A Sociolinguistic Study of Language Use in Jimma Town

Tadele Deressa

A Thesis Submitted to

The Department of Linguistics

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Linguistics

Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

June, 2013

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Tadele Deressa, entitled: *A Sociolinguistic Study of Language Use in Jimma town* and submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Linguistics complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by Examining Committee:

Advisor Dr. Bedilu Wakjira Signature _____ Date 27/06/2013

Examiner Dr. Derib Ado Signature _____ Date 27 June 2013

Examiner Dr. Mulugeta Seyoum Signature _____ Date 27 June 2013

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study is to describe and analyze the sociolinguistic situations of linguistically heterogeneous settings in Jimma town. To achieve the intended objective, 280 respondents were involved in the study. The required data were obtained through questionnaire, interview and observation. The collected data were analyzed through quantitative and qualitative methods. The result of the study revealed that Jimma is a multilingual town with nine languages spoken as MT and SL: Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e, Chaha, Ezha and Tigrigna. Of these languages, Afan Oromo is acquired as MT by majority of the respondents followed by Amharic whereas Tigrigna and Ezha are acquired as MT by a few respondents. Amharic is largely learned as SL by majority of the respondents followed by Afan Oromo whereas Chaha and Tigrigna are learned as SL by a few respondents. A considerable number of respondents from all the ethnic groups acquired Amharic as MT followed by Afan Oromo. Hence, there is a greater tendency to shift from all the languages to Amharic. In the home domain, all the languages are used while respondents communicate with their parents, grandparents and siblings. However, a shift to Amharic is evidenced when respondents communicate with their spouse and children. In the neighbourhood, friendship and recreational domains, Amharic is dominantly used followed by Afan Oromo. Furthermore, Amharic is widely used in public transportations, schools, religions and social gathering places. On the other hand, Afan Oromo is extensively used in governmental offices: court, public security and workplace. In market domain and health centres, the alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is dominant. Amharic is found to be the major language of out-group communication (lingua franca) in the town. Due to frequent and intense contact of different language speakers, some outcomes of language contact: borrowing, code switching and code mixing are manifested.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks and gratitude to my advisor Dr. Bedilu Wakjira, for his painstaking guidance and invaluable comments that have made the completion of this thesis possible. His constructive suggestions and useful hints were of great value for me. Without his constructive comments, this research paper would not have gotten its present form and content.

My thanks are also goes to my friends Bikila Ashenafi, Diriba Kumsa and Tamiru Mekuria, who helped me in reading and making valuable comments. A special thank goes to Teshome Kebede, who helped me in analyzing data. My best friends, Tariku Berhanu and Chali Dereje, deserve appreciation for their cooperation and moral supports. My appreciation also goes to my informants, who have been so willing to help me in the process of data collection.

Last but not least, my thanks forwarded to my families particularly my father Ato Deressa Negesa, my mother W/ro Chaltu Tore, and my brother Ato Adane Deressa for their moral supports throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract i

Acknowledgments ii

Table of contents iii

List of tables vii

List of abbreviations ix

Glossary xi

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Background of the study and the study area 1

1.1.1. Background of the study 1

1.1.2. The study area 1

1.2. Statement of the problem 4

1.3. Objectives of the study 5

1.3.1. General objective 5

1.3.2. Specific objectives 5

1.4. Research questions 5

1.5. Significance of the study 5

CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND REVIEW OF RELATED WORKS 6

2.1. Conceptual framework 6

2.1.1. Language use 6

2.1.2. Domains of language use 8

2.1.3. Multilingualism and language contact 10

2.1.3.1. Multilingualism 10

2.1.3.2. Language contact 11

2.1.3.3. Outcomes of language contact 12

2.1.3.3.1. Borrowing 12

2.1.3.3.2. Code switching and code mixing 13

2.1.3.3.3. Language maintenance and language shift 16

2.2. Review of related works 17

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY 20

3.1. Research design 20

3.2. Sampling technique 20

3.3. Methods of data collection 20

3.3.1. Questionnaire 20

3.3.2. Interview 21

3.3.3. Observation 21

3.4. Methods of data analysis 21

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATIONS 22

4.1. Demographic information of respondents 22

4.1.1. Sex of respondents 22

4.1.2. Age distribution of respondents 22

4.1.3. Religious affiliation of respondents 23

4.1.4. Educational level of respondents 23

4.1.5. Occupation of respondents 24

4.1.6. Marital status of respondents 25

4.1.7. Birth place of respondents 25

4.1.8. Ethnic background of respondents 26

4.2. Language background of respondents and their families 26

4.2.1. MT distribution of respondents 26

4.2.1.1. MT distribution of respondents in relation to their ethnic background 27

4.2.1.2. MT distribution of respondents across age groups 28

4.2.1.3. MT distribution of respondents in relation to their SL distribution 29

4.2.2. Language background of respondents` fathers 31

4.2.3. Language background of respondents` mothers 33

4.2.4. Language background of respondents` spouses 35

4.2.5. Language background of respondents` children 37

4.2.6. MT comparison of respondents` with their families` MT 38

4.3. Language use in various domains 39

4.3.1. Language use in home domain 39

Table 21: Language use in recreational domain.....43

Table 22: Language use in court.....44

Table 23: Language use in the workplaces.....45

Table 24: Language use in public security.....46

Table 25: Language use in health centre.....47

Table 26: Language use in market.....48

Table 27: Language use at public transportation.....49

Table 28: Language use in school domain.....50

Table 29: Language use in religious domain.....52

Table 30: Language use at social gathering places.....53

Table 31: Language used between speakers of different languages in Jimma town.....54

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
%	percentage
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
A	Amharic
A/O	Afan Oromo
AUX	auxiliary
C	Chaha
CONJ	conjunction
CM	code mixing
CS	code switching
CSA	central statistical agency
CNV	converb
COP	copula
D	Dawro
DAT	dative
DEF	definite article
E	Ezha
F	feminine
Fr	frequency
FOC	focus marker
GEN	genitive
INSTR	instrumental
INTR	interrogative
IMP	imperative
IPV	imperfective
JUS	jussive
K	Kafinoonoo
LM	language maintenance
LS	language shift

Glossary

Idir is traditional institution established by the community members to facilitate the social affairs

Ikub is traditional saving institution

Kebele local administrative unit

Woinadega temperate zone (at intermediate altitude)

Woreda province, district (administrative)

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the study and the study area

1.1.1. Background of the study

The core of sociolinguistics is the study of language use in social interaction. Sociolinguistics focuses on actual language use in everyday life (Clyne 1997). Descriptions of language use in a given community typically take into account a demographic profile of language users; language use in education, particularly which language is used as the medium of instruction; language use in the public sphere; language use in the mass media; language use in creative literature; and language use in administration (Phillipson 1999:94).

According to Coulmas (1997:1), sociolinguistics is concerned with describing language use as a social phenomenon and attempts to establish causal links between language and society, pursuing the complementary questions of what language contributes to making community possible and how communities shape their languages by using them. Language use and social context are closely related phenomena. We use one language or a variety of language for specific social domain and another language for another social domain (Cooper 1976:183). Thus, language can be used depending on social contexts as well as language use cannot be studied alone (detached from social contexts). So, sociolinguists have to study both details of how language is used, and of social situations in which the language is used.

In general, the studies of language use need some detailed investigation to come to the proper description of the community of its speakers (Cooper 1976). Therefore, the present study focuses on the investigation and description of language use in linguistically heterogeneous setting of Jimma town.

1.1.2. The study area

Ethiopia is a multilingual and multicultural country. Different ethnic groups with different language, culture and religion live together. This is particularly true in different towns of the country, where people come from different corners to live and seek a better way of life. These people come with their respective languages and cultures. This makes the towns more multilingual and multicultural than rural areas (Romaine 1994, and Myers-Scotton 2006). Due to this, many people in the towns are bilingual or multilingual and use different languages in different domains. According to Meyer and

Ritcher (2003:12) in large urban centers and towns with an ethnically and linguistically heterogeneous population, the language used in contact situations is very often not the mother tongues, but the second or even third language of the people.

Jimma town is one of Ethiopia`s historical towns which consists of different ethnic groups who speak different languages. It is located at about 335 KMs South-west of Addis Ababa. It is found in Jimma Zone of Oromiya Regional State. Historically, the town was founded in the second half of ninteenth century. Since then, the town has been serving as the major trade centre and main trade route in the South-western Ethiopia. Merchants from different directions including abroad (Sudan) have been engaged in trading in the town (Yonas 2002:2). Its geographical coordinates are approximately $7^{0}40'$N latitude and $36^{0}50'$E longitudes. The town is found in an area of average altitude, of about 5400 ft (1780m) above sea level. It lies in the climatic zone locally known as *Woyna Dega* which is considered ideal for agriculture as well as human settlement (Yonas 2002:1).

Jimma town is situated at cash crop area and trade centre of South-western Ethiopia. As a result of its geographical location and resourcefulness, different people from different corners migrate to the town for various socio-economic reasons: trade, education, and the like. Hence, speakers of different languages are in frequent and intense contact for aforementioned socio-economic reasons. Due to this, there are many languages spoken in the town. These languages are Afan Oromo[1], Amharic, Dawro, Kafinoonoo, some Gurage languages (Chaha and Ezha), Yem, Silt`e and Tigrigna. These languages are classified under three language families: Ethio-Semitic (Amharic, Tigrigna, Silt`e, Ezha and Chaha), Omotic (Dawro, Kafinoonoo and Yem), and Cushitic (Afan Oromo). Of these languages, Amharic is spoken as a first language (mother tongue) by 41.58% of the population; Afan Oromo is spoken as a first language by 39.96% of the population. The remaining languages are spoken as a first language by 18.46% of the population Central Statistical Agency (CSA, 2007). The presence of sociolinguistic diversity in the town has been the major reason that inspired the researcher.

[1] Throughout this paper, the researcher uses the term Oromo, Amhara, Dawro, Kafa, Yem, Silt`e and Tegaru to refer to the Oromo, Amhara, Dawro, Kafa, Yem, Silt`e and Tegaru people, respectively, and the term Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Kafinoonoo, Yem, Silt`e and Tigrigna are used to refer to their languages, respectively.

According to Central Statistical Agency (CSA, 2007), the town has a total population of 120,600 of whom 60,590 are male and 60,010 are female. There are several ethnic groups who live in the town. The three largest ethnic groups are the Oromo (46.71%), the Amhara (17.14%) and the Dawro (10.05%). All the other ethnic groups make up 26.1% of the population. The mainly practiced religions in the town are the Ethiopian Orthodox (constitutes 46.84%); Islam (constitutes 39.03%); Protestant (13.06%) and others (1.07%).

Predominantly and for so long, trading and coffee production have been the major economic activities for the dwellers` of the town. According to Yonas (2002:1), the urbanization of Jimma can be explained by the story of coffee production and marketing. Small scale industrial activities such as wood processing and skin processing are also the major economic activities in the town.

In Jimma town, two FM Radios are found: Jimma Community Radio (102.0 station) and Fana Broadcast Corporate FM (98.1 station). The former has 94 broadcasting hours per week, of which 47.5 hours is in Amharic and 46.5 hours is in Afan Oromo. The latter has 126 broadcasting hours per week, of which 83.5 hours is in Amharic and 42.5 hours is in Afan Oromo (Jimma town government communication office`s bulletin 2004: 25).

In Jimma town, there are 29 (25 elementary and 3 secondary and 1 preparatory) schools owned by government and private, and one teacher training college and one university. The medium of instruction in elementary schools (both government and private) is inconsistent. Government schools preferred the use of Afan Oromo and Amharic[2] as a medium of instruction and teach English as a school subject in all grade levels. It is the preference of the children and their parents` to choose between the medium of instruction of Afan Oromo and Amharic. If they choose the Afan Oromo medium of instruction, they learn all subjects in it except English and Amharic. English and Amharic are given as subjects starting from grade 1 and 5, respectively. On the other hand, if they choose the Amharic medium of instruction, they learn all subjects in it except English and Afan Oromo. English and Afan Oromo are given as subjects starting from grade 1 and 5, respectively. In line with this, out of 13 government elementary schools 10 are using both Afan Oromo and Amharic as medium of instruction, whereas 3 exclusively use Afan Oromo as medium of instruction. Ten schools that use Afan Oromo and Amharic as medium of instruction teach in shifts, one in the

[2] Primary school education is available in Amharic in most of the towns in the Oromiya National Regional State to satisfy the needs of the non-Afan Oromo speaking nationalities (Getachew Anteneh and Derib Ado 2006:18).

morning and the other in the afternoon (Jimma town government communication office`s bulletin 2004: 42).

In the case of private schools, most of them preferred Amharic and English as medium of instruction. The majority of private schools (11 out of 12) use Amharic as the medium of instruction and teach Afan Oromo as a subject starting from grade one. English is also given as subject starting from grade one and other major subjects (Maths and Sciences) are given using English as supplementary subjects. In addition, in order to gain the customers` interest, some of them teach Arabic[3] informally as a subject. There is only one private school that uses Afan Oromo as the medium of instruction. In this school, Amharic is given as school subject starting from grade one. English is also given as subject starting from grade one and the major subjects (Maths and Sciences) are given using English as supplementary subjects (Jimma town government communication office`s bulletin 2004: 42).

1.2. Statement of the problem

Although some sociolinguistic studies were conducted on language use in some parts of Ethiopia, to the best of the researcher`s knowledge, a substantial study has not been done on sociolinguistic study of language use in Jimma town. Since the town consists of different ethno-linguistic groups, it deserves a great attention to study its sociolinguistic situation. Describing the situation of language use in this diversified linguistic area is crucial for the planning and using of language in education, government administration, and other domains in the town.

[3] As the researcher was informed while conducting interview with the head of education office of the town, teaching Arabic is not recognized at all school levels by the regional education bureau and the town, even though some private schools teach the language as a subject.

1.3. Objectives of the study

1.3.1. General objective

The general objective of this study is to describe and analyze the sociolinguistic situations of linguistically heterogeneous settings of Jimma town.

1.3.2. Specific objectives

Specific objectives of the study are to:

- describe the pattern of multilingualism among different ethno-linguistic groups in the town.
- describe the pattern of language use in different domains in the town, including the lingua franca of the town .
- give a sketch overviews of some effects of language contact such as borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing in the linguistic behaviour of the town`s dwellers.

1.4. Research questions

The study will answer the following research questions:

- How could the patterns of multilingualism among different ethno-linguistic groups described?
- What are the patterns of language use in different domains in the town?
- How could the effects of language contact such as borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing in the linguistic behaviour of the town`s dwellers is described?

1.5. Significance of the Study

The study is expected to have the following contributions.

- It can give sociolinguistic description of the community in Jimma town so that social planners and development workers can make use of them.
- It is useful for the government bodies at different levels for administrative purposes, planning the socioeconomic development, and for finding ways of conflict resolution.
- It can also provide sociolinguistic profiles of the community for curriculum designers and language planners.

CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND REVIEW OF RELATED WORKS

In this chapter, the conceptual framework and review of relevant works are discussed and presented.

2.1. Conceptual framework

There are many sociolinguistic concepts that should be taken into consideration in studying language use. The commonly known are concepts related to language use, multilingualism and language contact.

2.1.1. Language use

Language use is one of the main concepts in sociolinguistic studies. Language use deals with the distribution of the functions of language into different social contexts. It refers to the way language is used in specific contexts, for specific purposes (Cooper 1976:183). It is concerned with the way people use and choose language in different social situations. Inseparably 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).

Language use is basically a form of joint action. It is more than the sum of a speaker speaking and a listener listening. It is the joint action that emerges when speakers and listeners – writers and readers - carry out their individual actions in coordination, as ensembles. Thus, language use embodies both the individual and the social (Clark 1996:1). Clark further illustrates language as an instrument for carrying out different activities such as buying and selling goods, gossiping, planning parties, playing games, exchanging stories, entertaining and being entertained. Hence, Language is rarely used as an end in itself (Clark 1996:387).

According to Clark (1996:56) language use has been studied from two broad points of view: the product approach and the action approach. The product approach grew out of the linguistic study of sentences, words and individual speech sounds (the products of language use). It is product centred approach and strongly influenced by the tradition of generative grammar. This approach has a drawback because it abstracts away sentences, words, and phonetic segments from the domains of language use in which they might have been produced. In contrast, the action approach grew out of the philosophical and sociological investigation of intentions and social actions. The primary focus of this approach is on what people do with language and it also takes into account various domains of language use. As Clark claimed, the action approach is more appropriate guide to the study of language use, because it considers social contexts.

The study of language use is context specific. Language use and social context are closely related phenomena. We use one language or a variety of language for a specific social domain and another language for another social domain (Cooper 1976:183). Thus, language can be used depending on social contexts as well as language use cannot be studied alone (detached from social contexts). So, sociolinguists have to study both details of how language is used, and of social situations in which the language is used. In other words, it means language use and social contexts are inseparable. Without society, language cannot evolve and also without language meaningful communication in society is hardly possible. Hence, we cannot study language use without studying social contexts and vice versa.

The main aim of the study of language use according to Cooper (1976:183) is to identify, describe, and explain the systematic differences in the use of language, that accompany differences in the circumstances in which language is employed. In other words, it studies the way people use and/or choose a particular language or variety of a language for specific purpose and another language for other purpose. Thus, it describes the change of language use from situation to situation, interlocutor to interlocutor and topic to topic.

Furthermore, Cooper (1976:184) has pointed out that the study of language use can focus on either single language (variety) or between different languages using by a single group or more than one group. That is, one can study a single ethnic group using a single language or a set of different languages. On the other hand, one can compare several ethnic groups using a single language or a set of different languages. To clarify the concept he used the following diagram.

	Who is studied?	
	Single group (Within-group)	more than one group (Between-group)
Single language or variety (Within-language)	1	2
More than one lang. or variety (Between-language)	3	4

Table1: Focal areas in the studies of language use (adapted from Cooper 1976:184)

The intersection of these different emphases (see Table 1 above) results in four focal areas representing four types of study. According to Cooper, studies falling into the first focal area are concerned with a single group`s use of a single language. Studies falling into the second focal area

are concerned with describing and comparing of the variation that occurs in the usage of a single language by two or more groups. The studies in the third focal area describe a single group`s usage of a set of language varieties, identifying the circumstances under which is used, and the studies in the fourth focal area describe two or more groups` usage of a set of language varieties.

Among the focal areas in the studies of language use, the current study focuses on focal area in the fourth i.e. it describes and compares different ethno-linguistic groups using a set of several languages in the multilingual settings of Jimma town.

Halliday (1968) distinguishes three general dimensions of language use: tenor/style, mode and field. Tenor/style is the subject matter of communication, which depends on relation between participants. It is about `to whom` i.e. how the speaker defines and sees persons with whom he is communicating. Mode is means by which communication takes place, i.e. speech vs writing, it is all about `how` the communication is carried out. Field is the purpose of the communication and generally refers to `why` and `what` the communication takes place.

In multilingual communities life of people is embedded by language choice. Bilinguals may be compelled or may prefer to use one language in particular setting, or with particular interlocutor, or in discussing certain topic. And only switch to another language (s) in another setting, with another interlocutor etc. According to Hoffmann (1991:177) such language switching are not results of random decisions, rather there are often certain patterns of language use in such communities. The patterns usually attribute to various social factors (Romaine 1994:44). In figuring out language use pattern of a community, sociolinguists employ a method called domain analysis.

2.1.2. Domains of language use

Domains are important notions in the study of language use. They are defined by different scholars according to their purposes of study. Among them, Fishman (1971:20) defines domains as social contexts which bring people together primarily for a certain cluster of purposes ... they are socio-cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationships between communicators, and locales of communication. According to Fishman (1971:19) domains are major constellations of three important factors that occur in interaction situation in particular domain: location, interlocutors and topic.

In the same way, Holmes (1992:24) defines domains of language use as it involves typical interactions between typical participants in typical settings about a typical topic. Clyne (1997:28) also defines domains of language use as contextualized spheres of communication. From these

definitions one can deduce that domains are an institutional context where the major clusters of interaction situations occur in particular multilingual settings. They are constellations of factors such as location, topic, and participants. In which, location refers to the place where the speaker talks, topic refers to the subject one is talking about, and participants refer to the persons one is talking to (Fishman 1971:19).

According to Fishman`s definition, there are about nine domains of language use. These are the family, the playground and street, the school (language of medium of instruction, school subject and language of entertainment and recess), the church, literature, the press, the military, the courts and governmental administration (Fishman 1971:18).

Family domain is one of the most vital domains to acquire, maintain, transmit and use language. Particularly it is the last domain reserved for minority language in a situation of language contact. Language use in a family domain can be in between various participants such as parents and children, wife and husband, among children and between family members and their relatives. The interaction within family members in the home is deemed to be the final spot in which a minority language can be used (Dittmar 1976, Romaine 1994 and Clyne 1997:5). When dominant language intrudes into the home domain (which is reserved for minority language) it shows a sign of language shift from minority to dominant language (Appel and Muysken 1987:40).

Neighbourhood domain is also very crucial to describe language use. It is one of the most critical settings to spread, develop and preserve languages particularly for minority languages. According to Fishman (1971) the neighbourhood is one of the informal or intimate domains deemed crucial for minority language maintenance.

Religious domain is one of the most crucial domains to observe and describe language use. It plays a vital role in language spreading and preserving. Language will have a better chance for maintenance when it is used in religious affairs of its respective speakers (Fishman 1991 cited in Clyne 1997:7).

School or education is another important domain for the development of individual and societal multilingualism. It is generally assumed that schools are one of the main agents of language spread (Fasold 1984). School domain also plays a significant role to maintain and support minority language in a state of contact with dominant language.

Governmental administration is also another decisive domain to observe and describe language use. Moreover, it is vital domain to maintain and support a minority language. This domain brings

different people together with various backgrounds. Hence, people in this domain have good exposure to learn different languages. In line with this, Myers-Scotton (2006:50) states, speakers whose occupations involve many contacts outside their own ethnic group may well have reasons to learn a second language.

Market is one of the most important domains for the description of language use (Cooper and Carpenter 1976: 244). It is a setting where different ethno-linguistic groups interact with one another for transaction.

The domains of language use mentioned above, can also be categorized into two levels: less powerful and more powerful domain. The former includes: family, friends, neighbourhood, community institution, and pre-school or elementary education, while the latter includes: employment, higher education, and government institutions such as court, health centre, offices, etc. (Fishman 2001).

According to Wolff (2000:298) there are basic sociolinguistic questions which need to be analyzed in the study of patterns of language use in particular multilingual settings. These are `*who speaks what language to whom, when and where,* and *why and in which language particular variety?* ` These can be illustrated in detail by looking into each question in terms of, ``who speak to whom? `` refers to the participants; ``what? `` refers to the topic of the discussion; ``where? `` refers to the place of the interaction; ``when? `` refers to the time of the interaction; ``why and in which language variety? `` refer to the pragmatic function of the particular variety ``lect``, ``code`` or ``register`` that is being used.

2.1.3. Multilingualism and language contact

2.1.3.1. Multilingualism

The term bilingualism and multilingualism have been used interchangeably by some scholars to refer to the knowledge or use of more than one language by an individual or community (Clyne 1997, Beardsmore 1982, Myers-Scotton 2006 and Romaine 1994). These terms in most cases, hold similar attributes except the context in which they developed. Weinreich (1963:1) states that, "Unless otherwise specified, all remarks about bilingualism apply as well to multilingualism, the practice of using alternately three or more languages." As to him, the practice of alternately using two languages is called bilingualism, and the persons involved are called bilinguals.

A multilingual setting is the situation in which where two or more languages co-exist, that often results in languages in contact. On the other hand, when languages come into contact as a result of

different socio-economic, historical, political reasons it leads to the situation of multilingualism. Therefore, multilingualism is the result of contact between speakers speaking different languages, especially different first languages (Myers-Scotton 2006:45).

In most cases, multilingualism at the individual level is subsumed under bilingualism (Clyne 1997:206). In defining bilingualism there are two contradicting groups. The first one is those who claim minimal proficiency is enough to say someone is bilingual or not. According to them, if someone has a competence in atleast one of the traditional skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), is qualified as a bilingual person. For instance speaking/listening a second language is sufficient to become a bilingual (Macnamara 1967, Weinreich 1963). The other group argues that, in order to qualify someone as bilinguals, s/he must possess the ability of `native-like control` of two languages. This means, one has to possess all the traditional skills to become a bilingual (Bloomfield 1933:55). However, both definitions have drawbacks: in the first definition, `how is minimal` to be defined and in the second one, how one can define and measure `native like ability`? (Myers-Scotton 2006:44).

At the societal level, multilingualism is defined based on a territorial principle (Clyne 1997:206). Accordingly, societal multilingualism is where there are more than two languages spoken in a given society. In multilingual nation or society, it is the case that individuals may be either monolingual or bilingual, even if the society in which they live shows societal multilingualism (Myers-Scotton 2006:46). Similarly, Downes (1998:39) defines societal multilingualism as "the situation in which two or more distinct languages form the repertoire of a community."

Clyne (1997:4) categorized societal multilingualism into two types: symmetric and asymmetric. Symmetrical multilingualism refers to where all languages have equal status, whereas asymmetrical multilingualism is where one at least of the languages has more status than the others.

2.1.3.2. Language contact

According to Matras (2009:1), "Language contact occurs when speakers of different languages interact and their languages influence each other." Similarly, Weinreich (1963:1) says, language contact is to occur, there should be two or more languages used alternately by the same persons. According to Thomason (2001:1), language contact is the use of more than one language in the same place at same time. She added language contact does not require fluent multilingualism, but some communication between speakers of different languages is necessary.

Language contact may result from various socio-economic interactions of speakers of different languages. For the occurrence of language contact, the interactions between speakers of different languages should be a frequent or regular contact. Language contact most often involves face-to-face interactions among groups of speakers, at least some of whom speak more than one language in a particular geographical locality (Thomason 2001:3). According to Thomason slavery, immigration (migration), intermarriage, neighbour, mutual bilingualism or multilingualism (speakers of two or more languages living together in a single community), trade, and education are factors that cause language contact. According to Appel and Muysken (1987:6), linguistic border, colonial expansion, ethno-linguistic enclaves, post-colonial migration to the developed world are the most accountable situations of language contact.

2.1.3.3. Outcomes of language contact

In multilingual settings prolonged language and social contact results in a variety of language mixing phenomenon. Often the outcomes can differ from one multilingual setting to another. This is resulted from several factors such as linguistic factors (e.g. the degree of typological similarity between the languages in contact), socio-economic factors (e.g. length and intensity between the groups, their respective demographic numbers, the power and prestige between the groups) and socio-political factors like attitudes and motivations towards each other languages and to use (Winford 2003).

Sociolinguists have identified several outcomes of languages in contact in multilingual settings, though it depends on factors such as duration of the contact, socio-economic and political prestige of speakers of the languages in contact. These outcomes are borrowing, code switching, code mixing, interference, language shift, pidgin, creole and even language death (Crystal 1987, Fasold 1984).

For the purpose of the present study borrowing, code switching and mixing, language maintenance and shift are discussed as outcomes of language contact.

2.1.3.3.1. Borrowing

In multilingual settings, where there are many languages co-exist, it is likely that these languages take features of one another. When one language takes the feature of another language the phenomenon is called borrowing. Trudgill (2003:19) defines borrowing as, "the process whereby bilingual speakers introduce words from one language into another language, these loan words eventually becoming accepted as an integral of the second language." Similarly, Thomason and Kaufman (1988:37) define borrowing is "the incorporation of foreign features into a group`s native language by speakers of that language." As can be understood from these definitions, linguistic

borrowing is the situation in which languages in contact give and take linguistic elements of one another.

Words that are borrowed from another language into a language are called loanwords or borrowed words. In the borrowing situation, the language from which the linguistic elements are borrowed is often referred to either as the source, donor or lending language. Whereas the language into which the linguistic elements are borrowed is either called the recipient or host language (Campbell 2004:57).

Borrowing elements (words in this study) can go into both languages involved in contact, but at different degree. Often there might be an asymmetry, such that words borrowed from one language to the other are much greater than the words borrowed from it (Winford 2003:6). The direction and intensity of borrowing can be influenced by factors such as power and prestige of the speakers of languages involved. For instance, if the speakers of languages involved have unequal power and prestige, then more linguistic elements are borrowed from the `high` to `low` prestigious one. This does not mean that borrowing is always from the more prestigious to the less prestigious ones; rather borrowing is a bi-directional phenomenon.

2.1.3.3.2. Code switching and code mixing

A code is language, a variety or style of language. In multilingual settings, the switching from one code or language or a variety of language to another is a habitual phenomenon. It occurs where speakers have codes available to them to switch from one to another. Code switching involves change of language or code in a given situation. It refers to the use of two languages at the same time in one situation (Appel and Muysken 1987).

Code-switching (hereafter CS) has been studied from different perspectives since about 1970. From a sociolinguistic perspective: why do people switch between languages. It can also be studied from a psycholinguistic perspective: what aspects of their language capacity enable them to switch? And from a linguistic perspective: how one can know that speakers are really switching and the grammatical properties of CS (Appel and Muysken 1987:115). From the aforementioned perspectives, in the present study, CS is studied from sociolinguistic and linguistic perspectives: i.e. why do people switch and the grammatical aspects of CS.

Muysken (2011:301) has defined CS as, "the use of more than one language during a single communicative event." According to him, CS is the phenomenon of producing alternately more than

one language during a single conversation. Hence, CS refers to the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation (Winford 2003).

According to Appel and Muysken (1987:118) and Romaine (1994:57) switching can be categorized as intra-sentential and inter-sentential switching. Intra-sentential switching (also called code mixing) occurs in the middle of a sentence, whereas inter-sentential switches occur between sentences (CS).

The difference between CS and borrowing is not straightforward. Different criteria are used by different scholars to distinguish CS from borrowing. Among these, Poplack (1980) has developed three types of integration[4] to discern the two language contact phenomena: phonological, morphological, and syntactic integration. These are useful to distinguish code-switching and borrowing. According to him, an embedded language material that shows all the three types of integration constitutes borrowing. In contrast, where an embedded language material shows only phonological integration, or only morphological integration, or only syntactic integration, or no integration at all, it is considered to be an instance of CS. Similarly, Muysken (2011:302) confirms this by claiming, linguistic elements that adapted morphologically into the matrix language are borrowed, while linguistic elements which are not adapted are instances of CS. Generally, the main difference between borrowing and CS is borrowing units are to some extent nativized[5] to the recipient language, whereas CS units are not nativized.

Moreover, CS and borrowing phenomena are different, in the sense that CS is a habit of bilinguals, whereas borrowing is a habit of both bilinguals and monolinguals (Bokamba 1988; Appel and Muysken 1987; Thomason 2001 and Matras 2009). According to them, in order to say an embedded language item borrowing, it should occur in the speech behaviour of both bilinguals and monolinguals speakers. In contrast, CS[6] items occur only in the speech behaviour of bilingual speakers since the monolinguals do not know the other language.

Other criteria used to discern the two language contact phenomenon is the frequency of occurrence (Appel and Muysken 1987 and Myers-Scotton 1993). According to them, the linguistic elements that occur frequently are regarded as borrowings, and that occur only occasionally are regarded as CS.

---

[4] Integration means that the embedded language element (e.g. word) changes its pronunciation and/or its morphology to look more like a normal matrix language.

[5] Nativization is instance in which foreign linguistic item morpho-syntactically integrated into the recipient language grammatical system.

[6] CS can be used by monolinguals, when monolinguals switch between different varieties of the same language, but the present study focuses on CS that occurs between different languages not varieties of the same language.

The present study uses both criteria illustrated above i.e., the three types of integration: phonological, morphological and syntactical, and the criteria that focuses on CS is a feature of bilinguals and that borrowing is a feature of both bilinguals and monolinguals are used.

CS is not arbitrary rather it has some implications or social functions. There are different reasons for switching from one language to another. The following are the sociolinguistic functions of CS (Crystal 1987; Appel and Muysken 1987; Hoffmann 1991; Holmes 1992; Myers-Scotton 1993; Romaine 1994; Winford 2003; Matras 2009 and Meyerhoff 2011).

1. CS can serve the referential function to fill a linguistic or conceptual gap. It occurs when matrix language lacks a technical term found in embedded language (to compensate language deficiency).
2. To express mixed identity through the use of two languages in the same discourse. For a certain group of people, constant or frequent CS may itself be a mark of their identity as belonging to two linguistic groups.
3. For the sake of clarification i.e. CS often used with the intention of clarifying the speech content for the interlocutor. This is the case in unbalanced bilingualism, when one of the interlocutors is weaker in one of the languages involved.
4. CS can signal the speaker`s attitude towards the listener – friendly, irritated, distant, ironic, jocular and so on.
5. To exclude a third person from conversation by using a language s/he do not know
6. To include a third person into conversation by using a language s/he knows
7. To (implicitly) boast or show off one`s linguistic ability
8. To create more social distance, or less distance from the interlocutor (metaphorical function of `we` and `they`).
9. To include quotation from another language

Code mixing (hereafter CM) can be defined as mixing of codes during a single exchange or even within a single speaker`s turn. Meyerhoff (2011:125) defines CM as alternations between languages within a clause or phrase. It refers to the use of one language in another language, the mixing of two or more language or varieties of language in a speech. It is the use of elements of one language in another language.

Some sociolinguists use the terms CS and CM more or less interchangeably. Among them Fasold (1984:183) says that, "CS and CM are points on a continuum from the sociolinguistics point of view." Meyerhoff (2011:121) views CS as it covers or includes the term code mixing. CS is the

situation in which two or more languages are used alternatively turn by turn depend on social contexts whereas CM refers to the situation of using elements or units (morphemes, words, phrases, etc) of one language in another language at the middle of a conversation (speech or sentence).

In contrast, Bokamba (1988) argues CS and CM are different sociolinguistic phenomena. According to his argument, CS is defined as, "the embedding or mixing of words, phrases, and sentences from two codes within the same speech situation and across sentence boundaries." Whereas, CM is defined as, "the embedding or mixing of various units, i.e. affixes, words, phrases, and clauses from two distinct grammatical systems or subsystems within the same sentence and the same speech situation," He defined the two phenomena as a complementary concepts, CS as the situation of language alternation between sentences and CM as the situation of language alternation within a single sentence.

In the current study, the two concepts are treated as different concepts. CM refers to an embedding of linguistic elements such as affixes, words, phrases and clauses in the same sentence whereas CS refers to an instance of embedding linguistic elements across sentences boundaries within the same speech event. Hence, CM and CS can be treated as intra-sentential and inter-sentential switching respectively (Gumperz and Bokamba cited in Zelealem 1998:198).

The major determinants of language choice such as domain (where the speaker is), participant (who he is talking to) and topic (issue he/she wants to discuss) are cause a speaker to switch from one language to another (Meyerhoff 2011:121; Stockwell 2007:11 and Appel and Muysken 1987:118).

2.1.3.3.3. Language maintenance and language shift

Language maintenance (LM) and language shift (LS) are opposite phenomena. LM occurs in a situation where there is stable multilingualism i.e. different languages are preserved for different functions, whereas LS is happen at unstable multilingualism. Hence, LM and LS are two sides of the same coin (Fasold 1984:213).

LM occurs when a speech community in given multilingual context collectively decides to continue using the language it has been using traditionally (Hoffmann 1991:186 and Fasold 1984:213). Maintaining multilingualism is maintaining languages. In other words, languages are maintained when they function in their preserved domains. This implies that, if multilingualism is stable, then languages are more likely to be maintained.

LS refers to the replacement of one language by another. Fasold (1984:213) defines LS as a situation in which "a community gives up a language completely in favour of another one." Similarly,

Thomason (2001:5) views, LS as a situation in which a group shifts from its language to another language in a contact setting. Weinreich (1963:68) defines LS as "the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another." As one can deduce from the above definitions, LS occurs when a speech community adopts another language at the expense of its traditional or own language. When LS has taken place, the members of the speech community, have collectively chosen a new language(s) to use at the place of the old one.

There are several conditions that cause people to give up their language in favour of another. An ethnic group may shift its older language for economic, social, demographic, political, religious, migration, urbanization, industrialization, language planning and policy and other reasons. Although, in most instances, language shift is resulted from societal bilingualism or multilingualism, especially in speech communities where a minority language is in a diglossic relationship with a majority language (Romaine 1994:58 and Schiffman 1997:3), the aforementioned factors can also lead a community to cease its old language in the favour of the new one (Fasold 1984:217). In addition, there are factors related to individual speakers of the language in question such as age, sex, religion, intermarriage, educational status, and so on.

LS begins when the language in question starts to lose domains in which it is found to be useful and in which its use is expected. As it begins to diminish the number of domains assigned to it, parents may decide that the language is less valuable resource for their children than another language, and so the language begins to lose users as well (Fishman 2001). The home domain is the last domain preserved for minority languages in multilingual setting. If the dominant language intrudes into the home domain, it would be the worst situation for minority language (Downes 1998:63). Clyne (1997:38) states that not using the minority language at the home domain distracts from its liveliness and endangers its transmission to the next generation.

Sociolinguists often study LM and LS using age-grading. They use survey method to collect data on language use, language choice and language proficiency across different age groups. Then, they look for age- distribution numbers (variations). Accordingly, if older speakers report more use of one language and younger speakers more use of another language, this can be an indication of LS (Fasold 1984:215). In contrast, if both groups report more use of the same language, though there might be additional languages used by one or both groups, it is an indication of LM.

2.2. Review of related works

The researcher has attempted to assess researches done on language use in Ethiopian context. Accordingly, he found some works related to the current study.

The first work reviewed is Samuel`s (2009) thesis entitled "language use in Shone town: A Sociolinguistic study." The target of this thesis was to describe the pattern of language use of different ethno-linguistic groups found in Shone town. The findings show that Shone is a multilingual town with six languages in use, which includes: Hadiyyisa, Amharic, Wolaytato, Kambatisata, Afan Oromo and Gurage[7]. According to the findings Amharic is the most learned as second language by native speakers of different languages. All the mother tongues are used in the home domain. Finally, the finding of the thesis indicated that Amharic is found to be a lingua franca among various linguistic groups in Shone town.

The present research is similar to Samuel`s research in following aspects: firstly, it has similarity in conceptual framework since both have tried to investigate the pattern of language use from sociolinguistic point of view. Secondly, the milieu of both researches is a town where different ethno-linguistic groups live. But, the present research differs from Samuel`s work: first, the sociolinguistic context of the present research is different from that of Samuel, it is conducted on Jimma town which is found in Oromiya Regional State where Afan Oromo is the working language. Second, the ethno-linguistic groups under investigations are different from that of Samuel.

Ayub (2008) has also conducted a sociolinguistic research entitled "Language use of Jamican and Rastafarian Community in Shashemene." The research attempted to investigate the settlers` language use among themselves and with the local people in different domains. The findings of the research show that Jamaican and Rastafarian community in Shashemene have the tendency to assimilate to the local society, particularly, socio-linguistically. Due to socio-economic factors particularly intermarriage, many languages are spoken as mother tongue and second language, but Amharic is the most chosen language because of its history in the Rastafarian ideology. The work of Ayub is focused on the study of one ethno-linguistic group (Jamaican and Rastafarian), which is an ethno-linguistic enclave, in relation to the surrounding community. On the contrary, the present research focuses on different ethno-linguistic groups found in Jimma town to describe their language use across different domains in the study area.

Teketel (2011) has conducted a sociolinguistic study on "Bilingualism and Language use in Hawassa Zurya Woreda." This study aimed to describe the pattern of bilingualism and language use situation among diverse community in Hawassa Zurya Woreda. The findings of the study show that different mother tongue speakers are bilingual in Amharic to a greater extent and in Sidaamuafoo to a lesser

[7] Samuel has treated Gurage as a single language. But, in the present study Gurage is not treated as a single language.

extent. The study also shows that there is a tendency to shift from Afan Oromo, Hadiyyisa, Kambatisata, and Sidaamuafoo to Amharic. Finally, it revealed that Amharic is a lingua franca followed by Sidaamuafoo.

The other work related to the current research is Adane (2010). He has studied "Language use and attitude of Gamo community living in Addis Ababa." The research tried to investigate the state of Gamo language maintenance among the specific community in Addis Ababa. The results obtained show that most of the members of the community are shifting to the use of Amharic at the home domain, ethnic in-group association, friendship circles and in the neighbourhood domain of language use. The study also revealed that most of the members of the community have negative attitudes towards their ethnic language, though they are almost equally proficient in both Gamo and Amharic. It has also been found that parents in the community do not make much effort to transmit their language to their children. The present research differs from Adane`s work, it describes the pattern of language use of different ethno-linguistic groups in contrast to that of Adane.

Meyer and Ritcher (2003) have conducted a research entitled "Language Use in Ethiopia from a Network Perspective". They tried to investigate the situation of language use in different Ethiopian towns. To this end, they collected sociolinguistic data from high school students in different towns. Their finding shows that Amharic is used as a lingua franca in different towns of Ethiopia. Moreover, they found that in multi-ethnic context of Ethiopian towns, different ethnic groups acquire Amharic as MT and SL. The current study differs from their work, in description of language use of different ethno-linguistic groups in only one town, i.e. Jimma.

Cooper and Carpertner (1976) have done study on language use in the Ethiopian markets. Their findings show that in the linguistically diverse selected Ethiopian markets transactions were facilitated by the multilingualism of the buyers and the sellers rather than by emergence of a lingua franca. The setting of Cooper and Carpenter (1976) study was vast since it included different Ethiopian markets. However, the current study focuses on the description of language use in only one town. Furthermore, this study aims at describing language use in different domains.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research design

The study employed descriptive method to describe and analyze the actual sociolinguistic situations of linguistically heterogeneous settings of Jimma town. Moreover, it followed mainly quantitative research design. However, to complement the results of the quantitative information, qualitative research method was used as well.

3.2. Sampling technique

To select a representative sample from different ethnic groups in the town, the researcher went through the following steps:

First, from the 13 Kebeles (small administrative units) of the town, 3[8] Kebeles; namely, Hirmata Merkato, Bossa Addis Ketema and Mendera K`ochi were selected by using simple random sampling method (lottery method).

After selecting Kebeles, the researcher with the help of his field assistant, distributed the prepared questionnaire by rounding in houses of the residents in the selected Kebeles. This was done by jumping **one** house and asking the next house to fill the questionnaire. In doing so, people were involved in the study to respond to the questionnaire based on their availability and willingness. Finally, from the total population of the selected Kebeles, 270 respondents were selected to provide sufficient data for the study. Besides, 10 resourceful persons were selected purposely for interview. 5 elders (56 and above age group) and 5 children (7-18 age group) were selected to respond to interview questions regarding the linguistic diversity of the town and their habitual language use situations. The researcher was directed to the elders for they were assumed to have good knowledge on the sociolinguistic diversity of the town.

3.3. Methods of data collection

Questionnaire, interview and observation were the tools employed for gathering data.

3.3.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaire was used to get in-depth information on the patterns of language use across different domains. Most of the questions were adapted from Fishman (1971) and Zelealem (2000). The

[8] Because of time, money and other resource constraints, three Kebeles were selected from overall Kebeles of the town.

questionnaire had three parts. The first part contains demographic information about the respondents: age, sex, educational level, ethnic group, occupation, marital status and religion. The second part includes language background of respondents and their families (fathers, mothers, spouses and children). The third part covers questions on the patterns of language use of the respondents in different domains with different interlocutors, which in general were of open and close ended question types.

The questionnaire was written in English, and then translated into Amharic and Afan Oromo to insure that the respondents can reply it efficiently. It was distributed to 270 respondents. The researcher and his field assistant read the items to some illiterate respondents and filled their replies in the spaces for answers.

3.3.2. Interview

The interview was employed to gather data from elders and children on issues related to language use and sociolinguistic situations of the study area. The elders were interviewed to provide information on linguistic diversity of the town. The children were interviewed to give information of their habitual language use. In line with this, some relevant linguistic data on the situations of language contact such as borrowing, code-switching, and code-mixing were obtained when the interviewees react to interview questions. The responses of the interviewees were recorded using audio recorder.

3.3.3. Observation

The researcher conducted observation to investigate language use and some effects of language contact (borrowing, code switching and code mixing) in different domains: street, market, court, offices and schools in the town. These domains were observed based on their ease of access (ease to observe). The researcher conducted the observation for about 22 days (from January 21 – February 11, 2013). While conducting the observation, the researcher wrote down notes based on the observation guidelines and where possible informally recorded the elicited data by using audio recorder when people freely interact with each other.

3.4. Methods of data analysis

Methods of data analysis for this study include both quantitative and qualitative methods. The data gathered through the questionnaire (close ended items) were analyzed quantitatively with the help of tables. Frequency counts and percentages were used as well. On the other hand, the data obtained through the open ended items of the questionnaire, observation and interviews were analyzed qualitatively.

Table 2: Age group of respondents

Age grouping	Frequency	Percent
7-18 (the children)	62	24.5
19-30 (the youths)	138	54.5
31-55 (the middle aged)	41	16.2
56 and above (the old aged)	12	4.7
Total	253	100.0

Among these age categories, the youth represents the larger proportion of the respondents which accounts for 54.5% of the total sample. The children age group takes the second larger proportion which accounts for 24.5% followed by the middle aged which accounts for 16.2%. The elderly age group only accounts for 4.7% of the total sample.

4.1.3. Religious affiliation of respondents

Jimma town is known by having many ethnic groups with different religious background. Of these, Muslim and Orthodox Christianity take the majority of the respondents.

Table 3: Religious affiliation of respondents

Religion	Frequency	Percent
Orthodox Christianity	97	38.3
Muslim	104	41.1
Protestant	42	16.6
Catholic	9	3.6
Traditional	1	0.4
Total	253	100.0

As depicted in the above table, 104(41.1%) respondents are followers of Muslim, whereas 97 (38.3%) are followers of Orthodox Christianity. While 42(16.6%) and 9(3.6%) respondents are followers of Protestant and Catholic, respectively. Only 1(0.4%) respondent is follower of traditional religious practice.

4.1.4. Educational level of respondents

Schooling is a setting where one can learn a new language as a second and/or foreign language in addition to his/her own mother tongue. Education, therefore, is one way in which multilingualism can develop. In line with this, Myers-Scotton (2006:64) asserts that, speakers may well add a language through education. Among the respondents of the study, only 16 (6.3%) have not received formal education. The remaining respondents are literate. They have different educational levels. Consider the following table.

Table 4: Educational levels of respondents

Educational level	Frequency	Percent
Not received formal education	16	6.3
Elementary level	57	22.5
Secondary and preparatory level	100	39.5
Received college education and above	80	31.6
Total	253	100.0

As illustrated in the above table, the majority of the respondents are at secondary and preparatory level. They constitute 100(39.5%) of the respondents. Respondents who received college education and above take the second largest proportion, 80(31.6%). Respondents at elementary level make up 57(22.5%). A few respondents 16(6.3%) have not received formal education.

4.1.5. Occupation of respondents

Occupation is one of the factors that determine language use among various ethno-linguistic groups. Some occupations bring together different people from different social backgrounds. For instance, employees speaking different mother tongues work together. As Myers-Scotton (2006:50) states, speakers whose occupations involve many contacts outside their own ethnic group may well have reasons to learn a second language. In Jimma town, there are many institutions and workplaces where many people from different ethno-linguistic groups work together. The occupational profiles of respondents are presented in the following table.

Table 5: Occupational profiles of respondents

Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Merchant	80	31.62
Government employee	60	23.71
Student	66	26.1
Casual worker[9]	34	13.4
Retired	9	3.6
Other	4	1.6
Total	253	100.0

As revealed in the above table, the three largest occupational profiles of the respondents are merchant, student and government employee. They make up 80(31.62%), 66(26.1%) and 60(23.71%) respondents, respectively. Casual worker respondents constitute 34(13.4%). While 9(3.6%) respondents are retired and a few respondents (4(1.6%)) have other types of occupation such as shoeshine, waitress/waiter, housewife and the like. From this one can deduce that as the larger

[9] Casual worker in this study refers to a person who does not have a regular job.

proportion of the respondents is merchants, students and government employees, they have access to learn different languages because they usually interact with speakers of different languages.

4.1.6. Marital status of respondents

The marital status of respondents is presented below in table 6.

Table 6: Marital status of respondents

Marital status	Frequency	Percent
Single	103	40.7
Married	150	59.3
Total	253	100.0

As depicted in the above table, the proportion of married respondents is more than that of the proportion of single. Married respondents constitute 150(59.3) and the single respondents 103(40.7%) of the total respondents.

4.1.7. Birth place of respondents

Jimma town is a centre of trade and cash crop. Due to this and its proximity to Southern Nations, Nationalities and People`s Regional State (SNNPRS), many people from the region come to live in the town. People also migrate from other Regional States such as Amhara, Tigray, Gambella and other Zones of Oromiya Regional State to live in the town (Yonas 2002: 63-66). As the researcher identified from the elders` interview, migration is very common from border areas to the town. Obviously, migration is one factor which promotes multilingualism both at individual and societal level. Regarding this, Myers-Scotton (2006:65) states that, migration is a prime reason for a person to become bilingual and/or multilingual. Likewise, respondents with a considerable number migrate from other places to the research setting to seek a better life. Therefore, most of the respondents are bilinguals and multilinguals in their mother tongue and other language(s) spoken in the town.

Table 7: Birth place of respondents

Place of birth	Frequency	Percent
Jimma town	155	61.3
Other places	98	38.7
Total	253	100.0

As presented in the above table, the largest proportion of the respondents, (61.3%) were born in Jimma town. Respondents who were born at other places (to mention some Amhara region, Kafa Zone, Dawro Zone, Gurage Zone, Yem special Woreda, and etc) make up (38.7%) of the total

respondents. Even though, respondents with considerable number were born outside Jimma town, all respondents of the study are permanent dwellers of the town.

4.1.8. Ethnic background of the respondents

Jimma is a home town of many ethno-linguistic groups. According to Ethiopian Central Statistical Agency (CSA, 2007), many ethnic groups live in the town. For the purpose of the present study, ethnic groups with considerable number are included as the sample of the study. Of these, ethnically Oromo people take the overwhelming majority of the respondents followed by Amhara and Dawro. Silt`e and Tegaru take the smaller proportion of the respondents.

Table 8: Ethnic background of respondents

Ethnic group	Frequency	Percent
Oromo	113	44.7
Amhara	45	17.8
Dawro	26	10.3
Gurage	19	7.5
Kafa	16	6.3
Yem	15	5.9
Silt`e	10	4.0
Tegaru	9	3.6
Total	253	100.0

As shown in table 8, the largest ethnic group is Oromo, which constitutes 113(44.7%) of the total respondents. Amhara takes the next largest position, with 45(17.8%) respondents. On the other hand, Silt`e and Tegaru ethnic groups are lesser, constitute 10(4%) and 9(3.6%) respondents, respectively. Generally, the variations of these ethnic groups seem to be related with the general demography of the ethnic groups of the town.

4.2. Language background of the respondents and their families

In this section, respondents` and their families` mother tongue (hereafter MT) and second language(s) (hereafter SL) are presented and discussed. Moreover, ethnic backgrounds of respondents and their MT are cross-tabulated and discussed. MT of respondents is distributed across age groups. Lastly, comparison of respondents` MT with their families` MTs is described in detail.

4.2.1. MT Distribution of respondents

When different ethno-linguistic groups interact with one another for social, economic, political, religion and other related reasons, bilingualism or multilingualism is a common phenomenon (Grosjean 1982). As well, in Jimma town many ethno-linguistic groups interact with one other daily

for the above reasons. As a result, there are many languages acquired as MTs and SLs. MT of respondents is presented in the following table.

Table 9: MT Distribution of respondents

MT of respondents	Frequency	Percent
Afan Oromo	105	41.5
Amharic	95	37.5
Dawro	18	7
Yem	11	4.3
Kafinoonoo	7	2.8
Silt`e	5	2
Chaha	5	2
Ezha[10]	4	1.6
Tigrigna	3	1.2
Total	253	100.0

As indicated in the above table, there are many languages spoken as MT in the study area. These are: Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e, Chaha, Ezha and Tigrigna. Among these languages, Afan Oromo is spoken as MT by the majority of respondents (41.5%) followed by Amharic (37.5%) whereas the least number of respondents speak Ezha and Tigrigna as MT. They encompass 4(1.6%) and 3(1.2%) respondents, respectively. In general, Afan Oromo is dominantly acquired as MT followed by Amharic whereas Tigrigna and Ezha are acquired as MT to a lesser extent in the study area.

4.2.1.1. MT distribution of respondents in relation to their ethnic background

In multilingual settings, society as a collective or individual member of the society may abandon their or its ethnic language in favour of another language for various economic, social, political, religious and the like reasons (Fasold 1984:213). Likewise, in the sociolinguistic setting of the current study respondents with considerable numbers are shifting their ethnic language in favour of Amharic to greater and Afan Oromo to lesser degree. Consider the following table.

[10] Among the Gurage languages, Ezha and Chaha are spoken in Jimma town with considerable number of speakers as MTs and SLs (as data obtained through questionnaire and interview evidenced).

Table 10: MT distribution of respondents in relation to their ethnic background

MT of Respondents		Ethnic background of respondents							
		Oromo	Amhara	Dawro	Gurage	Yem	Kafa	Silt`e	Tegaru
A/O[11]	105	89(79%)	4(9%)	3(12%)	3(16%)	1(7%)	2(12%)	1(10%)	2(22%)
A	95	24(21%)	41(91%)	5(19%)	7(37%)	3(20%)	7(44%)	4(40%)	4(45%)
D	18	___	___	18(69%)	___		___	___	___
Y	11	___	___	___	___	11(73%)	___	___	___
K	7	___	___	___			7(44%)	___	___
C	5	___	___	___	5(26%)		___	___	___
S	5	___	___	___	___		___	5(50%)	___
E	4	___	___	___	4(21%)	___	___	___	___
T	3	___	___	___	___		___	___	3(33%)
Total	253 (100%)	113(100%)	45(100%)	26(100%)	19(100%)	15(100%)	16(100%)	10(100%)	9(100%)

As illustrated in the above table, respondents with considerable number from all ethnic groups are shifting to Amharic at various degrees. Significant number of respondents from the Tegaru (45%), Kafa (44%), Silt`e (40%), Gurage (37%), Oromo (24%), Yem (20%) and Dawro (19%) ethnic groups acquired Amharic as a MT. The data also shows that some respondents from all the ethnic groups acquired Afan Oromo as a MT to lesser extent: Tegaru (22%), Gurage (16%), Kafa (12%), Dawro (12%), Silt`e (10%), Amhara (9%) and Yem (7%).

In general, as the above data evidences, considerable number of respondents from all ethnic groups acquired Amharic as MT to greater and Afan Oromo to lesser degree. This shows that there is a tendency of language shift in favour of Amharic to greater and Afan Oromo to lesser degree, i.e. respondents with good number from all ethnic groups do not speak their ethnic language as MT: the Tegaru (67%), Kafa (56%), Guarge (53%), Silt`e (50%), Dawro (31%), Yem (27%), Oromo (21%) and Amhara (9%).

4.2.1.2. MT distributions of respondents across age groups

In this sub-section, the researcher tries to analyze the MT distribution of respondents across different age groups. Significant difference is exhibited in the distribution of respondents` MT across age groups. Consider the following table.

[11] Names of languages are abbreviated as follows: A- Amharic; A/O- Afan Oromo; D-Dawro; E- Ezha; K-Kafinoonoo; Y- Yem; S- Silt`e; T- Tigrigna; C- Chaha.

Table 11: MT distribution of respondents across age groups

Age grouping	MT of respondents									
	A/O	A	D	Y	K	C	S	E	T	Total
7-18	23(37%)	36(58%)	1(1.6%)	1(1.6%)	1(1.6%)	–	–	–	–	62(24.5%)
19-30	66(48%)	53(38%)	7(5%)	4(3%)	1(0.7%)	2(1.4%)	2(1.4%)	1(0.7%)	2(1.4%)	138(54.5%)
31-55	11(27%)	3(6%)	10(24%)	5(12.2%)	3(7.3%)	3(7.3%)	2(5%)	3(7.3%)	1(2.43%)	41(16.2%)
above55	5(42%)	3(25%)	–	1(8.33%)	2(16.7%)	–	1(8.33%)	–	–	12(4.7%)
Total	105(41.5%)	95(37.5%)	18(7%)	11(4.35%)	7(2.77%)	5(1.98%)	5(1.98%)	4(1.6%)	3(1.18%)	253(100%)

According to the above table, relatively large numbers of Dawro, Ezha, Chaha, Yem, Silt`e, Kafinoonoo and Tigrigna MT speakers are at middle aged and youth age group to greater and lesser degree, respectively. Children of Dawro, Kafinoonoo and Yem MT speakers take relatively very small proportion as compared to Amharic and Afan Oromo MT speaking children. On the other hand, as the data evidences, children age group do not speak Ezha, Silt`e, Tigrigna and Chaha as MT. This is associated with language background of respondents` children (see section 4.2.5). The data also conveys that the percentage of Amharic MT speakers increase to a larger degree across the old aged to the children age groups. Large number of the children age group, 36(58%), speak Amharic as a MT followed by Afan Oromo, 23(37%) respondents.

In general, Amharic and Afan Oromo as MT are distributed across all the age groups followed by Kafinoonoo and Yem whereas Chaha, Silt`e, Ezha and Tigrigna are not spoken by children age group.

4.2.1.3. MT distribution of respondents in relation to their SL[12] distribution

As explained under section 4.2.1 above, there are about nine languages spoken with considerable number of population as a MT in the research setting. These are: Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e, Chaha, Ezha and Tigrigna. The geographical location and socioeconomic situations of the study area are the main factors for the current linguistic diversity of the area (Yonas 2002). Grosjean (1982) states that if different languages are spoken in a specific geographical setting, it could enhance bilingualism and/or multilingualism. As well, in Jimma town, many language

[12] Regarding SL of respondents the total number is greater than the sample, since many respondents mentioned more than one language as their SL. Hence, respondents with considerable number can speak more than one language (see table 12a and b).

speakers are in frequent contacts for different reasons: trading, education, and the like. Hence, dwellers of the town are bilingual and multilingual in their MT and various languages.

Table 12a: MT distribution of respondents in relation to their SL distribution

SLs	MT of respondents									TOTAL
	A/O	A	D	Y	K	C	S	E	T	
	105	95	18	11	7	5	5	4	3	253(100)
A/O	=	55(58%)	9(50%)	7(63%)	5(71%)	3(60%)	4(80%)	3(75%)	2(67%)	88(34.8%)
A	94(89%)	=	16(89%)	10(90%)	6(85%)	4(80%)	4(80%)	3(75%)	2(67%)	139(55%)
D	11(10%)	13(14%)	=	3(27%)	4(57%)	1(20%)	-	-	1(33%)	33(13%)
Y	4(3.8%)	5(5.3%)	2(11%)	=	3(43%)	-	1(20%)	1(25%)	1(33%)	17(6.7%)
K	3(2.85%)	4(4.2%)	5(27.8%)	2(18%)	=	1(20%)	2(40%)	1(25%)	-	18(7.1%)
C	1(0.95%)	3(3.15%)	-	-	-	=	3(60%)	1(25%)	-	8(3.1%)
S	5(4.76%)	3(3.15%)	1(5.5%)	1(9%)	2(28%)	1(20%)	=	2(50%)	1(33%)	16(6.3%)
E	5(4.76%)	2(2.10%)	-	-	-	4(80%)	1(20)	=	-	12(4.7%)
T	1(0.95%)	3(3.15%)	-	-	-	-	1(20%)	1(25%)	=	6(2.4%)

As indicated in table 12a, the overwhelming majority of respondents are bilinguals and multilinguals in their MT and different languages. Of these languages, Amharic takes the largest proportion being spoken as SL, with 139(55%) respondents. Next to Amharic, Afan Oromo is widely acquired as SL, with 88(34.8%) respondents. Tigrigna and Chaha are acquired as SL relatively by smaller number of respondents, 6(2.4%) and 8(3.1%) respondents, respectively. In contrary, very small numbers of respondents are monolinguals of Afan Oromo and Amharic. They make up 6(2.37%) respondents. The monolinguals are categorized under age group of old aged.

Regarding SL comparison across MT, Afan Oromo MT speakers are acquiring all languages as SL. The majority of them acquired Amharic as SL (89%) followed by Dawro (10%). However, the least number of Afan Oromo MT speakers acquired Tigrigna and Chaha as SL, with 1(0.95%) respondents, each.

Amharic MT speakers are acquiring all other languages as SL. The large numbers of Amharic MT speakers acquired Afan Oromo as SL (58%) followed by Dawro (14%). Nonetheless, Ezha is taken as SL by small number of Amharic MT speakers, 2(2.1%) respondents. Relatively speaking, Amharic MT speakers are highly acquiring various languages as SL. This is due to the fact that many

children from the all ethnic groups are acquiring Amharic as MT and learn their ethnic language latter on as SL (consider table 10 above).

Dawro, Kafinoonoo and Yem MT speakers are also acquiring different languages as SL. They are acquiring Amharic and Afan Oromo as their SL to a greater and certain degree, respectively. On the other hand, they have not been acquired Ezha, Tigrigna and Chaha as their SL in the study setting.

Silt`e and Tigrigna MT speakers are acquiring various languages as SL. Of these languages, Amharic and Afan Oromo take the majority being acquired as SL speakers by Silt`e and Tigrigna MT speakers. On the contrary, Dawro has not been acquired as SL by Silt`e MT speakers. Chaha, Ezha and Kafinoonoo have not acquired as SL by Tigrigna MT speakers.

Most of Ezha MT speakers are Chaha SL speakers. Similarly, most of Chaha MT speakers are Ezha SL speakers. Yem and Tigrigna have not been acquired as SL by Chaha MT speaking respondents.

In general, all languages are being acquired as SL. However, Amharic to a greater and Afan Oromo to a certain degree are acquired as SL by different languages speakers in the sociolinguistic situation of the study area whereas Tigrigna and Chaha are acquired as SL by the least number of respondents.

Regarding the number of languages known by respondents, the overwhelming majority of respondents are bilinguals and multilinguals in their MT and various languages. Consider the following table.

Table 12b: Number of languages known by respondents

monolingual respondents		bilingual respondents		multilingual respondents		Total	
Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
6	2.37	153	60.47	94	37.15	253	100

As can be seen from the above table, out of the total sample, majority of the respondents know more than one language. The greater number of respondents, 153(60.47%), know two languages, i.e. they are bilinguals; 94(37.37%) respondents know three languages, i.e. they are multilinguals. Only 6(2.37%) respondents know one language (monolinguals).

4.2.2. Language background of respondents` fathers

Language background (MT and SL) of respondents` fathers is presented and discussed as follows.

Table 13a: Language background of respondents` fathers

SLs	MT of respondents` fathers									Total
	A/O	A	D	Y	K	C	S	T	E	
	112	50	23	15	16	9	10	9	9	253
A/O	=	34(68%)	11(48%)	9(60%)	8(50%)	5(56%)	4(40%)	4(44%)	3(33%)	79(31%)
A	61(54.5 %)	=	13(56.5 %)	9(60%)	7(44%)	6(67%)	6(60%)	7(78%)	4(44%)	113(44. 7%)
D	17(15%)	11(22%)	=	7(47%)	4(25%)	-	-	-	2(22%)	41(16%)
Y	9(8%)	6(12%)	8(34%)	=	6(37%)	-	-	-	2(22%)	31(12%)
K	7(6%)	10(20%)	4(17%)	8(53%)	=	-	-	3(33%)	-	32(13%)
C	1(0.9%)	2(4%)	-	-	-	=	3(30%)	-	7(78%)	13(5%)
S	8(7%)	7(14%)	-	-	-	4(44%)	=	-	3(33%)	22(9%)
T	4(3%)	4(8%)	-	-	-	-	-	=	-	8(3%)
E	1(0.9%)	2(4%)	-	-	-	8(89%)	4(40%)	-	=	15(6%)

As shown in the above table, the majority of the respondents` fathers speak Afan Oromo as MT, account for 112(44.3%). Next to Afan Oromo, Amharic is spoken as MT with considerable numbers of respondents` fathers, 50(19.8%). On the other hand, the smaller number of respondents` fathers speak Ezha, Chaha and Tigrigna as MT, 9(3.6%), each.

When we consider SL of respondents` fathers, the largest proportion of respondents` fathers speak Amharic as SL 113(44.7%) followed by Afan Oromo 79(31%). Dawro, Kafinoonoo and Yem are also important languages of respondents` fathers as SL. But, Tigrigna, Chaha and Ezha have been acquired as SL with least number of respondents` fathers. On the contrary, out of the total respondents` fathers, 4(1.58%), are monolinguals in their MT.

With regard to SL distribution across different MT speakers, very good proportions of all MT speaking fathers acquired Amharic as SL followed by Afan Oromo. Amharic MT speaking fathers, on the other hand, are very much bilinguals in Afan Oromo than any other languages. Similarly, Afan Oromo MT fathers are highly bilinguals in Amharic than any other languages. Ezha and Chaha are acquired as SL both Afan Oromo and Amharic MT fathers to lesser extent. The above data also conveys that Chaha, Tigrigna, Silt`e and Ezha have not been learned as SL by Dawro, Kafinoonoo and Yem MT speaking fathers. In the contrary, Dawro, Yem and Kafinoonoo have not been learned as SL by Chaha and Silt`e MT fathers. Tigrigna MT speakers acquired Afan Oromo, Amharic and Kafinoonoo as SL. Ezha MT speaking fathers acquired all the languages except Kafinoonoo and Tigrigna as SL but at varying degrees. Afan Oromo and Amharic MT speaking fathers acquired all languages as SL than any other MT speaking fathers.

In general, Afan Oromo is spoken as MT by the overwhelming majority of respondents` fathers followed by Amharic whereas Ezha, Chaha and Tigrigna are spoken as MT by the smaller number of

respondents` fathers. Amharic is a predominant SL of fathers followed by Afan Oromo whereas Tigrigna and Chaha are learned as SL by the least number of respondents` fathers. All languages MT speaking fathers acquired Amharic and Afan Oromo as SL though at varying degrees. Amahric and Afan Oromo MT speaking fathers, on the other hand, acquired all languages as SL in this sociolinguistic setting.

To conclude respondents` fathers' language background, number of languages known by them is presented in the following table.

Table 13b: Number of languages known by respondents` fathers

monolingual respondents` fathers		bilingual respondents` fathers		multilingual respondents` fathers		Total	
Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
4	1.58	136	53.75	113	44.7	253	100

As depicted in the above table, out of the total sample, 136(53.75%) respondents` fathers know two languages, 113(44.7%) respondents` fathers know three languages. On the contrary, 4(1.58%) respondents` fathers know only one language, i.e. they are monolinguals in their MT.

4.2.3. Language background of respondents` mothers

In this section, the respondents` mothers MT and SL(s) is presented and discussed. Out of the total sample, 250(98.81%) respondents were reported on their mothers` language background.

Table14a: Language background of respondents` mothers

SLs	MT of Respondents` mothers									
	A/O	A	D	K	Y	T	S	E	C	Total
	104(41.6%)	70(28%)	16(6.4%)	14(5.6%)	13(5.2%)	10(4%)	9(3.6%)	9(3.6%)	5(2%)	250(100%)
A/O	=	40(57%)	6(37%)	4(28%)	9(69%)	3(30%)	5(56%)	3(33%)	2(40%)	72(28.8%)
A	82(79%)	=	8(50%)	6(43%)	5(38%)	9(90%)	5(56%)	4(44%)	3(60%)	122(48.8%)
D	7(6.7%)	2(2.8%)	=	3(21%)	3(23%)	2(20%)	_	1(11%)	_	18(7.2%)
K	3(2.9%)	1(1.4%)	4(25%)	=	4(31%)	2(20%)	_	1(11%)	_	15(6%)
Y	3(2.9%)	2(2.8%)	5(31%)	4(28%)	=	-	3(33%)	-	_	17(6.7%)
T	4(3.8%)	9(12%)	2(13%)	-	-	=	-	2(22%)	-	17(6.7%)
S	12(11%)	6(8.5%)	_	_	1(7.5%)	-	=	2(22%)	3(60%)	24(9%)
E	-	_	1(6%)	2(14%)	_	_	6(67%)	=	4(80%)	13(5%)
C	2(1.9%)	_	-	-	-	-	5(56%)	7(78%)	=	14(5.5%)

As shown in the table above, all the languages are acquired as MT by respondents` mothers. Of these languages, Afan Oromo takes the largest number; comprises 104(41.6%) respondents` mothers. Amharic takes the second position; constitutes 70(28%) respondents` mothers whereas a few respondents` mothers speak Chaha as MT, 5(2%).

When we consider SL of respondents` mothers, the majority of the respondents` mothers are SL speaker of Amharic to a greater and Afan Oromo to a certain degree, 122(48.8%) and 72(28.8%) respondents, respectively. However, some of the respondents` mothers are SL speakers of other languages: Silt`e, Dawro, Yem, Tigrigna, Kafinoonoo, Chaha and Ezha in respective order. On the other hand, 19(7.6%) respondents` mothers are monolinguals in Afan Oromo, Amharic and Dawro with respective order.

When we compare SL in relation to MT, Afan Oromo MT respondents` mothers are SL speakers of various languages. Of the total Afan Oromo MT speaking mothers, 82(79%) mothers are Amharic SL speakers, 12(11%) and 7(6.7%) mothers speak Dawro and Silt`e as SL, respectively. Large numbers of Amharic MT speaking mothers are Afan Oromo SL speakers. Kafinoonoo, Yem, Tigrigna, and Chaha are acquired as SL by Afan Oromo and Amharic MT speaking mothers to a lesser extents. Ezha has not been acquired as SL by Afan Oromo and Amharic MT speaking mothers. Out of Dawro MT speaking mothers nearly equal, 6(37%) and 8(50%) are SL speakers of Afan Oromo and Amharic, respectively. Chaha has not been acquired as SL by Dawro, Yem and Kafinoonoo MT speaking mothers.

The data presented above, generally, indicates that majority of Kafinoonoo, Tigrigna, Silt`e, Ezha and Chaha MT speaking mothers are SL speakers of Amharic to a greater and Afan Oromo to a certain degree. On the other hand, Dawro and Yem MT speaking mothers are SL speakers of Afan Oromo to a greater and Amharic to a certain degree. The majority of Amharic MT respondents` mothers are SL speakers of Afan Oromo. Afan Oromo MT speaking mothers, on the other hand, are largely SL speakers of Amharic to greater extent. To sum up, Afan Oromo is acquired as MT by overwhelming majority of respondents` mothers followed by Amharic whereas Chaha is acquired as MT by least number of respondents` mothers. With regard to SL, Amharic is highly acquired as SL by respondents` mothers followed by Afan Oromo whereas Ezha and Chaha are learned as SL by least number of respondents` mothers.

To sum up, the greatest numbers of respondents` mothers know more one language. Consider the following table.

Table 14b: Number of languages known by respondents` mothers

monolingual respondents` mothers		bilingual respondents` mothers		multilingual respondents` mothers		Total	
Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
19	7.6	152	60.8	79	31.6	250	100

As shown in the above table, out of the total sample, 152(60.8%) respondents reported that their mothers know two languages. 79(31.6%) respondents reported that their mothers know three languages. On the other hand, 19(7.6%) respondents` mothers know only one language, i.e. they are monolinguals in their MT.

4.2.4. Language background of respondents` spouses

Of the total sample, 150(59.28%) respondents reported that they have got married. They were asked to respond to what language(s) their spouses would speak as MT and SL(s). Consider the following table.

Table 15a: Language background of respondents` spouses

SL	MT of Respondents` spouses										Total
	A/O	A	Y	K	T	S	C	E	D	Other [13]	
	57(38%)	55(36.67%)	10(6.7%)	8(5.33%)	8(5.33%)	5(3.3%)	2(1.33%)	2(1.33%)	1(0.7%)	2(1.33%)	150(100%)
A/O	=	32(58%)	7(70%)	5(62%)	2(25%)	_	1(50%)	-	-	_	47(31%)
A	49(86%)	=	8(80%)	6(67%)	6(75%)	4(80%)	1(50%)	2(100%)	1(100%)	2(100)	80(53.3%)
Y	4(7%)	2(3.6%)	=	-	-	-	-	-		-	6(4%)
K	2(3.6%)	3(5%)		=	-	-	-	-	-	-	5(3.3%)
T	1(1.7%)	1(1.8%)	-		=	-	-	-	-		2(1.3%)
S	5(8.7%)	2(3.6%)	-	-	-	=	1(50)	-	-	-	8(5.3%)
C	-	1(1.8%)	-	-	-	3(60%)	=	1(50%)	-	-	5(3.3%)
E	-	-	-	-	-	2(40%)	2(100%)	=	-	-	4(2.7%)
D	8(14%)	2(3.6%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	=	-	10(6.7%)

As depicted in the above table, the majority of the respondents` spouses are Afan Oromo and Amharic MT speakers, 57(38%) and 55(36.67%), respectively. Only 1(0.67%) respondent`s spouse speak Dawro as MT.

[13] Two respondents mentioned Hadiyyisa as the MT of their spouses.

With regard to SL of respondents` spouses, all languages are acquired as SL by respondents` spouses. However, the overwhelming majority of respondents` spouses acquired Amharic as SL, 80(53.3%), followed by Afan Oromo, 47(31%). Amharic is acquired as SL by all MT speaking spouses. Afan Oromo, on the other hand, is only acquired as SL by Amharic, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Tigrigna and Chaha MT speaking spouses. Tigrigna and Ezha are acquired as SL by the least number of respondents` spouses.

When we consider respondents` spouses MT distribution across SL, Afan Oromo MT spouses are SL speakers of all languages except Chaha and Ezha. The majority of them are Amharic SL speakers, 49(86%). In contrary, the least number of Afan Oromo MT spouse speak Tigrigna as SL, 1(1.7%). Amharic MT speaking spouses are acquiring all languages except Ezha. However, majority of them acquired Afan Oromo as SL, 32(58%) respondents. Yem, Kafinoonoo and Tigrigna MT speaking spouses acquired only Amharic and Afan Oromo as their SL. Silt`e MT speaking spouses learned Amharic as SL followed by Chaha and Ezha. On the other hand, all of Chaha MT speaking spouses acquired Ezha as SL. They also acquired Amharic, Afan Oromo and Silt`e as SL. In addition, all of Ezha and Dawro MT speaking spouses acquire Amharic as SL.

In general, the above data indicates that Afan Oromo takes first rank being spoken as MT by respondents` spouses followed by Amharic whereas Dawro takes the least rank being spoken as MT by respondents` spouses. Regarding SL, Amharic is a predominant SL of respondents` spouses followed by Afan Oromo while Tigrigna and Ezha are learnt as SL by least number of respondents` spouses.

When we consider the number of languages known by respondents` spouses, the overwhelming majority of respondents` spouses know two languages. Consider the following table.

Table 15b: Number of languages known by respondents` spouses

monolingual respondents` spouses		bilingual respondents` spouses		multilingual respondents` spouses		Total	
Fr	%	Fr	F%	Fr	%	Fr	%
2	1.33	129	86	19	12.67	150	100

As seen from the above table, of the total respondents` spouses, 129(86%) spouses speak two languages; 19(12.67%) speak three languages. On the other hand, 2(1.33%) speak only one language, i.e. they are monolinguals in their MT.

4.2.5. Language background of respondents` children

Out of the total sample, 139(55%) respondents have children. They were asked to report on their child/ren`s language background. Accordingly, language background of respondents` children as MT and SL is analyzed in this study as follows.

Table 16a: Language background of respondents` children

SL	MT of respondents` children									
	A/O	A	D	K	Y	S	C	E	T	Total
	52(37.41%)	81(58%)	3(2.15)	1(0.7%)	2(1.4%)	0	0	0	0	139(100%)
A/O	=	63(78%)	1(33.3%)	-	2(100%)	-	-	-	-	66(47.5%)
A	49(94%)	=	3(100%)	1(100%)	2(100%)	-	-	-	-	55(39.56%)
D	4(7.7%)	4(4.9%)	=	-	-	-	-	-	-	8(5.7%)
K	5(9.6%)	2(2.5%)	-	=	_	-	-	-	-	7(5%)
Y	-	3(3.7%)	-	-	=	-	-	-	-	3(2.16%)
C	-	2(2.5%)	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	2(1.43%)
E	-	2(2.5%)	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	2(1.43%)
S	3(5.8%)	3(3.7%)	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	6(4.3%)
T	-	5(6.2%)	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	5(3.6%)

As can be seen from the table, the overwhelming majority of children are Amharic MT speakers 81(58%); 52(37.41%) of children are Afan Oromo MT speakers; 3(2.5%) children speak Dawro as MT; 2(1.4%) speak Yem as MT and 1(0.7%) speaks Kafinoonoo as MT. However, Silt`e, Chaha, Ezha and Tigrigna are not reported as MT of children by parent respondents in the sociolinguistic setting of the study.

Regarding SL of respondents` children, the majority of children, 66(47.3%), are Afan Oromo SL speakers followed by Amharic, 55(39.56%). All the remaining languages are spoken as SL by respondents` children but at lesser extents. In general, Afan Oromo is a dominant SL of children followed by Amharic whereas Chaha and Ezha are SL of respondents` children to lesser extents.

When we compare SL of children in relation to their MT; all Dawro, Yem and Kafinoonoo MT speaking children are SL speakers of Amharic. All Yem and 1(33.3%) of Dawro MT speaking children are SL speakers of Afan Oromo. Most 49(94%) of Afan Oromo MT speaking children are Amharic SL speakers. However, some Afan Oromo MT children are SL speakers of Kafinoonoo, Dawro and Silt`e. The majority of Amharic MT speaking children, on the other hand, are Afan Oromo SL speakers. All languages are acquired as SL by Amharic MT speaking children though at varying degree.

To sum up, the overwhelming majority of children are Amharic MT speakers followed by Afan Oromo. Concerning SL, largest numbers of children speak Afan Oromo as SL followed by Amharic whereas the least number of children speak Chaha and Ezha as SL in the study area.

Concerning the number of languages known by respondents` children, the greatest percentages of respondents` children speak two languages. Consider the following table.

Table 16b: Number of languages known by respondents` children

monolingual respondents` children		bilingual respondents` children		multilingual respondents` children		Total	
Fr	%	Fr	F%	Fr	%	Fr	%
2	1.43	118	84.89	19	13.7	139	100

As conveyed in the above table, out of the total respondents` children, 118(84.89%) know two languages, 19(13.7%) know three languages. Only 2(1.43%) know one language.

4.2.6. MT comparison of respondents with their families` MT

In this section, comparison of respondents` MT in relation to their families` MT (fathers, mothers and children) will be described in detail.

Table 17: MT comparison of respondents with their families` MT

	MT																			
	A/O		A		D		E		K		Y		S		T		C		Total	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
F	112	44	50	19.8	23	9	9	3.6	16	6.3	15	5.9	10	4	9	3.6	9	3.6	253	100
M	104	41	70	27.7	16	6	9	3.6	14	5.5	13	5.1	9	3.6	10	4	5	2	250	100
R	105	41	95	37	18	7	4	1.6	7	2.8	11	4.3	5	2	3	1.2	5	2	253	100
C	52	37	81	58	3	2	_	_	1	0.7	2	1.4	_	_	_	_	_	_	139	100

F- fathers, M-mothers, R-respondents, C-children

As can be seen from the table, significant differences are observed when we compare MT of respondents with their families` MT. In the case of fathers` and mothers` MT, Afan Oromo is a predominant language and all the other languages are also acquired as MT by much number of respondents` fathers and mothers. In the contrary, with respect to respondents` MT, Afan Oromo still takes the largest proportion but the number of Amharic speakers as MT becomes much bigger than the number of fathers and mothers Amharic speakers as MT. In this case, as the number of Amharic

MT speakers increase, the numbers of all the other languages MT speakers decrease. Moreover, in the case of respondents` children the proportion of Amharic MT speakers extremely increases. While the number of Afan Oromo, Dawro, Yem and Kafinoonoo MT speakers decrease. Even, the numbers of Ezha, Silt`e, Tigrigna and Chaha MT speakers have reduced to zero.

In general, the number of Amharic MT speakers is high among children and low among fathers and mothers whereas the numbers of all the remaining languages MT speakers are low among children (even zero for Ezha, Silt`e, Chaha and Tigrigna) and high among fathers and mothers.

To sum up, the above data indicates that as the number of Amharic MT speakers increase from the fathers and mothers to the respondents` children, the numbers of all the other languages MT speakers decrease from the fathers and mothers to the respondents` children. This shows that there is a tendency of language shift from all languages to Amharic. In line with this, Fasold (1984) states when a language is more used by older generation than younger, it shows a good symptom of language shift.

4.3. Language use in various domains

In this section, language use across different domains such as the home, neighbourhood, friendship, recreational, school, administration, public security, public transportation, market, school, religious and social gathering places is presented and discussed. Language use can be studied in terms of domain (Fishman 1971). According to Fishman, a domain is distinguished by three characteristics: participants, location, and topic. Accordingly, the language use of respondents in different domains while communicating with different interlocutors is analyzed and interpreted. The analysis of these domains of language use highlights the description of the functional distribution of Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e, Ezha, Tigrigna and Chaha in the research setting. In some domains more than one language could be used. In the subsequent sections the major domains of language use will be described in detail. Along with the respondents` report on their language use in various domains, the researcher will cross-check it with the data gained through interview and observations.

4.3.1. Language use in home domain

Home is a setting where members of a family usually interact with each other. The interaction within family members in the home is deemed to be the final spot in which a minority language can be used (Dittmar 1976 and Romaine 1994). Hence, the home is the last bastion of minority languages. Regarding this Clyne (1997) argues that the home domain is the least locale in which minority

languages can survive. In line with this, respondents of this study were asked what language(s) they most often use with their family members (grandparents, parents, children, siblings and spouse) in the home domain. Their responses are presented and analyzed in the following table.

Table 18: Language use in the home domain: with parents, grandparents, children, siblings and spouses.

Language(s)	Language most often used at home with:									
	Parents		Grandparents		Children		Siblings		Spouse	
	Fr	**%**	**Fr**	**%**	**Fr**	**%**	**Fr**	**%**	**Fr**	**%**
A/O	113	44.66	86	38.22	27	19.4	65	25.7	45	30
A	99	39.13	73	32.44	64	46	112	44.3	63	42
D	8	3.2	13	5.78	_	-	11	4.3	_	_
E	4	1.6	7	3.11	_	-	4	1.6	_	_
K	2	0.8	9	4	_	_	3	1.2	_	_
Y	6	2.4	11	4.9	5	3.6	4	1.6	4	2.67
S	4	1.6	6	2.67	_	_	3	1.2	__	_
T	2	0.8	5	2.22	_	_	3	1.2	_	_
C	3	1.2	5	2.22	_	_	4	1.6	_	_
A+A/O	12	4.7	10	4.44	25	18	25	10	23	15.33
A+K	_	_	_	_	5	3.6	4	1.6	7	4.67
A+Y	_	_	_	_	3	2.16	8	3.2	_	_
A+S	_	_	_	_	7	5	3	1.2	5	3.33
A+T	_	_	_	_	4	2.9	4	1.6	3	2
Total	***253***	***100***	***225***	***100***	***139***	***100***	***253***	***100***	***150***	***100***

As it can be observed from table 18, the majority of respondents, 113(44.66%), use Afan Oromo in the home domain with their parents; 99(39.13%) respondents use Amharic with their parents. On the other hand, the use of other languages in the home domain with parents is lesser. Besides, the alternate use of all languages except Amharic and Afan Oromo is not reported by respondents. This shows that Afan Oromo followed by Amharic are dominantly used by respondents with their parents.

Out of the total sample, 225(88.93%) respondents have reported the language they use with their grandparents at home domain. The large number of respondents, 86(38.22%), use Afan Oromo while communicating with their grandparents. Next to Afan Oromo, Amharic is dominantly used, with 73(32.44%) respondents. However, the use of Ezha, Silt`e, Tigrigna are lesser in the home domain while respondents communicate with their grandparents. Moreover, the alternate use of all languages except Amharic and Afan Oromo is not claimed by respondents when they communicate with their grandparents in the home domain.

Concerning language use with children, out of 139(100%) respondents who have children, the overwhelming majority, 64(46%), use Amharic while communicating with their children at home. Following Amharic, 27(19.4%) respondents use Afan Oromo with their children. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is used by 25(18%) respondents. The least number of respondents use Yem with their children, 5(3.6%). Nonetheless, the alternate use of Amharic with all the other languages is smaller and the sole use of other languages is not indicated while respondents communicate with their children in the home domain.

When we consider language use of respondents with their siblings, the majority of respondents, 112(44.3%), use Amharic while communicating with their brothers and sisters at home, Next to Amharic, Afan Oromo takes the second rank being used between respondents and siblings in the home domain, with 65(25.7%) respondents. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is also significantly used between respondents and their siblings at home, 25(10%) respondents. On the contrary, the use of other languages is lesser when respondents communicate with their siblings in the home domain.

Regarding language use of respondents with their spouses, of the total 150(100%) married respondents, 63(42%) respondents use Amharic; 45(30%) use Afan Oromo while communicating with their wife or husband at home. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo between respondents and their spouses takes the third rank to be used between respondents and their spouses, with 23(15.33%) respondents. However, the use of Dawro, Ezha, Kafinoonoo, Tigrigna, Chaha and Silt`e is not reported while respondents communicate with their spouses at home.

In general, all languages (Amharic, Afan Oromo, Dawro, Yem, Ezha, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e, Chaha and Tigrigna) are used in the home domain. However, Amharic and Afan Oromo are predominantly used. Of these languages, Afan Oromo is extensively used while respondents communicate with their parents and grandparents. Amharic is largely used when respondents communicate with their children, siblings and spouses.

The above data discloses the intrusion of Amharic into the home domain. When seen across generational category, the Amharic use of respondents with children 46%, siblings 44.3%, spouses 42%, parents 39.13%, and grandparents 32.44%. This shows that a considerable proportion of the respondents is undergoing language shift from using their MT towards using Amharic. This result goes with Teketel`s (2011:48-50) findings. Regarding this, Dittmar (1976:178) expressed that a language which is not used at home is subject to shift. Similarly, Clyne (1997) argued that, the home

domain is often the last domain that survives in a minority language. Increasing use of a dominant language in the home domain is a very good indicator of the degree of language shift in a society.

4.3.2. Language use in neighbourhood, friendship and recreational domain

In this section, language use in the neighbourhood, friendship and recreational domain is analyzed.

4.3.2.1. Language use in neighbourhood domain

Table 19: Language use in the neighbourhood domain

Domain	Setting	Interlocutor	Languages used	Frequency	Percentage
Neighbourhood	***Neighbourhood***	***Neighbour***	Afan Oromo	82	32.41
			Amharic	102	40.31
			Dawro	6	2.4
			Yem	8	3.16
			Kafinoonoo	9	3.55
			Amharic+Afan Oromo	41	16.20
			Amharic+Tigrigna	5	1.98
			Total	***253***	***100***

As the above data reveals there are about six languages in use either exclusively or alternatively with Amharic in the neighbourhood domain. These are Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Yem, Kafinoonoo and Tigrigna. Of these languages, Amharic is widely used, with 102(40.31%) respondents followed by Afan Oromo, 82(32.41%) respondents. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo while respondents communicate with their neighbours is also significant. According to the above data Yem, Dawro, Kafinoonoo and Tigrigna are used in the neighbourhood domain to a lesser extent. Generally in this domain, Amharic is found to be the most dominant language followed by Afan Oromo.

4.3.2.2. Language use in friendship domain

Table 20: Language use in friendship domain

Domain	Setting	Interlocutor	Languages used	Frequency	Percentage
Friendship	***Cafeteria/ Bar***	***Friend***	Afan Oromo	70	27.67
			Amharic	93	36.76
			Dawro	9	3.55
			Yem	12	4.74
			Kafinoonoo	8	3.16
			Amharic+Afan Oromo	57	22.53
			Amharic+Tigrigna	4	1.58
			Total	***253***	***100***

As depicted in the above table, the majority of respondents, 93(36.76%), use Amharic while communicating with their friends followed by Afan Oromo, 70(27.67%) respondents. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo takes the third largest proportion to be used between respondents and their friends, with 57(22.53%) respondents. The use of Yem, Dawro, Kafinoonoo and Tigrigna is lesser in the friendship domain. In general, Amharic is a predominant language of friendship domain. Observation of the researcher also conveyed the dominant use of Amharic in this domain. Next to Amharic, Afan Oromo is used in this setting.

4.3.2.3. Language use in recreational domain

Among the total sample, 239 respondents have an experience of recreation in cafe` and bar. Accordingly, they have reported on their language use in recreational places.

Table 21: Language use in recreational domain

Domain	Setting	Interlocutor	Languages used	Frequency	Percentage
Recreational	***Cafeteria/Bar***	***Waiters/ waitress***	Afan Oromo	32	13.4
			Amharic	149	62.34
			Amharic+Afan Oromo	56	23.43
			Afan Oromo+Kafinoonoo	2	0.84
			Total	***239***	***100***

As can be seen from the above table, more than half of the respondents, 149(62.34%), use Amharic while communicating with waitress/waiters. A considerable number of respondents, 56(23.43%), use both Amharic and Afan Oromo alternatively while communicating with waiters/waitress in cafe`s/bars. The sole use of Afan Oromo in recreational area is lesser, 32(13.4%) respondents. Moreover, the alternate use of Amharic and Kafinoonoo is very rare.

Generally, Amharic is widely used in recreational areas as the above data indicates. It is also insured by the researcher while observing language use in the recreational domain.

4.3.3. Language use in court, public security, health centres, and workplace domains

This section describes the situation of language use in government offices such as court, public security, health centre, and workplace arenas. These arenas are also important to study language use of certain multilingual setting since they bring together different people with different backgrounds. Thus, in subsequent sections the respondents' response on what language(s) they most often use in court, public security, health centre and workplace are described in details in line with the data gained through observations and interview.

4.3.3.1. Language use in court

A court is one of the domains where different language speakers interact with judge to accuse someone or defend prosecution. Out of the total sample, 117 respondents have an experience of going court. In line with this, they were asked to report on their language use in court. The result of the report, hence, is revealed in table (22) below.

Table 22: Language use in court

Domain	Setting	Interlocutors	Language(s)	Frequency	Percent
Administration	Court	Judge	Afan Oromo	60	51.28
			Amharic	21[14]	17.95
			Amharic/Afan Oromo	17	14.6
			Interpreter	19	16.23
			Total	117	100.0

As can be seen from the above table, the majority of the respondents, 60(51.28%), use Afan Oromo while communicating with judge in the court domain. While 21(17.95%) respondents use Amharic in court, 19(16.23%) respondents communicate with judge through the help of interpreter. They claimed that, they express their ideas in Amharic then the interpreter interprets their ideas into Afan Oromo and again when the judge reply the interpreter interprets it into Amharic to the non-Afan Oromo speakers. Similarly, the researcher also observed the same thing while the legal process was going on in the court domain. The least number of respondents, 17(14.6%) use alternatively Amharic and Afan Oromo in the court domain.

4.3.3.2. Language use in the workplace

Workplace is another setting where different ethno-linguistic groups interact with each other for different purposes. According to Fishman (1971), workplaces are formal domains of language use. There are many government offices which bring together many people from various ethno-linguistic groups in Jimma town. Language use in workplace is mainly between workers and boss, workers and workers, and workers and customers. In accordance with this, out of the total sample, 60(23.71%) respondents are government employees in different offices. They were asked to report on their

[14] Though, the Oromiya Regional State Constitution recognizes only the use of Afan Oromo and interpreter in court, in this study some respondents indicated that they use Amharic while communicating with judge in court domain.

language use in their workplaces with their boss, colleagues and customers. Consider the table (23) below.

Table 23: Language use in workplaces

Language(s) used	*Interlocutors*					
	Boss		Colleagues		Customers	
	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
Afan Oromo	35	58.33	19	31.67	22	36.67
Amharic	16	26.67	13	21.67	11	18.33
Amharic/Afan Oromo	9	15	28	46.67	27	45
Total	60	100	60	100	60	100

As conveyed in the table above, out of the total sample, 60(23.71%) respondents are government employees in different institutions (both federal and regional) found in Jimma town. They were asked to report on their language use in their respective workplace with different interlocutors.

When we consider language use of respondents with their boss, Afan Oromo is mostly used 35(58.33%) followed by Amharic 16(26.67%). The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is lesser 9(15%) in the interactions of worker and boss.

In the case of interactions among workers, the greater number of respondents, 28(46.67%) reported that they alternatively use Amharic and Afan Oromo with their colleagues. Whereas 19(31.67%) respondents indicated that they use Afan Oromo, 13(21.67%) respondents use Amharic.

With regard to language use of government employee respondents with customers, nearly half of the respondents, 27(45%) use alternatively both Amharic and Afan Oromo. A considerable number of respondents, 22(36.67%) use sole Afan Oromo while communicating with customers in the workplaces. While 11(18.33%) respondents use Amharic with customers.

The data which obtained from observations and interview indicate that Afan Oromo and Amharic are major languages in the work places. The phenomena could be attributed to the sociolinguistic contexts of the workplace. Workers working in offices under Oromiya Regional State usually use Afan Oromo and sometimes use alternatively Afan Oromo and Amharic, while workers working in offices under Federal Government of Ethiopia usually use Amharic and sometimes both languages. Furthermore, in the offices that are under Oromiya Regional State, workers use Afan Oromo in formal situations (e.g. meeting, writing), but in informal occasions (e.g. spoken) they use Amharic and alternatively both languages to each other and customers. Moreover, it seems Amharic is

reserved for spoken interactions and Afan Oromo is used for written purposes such as writing letter, report, notices and the like.

In general, in the work places (offices), Afan Oromo is dominantly used when government employee respondents communicate with their boss. On the other hand, when government employee respondents communicate with their colleagues and customers the alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is dominant.

4.3.3.3. Language use in public security

Out of the total sample, 117(46.25%) respondents have experiences of interacting with police. They were asked to report on their language use while interacting with police. The result of the report, therefore, is revealed in table (24) below.

Table 24: Language use in public security

Domain	Setting	Interlocutors	Language(s)	Frequency	Percent
Adminis tration	Police station	Police	Afan Oromo	64	54.7
			Amharic	36	30.4
			Amharic+Afan Oromo	17	14.6
			Total	117	100.0

As disclosed in the above table, the majority of the respondents, 64(54.7%) use Afan Oromo while communicating with police; 36(30.76%) respondents use Amharic. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is reported by less number of respondents, 17(14.6%). The above data as well as observation of the researcher generally shows that Afan Oromo is dominantly used in the public security domain followed by Amharic.

4.3.3.4. Language use in health centre

Health centre is another domain where different ethno-linguistic groups interact with physicians. It is an important domain where various ethnic groups interact in order to get services they want. In accordance with this, out of the sample, 197(77.87%) respondents conveyed that they have experiences of going to health centres. They were asked to report on their language use with physicians in health centre.

Table 25: Language use in health centre

Domain	Setting	Interlocutors	Language(s)	Frequency	Percent
Administration	Health centre	Physician	Afan Oromo	43	21.82
			Amharic	58	29.44
			Amharic+Afan Oromo	96	48.73
			Total	197	100.0

As shown in the above table, relatively half of the respondents, 96(48.73%) reported that they alternatively use Amharic and Afan Oromo with their physicians at health centres. Amharic takes the second largest to be used between respondents and their physician, with 58(29.44%) respondents. A considerable number of respondents reported that they use Afan Oromo with their physician, with 43(21.82%) respondents. In general, the alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is dominant in health centres followed by the exclusive use of Amharic.

The researcher observation of the health centre domain also shows similar finding. The language use situation of one hospital and two clinics was observed by the researcher. The interaction between patients and physician was taken place predominantly by using the two languages alternatively.

4.3.4. Language use in market and public transportation domains

In this sub-section language use in market domain and public transportation places is presented and analyzed.

4.3.4.1. Language use in market domain

In market domain, different people with different backgrounds interact with each other for trading purpose. Therefore, it is one of the most important domains to describe language use. The Jimma markets are a setting where people of different linguistic and ethnic backgrounds interact with each other three times a week: Monday, Thursday and Saturday. There are three market places in the town. Two are local (small) markets and one is a principal market. As the town is situated at the border area of the SNNPRS, people come from the surrounding localities of this bordering region and different Woreda towns of Jimma Zone (Yonas 2002). On the market days, the degree of contact between different ethno-linguistic groups highly increases since the non-residents as well as residents of the town are gathered at the market places. In Jimma town markets, particularly Hirmata principal market, several items and commodities are usually exchanged between buyers and sellers. Respondents of this study were asked to report on what language(s) they use in market areas. The following table reveals the respondents` report on language use in the market places.

Table 26: Language use in market

Language used	Frequency	Percent
Afan Oromo	70	27.67
Amharic	44	17.4
Dawro	6	2.37
Kafinoonoo	7	2.76
Yem	7	2.76
Silt`e	9	3.55
Amharic/Afan Oromo	101	39.92
Amharic/Silt`e	6	2.37
Amharic / Ezha	3	1.2
Total	253	100.0

As depicted in the table above, out of the sample, 101(39.92%) respondents alternatively use Amharic and Afan Oromo with buyers or sellers while buying or selling different commodities in the market; 70(27.67%) respondents use Afan Oromo; 44(17.4%) respondents use Amharic. The use of Silt`e, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Dawro, the alternate use of Amharic and Silte, the alternate use of Amharic and Yem are reported by respondents to lesser extents.

According to the above data, there are seven languages (Amharic, Afan Oromo, Silt`e, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Dawro and Ezha) used in market domain. These languages are used either exclusively or alternatively together with Amharic. Of these, the alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is widely used. In line with this, the researcher personally observed the market domain when people buy or sell different commodities from each other. Transactions were carried out in different languages: Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e and the alternation of Amharic and some other languages. The alternation of Amharic and Afan Oromo is the most widely used language between buyers and sellers in the market places. The sole use of Amharic and Afan Oromo are also significantly used in the market places. On the contrary, the sole use of Dawro, Kafinoonoo, Yem and Silt`e are lesser.

In general, in the market domain of the research setting, Afan Oromo, Amharic, Silt`e, Kafinoonoo, Yem, Dawro and Ezha are used but at varying degrees. Buyers and/or sellers communicate in different languages. However, the alternation of Amharic and Afan Oromo is predominantly used followed the sole use of Afan Oromo and Amharic in the market domain. This finding goes with the finding of Cooper and Carpenter (1976: 253), and goes contrary to the finding of Samuel (2009) and Teketel (2011).

4.3.4.2. Language use at public transportation places

In this section, language use of respondents at public transportation places is presented and interpreted. Consider the following table.

Table 27: language use in public transportation

Language(s)	Language use with driver and/or assistant		Language use with passenger	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Afan Oromo	32	12.6	45	17.79
Amharic	154	60.86	125	49.4
Kafinoonoo	6	2.37	3	1.18
Dawro	4	1.6	4	1.58
Amharic+Afan Oromo	57	22.5	76	30.0
Total	253	100.0	253	100.0

As can be seen from the table above, language use in public transportation places is dominated by two languages: Amharic and Afan Oromo. These languages are used either exclusively or alternately. The use of the other languages (Kafinoonoo and Dawro) is lesser.

In the case of language use with drivers and/or assistants, more than half of respondents, 154(60.86%), use Amharic while communicating with drivers and/or assistants in public transportation areas. A considerable number of respondents, 57(22.5%), alternatively use Amharic and Afan Oromo when communicate with drivers and/or assistants. The sole use of Afan Oromo is reported by 32(12.6%) respondents. On the other hand, the use of Kafinoonoo and Dawro is reported by few number of respondents, with 6(2.37%) and 4(1.6%) respondents, respectively.

With regard to language use with passengers, again, the majority of respondents, 125(49.4%), use Amharic with passengers. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo takes the second proportion, with 76(30%) respondents. The sole use of Afan Oromo is also significantly used while respondents communicate with passengers, with 45(17.7%) respondents. The use of Dawro and Kafinoonoo is reported by the fewest number of respondents, (1.58% and 1.18%) respondents, respectively.

In general, Amharic is found to be a predominant language at public transportation places followed by the alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo. The researcher`s observation also reveals the extensive use of Amharic at this setting. This finding is associated with language of wider communication (see section 4.3.7).

4.3.5. Language use in school domain

It is generally assumed that schools are one of the main agents of language spread (Fasold 1984). Education and language have a very close relationship. On one hand, the acquisition of knowledge is highly connected to the ability to speak and understand a language; on the other hand, a language due to its function as a means of cognition, promotes and secures the acquisition of knowledge (Meyer and Ritcher 2003). Schools are a domain in which members of all ethno-linguistic groups are served.

Of the total sample, 66(26%) respondents are students at both primary and secondary levels. They were asked to report on their language use with their teachers and classmates in the school domain. In accordance with this, their responses have been analyzed in the subsequent table.

Table 28: Language use in school domain

Setting	School level	Interlocutor	Language(s) used					
			A/O	A	A+A/O	A+ENG	A/O+ENG	Total
School	1-4	Teacher	6(46.15%)	5(38.46%)	3(23%)	1(7.69%)	_	13(100)
		Classmate	5(38.46%)	4(30.76%)	4(30.76%)	_	_	13(100)
school	5-8	Teacher	8(33.33%)	9(37.5%)	7(29%)	_	_	24(100)
		Classmate	3(12.5%)	9(37.5%)	12(50%)	_	_	24(100)
school	9-12	Teacher	7(24.13%)	16(55.1%)	3(10.3%)	2(6.88%)	1(3.44%)	29(100)
		Classmate	5(17.24%)	17(48.3%)	4(13.8%)	3(10.3%)	_	29(100)

As illustrated in the table above, three languages: Afan Oromo, Amharic and English are used in the school domain.

In the first cycle of elementary level (1-4th grades), communication between students and teachers is dominated by the use of Afan Oromo followed by Amharic. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo and the alternate use of Amharic and English are lesser. Besides, communication among students is widely carried out through the use of Afan Oromo. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo and the sole use of Amharic are also significantly used between students at this school level.

In the second cycle of elementary level (5-8th grades), communication between students and teachers is mostly conducted by Amharic, 9(37.5%), followed by Afan Oromo, 8(33.33%). The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is also significantly used for this function, 7(29%). On the other hand, communication among students is carried out mostly in alternation of Amharic and Afan Oromo, 12(50%), followed by the sole use of Amharic, 9(37.5%). The exclusive use of Afan Oromo is less significant in communication between students at this school level, 3(12.5%).

In the secondary level (9-12th grades), communication between students and teachers is frequently carried out through Amharic, 16(55.1%). A considerable number of student respondents use Afan Oromo with their teacher, 7(24.13%). The rest student respondents use Amharic and Afan Oromo alternatively 3(10.3%), English 2(6.88%), and the alternation of Amharic and English 1(3.44%) while communicating with their teachers. On the other hand, with regard to communication among students, majority of respondents use Amharic while communicating with their classmates, 17(48.3%). While 5(17.24%) respondents use Afan Oromo; 4(13.8%) respondents use Amharic and Afan Oromo alternatively and 3(10.3%) respondents use Amharic and English alternatively with their classmates.

In general, as the above data indicates, Amharic, Afan Oromo and English are used either exclusively or alternatively in school domain. With regard to first cycle of elementary school (1-4th grades) Afan Oromo is dominantly used followed by Amharic. However, in the case of second cycle of elementary school (5-8th grades) the alternate use of Afan Oromo and Amharic is most common whereas in the secondary school (9-12th grades) Amharic is dominantly used followed by Afan Oromo. This attributes to the reason that both languages have significant role as medium of instruction in elementary level in the study area. From this finding we can deduce that as the school level of pupils increases, the language they use is more of SL, i.e. Amharic.

4.3.6. Language use in religious domain and social gathering places

This section presents language use in the religious institutions and social gathering places.

4.3.6.1. Language use in religious domain

Language and religion are highly interrelated phenomena. Language will have a better chance for maintenance when it is used in religious affairs of its respective speakers (Fishman 1991 cited in Clyne 1997). Language is an important instrument through which religious issues are practically manifested. Religion is also the most important domain to maintain and develop a language of its respective followers. It plays a vital role in shaping a language use of an individual and society. In line with this, Spolsky (2009:32) states, "the religious domain is the first social structure outside the family that aims to influence language use." Hence, using a language in religion domain has a very strong impact on its future status (maintenance). Respondents of this study were asked to report on what language(s) they most frequently use in the religious domain such as churches, mosques and other traditional religious practices areas with religious leaders, and other followers of the religion. Their responses are described in the following table.

Table 29: language use in religious domain

Language(s) used	when praying and discussing with religious leaders			
	Praying in group		Discussing spiritual issues with religious leaders	
	Fr	%	Fr	%
A/O	81	33.9	62	26.5
A	93	38.91	115	49.14
Geez[15]	_	_	6	2.6
Arabic	_	_	16	6.4
A+A/O	65	27.2	27	11.53
A/O+ Arabic	_	_	1	0.4
A+ Geez	_	_	7	3
Total	239	100	234	100

As can be seen from the table above, out of the total sample, 239 (94.47%) respondents have an experience of praying in group. As the above data reveals when religious followers pray in group, there are only two languages used: Afan Oromo and Amharic. These languages are used either solely or alternatively. Out of the total, 93(38.91%) respondents use Amharic when praying in group; 81(33.9%) respondents use Afan Oromo and 65(27.2%) respondents alternatively use Amharic and Afan Oromo when praying in group in the religious places.

With regard to language use with religious leaders, relatively half of respondents, 115(49.14%), use Amharic while communicating with religious leaders. Next to Amharic, substantial number of respondents, 62(26.5%), use Afan Oromo with religious leaders. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is reported by 27(11.5%) respondents. The exclusive use of Arabic and Geez are indicated by 16(6.4%) and 13(5.55%) respondents, respectively. The alternate use of Amharic and Geez, and Afan Oromo and Arabic are reported by least number of respondents, 7(3%) and 1(0.4%), respectively.

According to the interviewees (the elders) and researcher`s observation, in the Orthodox Church, preaching has been held frequently in Amharic. Besides, Geez is the liturgical language of Ethiopian Orthodox Christian Church. On the other hand, in the Protestant Church, preaching has been held mostly in Amharic and Afan Oromo. The interviewees also indicated that there are some Protestant Churches that exclusively use Afan Oromo. In Mosque, preaching has been held in three languages (Afan Oromo, Amharic and Arabic) according to the interviewees` response and the researcher`s observation of religious domain.

[15] Geez and Arabic were not mentioned as SL by respondents, but here they were reported by a few respondents as used in religious domain when respondents communicate with religious leaders.

In general, two languages are dominantly used in religious domain. Amharic is extensively used for both functions followed by Afan Oromo. However, the other languages are not used in this domain. Nevertheless, the religious sphere is believed to be one area where a minority language is sought to be used and there by this would help the language's upholding (Baker 1996).

4.3.6.2. Language use at social gathering places

Social gathering places such as *Ikub*, *Idir*, wedding and funeral ceremonies are very important to describe language use. They are important because they are areas where different people from different ethnic groups interact with each other. With regard to this, respondents were asked to report on their language use at these places. Consider the following table.

Table 30: language use at social gathering places

Language(s)	Language use at social gathering places	
	Frequency	Percent
Afan Oromo	57	22.5
Amharic	103	40.71
Dawro	5	1.97
Kafinoonoo	2	0.8
Yem	2	0.8
Amharic+Afan Oromo	46	18.18
Amharic+Dawro	7	2.8
Amharic+Ezha	4	1.6
Amharic+Kafinoonoo	4	1.6
Amharic+Yem	7	2.8
Amharic+Silt`e	3	1.2
Amharic+Tigrigna	7	2.8
Amharic+Chaha	5	2.0
Total	253	100.0

As depicted in the above table, with regard to language use at social gathering places, most respondents use Amharic followed by Afan Oromo, 103(40.71%) and 57(22.5%) respondents, respectively. The alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is also used at this setting, 46(18.18%) respondents. On the other hand, the use of Dawro, Kafinoonoo and Yem is lesser. In general, Amharic is widely used at social gathering places followed by Afan Oromo. The use of other languages at this setting is less dominant.

4.3.7. Lingua franca in Jimma town

In a multilingual society, it often happens that one language is restricted to the home or neighbourhood domains while the other language is used much more widely, especially for communicating with people who speak other language. The language that used widely among a

different languages speaker is often referred to as lingua franca or language of wider (inter-ethnic) communication. Lingua franca may also be used in the home and neighbourhood domains, especially by the younger generation; but typically it is spoken as a vehicle of communication between people who come from local communities and speak different languages (MTs). Respondents of this study were asked to report on what language(s) they use when meet someone for first time and do not know what language s/he speaks. Consider the following table.

Table 31: language used between speakers of different languages in Jimma town

Language(s)	Frequency	Percent
Afan Oromo	76	30
Amharic	160	63.24
Amharic + Afan Oromo	17	6.71
Total	253	100.0

As depicted in the table above, the majority of respondents, 160(63.24%), use Amharic while communicating with speakers of other languages. Respondents with considerable number, 70(30%), use Afan Oromo when they communicate with speakers of other languages whereas 17(6.71%) respondents use both Amharic and Afan Oromo to communicate with speakers of other languages. From this we can conclude that Amharic facilitates communication between different languages speakers. Observation of the researcher and interview with elders also revealed that Amharic is serving as a lingua franca between speakers of different languages across various domains. In general, Amharic is found to be the language of out-group communication (lingua franca) in Jimma town followed by Afan Oromo. This result goes with Meyer`s finding (2006) who found that Amharic is used as a lingua franca in many towns` of Ethiopia.

4.4. Linguistic data on language contact

In the following sections, the sketch overviews of borrowing and CS are presented and discussed in some details.

Borrowing and CS are some linguistic outcomes of language contact in multilingual settings. These linguistic outcomes of language contact are often observed among Afan Oromo[16] and Amharic MTs and/or SLs speakers. This is due to the fact that these languages are dominantly used across various domains, either together or exclusively. Again, they are relatively the predominant languages as MT and SL in the study area.

[16] This does not mean that there is no language contact (borrowing and CS) between the other languages in the study area, but in the current study the most frequently observed is between Afan Oromo and Amharic.

The data on these concepts were collected via observation: in recreational areas (children and youth, while they communicate with each other); in the offices (civil servants, while they interact with each other); and in the market areas (merchants, while communicating with each other to buy and/or sell). Moreover, some data were extracted from data gained through interview. The researcher informally recorded the elicited data by audio recorder and wrote down in some cases (offices).

4.5.1. Borrowing

As it was discussed in section 4.3, Amharic and Afan Oromo are predominantly used alternatively in different domains. For this reason, Amharic loan words are incorporated in Afan Oromo speakers' conversation (MT and/or SL). In other words, borrowed words from Amharic into Afan Oromo are commonly observed in the habitual language use of Afan Oromo speakers in the study area. Consider the following extracts.

Amharic Loan words in Afan Oromo (collected from market domain)

Amharic	Afan Oromo	Gloss
tɨrf	tirfi:	`profit`
kisara	kisa:ra:	`deficit`
bərbər:e	barbare:	`pepper`
ʃɨnkurt	ʃunkurti:	`onion`

Loan words in religious terminologies (collected from religious domain)

Amharic	Afan Oromo	Gloss
k`ɨd:ase	k`id:ase:	`liturgy`
k`es	k`e:si:	`priest`
tabot	ta:bota	`arc of the convenant`
s`əbəl	t`abala	`holy water`
məsk`əl	mask`ali:	`cross`
s`o:m	t`o:mi:	`fasting`

Usually, loan words from Amharic into Afan Oromo undergo phonological processes (Tesfaye 2008: 34-47). Phonotactically for the reason that Afan Oromo and Amharic exhibit differences, this brings about internal modification of borrowed words from source language (Amharic) to recipient language (Afan Oromo). This is illustrated as follows:

(1)Vowel epenthesis – insertion of vowel in order to block impermissible existence of consonant at word final position. According to Tesfaye (2008:35), most Afan Oromo words do not end in consonantal phonemes except: /l/, /t/, /n/, and /s/. Thus, Amharic loan words in Afan Oromo insert vowel at word final position. Consider the following extract.

Amharic	Afan Oromo	Gloss
s`o:m	t`o:mi:	`fasting`
ʃɨnkurt	ʃunkurti:	`onion`
sərg	sargi:	`feast`

In the data above, it can basically be considered that words in Amharic end in consonantal phonemes. The borrowing Amharic words in Afan Oromo, however, are finally added the default vowel forms although most frequently /i:/ is used for this purpose.

The other and most frequently occurring phonological process which modifies vowel phonemes is the replacement of central vowels of Amharic by non-central vowels in Afan Oromo. Amharic vowels /ɨ/ (the high central vowel) and /ə/ (the mid central vowel) are absent in Afan Oromo. Upon their adaptation into Afan Oromo, these non-native vowels are always replaced by one of the native vowels of the language.

The Amharic mid central vowel /ə/ and /ɨ/ are usually replaced by /a/ and /i/ in Afan Oromo, respectively. Consider the following extracts:

(2) /ə/ _____/a/

Amharic	Afan Oromo	Gloss
bərbər:e	barbare:	`pepper`
məsk`al	mask`ali:	`cross`

(3) /ɨ/ _____/i/

Amharic	Afan Oromo	Gloss
gɨbɨr	gibira	`tax`

The above data shows that in the course of borrowing Amharic loan words into Afan Oromo, the vowels forms change is visible. Due to the reason that Afan Oromo does not have mid central

vowels, the sounds are replaced by non_mid central vowels in the borrowing language, Afan Oromo (Tesfaye 2008:36).

(4) Native Afan Oromo words do not have the consonants such as /s`/, /v/, and /z/ (Tesfaye 2008:35). These sounds occur only in loan words and pronounced by people speaking Afan Oromo but have good awareness of Amharic loan words to Afan Oromo.

Amharic	Afan Oromo	Gloss
s`əbəl	t`abala	` holy water` /s`/_____/t`/
s`ələt	t`alo:ti:	`praying`/s`/_____/t`/
məzmur	masmu:ri:	`spiritual songs` /z/ _____ /s/
mize	mi:ndʒe:	` best man` /z/_____/dʒ/

To sum up, the above analysis on borrowing reveals that most of the Amharic loan words in Afan Oromo are modified to fit the phonological rules of the language.

4.5.2. Code switching and code mixing

In Jimma town, as it was discussed under section 4.3, Amharic and Afan Oromo are widely used across all domains exclusively or alternatively. The researcher also observed that many people use both the languages interchangeably. In such contexts, instances of CS and CM were observed and some were also recorded informally using a tape recorder.

CS and CM take place mostly among Afan Oromo, Amharic and English languages. Since the majority of the dwellers of the town are MT or SL speakers of Afan Oromo and Amharic, instances of CS are predominantly (most visibly) happened between the two languages, i.e. the practice of CS between Afan Oromo and Amharic is frequently observed in the study area. This can be associated with the result of the description of respondents language use across different domains. That is, in most of the domains, the alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is more common than the use of other languages. As the researcher`s observations reveal, Afan Oromo speakers are observed while switching between Afan Oromo and Amharic in different domains: market, administration, recreation and the like.

Consider the following instances of both intra-sentential and inter-sentential switching between Afan Oromo and Amharic. **Amharic mixed items are written in italics whereas the borrowed ones are**

written in bold. Throughout the discussion, the researcher tries to analyze the question `why the speakers switched into another language? `

Data taken from market domain while a person from the kebele and a merchant of cabbage discuss on environmental sanitation.

A: ma:li:-f **bo:ta**: kana_t:i *k`oʃa:ʃa:* gat:_an

INTR-FOC place PROX :VIC-DAT dust leave:PV_2PL

`Why did you send out the dust things here? `

B: ma:li:-f *ʔand bir:_u_n kafl_nal*

INTR-FOC one birr_DEF_ACC pay:PV-1PL

`Why? We already paid the one birr. `

A : *k`oʃa:ʃa: t`ara:*g-ot_*ni* im:o: **bir:i**: tok:o **bič**a:_**n** iʃ:i ʤeɗ - ani - i kana hin ka:s_an

dust sweep-3PL_NOM in-addition birr one only_INST ok say:pv-3PL - CNV this NEG take up:IPV-3PL

`Dust Sweepers will not take out this by only one birr. `

B: *ʔiň:a iz:i mə_sira_t ʔann_čil_mm mabt jel:ə_ni-mm*

we here VN_work_VN NEG_be able:IPV_NEG right aux:IPV-3P-NEG

`Can`t we work here! Don`t we have the right to do so. `

In the above data, the items: *k`oʃa:ʃa:, ʔand bir:un kaflanal, k`oʃa:ʃa: t`ara:got_ni,* and iʃ:i are Amharic items mixed in the middle of Afan Oromo sentences (intra-sentential switching). In the conversation, there is also an instance of inter-sentential switching, what B utters at the end (*ʔiň:a iz:i məsirat ʔan čilim mabt jel:ənim)* is switched at sentence boundary into an Afan Oromo speech event (inter-sentential switching). The items that are written in bold are Amharic loan words in Afan Oromo.

Linguistic data on intra-sentential switching are collected from office while boss and worker communicate with each other. **Amharic mixed items are written in italics whereas the borrowed ones are written bold.**

Boss: harʔa *ka – sa:ti: sabsaba: - n* ʤir - a

today DAT – time meeting – NOM AUX:IPV-3SM

`Today in the afternoon, there is a meeting. `

Worker: **bo:ta:** kami – tti

place where– DAT

(Lit. at which place?)

`Where is a venue? `

Boss: gibe: *ʔad:era:ʃi-t:i*

gibe hall-DAT

`At Gibe hall. `

In the above data, Amharic structures at Phrase and word level are code mixed into Afan Oromo discourse.

Instances of intra-sentential and inter-sentential switching between Afan Oromo and Amharic collected from office while colleagues communicate with each other are addressed in the following section.

1) t`alaja: ʤar:i *timirt ministe:r:i* bar:e:s:-an sana dub:is - e - n ʤir – a

letter family education minister write:PV-3P that read:PV – 1S – CNV AUX:IPV-3SM

`I read a letter that ministry of education wrote. `

2) nama bara kana-a ma:l ʔaman- u *səw –n ma-man k`əbr – o nəw* ʤeɗ - a

man year this- GEN INTR believe:IPV-3P man-ACC VN-believe bury:IP-3PV:CNN COP say:IPV-3SM

ʔama:r:i

Amhara

`How to believe the present days man? Amhara, even stresses ``believing in man is after he/she buried! ``

3) **demo:za** ko: kan ʤiʔa tok:o - o *hid:a:se: gid:ibi- if* guma:č - e – n ʤir – a

salary POSS:1S REL month one-DAT renaissance dam- DAT contribute:PV-1S-CNV AUX:IPV-3SM

`I contributed my one month salary for Renaissance dam project. `

From the above data, the following linguistic items were identified as Amharic linguistic elements switched into Afan Oromo at the middle of sentence: (1) *timirt ministe:r:i* and (2) *hid:a:se: gid:ibiif.*

An instance of inter-sentential switching was also identified in the above data: *səwn maman k`əbro nəw.*

When we analyze the reasons (why code switch) of the above linguistic data, in the first data (1) the speaker was switched for referential purpose. He/she might face difficulty in finding appropriate items due to his/her linguistic ability. In the second data (2) the speaker code switched to quote the original message in the language it was said (Amharic). In the third data (3) the speaker code switched to fill lexical gap.

Instances of intra-sentential and inter-sentential switching extracted from data gathered from recreational domain while friends communicate each other.

4) k`ar*ʃ*i: ba:jʔe: hin k`ab-n-u *silazi: za:re: mə-znan- at ʔann_čil_mm*

money much NEG AUX:PV-1PL-NEG so today VN-be glorious:IPV-VN NEG_be able:IPV_NEG

`We do not have much money! Therefore, today, we can`t refresh ourselves. `

5) *wuha: - n:a: fisa: ʃ-i* bira gaʔ- e – n ʤir -a na e:g – i

water- CONJ fluid-GEN LOC arrive:PV – 1S – CNV AUX:PV-3SM 1S:OM wait:IMP-2S

`I have arrived around the water and sewerage bureau wait for me! `

6) *maz:agaʤ:a: fit-la-fi:ti- tti* wal ha argi-n-u

municipality face – ABL- face –DAT each other JUS see:IPV- 3P-JUS

`Let`s see each other in front of municipality. `

7) *iʃ:i* boru na – af *daw:al - i*

ok tomorrow 1S:OM-ABL call:IMP-2S

`Ok! Call me back tomorrow! `

Here, example (4) is an instance of inter-sentential switching between Afan Oromo and Amharic whereas (5), (6) and (7) are instances of intra-sentential switching between Afan Oromo and Amharic.

In the following extract, CS could be occurred at conversational level. In which one speaker (buyer) utters in Amharic and another speaker (seller) in Afan Oromo.

8) A: *do:ro: -w* *sint* *new*

hen- 3SM:DEF how much COP:3SM

`How much is the hen? `

B: sad:et:ami: *ʃ*an

eighty five

`Eighty five birr. `

In the above extract, a remarkable instance of CS at conversational turns was observed. Such kind of conversational turns were frequently observed by the researcher in various domains, especially, in recreational and market domains.

There are also some English discourse markers inserted in the speech behaviour of bilingual speakers of Afan Oromo. Consider the following extracts.

9) *eni:we:ji* boru hodʒi: gal-u-n ko: hin haf-u

anyway tomorrow work get:IPV-VN-NOM 1S:POSS NEG leave:IPV:3SM-NEG

`Anyway, tomorrow I will at work. `

10) kun *or:edi:* wa:n ɗum-e ɗa

this already thing finish:PV-3SM COP

`This is already finished. `

In the above data, English discourse markers (*eni:we:ji*) and (*or:edi:*) were identified as instances of intra-sentential switching into Afan Oromo.

To sum up, these all instances of CS and CM reveal that there has been frequent contact between Afan Oromo and Amharic in the study area. In other words, it seems to be the richest data showing the pervasive contact between the two languages. Only a few items are found to be English words.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary

The main objective of this study was to describe and analyze the sociolinguistic situations of the linguistically diversified settings of Jimma town. To attain the intended objective of the study, basic research questions were raised regarding patterns of multilingualism, language use and language contact in chapter one. Moreover, the socio-historical background of the community and the basic information of the study area were described in the first chapter.

The conceptual framework and review of related studies were reviewed and presented in the second chapter. Concepts like language use, domains of language use, multilingualism, language contact and outcomes of language contact: borrowing, code switching, code mixing, language maintenance and shift, and studies related to this research were discussed in the second chapter.

The research design and methodology employed in the study were discussed in the third chapter. To address basic research questions and objectives raised in chapter one, 3 kebeles were randomly selected from 13 kebeles of the town. From the selected kebeles, 270 respondents were selected on the basis of the availability and willingness to participate in the study. In addition, 10 resourceful persons (5 from elders and 5 from children) were selected purposely for interview. The required data were gathered through questionnaire, interview and observation. The collected data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively.

The collected data were analyzed and interpreted in the fourth chapter. For doing this, the results from the questionnaires (close-ended items) were tabulated and their frequencies and percentages were calculated for each item. The data obtained from the open ended items of the questionnaire, interview and observation were qualitatively analyzed.

Based on the analayzed data the following major findings are drawn:

1. Concerning patterns of multilingualism among various ethno-linguistic groups in the town the following results are obtained:

1.1. The results of the study disclosed that Jimma is a multilingual town with nine languages spoken as MT and SL: Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e, Chaha, Ezha and Tigrigna. Of these languages, Afan Oromo is acquired as MT by majority of the

respondents followed by Amharic whereas Tigrigna and Ezha are acquired as MT by a few respondents. Amharic is largely learned as SL by majority of the respondents followed by Afan Oromo whereas Chaha and Tigrigna are learned as SL by a few respondents.

1.2. Out of the total sample, majority of the respondents know more than one language. The overwhelming majority of the respondents, 153(60.47%), know two languages; 94(37.37%) respondents know three languages whereas a few respondents, 6(2.37%), know only one language, i.e. their MT. Most of the monolinguals are Afan Oromo and Amharic speaking respondents.

1.3. A considerable number of respondents from all ethnic groups acquired Amharic as MT to greater and Afan Oromo to lesser degree. This shows that there is a tendency of language shift in favour of Amharic to greater and Afan Oromo to lesser degree, i.e. respondents with good number from all ethnic groups do not speak their ethnic language as MT: the Tegaru (67%), Kafa (56%),Guarge (53%), Silt`e (50%), Dawro (31%), Yem (27%), Oromo (21%) and Amhara (9%).

1.4. Amharic and Afan Oromo as MT are distributed across all the age groups followed by Kafinoonoo and Yem. Furthermore, Amharic takes the largest proportion being spoken by respondents` children as MT followed by Afan Oromo whereas Ezha, Silt`e, Tigrigna and Chaha are not acquired as MT by children age group in the study area.

1.5. Parents (mothers and fathers) are MT speakers of all the languages. However, the majority of them speak Afan Oromo as MT followed by Amharic whereas the least of them speak Tigrigna, Chaha and Ezha as MT. Most of respondents` parents are SL speakers of Amharic to a greater and Afan Oromo to a certain extent while the least number of respondents` parents are SL speakers of Ezha, Chaha and Tigrigna.

1.6. Afan Oromo takes the first rank being spoken as MT by respondents` spouses followed by Amharic whereas Dawro takes the least rank being spoken as MT by respondents` spouses. Regarding SL, Amharic is a predominant SL of respondents` spouses followed by Afan Oromo while Tigrigna and Ezha are learnt as SL by the least number of respondents` spouses.

1.7. Children of respondents are largely MT speakers of Amharic followed by Afan Oromo whereas Silt`e, Chaha, Ezha and Tigrigna are not reported as MT of children by their parents in the sociolinguistic setting of the study. Concerning children`s SL, majority of them are SL speakers of Afan Oromo followed by Amharic; whereas the least number of children`s are SL speakers of Chaha and Ezha.

1.8. When we compare respondents` MT with their families` MT, significant difference is shown; in the case of fathers` and mothers` MT, Afan Oromo and all the other languages are acquired as MT by significant number of respondents. In the case of respondents` MT, Afan Oromo still takes the majority being spoken as MT, but the percentage of Amharic MT speakers becomes much bigger than fathers` and mothers` MT while the number of all the other languages MT speakers decrease. Moreover, in the case of respondents` children MT, the percentage of Amharic MT speakers extremely increases. Hence, the percentage of Amharic MT speakers increases to a larger degree across the parents` MT into the children`s MT whereas the percentages of all the other languages speakers as MT decrease across the parents` MT into the children`s MT. Even, reduced to zero for some languages: Ezha, Silt`e, Tigrigna and Chaha.

2. Regarding language use across various domains the following findings are obtained:

2.1. In the home domain, all the languages (Amharic, Afan Oromo, Dawro, Yem, Ezha, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e, Chaha and Tigrigna) are used. However, Amharic and Afan Oromo are predominantly used. Of these languages, Afan Oromo is extensively used while respondents communicating with their parents and grandparents whereas Amharic is largely used when respondents communicating with their children, siblings and spouses. On the other hand, Dawro, Ezha, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e, Tigrigna and Chaha are not used while respondents communicating with their spouse and children. For these respondents, Amharic is the preferred language to communicate with their spouse and children. This discloses that the intrusion of Amharic into the home domain.

2.2. In the neighbourhood and friendship domains: Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Yem, Kafinoonoo and Tigrigna are used. However, Amharic is dominantly used followed by Afan Oromo whereas Tigrigna and Dawro are used to a lesser extent. On the other hand, in

recreational domain only three languages are used: Afan Oromo, Amharic and Kafinoonoo. Of these languages, Amharic is extensively used whereas the use of Kafinoonoo is lesser.

2.3. In the government offices: court, public security, health centres and workplace, only two languages are used: Afan Oromo and Amharic. These languages are used exclusively or alternatively. Nonetheless, the exclusive use of Afan Oromo is most common in court, public security and workplace. The alternate use of both languages, on the other hand, is frequent in health centres.

2.4. In market domain, all the languages are used except Chaha and Tigrigna. However, the alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is dominant. Amharic and Afan Oromo are also considerably used exclusively. Moreover, in the public transportation places: Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro and Kafinoonoo are used. Nevertheless, Amharic is found to be a predominant language at public transportation places followed by the alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo.

2.5. In the school domain, Amharic, Afan Oromo and English are used. These languages are used exclusively or alternatively. With regard to first cycle of elementary school (1-4th grades) Afan Oromo is dominantly used followed by Amharic. However, in the case of second cycle of elementary school (5-8th grades) the alternate use of Afan Oromo and Amharic is most common whereas in the secondary school (9-12th grades) Amharic is dominantly used followed by Afan Oromo. This attributes to the reason that both languages have significant role as medium of instruction in the town.

2.6. In the religious domain, Amharic and Afan Oromo are dominantly used. Amharic is extensively used in this domain followed by Afan Oromo. Geez and Arabic are also used to some extent when respondents discuss spiritual issues with religious leaders. However, other languages are not used in this domain. On the other hand, in the social gathering places all the languages are used. Some of these languages are used exclusively and others used alternatively with Amharic. But, Amharic is widely used followed by Afan Oromo. The use of other languages in the social gathering places is less dominant.

2.7. Amharic is found to be the major language of out-group communication in the town followed by Afan Oromo.

3. Due to frequent and intense contact of people for various socio-economic reasons some effects of language contact: borrowing, code mixing and code switching are observed in the study area. These linguistic outcomes of language contact are often observed among Afan Oromo and Amharic MTs and/or SLs speakers.

5.2. Conclusion

To conclude, the above stated findings of the study revealed that Jimma is a multilingual town, consists of different language speakers as MT and/or SL: Afan Oromo, Amharic, Dawro, Yem, Kafinoonoo, Silt`e, Chaha, Ezha and Tigrigna. Of these languages, Afan Oromo is acquired as MT by majority of respondents followed by Amharic whereas Tigrigna and Ezha are acquired as MT by a few of respondents. Amharic is highly learned as SL by majority of respondents followed by Afan Oromo whereas Chaha and Tigrigna are learned as SL by a few respondents. The majority of respondents are bilinguals and multilinguals in their MT and various languages. Considerable number of respondents from all the ethnic groups acquired Amharic and Afan Oromo as MT at the expense of their ethnic language. Thus, there is a greater tendency to shift from all languages to Amharic to greater and Afan Oromo to lesser degree.

Amharic is predominantly used in most domains: home (between respondents and their spouse, siblings and children), neighbourhood, friendship, recreational, public transportation places, school (secondary level), religious, and social gathering places. Afan Oromo, on the other hand, is extensively used in home (between respondents and their grandparents and their parents), first cycle of elementary school, work palces, court and public security. In market domain, second cycle of elementary school and health centre the alternate use of Amharic and Afan Oromo is dominant. In general, Amharic is largely used in most domains followed by Afan Oromo. Hence, Amharic is found to be the language of out-group communication (lingua franca) in Jimma town. It facilitates communication among different languages speakers.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the above conclusions the researcher forwards the following recommendations for the concerned bodies;

- Jimma is a linguistically heterogeneous town. Different languages speakers live in the town. Thus, the culture and tourism office of the town should take into attention the language diversity of the community. Moreover, it should also create a suitable situation for the diverse community to develop and preserve their languages.
- The government bodies should give attention to the linguistic profile of the community, when planning language for education, administration and the like.
- Since there is frequent and intense contact among speakers of different languages in the study area, it needs further research on outcomes of language contact to come up with details of borrowing, code switching and code mixing between different languages.

References

Adane Feleke. 2010. Language Use and Attitude of Gamo Community living in Addis Ababa. Unpublished M.A.Thesis. Addis Ababa University.

Appel, R. and Muysken, P. 1987. *Language Contact and Bilingualism.* London: Edward Arnold.

Ayub Ismael. 2008. Language Use of the Jamaican and Rastafarian Community in Shashemene: A Sociolinguistic Study. Unpublished MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University.

Baker, C. 1996. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* 2nd ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Beardsmore, H. B.1982. *Bilingualism: Basic Principles*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language.* USA: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Bokamba, E. 1988. Code-mixing, Language variation, and Linguistic Theory: Evidence from Bantu Languages. *Language* 19, 76: 21-62.

Central Statistical Agency (CSA). 2007. *Summary and Statistical Report of the Population and Housing Census*, Addis Ababa: Ethiopia.

Campbell, L. 2004. *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Clark, H.C. 1996. *Using Language.* Cambridge University Press: UK.

Clyne, M. G. 1997. Multilingualism. In *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics,* ed. Coulmas, F. 206-214. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cooper, L.R. 1976. The Study of Language Use. In *Language in Ethiopia,* eds. Bender, M.L, Bowen, J.D, Cooper and Ferguson, C.A, 183-186. London: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, L, R. and Carpenter, S. 1976. Language in the Market. In *Language in Ethiopia,* Eds. Bender, M.L, Bowen, J.D, Cooper and Ferguson, C.A, 244-255. London: Oxford University Press.

Coulmas, F. 1997. Introduction. In *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Crystal, D. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dittmar, N. 1976. *Sociolinguistics: A critical Survey of Theory and Application.* German: Edward Arnold.

Downes, W. 1998. *Language and Society.* 2nd ed.. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fasold, R.1984. *The Sociolinguistics of society*. Basil Blackwell.

Fishman, J.A. 1971. The Relationship between Micro and Macro Sociolinguistics in the Study of Who Speak What Language to Whom and When. In *Sociolinguistics,* Pride, J.B. and Holmes, J. Eds., 15-32. Penguin Books: USA.

Fishman, J. A. 2001. Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Getachew Anteneh and Derib Ado. 2006. Language Policy in Ethiopia: History and Current Trends. In *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Science* 2, 1 37-62.

Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Halliday, M. 1968. The users and uses of language. In Fishman, Joshua A. ed. *Language problems of Developing Nations*. Mouton and Co: The Hague.

Hoffmann, C. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism.* New York: Longman Group UK Limited.

Holmes, J. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman Publishing.

Jimma town Government Communication Office. 2004. Hirmata. Bulletin

Macnamara, J. 1967. The Bilingual`s Linguistic Performance. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 23: 58-77.

Matras, Y. 2009. *Language Contact.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, R. and Richter, R. 2003. *Language use in Ethiopia from a network perspective: Results Of a sociolinguistic survey conducted among high school students*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.

Meyer, R. 2006. Amharic as Lingua Franca in Ethiopia. In: Girma, D.A. (ed.) *LISSAN: Journal of African Languages and Linguistics.* XX(I/II), 117-131.

Meyerhoff, M. 2011. *Introducing Sociolinguistics.* 2nd ed. Routledge.

Muysken, P. 2011. Code-switching. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics.* ed. Mesthrie, R, 301-314. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code Switching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. 2006. *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism.* Blackwell Publishing.

Oromiya National Regional State. 2002. *The Revised Constitution of the Oromiya Regional State.*

Phillipson, R. 1999. Political Science. In *Handbook of Langauge and Ethnic Identity*, ed. Fishman, J.A. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poplack, S. 1980. Sometimes I`ll start a sentence in Spanish Y Termino EN ESPANAL: Toward a Typology of Code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18: 587-618.

Romaine, S. 1994. *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* Merton College: University of Oxford, Blackwell publishers.

Samuel Handamo. 2009. Language Use in Shone Town: A Sociolinguistic Study. M.A. Thesis. Addis Ababa University.

Schiffman, H. F. 1997. Diglossia as a sociolinguistic situation. In *the Hand Book of Sociolinguistics* ed. Coulmas, F. Blackwell publishing.

Spolsky, B. 2009. *Language Management.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stockwell, P. 2007. *Sociolinguistics: A Resource Book for Students.* 2nd ed. Routledge.

Teketel Alemayehu. 2011. Bilingualism and Language Use in Hawassa Zurya Woreda. M.A.Thesis. Addis Ababa University.

Tesfaye Teshome. 2008. A Sociolinguistic and Phonological Study of Amharic Loanwords in Afan Oromo Spoken around Salale. MA Unpublished. AAU.

Thomason, G.S. 2001. *Language Contact: An introduction.* Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, G.S and Kaufman, T. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics.* Berkeley: University of California.

Trudgill, P. 2003. *A Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wardhaugh, R. 1976. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 1st Edition. Blackwell: Oxford, UK & Cambridge, USA

Weinreich, U. 1963. *Language in Contact: Findings and problems.* The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. London: Blackwell publishing.

Wolff, H.E. 2000. Language and Society. In *African Languages: An Introduction,* 288-347 eds. Henie, B and Nurse, D. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yonas Seifu. 2002. *A Historical Survey of Jimma Town (1936-1974).* MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University.

Zelealem Leyew. 1998. Code- switching: Amharic- English. *Journal of African Cultural Studies. 11, 97-123.*

Zelealem Leyew. 2000. *The Kemantney language: A Sociolinguistic and Grammatical Study of Language Replacement.* Dissertation, AAU.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: The Questionnaire in English

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATION

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on issues related to patterns of language use in multilingual settings of Jimma town. To this end, your participation by filling this questionnaire is invaluable for the study. There is no need of writing your name anywhere in the form.

I would like to assure you that your responses will be kept confidential and used only for the purpose of this study. If you do not understand a certain question, please do not hesitate to ask me. Please mark ``√`` for your answer in the corresponding boxes when alternative answers are given. For the subjective questions, you could use extra spaces if the given spaces are not enough.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Part I: Demographic Information of the Respondents

1. Sex — 1.1 Male ☐ 1.2 Female ☐
2. Age — 2.1 (7-18) ☐ 2.2 (19-30) ☐
   2.3. (31-55) ☐ 2.4 (above 56) ☐
3. Religion — 3.1 Orthodox Christian ☐ 3.2 Muslim ☐
   3.3 Protestant ☐ 3.4 other (specify) _____
4. Education — 4.1 Not received formal education ☐
   4.2 Elementary (grade 1-8) ☐
   4.3 Secondary (grade 9-12) ☐
   4.4 Received College Education and Above ☐
5. Occupation — 5.1 Merchant ☐ 5.2 Government employee ☐
   5.3 Student ☐ 5.4 Casual worker ☐
   5.5 Retired ☐ 5.6 other (please specify) _____
6. Marital status — 6.1 Single ☐ 6.2 Married ☐

7. Birth place 7.1 Jimma town ☐ 7.2 Other place (specify) _____

8. Ethnic group 8.1 Oromo ☐ 8.2 Amhara ☐

8.3 Tegaru ☐ 8.4 Gurage ☐

8.5 Dawro ☐ 8.6 Kafa ☐

8.7 Yem ☐ 8.8 Silt`e ☐

8.9 Other (please specify)_____

Part II: Language Knowledge of the Respondents and their families

9. What is your mother tongue or first Language? _____
10. If you know any other language(s), please name them _____ _____
11. What is your Father's Mother tongue _____and if he knows any other language(s), please name them: _____ _____ _____
12. What is your Mother's Mother tongue _____and if she knows any other language(s), please name them: _____ _____ _____
13. What is your spouse's Mother tongue (If you have)_____ and if he/she knows any other language(s), please name them: _____ _____ _____
14. What is your children's Mother tongue (If you have)_____ and if they know any other language(s), please name them: _____ _____ _____

Part III: Language use in various domains

A. The following questions are based on language use with your families in home; please fill in the space provided the language(s) which you use most frequently.

15. What language do you use with your parents _____
16. What language do you use with your grandparents_____
17. What language do you use with your children _____
18. What language do you use with your siblings _____
19. What language do you use with your spouse _____

B. The following questions are prepared to analyze situations of your language use in different domains. Please fill in the space provided the language which you use most often.

20. What language do you use with your neighbour _____
21. What language do you use with your friends_____
22. What language do you use with waiters/waitress at hotels or recreational areas _____
23. What language do you use with your teacher at school _____

24. What language do you use with your classmates at school _____
25. What language do you use with religious leaders _____
26. What language do you use when praying in group at church/mosque to God/Allah _____
27. What language do you use with physicians at health centres _____
28. At court what language do you use with judge _____
29. At police station what language do you use with police_____
30. At work place what language do you use with your boss _____
31. At work place what language do you use with your colleagues _____
32. At work place what language do you use with customers _____
33. At market or shop what language do you use with seller or buyer _____
34. At transportation giving areas what language do you use_____
35. What language do you use with passengers _____
36. At social gathering places what language do you use _____
37. Which language do you use when you meet someone for first time and do not know what language he/she speaks _____

APPENDIX II: The questionnaire in Amharic

አዲስ አበበ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

የህዩማንቲስ፣ ቋንቋዎች ጥናት፣ ጆርናሊዝምና ኮሙንኬሽን ኮሌጅ

የስነ-ልሳን ትምህርት ክፍል

የጽሁፍ መጠይቅ

የዚህ መጠይቅ ዋና አላማ በጅማ ከተማ የቋንቋ አጠቃቀም ሁኔታ ላይ መረጃ መሰብሰብ ይሆናል። ለዚህም ስኬት የእርስዎ ተሳትፎ በጣም አስፈላጊ ሆኖ ተገኝቷል። እባክዎን ስሞትን መጻፍ አስፈላጊ አይደለም።

የአስተያየትዎ አላማው ለጥናቱ ብቻ የተፈለገ ስለሆነ የመልስዎ ምስጥር የተጠበቀ መሆኑን በእርግጠኝነት አሳውቃለሁ። ያልገባዎት ነገር ካለ እባክዎ ከመጠየቅ ወደ ኋላ አይበሉ። መልስዎትን ሲሰጡ ምርጫዎትን በተሰጠው ሳጥን ውስጥ የ "✓" ምልክት ያሳዩ፤ የግልዎትን ማብራሪያ በሚሰጡበት ቦታ የተሰጠውን ባዶ ቦታ ይጠቀሙ።

ለትብብርዎ በጣም አመሰግናለሁ።

ክፍል ሀ፡ የግልዎት መረጃ

1. ፆታ — 1.1 ወንድ ☐ — 1.2 ሴት ☐
2. እድሜ — 2.1 (7-18) ☐ — 2.2 (19-30) ☐ — 2.3 (31-55) ☐ — 2.4 (ከ56 በላይ) ☐
3. ሀይማኖት — 3.1 ኦርቶዶክስ ☐ — 3.2 ሙስሊም ☐ — 3.3 ፕሮቴስታንት ☐ — 3.4 ሌላ (ይግለፁ)_____
4. የትምህርት ደረጃ — 4.1 መደበኛ ትምህርት ያልተከታተለ(ች) ☐ — 4.2 አንደኛ ደረጃ (ከ1-8 ክፍል) ☐ — 4.3 ሁለተኛ ደረጃና መሰናዶ (ከ9-12 ክፍል) ☐ — 4.4 ኮሌጅና ከዚያ በላይ የተከታተለ(ች) ☐
5. ሥራ — 5.1 ነጋዴ ☐ — 5.2 የመንግስት ሠራተኛ ☐ — 5.3 መደበኛ ሥራ የሌለው(ላት) ☐ — 5.4 ተማሪ ☐ — 5.5 ጡረታ የወጣ (ች) ☐ — 5.6 ሌላ (ይግለፁ) _____
6. የጋብቻ ሁኔታ — 6.1 ያለገባ(ች) ☐ — 6.2 ያገባ(ች) ☐
7. የትውልድ ቦታ — 7.1 ጅማ ከተማ ☐ — 7.2 ሌላ ቦታ (ይግለጹ)_____

8. ብሔር 8.1 ኦሮሞ ☐ 8.2 አማራ ☐ 8.3 ትግሬ ☐ 8.4 ጉራጌ ☐
8.5 ዳውሮ ☐ 8.6 ካፋ ☐ 8.7 የም ☐ 8.8. ስልጠ ☐
8.9 ሌላ (ይግለጹ)_____

ክፍል ለ፡ የርስዎና የቤተሰብዎ የቋንቋ እውቀት

9. የእርሶ የአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ_____
10. ከአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ ውጭ ሌላ የሚችሉት ቋንቋ(ዎች) ካለ ይግለጹ:: _____
_____ _____ _____
11. የአባትዎ የአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ_____ እና ከአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋው ሌላ የሚችሉት ቋንቋ(ዎች) ካለ(ሉ) ይግለጹ::_____ _____ _____
12. የእናትዎ የአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ_____ እና ከአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋው ውጭ ሌላ የሚችሉት ቋንቋ(ዎች) ካለ(ሉ) ይግለጹ::_____ _____ _____
13. የትዳር አጋርዎ (ካሎዎት) የአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ_____ እና ከአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋው ውጭ ሌላ የሚችሉት ቋንቋ(ዎች) ካለ(ሉ) ይግለጹ::_____ _____ _____
14. የልጆችዎ (ካሎዎት) የአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ_____ እና ከአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ ውጭ ሌላ የሚችሉት ቋንቋ(ዎች) ካለ(ሉ) ይግለጹ::_____ _____ _____

ክፍል ሐ. የቋንቋ አጠቃቀም በማህበራዊ ተቋማት

I. እባክዎን ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች አብዛኛውን ጊዜ ከቤተሰብዎ ጋር በቤት ውስጥ የሚጠቀሙበትን ቋንቋ በተሰጠው ባዶ ቦታ ላይ በመፃፍ ይግለፁ::

15. ከወላጅዎ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____
16. ከአያትዎ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____
17. ከልጆችዎ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____
18. ከትዳር አጋርዎ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው_____
19. ከወንድሞችዎ እና ከእህትዎቸዎ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

II. የሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች የተለያዩ ማህበራዊ ተቋማት ውስጥ የቋንቋ አጠቃቀም ሁኔታን መሠረት በማድረግ የተዘጋጁ ናቸው:: እባክዎን ለእያንዳንዱ ሁኔታ አብዛኛውን ጊዜ የሚጠቀሙበትን ቋንቋ በተሰጠው ባዶ ቦታ ላይ በመፃፍ ይግለፁ::

20. ከጎረቤትዎ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____
21. ከጓደኛዎ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____
22. በሆቴሎች ወይም በመዝናኛ ቦታዎች ከአስተናጋጆች ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____
23. በትምህርት ቤት ከመምህራን ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

24. በትምህርት ቤት ከተማሪዎች ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው_____

25. በቤቱ -እምነት ከእምነት አባቶች ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው_____

26. በቤቱ-እምነት ከሌሎች ምህመናን ጋር ፀሎት ሲያደርሱ የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው_____

27. በህክምና መስጫ ቦታዎች ከሀኪሞች ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

28. በፍርድ ቤት ከዳኛጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

29. በፖሊስ ጣቢያ ከፖሊስ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

30. በስራ ቦታዎ ከኃላፊዎ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

31. በስራ ቦታዎ ከስራ ባልደረባዎ ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

32. በስራ ቦታዎ ለተገልጋይ አገልግሎት ሲሰጡ የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

33. ገበያ ሱቅ ውስጥ ከሻጭ ወይም ሸማች ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

34. በትራንስፖርት መስጫ ቦታዎች የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

35. በጉዞ ላይ ከሌሎች መንገደኞች ጋር የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋምንድ ነው _____

36. በየተለያዩ ስነስርዓቶች ላይ የሚጠቀሙበት ቋንቋ ምንድ ነው _____

37. አንድ የሚናገረውን/የምትናገረውን ቋንቋ የማታውቀውን ሰው ለመጀመሪያ ጊዜ ስታገኘው ለመግባባት የትኛውን ቋንቋ ትጠቀማለህ/ትጠቀሚያለሽ _____

ጊዜዎትን ሰጥተው ስለተባበሩኝ በጣም አመሰግኖታለሁ::

APPENDIX III: The Questionnaire in Afan Oromo

Yuunivarsiitii Addis Ababaa

Koollejjii Namummaa, Qo`annoo Afaanii, Gaazexeessummaafi Walqunnamtii

Muummee Xiinqooqaa

Bargaaffii

Kaayyoon bargaaffii kanaa odeeffannoo haala fayyadama afaanii magaalaa Jimmaa keessa jiru funaanuudha. Kaayyoo kana galmaan ga`uuf, hirmaannaan keessan qooda guddaa qaba. Maqaa keessan bakka kamittuu barreessuun hin barbaachisu.

Deebiin isin deebistaniifi odeeffannoon dhuunfaa keessan icciitiidhaan akka eegamuufi dhimma qorannoo kana qofaaf akka oolu isin hubachiisa. Yoo gaaffileen tokko tokko isiniif hubatamuu didan ana gaafachuu dandeessu. Deebii keessan bakka filannoowwan kennamanitti, mallattoo ``√`` kana sanduuqa fuuldura gaaffii jiru keessatti kaa`uudhaan deebisaa. Yoo filannoowwan hin kennamne ta`e, yaada keessan barreessuudhaan deebisaa.

Kutaa I: Odeeffannoo dhuunfaa deebistootaa

1.	Saala	1.1 Dhiira ☐	1.2 Dhalaa ☐
2.	Umrii	2.1 (7-18) ☐	2.2 (19-30) ☐
		2.3. (31-55) ☐	2.4 (56 ol) ☐
3.	Amantii	3.1 Kiristaana Ortoodoksiii ☐	3.2 Musliima ☐
		3.3 Pirootestaantii ☐	3.4 kan biroo (ibsaa)_____
4.	Sadarkaa barumsaa	4.1 barnoota idilee hin arganne ☐	
		4.2 Sad. 1^{ffaa} (kutaa 1-8) ☐	
		4.3 Sad. 2^{ffaa} (kutaa 9-12) ☐	
		4.4 Barnoota Koollejjiifi isaa ol ☐	
5.	Hojii	5.1 Daldalaa ☐	5.2 Hojjetaa mootummaa ☐
		5.3 Barataa ☐	5.4 hojii idilee hin qabu ☐
		5.5 Soorama kan ba`e ☐	5.6 kan biroo (ibsaa) _____
6.	Haala fuudhaa	6.1 Hin fuune / heerumne ☐	6.2 fuudheera / heerumeera ☐
7.	Bakka dhalootaa	7.1 mag. Jimmaa ☐	7.2 bakka biroo (ibsaa) _____
8.	Qomoo	8.1 Oromoo ☐	8.2 Amaara ☐
		8.3 Tigiree ☐	8.4 Guraagee ☐

8.5 Daawwaroo ☐ 8.6 Kafaa ☐

8.7 Yeem ☐ 8.8 Silxee ☐

8.9 kan biroo (ibsaa)_____

Kutaa II: Beekumsa afaanii keessaniifi maatii keessan

9. Afaan jalqabaa yookaan tokkoffaa keessan maal jedhama?_____
10. Yoo afaan(oota) biroo yoo beektu ta`e, bakka duwwaa armaan gadiirratti tarreessaa?

    _____ _____ _____
11. Afaan jalqabaa Abbaa keessanii maali _____ yoo afaan(oota) biraa beeku ta`e tarreessaa _____ _____ _____
12. Afaan jalqabaa Haadha keessanii maali _____ yoo afaan(oota) biroo ni beeku ta`e tarreessaa _____ _____ _____
13. Yoo abbaa / haadha warraa qabaattan, afaan jalqabaa isaa/ ishee maali _____ yoo afaan(oota) biroo beeku ta`e tarreessaa: _____ _____ _____
14. Yoo daa`imman qabdu ta`e afaan jalqabaa isaanii maali_____ Yoo afaan(oota) biroo beeku ta`e tarreesssaa: _____ _____ _____

Kutaa III: Fayyadama Afaanii Dhaabbilee hawaasummaa garaagaraa keessatti

A. **Gaaffilee armaan gadiif maatii keessan wajjin mana keessatti yeroo baay`ee afaan fayyadamtan bakka duwwaa kennamerratti guutaa.**

15. Maatii keessan wajjin afaaan kam fayyadamtu _____
16. Akaakayyu/Akkoo keessan wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
17. Ijoollee/daa`imman wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
18. Abbaa/haadha warraa keessan wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu_____
19. Obboleewwan keessan wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____

B. Gaaffileen armaan gadii haalli fayyadama afaanii dhaabbilee hawaasummaa garaagaraa keessatti maal akka fakkaatu xiinxaluuf qophaa`an. Bakka duwwaa kennamerratti afaan yeroo baay`ee gargaaramtan guutaa.

20. Ollaa keessan wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
21. Hiriyyaa keessan wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
22. Bakkeewwan bashannanaatti yookaan Hoteelotatti keessumeessitoota wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____

23. Mana barumsaatti barsiisaa(oota) keessan wajjin afaan kam gargaaramtu _____
24. Mana barumsaatti barattoota wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
25. Mana amantaatti abbootii amantii wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
26. Mana amantaatti amantoota biroo wajjin yogguu kadhattan afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
27. Mana yaalaatti ogeessa fayyaa wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
28. Mana murtiitti abbaa alangaa wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
29. Waajjira poolisiitti poolisii wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
30. Bakka hojiitti hogganaa keessan wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
31. Bakka hojiitti namoota wajjin hojjettan wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
32. Bakka hojiitti tajaajilamtoota yogguu keessumeessitan afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
33. Gabaa fi suuqii keessatti nama bituu yookaan gurguru wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
34. Bakkeewwan tajaajila geejjibaa kennaniitti konkolaachisaa yookaan gargaaraa wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
35. Yogguu karaa deemtan imaltoota biroo wajjin afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
36. Bakka hawaasni baay`een walitti qabame jirutti afaan kam fayyadamtu _____
37. Nama tokkko yeroo jalqabaaf yoo argituufi afaan inni dubbatu beektu yoo ta`e afaan kam itti dubbatta? _____

APPENDIX IV: Interview questions

Interview questions for Adults

Age: _____ Birth place: _____ Ethnic group: _____

Sex: _____ Education: _____ Mother tongue: _____

Additional language(s): _____ _____ _____

1. Which language do you use most often with your children? Why?
2. What language do you use most often when you go different offices in the court?
3. Which language is better facilitates communication between different languages speakers in the town?
4. Which language do you want to be the working language in government offices in the town? Why?

Interview children for Children

Age: _____ Birth place: _____ Ethnic group: _____

Sex: _____ Education: _____ Mother tongue: _____

Additional language(s): _____ _____ _____

1. Which language do you use most often in your daily life?
2. What language(s) are used in your home?

APPENDIX V: Observation guidelines

Observations guide

Date of visit:

Kebele`s chairperson:

The Kebeles administration:

School:

Health centre / clinic / pharmacy:

Market:

Worship places:

Play ground:

Court:

Other institutions:

Language viability and use

Language(s) spoken:

Domains of usage: in the school, administration, health centre, worship places, market, and street.

Other observations:

_____

_____

Appendix VI: Demographic profiles of the interviewees

Demographic profiles of the interviewees

Name	Age	Sex	MT	SLs	Place of birth	Occupation
Wondimu Kebede	56	M	Dawro	Amharic A/Oromo Kafinoonoo	Dawro Zone	Artist and merchant
Abebe Nigard	62	M	Chaha	Amharic Silt`e, Ezha Afan Oromo	Gurage Zone	Merchant
Halima Abba Fogi	67	F	Afan Oromo	Amharic	Jimma town	Retired
G/Meskal Kiya	58	M	Yem	Amharic A/ Oromo, Dawro	Yem Special Woreda	
Molla Gebru	64	M	Amharic	Tigrigna, A/Oromo	Amhara region	
Chala Adane	15	M	Afan Oromo	Amharic	Jimma town	Student
Fatuma Abba Macca	18	F	Afan Oromo	Amharic , Silt`e	Jimma town	Student
Samuel Dessalegn	17	M	Amharic	Afan Oromo	Jimma town	Student
Bilen Wondimu	17	F	Amharic	Dawro Afan Oromo	Jimma town	Student
Birhane	18	F	Yem	Afan Oromo Amharic	Yem Special Woreda	Student