  
**Reading=R**  
**Writing=W**

**Respondents Mean Score by Education**  
**M<sub>L</sub> (H) = 4.48, M<sub>L</sub> (L) = 4.16**  
**M<sub>S</sub> (H) = 4.33, M<sub>S</sub> (L) = 4.20**  
**M<sub>R</sub> (H) = 4.53, M<sub>R</sub> (L) = 3.80**  
**M<sub>W</sub> (H) = 4.45, M<sub>W</sub> (L) = 3.36**

Respondents of higher educational status group have a mean value record of 4.48 for listening skill while those of lower educational status group have 4.16. This shows that highly educated respondents have a relatively better proficiency of listening Afan Oromo than the lower educational status respondents.

Regarding speaking skill, the mean score value of the respondents of higher educational status is 4.33 whereas those of lower educational status is 4.20. The difference shows that respondents of higher educational status group are slightly more proficient in speaking Afan Oromo than those of the lower educational status.

4.68, a relatively bigger mean score value, has been recorded by highly educated respondents for reading. Lower educational level respondents have a mean score of 3.80. This implies that respondents of higher educational status group are more proficient in reading Afan Oromo than those who belong to the lower educational status group.

The mean score value of the respondents for writing skill shows that 4.45 has been registered for respondents of higher educational group while 3.36 has been registered for respondents of lower educational status group. This indicates that highly educated respondents are more proficient in writing Afan Oromo than respondents of lower education.

The analyses indicate that highly educated respondents generally are more proficient in the four language skill than those of lower educational status. Their proficiency difference is more pronounced when it comes to the literacy skills than the oracy skills. Respondents of lower educational status are less proficient in literacy skills.

### 3.5.2. Respondents' Report on their Children's Language Proficiency

#### 3.5.2.1. First Born Children's Language Proficiency

	Responses																							
	Amharic												Afan Oromo											
	5		4		3		2		1		Total		5		4		3		2		1		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>L</b>	9	26	8	23	13	37			5	14	35	100	29	83	6	17							35	100
<b>S</b>	11	31	9	26	12	34			3	9	35	100	26	74	4	11					5	14	35	100
<b>R</b>	8	23	11	31	10	29			6	17	35	100	24	67	7	20	4	11					35	100
<b>W</b>	10	29	10	29	8	23			7	20	35	100	21	60	9	26	5	14					35	100

Table.11. Responses on First Born Children's Language Proficiency <sup>4</sup>

5. Excellent 4. Very good 3. Good 2. Poor 1. Unable  
 $\mu$ =Expected Mean Score= 3

The first born children's means of the four language skills for Amharic and Afan Oromo respectively  
 Listening (3.45 \$ 4.82), Speaking (3.71 \$ 4.31), Reading (3.42 \$ 4.57), Writing (3.45 \$4.45)

**Key: L=listening, S= speaking, R=reading, W= writing**

<sup>4</sup> The percentage of the responses is rounded to one decimal place for convenience

The obtained mean score for the respondents' first born children's listening proficiency in Amharic, 3.45, is slightly different from the expected mean score, 3.00; however for Afan Oromo it is very big, the real mean score being 4.82. Therefore, it can be deduced that the first born children have some proficiency in listening Amharic while they have a good proficiency in listening Afan Oromo.

The obtained mean score for the respondents' first children's speaking proficiency in Amharic, 3.71, has a slight difference from the expected mean score, 3.00; however, for Afan Oromo it is very big, the real mean score being 4.31. The figures therefore indicate that the children have a relatively little proficiency in speaking in Amharic while they are very proficient in speaking in Afan Oromo.

The obtained mean score for the reading proficiency of the respondents' first born children's in Amharic, 3.42, has an insignificant difference from the expected mean score, 3.00; however for Afan Oromo it is still very big as the obtained mean score is 4.57. This indicates that the first born children are more proficient in reading Afan Oromo than Amharic.

The obtained mean score for Amharic writing proficiency of the respondents' first born children is 3.45, relatively smaller; however the obtained mean score for Afan Oromo writing proficiency is bigger, 4.45. This implies that the respondents' first born children are more proficient in writing Afan Oromo than Amharic.

Generally, the discussion shows that the first children of the respondents are very proficient in Afan Oromo listening, speaking, reading and writing than in Amharic. Therefore, Afan Oromo language proficiency among the respondents' first born children is safe. Language proficiency of children

becomes lesser than their parents when a language is subject to functional reduction (Appel and Muysken, 1987:42 and Holmes, 1992:62). As the evidence about respondents' first born children revealed Afan Oromo is found to be free of this threat. The first born children are relatively as proficient as their parents in Afan Oromo guaranteeing the maintenance of their language.

### 3.5.2.2. Second Born Children's Language Proficiency

	Responses																					
	Amharic										Afan Oromo											
	5		4		3		2		1		5		4		3		2		1		Totaln	
Skills	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>Listening</b>	5	17			11	37			14	47	26	87	4	13							30	100
<b>Speaking</b>	7	23			10	33			13	43	27	90	3	10							30	100
<b>Reading</b>	6	20			9	30			15	50	25	83	5	17							30	100
<b>Writing</b>					17	57			13	43	27	90	3	10							30	100

Table.12. Responses on Second Born Children's Language Proficiency <sup>5</sup>

5. Excellent 4. Very good 3. Good 2. Poor 1. Unable  
 $\mu$ =Expected Mean Score= 3

Second children's means of the four language skills for Amharic and Afan Oromo respectively  
**Listening (2.40 \$ 4.86), Speaking (2.60 \$ 4.90), Reading (2.40 \$ 4.80), Writing (2.13 \$4.90)**

<sup>5</sup> Responses in percentage are rounded to one decimal place for convenience

The obtained mean score value for Amharic listening proficiency of the second born children is below the expected mean score, 2.40 by 3, whereas that of Afan Oromo is extremely bigger, 4.86 by 3. This shows that the second born children are more proficient in Listening Afan Oromo than Amharic.

The obtained mean score value for the respondents' second born children's proficiency in speaking Amharic is below the expected mean score value, 2.60 by 3, and that of Afan Oromo is by far bigger, 4.90 by 3. This implies that the children are more proficient in speaking Afan Oromo than Amharic, too.

The obtained mean score for Amharic reading proficiency of the second born children of the respondents is below the expected mean score, 2.40 by 3 whereas that of Afan Oromo is strikingly bigger, 4.80 by 3. This also shows that the children have a good reading proficiency in Afan Oromo than Amharic.

Finally, the obtained mean score value of the respondents' second born children's Amharic writing proficiency is strikingly below the expected mean score, 2.13 by 3. On the contrary, the obtained mean score for Afan Oromo writing proficiency of the children is strikingly bigger than the expected mean score value, 4.90 by 3. This implies that the children are more proficient in reading Afan Oromo than Amharic.

The respondents' second born children are found to more proficient in Afan Oromo than Amharic.

Generally, regarding parents' report about their children's language proficiency, it can be observed that Amharic proficiency of the first born children is relatively constant down the four language skills even though

it is poor for all. Afan Oromo language proficiency for the same group of children is slightly decreasing even though it is very big for all.

The trend of language proficiency report for the group of the second born children indicates that Amharic proficiency is relatively decreasing down the skills while that of Afan Oromo is relatively constant and strikingly significant.

The degree of Amharic proficiency of the first born children is lower than that of their parents; however they are still relatively as proficient as their parents in Afan Oromo. Amharic language proficiency of the second children of the respondents is poorer than their first born brothers and sisters but their proficiency in Afan Oromo is almost as strong as their parents and their elder brothers/sisters. Therefore, this finding shows that Afan Oromo is being maintained among the children of the respondents. However, the younger children are showing strong tendency towards Afan Oromo than Amharic which does not seem to be encouraging since the advantage of bilingualism always outweighs that of monolingualism.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

#### **4.1. Summary**

The primary objective of this paper was to study the degree of LM or LS among Afan Oromo speakers in Addis Ababa. In order to meet this objective, 145 respondents were randomly selected from three offices and two protestant churches that use Afan Oromo as a medium. However, five of the respondents of the questionnaire were missing due to not returning the questionnaire to the researcher. Among the subjects, 15 were children. The required data were collected from these subjects through questionnaire, interview, and observation. Quantitative as well as qualitative analysis were employed to get the findings.

The review of literature and related works were presented in the second chapter to make a basis for the discussion of the findings. They deal with major issues of language use, language attitude, factors of LM, LM effort and language proficiency. These points were dealt with in such a way that they are pertinent to the topic under treatment. In addition, two related works were considered for being relatively more relevant to this paper.

The third chapter of the paper is about the presentation and the analysis of the collected data. The results from the questionnaire were tabulated and percentages and frequencies were calculated for each item. The expected mean values as well as the obtained mean values were calculated for questions concerning LM effort and language proficiency since they are five-point-likert-scale items. In addition, the calculation of the expected as well as obtained mean score values have been done to see how well demographic factors like age, sex, and educational status influence LM effort and language proficiency. With regard to showing how these demographic factors affect language use and language attitude of

the respondents, frequencies and percentages were used. Finally, analysis and interpretation of the acquired data are carried out and the findings are generalized in each section.

Finally the researcher has come up with the following findings:

1. Afan Oromo is the most dominantly used language of the home. It is widely used between respondents and their parents, grand parents, children, spouses, grand children, brothers and sisters.
  - 1.1. The older age respondents use Afan Oromo better with their children, spouses and grand children than the younger age group.
  - 1.2. Gender difference does not affect respondents' language use with their parents, grand parents and siblings. However females use Afan Oromo better with their spouses, grand children and children.
  - 1.3. Highly educated respondents use Afan Oromo with their fathers and mothers better than respondents of lower educational status while respondents of lower educational status slightly use Afan Oromo better with their children than the respondents of the higher educational status.
2. Afan Oromo is dominantly used at the home within intra-ethnic marriage groups.
  - 2.1. Amharic dominates in interethnic marriage in which the husband is Amhara and the wife is an Oromo but not the other way round. The more Oromo females are married to Amhara males the more the likelihood of the shift of Afan Oromo to Amharic.
3. Afan Oromo is widely used in the religious affairs.
4. Afan Oromo is dominantly used during expressions of emotion, force, and authority among the respondents.
5. Afan Oromo is relatively equally used with Amharic by the respondents while communicating with neighbors. Bilingualism is the most important feature of the respondents at this domain.

6. Bilingualism seems to be the most important feature among the respondents at work places and Afan Oromo is considerably used at this domain.
7. The linguistic data on borrowing and code-switching do not show the symptom of Afan Oromo shift.
8. The respondents have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo. The same is true for children.
  - 8.1. The  $\geq 40$  aged respondents have a stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo than 20-39 age group respondents and their language use practices and LM effort is also very significant.
  - 8.2. Females have a stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo. They also play the most important role in Afan Oromo use and maintenance effort. They also better contribute in Afan Oromo maintenance.
  - 8.3. Highly educated respondents do have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo and respondents of lower educational status have a positive attitude towards Amharic.
9. All respondents who have children make a big effort in maintaining and transmitting Afan Oromo to their children.
  - 9.1. The younger and the older respondents relatively equally create opportunities for their children to speak in Afan Oromo at home and tell their children stories in Afan Oromo. However, the older age group teach their children better to read and write in Afan Oromo.
  - 9.2. Males better contribute in teaching their children to read and write in Afan Oromo while females better contribute in creating opportunities for their children to speak in Afan Oromo at home and telling the children stories in the language.
  - 9.3. Highly educated respondents show a strong effort in maintaining and transferring the language to their children.

10. OCTB contributes much in Afan Oromo maintenance in Addis Ababa.
11. The subjects are nearly equally proficient in both languages (Amharic and Afan Oromo) oracy skill is concerned, but their Afan Oromo literacy skill is stronger than their Amharic literacy skill. Bilingualism is also a visible feature among the speakers.
  - 11.1. The younger age group is more proficient in literacy skills than the older age group while the older age group is relatively stronger in Oracy skill.
  - 11.2. Males are more proficient than females in Afan Oromo.
  - 11.3. Highly educated respondents are more proficient in speaking Afan Oromo than the lower educational status respondents.
12. First born children of the respondents are more proficient in Afan Oromo than Amharic.
13. Second born children of the respondents are more proficient in Afan Oromo than in Amharic, too.
14. Second born children are less proficient than first born children in Amharic, but their proficiency in Afan Oromo is relatively equal with their first born brother and sisters as well as their parents.

## **4.2. Conclusion**

Afan Oromo is dominantly used among the target groups at the home level. The demographic factors such as: age, sex, educational status and inter-ethnic marriage do not very significantly affect the respondents' language use at home level. However, the contribution of old, female and low educational status respondents in Afan Oromo maintenance is very important. The language is dominantly used by the research participants in their religious practices and during expressions of emotion, force and authority. It is also considerably used by the subjects with their neighbors and at their work places even though bilingualism in these two domains is the most important feature. This generally shows that the language is being maintained at the home level, religious places and relatively at work places and during communication with neighbors.

Amharic dominates at the home among the respondents of the inter-ethnic marriage in which the husband is Amhara and the wife is an Oromo but not the other way round.

The speakers have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo. The old, highly educated and males show a stronger positive attitude towards Afan Oromo than their counter parts. Afan Oromo language use practices and maintenance effort for the old and the females' coincide with their strong positive attitude. However, even though the highly educated respondents have a positive attitude towards Afan Oromo, their language use practice is not as important as the low educational status respondents. Nevertheless, the LM effort of the highly educated respondents coincides with their strong attitude.

Afan Oromo is being well maintained and transferred to the younger generation by the respondents. The old, highly educated groups and male respondents contribute much in this respect. The linguistic data also shows that there is no considerable linguistic symptom of Afan Oromo shift towards the dominant language among the speakers. Afan Oromo maintenance is supported by OCTB (Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau) as an institution.

The speakers have nearly equal proficiency in both Amharic and Afan Oromo. The young, highly educated, and males are found to be more proficient in Afan Oromo. The children of the speakers were found to be more proficient in Afan Oromo than Amharic and their proficiency in Amharic decreases from the first born child to the second.

Generally, Afan Oromo is found to be widely used among the speakers and it is being maintained and transferred to the younger generation in Addis Ababa. So, it is a safe language in the city. The currently prevailing diversity-oriented political atmosphere due to the post-1991 sociopolitical change of the country seems to be the most important factor behind this finding as far as this researcher is concerned.

## References

- Addis Ababa. (1986). *Various Documents on Addis Ababa Taken from Books*. Commercial Printing Press.
- Addis Ababa City Council. (1989). *Addis Ababa after 100 Years*. Devon, H. and L. Communication Ltd.
- Addis Ababa Municipality. (1956). *Guide to Addis Ababa*. Addis Ababa Commercial Printing Press.
- Adegbija, E. (2000). *Language Attitude in West Africa*. In Bamgbose, A. 2000 (Ed). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (pp. 76-100). Great Britain: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Aitchison, J. (1981). *Language Change: Process or Decay?* UK: Fontan Press
- Appel, R. and Muysken, P (1987). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Backer, C. (2006). Psycho-Sociological Analysis in Language Policy. In Ricento, T. (Ed.). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Beder, M. L. (1976). Languages in Ethiopia. In Bender, M.L., Bown, J.D., Cooper, R.L. and Ferguson, C.A. (Eds). *Languages in Ethiopia*. (pp. 1-22). London: Oxford University Press.
- Brenzinger, M. (1997). Language Contact and Language Displacement. In Coulmas, F. (Ed). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. (pp.273-285). UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Burck, C. (2005). *Multilingual Living: Exploration of Language and Subjectivity*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Campbell, L. (2004). *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Cheng, K. K. Y. (2003). Language Shift and Language Maintenance in Mixed Marriages: a Case Study of Malaysian Chinese Family. In David, M.K. (Ed.) *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 161, 81-90. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Clark, H. (1996). *Using Language*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, M. (1985). Language Maintenance and Language Shift: Some Data from Australia. . In Nolfson, N. and Manes, J. (Ed). *Languages of Inequality*. (pp.163-181). Berlin: Mouton
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1997). Multilingualism. In Coulmas, F. (Ed). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. (pp. 301-314). UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cohen, G. (2006). The development of Regional and Local Languages in Ethiopia's Federal System. In David, T. (Ed). *Ethnic Federalism: The Ethiopian Experience in Comparative Perspective*. (pp.165-180). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Printing Press.
- David, M. K., Naji, I. M. H. and Kaur, S. (2003). Language Maintenance or Language Shift among the Pujabi Sikh Community in Malaysia. In David, M.K. (Ed.) *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 161, 1-24. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Day, R. (1985). The Ultimate Inequality: Linguistic Genocide. In Nolfson, N and Manes, J (Ed). *Languages of Inequality*. (pp.163-181). Berlin: Mouton Publishers.
- Demos, V. (1988). Ethnic Mother Tongue Maintenance among Greek Orthodox Americans. In Dow, J.R. (Eds). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (pp. 59-71). Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dittmar, N. (1976). *Sociolinguistics: A critical survey of Theory and Application*. USA: Edward Arnold.

- Dorian, N. (1980). Language Shift in Community and Individual: The Phenomenon of the Laggard Semi-speaker. In Dow, J.R, (Ed). *International Journal of the sociology of Language*. (25), 85-94. New York: Mouton Publisher.
- Downs, W. (1998). *Language and Society (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. UK: Cambridge University Press
- Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fishman, J.A. (1971). The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society. In Fishman, J.A. (Ed.) *Advances in the Sociology of Language*. (pp.217-404). Paris: Mouton-The Hague.
- Fishman, J. A. (1997). Language and Ethnicity: The view from within. In Coulmas, F. (Ed). *The Handbook of Socio-linguistics*. Great Britain: Blackwell Publisher.
- Gadaa Melba (1999). *Oromia: an Introduction to the History of the Oromo People*. .Mineapolis, Minnesota: Krik House Publisher.
- Gebre Hishe. (2008). Language Use and Identitty of Children Born to the Tigrnya Speaking Families in Addis Ababa. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. England: Harvard University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Kebede Hordofa (2005). Varieties of Oromo. In Girma, A. D (Ed). *Ethiopian Language Research Center Working Paper* Addis Ababa University (pp.134-143).

- Leslau, W. (1990). *Arabic Loanwords in Ethiopian Semitic*. Germany: Otto Harrassowitz. Wiesbaden.
- Liberson, S. (1988). Procedures of Improving Sociolinguistic Survey of Language Maintenance and Language Shift. In Dow, J.R, (Ed). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 11-27. New York: Mouton Publisher.
- Mekacha, R. D. K. (1993). *The Sociolinguistic Impact of Kiswahili on Ethnic Community Language in Tanzania: A Cases Study of Ekinata*. Bayreuth African Studies.
- May, S. (2006). Language Policy and Minority Rights. In Ricento, T. (Ed.). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Meyer, R. (2006). Amharic as a Lingua Franca in Ethiopia. In Demeke, D. A. (Ed.) *LISSAN: Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, XX (I/II), 117-133. Addis Ababa: AAU Printing Press.
- Mulugeta Eteffa. (1989). Issues in Language Policy and Planning in Present-day Ethiopia (a Glance at Multilingualism). In Tadesse Beyene (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, (2), (531-538), AAU.
- Mutasa, D. (2006). African Languages in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Main Challenges. In Mutasa, D. (Ed.) *African Languages in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Main Challenges*. (pp.60-93). Pretoria: Simba Guru Publishers.
- Spolsky, B. (2006). *Sociolinguistics*. China: Oxford University Press.
- Stockwell, P. (2008). *Sociolinguistics: the resource book for students*. London: Roultege.

- Tabouret- Keller, A. (1997). Language and Identity. In Coulmas, F. (Ed).  
*The Hand Book of Sociolinguistics*. (pp.315-327). UK: Blackwell  
Publishing.
- Takkele Taddese. (2004). *Sociolinguistics in Multilingual Society: The  
Case of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Wardough, R. (1976). *The Context of Language*. USA: Newbury House  
Publisher, inc. (Rowley).
- Webb, V. and Kembo-Sure. (2000). Language as a Problem in Africa. In  
Webb, V and Kembo-Sure (Eds.) *African Voices: An Introduction to  
the Languages and Linguistics of Africa*. (pp. 1-25).South Africa:  
Oxford University Press.
- Winford, D. (2003). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. India:  
Blackwell Publisher.
- Zealelem Leyew. (1998). Code-Switching: Amharic- English. *Journal of  
African Cultural Studies*, 11, (2), 197-216.

### **Web Sources**

- Crystal, D. (1992). What are Language Attitudes? Retrived April, 2009 from  
[http://sil.org/lingualinks/literacy/ReferenceMaterials/Glossary of Literary  
terms/htm](http://sil.org/lingualinks/literacy/ReferenceMaterials/Glossary%20of%20Literary%20terms/htm).
- <http://www.gol.ethiopiatriavel.com.et/addis.htm>

## APPENDIX-B

### YUUNIVERSITII ADDIS AABABAA INSTIITIYUUTII QO'ANNOO AFAANII MUUMMEE XIIN-QOOQAA

Kaayyoon qo'annoo kanaa Finfinnee kessatti itti-fayyadamni Afaan Oromoo Oromoota biratti maal akka fakkaatu ilaalchisuudhaan odeeffannoo argachuudhaaf. Gaaffilee armaan gadii dubbisuudhaan debii sirrii akka naalaattan kabajaan isin gaafadha. Deebin sirrii ta'e galmaga'insa qo'annoo kannaf murteessaadha. Gaaffileen isin hin ilaallane yoo jiraatan ira taruun barbaachisaa dha.

**Galatoomaa!**

#### I. Odeeffannoo Dhuunfaa

Gaaffilee armaan gadiif deebii keessan bakka duwwaa irratti mallatto “✓” kaa'uudhaan agarsiisaa. Gaaffilee lakk. 1 fi 7f deebii keessan bakka duwwaa irratti barreessaa.

1. Umurii \_\_\_\_\_
2. Saala \_\_\_\_\_ Dhiira \_\_\_\_\_ Dhalaa
3. Gaa'ela \_\_\_\_\_ hinqabu \_\_\_\_\_ qaba
4. Sadarkaa Barnootaa  
\_\_\_\_\_ Hin baranne \_\_\_\_\_ Sad. 1ffaa \_\_\_\_\_ Sad. 2ffaa  
\_\_\_\_\_ Dippiloomaa \_\_\_\_\_ Digrii 1ffa \_\_\_\_\_ Degree 2ffaa
5. Bakka dhalootaa \_\_\_\_\_ Finfinnee \_\_\_\_\_ Oromiyaa  
\_\_\_\_\_ bakka biraa yoo ta'e, eessa? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Qomoo, *Keessan* \_\_\_\_\_ Oromoo \_\_\_\_\_ Amaara  
\_\_\_\_\_ Kan biraa yoo ta'e, maal? \_\_\_\_\_  
*Haadha warraa/ abbaawarraa* \_\_\_\_\_ Oromoo  
\_\_\_\_\_ Amaara \_\_\_\_\_ Kan biraa yoo ta'e, maal? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Gara Finfinnee yoom dhuftan? \_\_\_\_\_
8. Mana keessatti afaan kamiin fayyadamtu? \_\_\_\_\_ Afaan Oromo  
\_\_\_\_\_ Amaariffa \_\_\_\_\_ Kan biraa, maal? \_\_\_\_\_

## II. Ittifayyadama Afaanii

Gaafilee armaan gadiif deebii keessan bakka duwwaa irratti mallatto “✓”  
kaa’uudhaan agarsiiaa.

	<b>Namoota armaan gadii waliin afaan kamiin fayyadamtu?</b>	<b>Amaariffa</b>	<b>Afan Oromoo</b>	<b>makaa</b>	<b>Kan biraa (barreessaa)</b>
1	Abbaa				
2	Haadha				
3	Ollaa				
4	Akaakayyuu (yoo qabaattan)				
5	Akkoo(yoo qabaattan)				
6	Daa’imman				
7	Haadha warraa/abbaa warraa				
8	Mucaa mucaa keessani waliin				
9	Obboleessa				
10	Obboleetti				

	<b>Haala armaan gadii keessati afaan kam fayyadamtu</b>	<b>Amaariffa</b>	<b>Afan Oromoo</b>	<b>makaa</b>	<b>Kan biraa (barreessaa)</b>
1	Yeroo sagaddan?				
2	Yeroo aartani?				
3	Eddoo amanti keessaniitti?				
4	Yeroo dheekkamsaan dubbattan?				
6	Yeroo ajaja laattan?				
7	Yeroo nama abaartan?				
8	Yeroo nama eebbifan?				
9	Bakka hojii kessaniitti?				

## III. Ilaalcha Afaaniif

Gaaffilee armaan gadiif filannoo sirrii ta’e qubee kennametti marsuun agarsiisaa. Sababii keessan immo bakka duwwaa irratti barreessaa.

1. Amaariffi Afaan Oromoo irra faayidaa-qabeessa isinitti fakkataa?

A. Eeyyee      B. Lakki      C. Hinbeeku

Maalif? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Afaan Oromoo irra Amaariffa dubachuun barbaachisaa isinitti fakkaata? A. Eyyee      B. Lakki      C. Hin beeku

Maalif? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Afaan Oromoo mana kessan keessaatii badaa jiraa?  
 A. Eyyee    B. Lakki    C. Hin beeku  
 Maalif? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
4. Finfinneeti Afaan Oromoo dubbachuun barbaachisaa dhaa?  
 A. Eyyee    B. Lakki    C. Hin beeku  
 Maalif? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
5. Afaan Oromoo Finfinnee keessatti dhaloota dhufutti dabarsuun barbaachisaadha?  
 A. Eyyee    B. Lakki    C. Hin beeku  
 Maalif? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
6. Finfinnee keessa haala gariin jiraachuuf Amaariffa dubbachuu murteessaadhaa?  
 A. Eyyee    B. Lakki    C. Hin beeku  
 Maalif? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
7. Afaan Oromoo fayyadamuun Amaariff irra isiniif mijartaa?  
 A. Eyyee    B. Lakki    C. Hinbeeku  
 Maalif? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
8. Amaariffa dubbachuun ammayyuma ni mul'isaa?  
 A. Eyyee    B. Lakki    C. Hin beeku  
 Maalif? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
9. Afaan Oromorra Amaariffaan yaadakeessan sirriitti ibsachuu dandeesu?  
 A. Eyyee    B. Lakki . C. Hinbeeku  
 Maalif? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

#### **IV. Yaalii Faaydaa Afaan Oromoo Jajjabeessuu**

Gaafilee armaan gadiif deebii sirrii ta'e filadhaa.

1. Ilmaan keessan Afaan Oromoo akka fayyadmaniif mana keessanitti hagam yaalii gootu?  
A. yeroo hunda B. yroo baaye'ee C. takka takka D. darbe darbe  
E. gonkumaa.
2. Durdurii Afaan Oromoo ilmaan kessanif hagam himtu?  
A. yeroo hunda B. Yroo baaye'ee C. takka takka D. darbe darbe  
E. gonkumaa.
3. Ilmaan keessan Afaan Oromoo dubbisuuf barreessu akka dand'aniif hangam jajjabeessitu?  
A. yeroo hunda B. Yroo baaye'ee C. takka takka D. darbe darbe  
E. gonkumaa.
4. Afaan Oromoo maatii keessan keessaa akka hin bannef waan gootan jiraa? ibsaa \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

#### **IV. Dandeettii Afaanii**

Gabatee armaan gadii kessatti sadarkaa dandeettii Ammariffaaf fi Afaan Oromoo kessanii mallattoo“✓” kaa'uudhaan agarsiiaa.

### Dandeettii keessan

Skills	Sadarkaalee									
	Amaariffa					Afaan Oromoo				
	Baayyee, baayee gaarii	Baayee gaarii	Gaarii	Dadhabaa	Hin danda'u	Baayyee, baayee gaarii	Baayee gaarii	Gaarii	Dadhabaa	Hin danda'u
<b>Dhagahuu</b>										
<b>Dubbachuu</b>										
<b>Dubbisuu</b>										
<b>Barreessuu</b>										

## A. Dandeettii da'imman kessan

### Daa'ima 1ffaa

Skills	Sadarkaalee									
	Amaariffa					Afaan Oromoo				
	Baayyee, baayee gaarii	Baayee gaarii	Gaarii	Dadhabaa	Hin danda'u	Baayyee, baayee gaarii	Baayee gaarii	Gaarii	Dadhabaa	Hin danda'u
<b>Dhagahuu</b>										
<b>Dubbachuu</b>										
<b>Dubbisuu</b>										
<b>Barreessuu</b>										

### Daa'ima 2ffaa

Skills	Sadarkaalee									
	Amaariffa					Afaan Oromoo				
	Baayyee, baayee gaarii	Baayee gaarii	Gaarii	Dadhabaa	Hin danda'u	Baayyee, baayee gaarii	Baayee gaarii	Gaarii	Dadhabaa	Hin danda'u
<b>Dhagahuu</b>										
<b>Dubbachuu</b>										
<b>Dubbisuu</b>										
<b>Barreessuu</b>										

## **APPENDIX-D**

### **INTERVIEW**

#### **1. Interview for the students**

##### **Questions**

1. Which languages do you like best, Amharic or Afan Oromo?
2. Why?
3. Which language do you want to be very much proficient in Amharic or Afan Oromo?
4. Why?
5. Which language is more important to you Afan Oromo or Amharic?
6. In which language do you communicate in your family, with a friend in school, with a friend in neighborhood, in playing grounds?

#### **3. Interview for the person in charge of the Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau (OCTB)**

1. What is the role OCTB in promoting Afan Oromo maintenance in Addis Ababa? What have you done so far? What are you doing now? What are your future plans?

#### **OBSERVATION CHECKLIST**

1. Government employees language use in the office(in the randomly selected offices)
2. believers language in the church(in the randomly selected)

### **Declaration**

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other University and that all resources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name Mesfin Wodajo

Signature\_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_\_\_

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

Name Ato Bekale Seyoum (Assistant Professor)

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_\_\_