ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE DISCOURSES OF ADOLESCENTS AND ADULTS AT KOMBOLCHA TOWN, SOUTH WOLLO

BY
ABEBE MENGESHA BESHAH

ADDIS ABABA

JULY, 2016

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE DISCOURSES OF ADOLESCENTS AND ADULTS AT KOMBOLCHA TOWN, SOUTH WOLLO

BY

ABEBE MENGESHA BESHAH

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics and Communication

Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

July, 2016

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Abebe Mengesha Beshah entitled: *A Comparative Analysis of the Discourses of Adolescents and Adults at Kombolcha Town, South Wollo* and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Dr. Ronny Ny		24.06.2016
ADVISOR	SIGNATURE	DATE
Dr. Marko Lemala		24-6-2016
EXAMINER	SIGNATURE	DATE
Bedilu Wakene		24-6-16
EXAMINER	SIGNATURE	DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I thank the Lord who is my God for giving me all the energy and health to reach this stage in my life. Then I am highly indebted to my advisor Dr Ronny Meyer for his patience in reading all the drafts and for his unreserved comments, suggestions and guidance. I am really lucky to work with such an advisor who is not tired of repeatedly showing me my problems despite my repeated failure to be up to his expectations. Next I am grateful to my life companion Meselech Taddesse because her encouragement and unceasing prayer have a decisive contribution for my success. Then I am in gratitude to Solomon Yesuf, Girmaye, Etagegn Mengistu, Meseret Zeru, Hussien Ahmed, and Tiruye Hussien for their great help in locating and coordinating the research participants. I also thank Abraham Taddesse for his continuous financial and logistic support. Finally, I am thankful to all my participants for their willingness to sit for a long time in one place for the conversations and the interview, the causes they do not personally benefit from.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ACRONYMS

ABSTRACT

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Background of the Study 1

1.2. Statement of the Problem 3

1.3. Objectives of the Study 6

1.4. Significance of the Study 6

1.5. Scope of the Study 6

1.6. Limitations of the Study 7

1.7. Operational Definitions of Terms 8

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 9

2.1. Nature of Language Variation 9

2.2. Age as a Social Factor for Language Variation 10

2.3. Other Factors for Language Variation 12

2.4. The Efeect of Psychological and Social Differences on Language Use 15

2.5. Linguistic Differences between Adolescents and Adults 18

2.6. Intersection of Social Class and Gender with Age 23

2.6.1. Age and Social Class 23

2.6.2. Age and Gender 27

2.7. Theoretical Framework 32

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY 37

3.1. Research Design 37

3.2. Research Site 38

3.3. Participants of the Study and Sampling Procedures 38

3.4. The Criteria for Deciding Socioeconomic Grouping 39
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection 40
3.6. Procedures of Recording the Conversations 41
3.7. Transcription Procedures 42
3.8. Methods of Data Analysis 42
3.9. Mechanisms of Controlling Validity and Re;iability of the Results 44
3.10. Ethical Considerations 44
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA 45
4.1. Discourse Markers 45
4.1.1. Types of Discourse Markers and Their Variants 45
4.1.2. Distribution of Discourse Markers 48
4.1.3. The Most Frequent Discourse Markers 51
4.1.4. Summary 52
4.2. Quotatives 52
4.2.1. Types of Quotatives 52
4.2.2. Distribution of Quotatives 52
4.2.3. Uses of the Quotatives 56
4.2.4. Summary 66
4.3. Slang 66
4.3.1. Types of Slang and the Variants 66
4.3.2. Distribution of Slang 68
4.3.3. The Most Frequent Slang Expressions 70
4.3.4. Slang Expressions and Their Standard Synonyms 80
4.3.5. Summary 88
4.4. Repair Strategies 88
4.4.1. Types of Patterns of Repairing Syrategies 88
4.4.2. Distribution of Patterns of and Roles in Repairing Strategies 89
4.4.3. Mechanisms of Initiating Others to Repair Their Speeches 97
4.4.4. Reasons of Other-Repair 108
4.4.5. No Repair 111

4.4.6. Summary 118
4.5. Question Tags 119
4.5.1. Types of Question Tags and Their Variants 119
4.5.2. Distribution of Question Tags 121
4.5.3. Uses of Question Tags 123
4.5.4. The Most Frequent Question Tags 130
4.5.5. Summary 131
4.6. Addressing Terms 131
4.6.1. Types of Addressing Terms 131
4.6.2. Distribution of Addressing Terms 133
4.6.3. Choice of Variants of Addressing Terms 139
4.6.4. Summary 141
4.7. Vowing Expressions 142
4.7.1. Types of Vowing Expressions 142
4.7.2. Distribution of Vowing Expressions 143
4.7.3. Uses of Vowing Expressions 147
4.7.4. Choice of Variants of Vowing Expressions 153
4.7.5. The Most Frequent Vowing Expressions 154
4.7.6. Summary 154
4.8. Vulgar Language 156
4.8.1. Types of Vulgar Language and the Variants 156
4.8.2. Distribution of Vulgar Expressions 156
4.8.3. Uses of Vulgar Expressions 158
4.8.4. The Most Frequent Vulgar Expressions 164
4.8.5. Summary 164
4.9. Speech Overlap 165
4.9.1. Types of Overlap 165
4.9.2. Distibution of Overlap 166
4.9.3. Summary 169
4.10. Other-Selection of Next Speakers 170
4.10.1. Types of Selection Strategies 170

4.10.2. Distribution of Other-Selection of Next Speakers 171
4.10.3. Strategies of Selecting Next Speakers 173
4.10.4. Summary 186
4.11. Back Channeling Utterances 186
4.11.1. Types of Back Channeling Utterances and Their Variants 186
4.11.2. Distribution of Back Channeling Utterances 187
4.11.3. The Most Frequent Back Channeling Utterances 189
4.11.4. Summary 190
4.12. General Communicative Behaviors of Adolescents and Adults 190
4.12.1. Time Members of the Two Age Groups Spend Together 190
4.12.2. Their Intereset toSpend Time Together 191
4.12.3. Dislikes of the Age Groups about Each Other's Communicative Behaviors 192
4.12.4. Understanding of Each Other's Interest 193
4.12.5. Difficulty Level the Age Groups Interacting with Each Other 193
4.12.6. Communicative Behaviors of Adolescents and Adults 194
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 196
5.1. Discussion 196
5.2. Conclusions 199
5.2.1. The Discourse Features in Which the Adolescents and Adults Diifer 200
5.2.2 The Impact of Gender, Socioeconomic Status and Religion on the Differences.. 202
5.2.3 The Implications of the Discourse Differences about Communicative Behaviors of the Two Age Groups.. 204
5.2.4. The Reasons for the Differences in Discourse between the Two Age Groups.. . 206
5.3. Recommendations 207
REFERENCES
APPENDICES
Appendix 1: Profile of Participants
Appendix 2: Transcription Conventions
Appendix 3: Symbols and Signs Used for Coding the Data
Appendix 4: Transcripts

Appendix 5: Interview Questions
Appendix 6: List of Discourse Markers Used in the Study
Appendix 7: List of Slang Expressions Used in the Study
Appendix 8: List of Vulgar Expressions Used in the Study
Appendix 9: List of Back Channeling Utterances Used in the Study

LIST OF TABLES

Tables **Page**

Table 1 Distribution of the participants of the study across social variables…….. 39

Table 2 Socioeconomic classification scheme…… 40

Table 3 Distribution of variants of discourse markers across the age groups……. 47

Table 4 Distribution of discourse markers across the two age groups…… 48

Table 5 Distribution of discourse markers across the genders ……... 49

Table 6 Distribution of discourse markers across socioeconomic groups…….. 50

Table 7 Distribution of discourse markers across the two religions…….. 50

Table 8 Distribution of quotatives across the two age groups…… 53

Table 9 Distribution of quotatives across the genders…… 53

Table 10 Distribution of quotatives across socioeconomic groups …… 54

Table 11 Distribution of quotatives across religions …….. 55

Table 12 Distribution of slang across the age groups…….. 68

Table 13 Distribution of slang across the genders in the two age groups ……. 69

Table 14 Distribution of slang across socioeconomic groups……. 69

Table 15 Distribution of slang across religions……... 70

Table 16 Distribution of patterns of the repairing strategies across the age groups ….. 89

Table 17 Distribution of patterns of the repairing strategies across the genders……. 90

Table 18 Distribution of patterns of the repairing strategies across socioeconomic groups…….. 91

Table 19 Distribution of patterns of the repairing strategies across religions……. 92

Table 20 Distribution of troublesome utterances across the age groups……. 93

Table 21 Distribution of troublesome utterances across the genders…….. 93

Table 22 Distribution of troublesome utterances across socioeconomic groups…… 94

Table 23 Distribution of troublesome utterances across religions…….. 94

Table 24 Distribution of roles in repairing strategies across the age groups…….. 95

Table 25 Distribution of roles in repairing strategies across the genders…… 95

Table 26 Distribution of roles in repairing strategies across socioeconomic groups…. 96

Table 27 Distribution of roles in repairing strategies across religions…… 97

Tables **Page**

Table 28 Distribution of question tags across the age groups……. 121
Table 29 Distribution of question tags across the genders…….. 121
Table 30 Distribution of question tags across socioeconomic groups……. 122
Table 31 Distribution of question tags across religions…….. 123
Table 32 Proportion of addressing terms in each age group……... 134
Table 33 Distribution of addressing terms across the age groups……... 134
Table 34 Distribution of addressing terms across the genders…… 135
Table 35 Distribution of addressing terms across socioeconomic groups…….. 136
Table 36 Distribution of addressing terms across religions…… 138
Table 37 Distribution of vowing expressions across the age groups……. 143
Table 38 Distribution of vowing expressions across the genders…….. 144
Table 39 Distribution of vowing expressions across socioeconomic groups……. 145
Table 40 Distribution of vowing expressions across religions…… 146
Table 41 Distribution of vulgar expressions across the age groups…… 156
Table 42 Proportion of users of vulgar expressions in each age group…….. 157
Table 43 Distribution of vulgar expressions across the genders……. 157
Table 44 Distribution of vulgar expressions across socioeconomic groups…… 157
Table 45 Distribution of vulgar expressions across religions…….. 158
Table 46 Distribution of speech overlap across the age groups ……. 166
Table 47 Distribution of each type of speech overlap across the age groups ……. 167
Table 48 Proportion of types of speech overlap in each age group……. 168
Table 49 Distribution of speech overlap across the genders……... 168
Table 50 Distribution of speech overlap across socioeconomic groups…….. 169
Table 51 Distribution of speech overlap across religions…… 169
Table 52 Distribution of other -selection of speakers across the age groups…….. 171
Table 53 Distribution of other-selection of speakers across the genders…… 171
Table 54 Distribution of other -selection of speakers across socioeconomic groups….. 172
Table 55 Distribution of other -selection of speakers across religions…….. 172
Table 56 Proportion of strategies of selecting next speakers in each age group…… 172
Table 57 Distribution of back channeling utterances across the age groups…….. 188

Tables **Page**

Table 58 Distribution of back channeling utterances across the two genders……. 188

Table 59 Distribution of back channeling utterances across socioeconomic groups….. 189

Table 60 Distribution of back channeling utterances across religions…… 189

Table 61 Communicative behaviors of adolescents and adults……... 195

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ACRONYMS

1	First Person
2	Second Person
3	Third Person
ACC	Accusative case
ACTO	Abrupt change of topic
	Overlap
ATT	Attenuative
AO	Addition overlap
AUX	Auxiliary verb
CAUS	causative case
CBO	Call back overlap
CIO	Coincidental overlap
CO	Completion overlap
COM	Commitative case
COMP	Complementizer
CQ	Confirmation question
CS	Completion statement or
	Phrase
CUA	Checking the listener's
	understanding, attention or
	acceptance, or asking for
	their confirmation
CVB	Converb
DAT	Dative case
DC	Direct calling by name and
	attracting attention to a talk
DEF	Definitiness
DM	Discourse marker
DI	Directed invitation
DQ	Directed question
F	Feminine gender
FOC	Focuser
FQ	Follow up question
GEN	Genitive case
H	Honorific
IDEO	Ideophone
IMP	Imperative
IMPR	Impersonal subject
INCP	Inceptive aspect
INDFPRO	Indefinite pronoun
INF	Infinitive
IO	Indirect Object
IPFV	Imperfective aspect
ITO	Interfering topic overlap
LTO	Lack of tolerance overlap
LSG	Lower socioeconomic group
M	Masculine gender
MSG	Middle socioeconomic group
NEG	Negative
NEGCOMP	Negative complementizer
NMLZ	Nominalizer
NPST	Non-past
OBJ	Object
OINR	Other-initiated No repair
OIOR	Other-initiated Other-repair
OISR	Other-initiated self-repair
PASS	Passive
PFV	Perfective aspect

PL	Plural
PROG	Progressive aspect
PROS	Prospective aspect
PST	Past
PTRO	Predicting turn relevance Overlap
Q	Question particle
QPE	A question to who it is addressed is known from the preceding exchanges, the physical context and history
QR	Question for repetition
QUOT	Quotative
REL	Relativiser
ROO	Right override overlap
SF	Suggestive form that encourages others to continue to speak
SBJV	Subjunctive case
SG	Singular
SISR	Self-initiated self-repair
SG	Singular
SGV	Singulative
VBW	Bad wish as vowing Expression
VDST	Declaration of seriousness or truthfulness as vowing Expression
VRT	Religious term as vowing Expression

ABSTRACT

Key Words

adolescent , adult, age, age grading, communicative behaviors , discourse feature, gender, language change, natural language, religion, socioeconomic status, variant, variation

Language variation due to age is a normal phenomenon but is not universally regular because the factors that cause the variation do not have a regular impact in all situations. Their level of impact varies from place to place, from language to language, and from culture to culture. Though many variationist studies were conducted so far, variation within the Amharic discourse is not addressed. This research embarks to compare the discourses of Amharic speaking adolescents and adults and reveal the impact level of other three social factors such as gender, socioeconomic grouping and religion on the differrences. It also tries to give insight about the differences between the age groups in their communicative behaviors as it is implied by the differences in their discourses. The researcher derived the data from tape-recorded natural conversations of twenty-seven adolescents and twenty-seven adults, fifty-four in total. An interview was also conducted with the participants to substantiate the conversational data and to find some facts that lie behind the preference differences between the specified age groups.

At the end it was found out that the differences between the two age groups exceed their similarities. This leads to a conclusion that there is age-caused difference between the discourses of adolescents and adults.

With regard to the impact of the three social factors, males, the lower socioeconomic group and Christians are more active in causing differences though their level of influence varies. In their power to predict the differences between the adolescents and the adults in their use of the discourse features, gender and socioeconomic grouping are at the top and religion is in a second place.

The study on the diversification of the uses and variants of discourse features also indicates that adolescents lead adults.

The comparisons with former researches shows that results on syntax and phonology may not predict results on discourse and research results on other languages cannot be generalized for Amharic because the Amharic speaking community has its own characteristics not shared by speakers of other languages.

The discourse features in which the age groups differ imply differences in their communicative behaviors. The age groups show clear divergence from one another in their act of recognition and singularization of interlocutors, the level of intimacy they create with their interlocutors, their attitude towards their interlocutors, their skill in handling language as instrument of communication, their choice to cooperative methods of developing discourse, the way they maintain their credibility, the topics they choose and the rate at which they change topics, and their communicative styles.

The major reason for all these differences between adolescents and adults in their preferences of discourse features and their variants is lack of shared time which in turn is attributed to the differences in the types of daily engagements of each age group, their awareness to their age-driven behavioral and interest differences, lack of knowledge of developmental features of different age groups, and a culture that imposes silence on adolescents when being together with adults.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Language use varies from society to society, from group to group, and even from person to person. The common sociolinguistic factors for linguistic variation in a society are social class, educational level, religion, sex, age, ethnicity, and social network.

The relationship between these social factors and linguistic variation can be viewed from two perspectives. First, the factors are parameters of social structures, and human society is distributed into structures via these parameters. People in the same structure share the same life styles. By way of that, they develop unique interactive styles and their language through time develops features different from the language of people in another structure (Eckert 2003, 113). Second, once people in the same structure develop stronger ties among each other, they identify themselves with the group and begin to use specific ways of interaction as tools of showing their affiliation to that group (Holmes 1992, 33; Meyerhoff 2006, 96).

Age, being one of these parameters, plays an important role in creating social and subsequently linguistic stratification. People have different linguistic characteristics based on their age (Holmes 1992, 164). Age has a direct relationship with people's standing in the society, community and family. It signals people's position in life and determines their attitudes to each other. All this is reflected in language choice by different age groups (Eckert 1998, 107-108; Llamas 2007, 69). However, age is commonly not taken as an important variable in the sociolinguistic study of language.

> Of all global categories employed in investigations of language variation, age is perhaps the least examined and the least understood in sociolinguistic terms. Unlike gender, ethnicity or social class, age is often approached uncritically, and treated as a biological fact with which to categorize speakers, and against with other facets of our identity are played out (Llamas 2007, 69).

The impact of age on variability can be explained from three perspectives. First, people at different life stages have different mind preoccupations, interests etc. In connection to that specific mind setup, people develop unique types of communicative behaviors. For example, young people have high zeal and ideal expectations; they pass most of their time anticipating the future. Older people, however, have learned from experiences and life's limitations not to do so, i.e., they are more realistic. Their interests are more practical. Therefore, the topics younger and older people need to get engaged in and the type of vocabulary they use are quite different (Adler and Rodman 2003, 8, 32; Milroy and Gordon 2003, 60).

Second, people at different ages have different levels of language command and communication skills. The language of children at different ages reflects their various levels of social maturation. But this relationship does not exist in middle life stages (Eckert 1998, 109). For example, it was found that children use multiple negations in the highest frequency, and as they gradually acquire the standard forms, this kind of language use decreases; it gets moderate in their adolescence; and it even becomes low when they reach adulthood (Holmes 1992, 184).

Third, people of different ages have different social engagements. At different ages, they have different daily experiences; the type of people they associate with, the things they are engaged with, and their economical status are different. This makes their language at each stage to specialize and get distinct from that of the people of the other ages (Eckert 1998, 107-108). Moreover, the society has various expectations to people of different ages, and in response to the expectations people at different ages develop peculiar characteristics of communication (Collins, Gleason, and Sesma 1997, 83).

For example, adolescence is the age when peer pressure takes the central place for self-formation and self-evaluation. Adolescents spend much time in schools but little time with adults (Eckert 2003, 113; Collins, Gleason, and Sesma 1997, 83). The members devote more time for their relationship with peers (Collins, Gleason, and Sesma 1997, 83). Their communication is group-determined and they strive a lot to integrate their personal communication characteristics to that of the group (Fortman 2003, 104-105). Because they view their identity as the function of their practice of the group's norms, they become less sensitive to communicative norms of the wider society. The fact that they are also preoccupied with the activity of forming their own identities, which are contrary to or independent of those of adults involves them in linguistic innovations

and linguistic change more than people of any other age (Llamas 2007, 70; Milroy and Gordon 2003, 39). They use language as a signal to mark their social territory and the solidarity among the group members (Eckert 2003, 113; Holmes 1992, 184).

What is more, in congruence to biological changes on adolescents (giving testimony that they are no more children), other people around them change their expectations about them and their reactions to their behaviors. Adults expect from them high level of "social values and moral standards" (Collins, Gleason, and Sesma 1997, 83). These changes of expectations and reactions in turn affect the behaviors and emotions of the adolescents; they get stressed and their relationship with others gets in problem (Collins, Gleason, and Sesma 1997, 83). They express these problems in their communication. They develop a specific pattern of language use that reflects their distinctiveness, and their contradictions with the adult culture.

Adults, especially in the working age, are mostly engaged in formal transactions concerning matters related to their job and interpersonal issues that need careful and skilled use of language. They more frequently interact with the wider society. In other words, more than any other age group, they experience impositions from the wider society to conform to the language that is taken as standard. Therefore, they tend to be conservative in their language use (Holmes 1992, 186; Milroy and Gordon 2003, 39).

During old age, especially after retirement, colloquial language is very frequent because old people become aloof and have only little interaction with the rest of the society (Holmes 1992, 184). Similar to adolescents, they are less conservative (Milroy and Gordon 2003, 39).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Despite the available research done on language variation based on age, there are still fundamental questions and areas that are not yet addressed. It is the strong belief of the researcher that the inquiries so far done fall short of some important aspects of variation.

First, comparisons are done mostly on the phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical levels of language; discourse is given little attention (Wolfram 2006, 334). Watt (2007, 4) also states that grammar is the most researched linguistic system and most of the sociolinguistic writings focus on it while discourse variables are the least studied area since the study of

discourse is challenging to pursue. He further explains that sociolinguists are prejudiced to structure particularly phonological features because phonological variation is vivid to notice and phonological data are easy to collect (Watt 2007, 6). While many scholars like Milroy and Milroy (1998, 34), Holmes (1992), Meyerhoff (2006), Watt (2007) and Llamas (2007) list different levels at which language varies, they did not include discourse. All of the examples they cite are on phonology, morphology and syntax. Wodak and Benke (1998, 96) and Barbieri (2008, 59) argue that the inclusion of discourse in variation studies is a recent phenomenon. For this reason, there is only little research outcome on discourse.

In the Ethiopian context, the researcher could access only one study done by Getachew (1995) on Amharic text linkers in written texts. However, this study is limited to formal written discourse and does not attend to the variation that might exist across age groups.

Secondly, most of the available studies on discourse use dominantly uncontextualized quantitative methods and ignore the role of underlying and parallel social factors that contribute to variation. Milroy and Milroy (1998, 37) admit this when they state, "it is … likely in any study that there will be a residue of apparently random variation which is difficult to account for using the methods of quantitative sociolinguistics." Wodak and Benke (1998, 90-91) also emphasize that the effect of social variables on language variation is difficult to sort out unless the observation is done in natural linguistic contexts. Thus, quantitative methods have to be complemented with qualitative methods for a better understanding of the involved factors.

Thirdly, most of the data derived as evidence for variation between adolescent and adult communicative behaviors are from the industrialized and highly individualized societies of America and Europe. Sankoff's (2005) review of variation studies until 2001 confirms this fact. Eckert (2003, 112) and Lesko (2002, 182) argue that the specialized or 'deviant' communicative behavior of adolescents is the result of their segregation from adults and their long time stay together with their age-mates at school, which is, in turn, caused by industrialization. It is not clear if the variation is the consequence of industrialization or if it also occurs in less industrialized and more collective societies, like Ethiopia.

Fourthly, the data on language variation due to age are dominantly taken from European languages like English, French, Danish, Spanish and Portuguese (Sankoff 2005). In other words,

it still has to be shown that variation in these languages also implies variation in non-European languages, like Amharic, which is the focus of this study.

Therefore, the present research investigates the differences between adolescents' and adults' discourse behaviors in the non-European language, Amharic, spoken by a non-European people with a different cultural and social orientation.

The Amharic-speaking community selected for this study is the people of the town of Kombolcha. The researcher observed that the communicative tension between the two age groups (adults and adolescents) is pervasive there. The family and the schools are the typical harbors of these tensions. It is the researcher's conviction that this tension is rooted partly in the differences in the two groups' linguistic repertoires. Therefore, research is needed to uncover the extent to which the languages of adolescents and adults differ at discourse level, to confirm the systematism of the differences and to find out the reasons behind them.

The researcher is well aware that linguistic variation is complex. Various factors like gender, socioeconomic grouping, and religion have effect in modifying the relationship between age and linguistic variation. For this reason, the study explores the role of these factors to the linguistic variation due to age. In other words, it involves discourse as a dependent variable, age as an independent variable, and the other three social factors, namely gender, socioeconomic grouping and religion as moderating variables. As a reference point, the researcher hypotheses that there is a difference between the age groups in their use of all the discourse features under study.

To be specific, the study is conducted to find out tangible answers to the following questions:

1. Which elements of discourse do differ between adolescents and adults?
2. Are the differences consistent across genders?
3. Does socioeconomic status affect the differences?
4. Does religion has a power to predict the differences?
5. What do the differences imply about the communicative behaviors of the two age groups?
6. What are the reasons for the differences in discourse?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The study is aimed at finding out the differences between the discourses of adolescents and adults at Kombolcha town.

The specific objectives are to:

1. identify the discourse features in which adolescents and adults differ;
2. discover the impact of gender on the differences;
3. find out the influence of socioeconomic status on the differences;
4. assess the effect of religion on the differences;
5. diagnose the implications of the differences about the communicative behaviors of the two age groups; and
6. investigate the reasons why each group has different choices in discourse;

1.4. Significance of the Study

The study will:

1. give information to language pedagogy professionals about the linguistic needs of the two age groups so that they can select appropriate teaching content and teaching methods,
2. assist communication experts in their work to deal with problems adolescents experience when communicating with adults, like parents, teachers, people in the government etc.
3. serve as a reference for linguists who do research on language variation; and
4. help developmental psychologists to understand the psychological differences between adolescents and adults as reflected in their discourse.

1.5. Scope of the Study

The study is restricted to the study of face-to-face conversational discourse with a focus on major elements of discourse like discourse markers, quotatives, slang, repair strategies, tag questions, addressing terms, vowing expressions, vulgar language, speech overlap, speaker selection, and back channeling utterances. It emphasizes the extent to which these elements are chosen and the manner they are used by the two age groups. The structural patterns and features the discourse features have in the conversations are not the direct concern of the researcher. However, they

occasionally appear in the analysis when they are helpful to define the discourse features and to make distinction between the multiple uses of the features.

Discourse is not all about the eleven elements covered in this study. The study is limited to the eleven elements for two reasons. First, if other elements are added, the length goes beyond a dissertation. Second, certain discourse features cannot be investigated based on free casual conversations; they need other elicitation techniques such as a sociolinguistic interview and a continuous one-party speech.

Since the purpose of the research is comparing the discourses of adolescents and adults, it does not try to analyze the discourse of Amharic in detail.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

First, due to scope problem important discourse features such as narrative structure, techniques of opening and closing conversations, coherence, cohesion, rules of turn taking, gap, interruption, topic management, and nomenclature are excluded form the study. This has affected the comprehensiveness of the research.

In addition, some parts of the conversations have become difficult to listen and transcribe due to unclear articulation, overlapping speeches, and low voices that are caused by far distances of some of the interlocutors from the recorder. Though the researcher tried to understand these parts and decrease their negative impact by rewinding the recordings and listening to the parts again and again, there still exist in the transcripts notes of unheard utterances.

What is more, despite many clear and limpid results, there are certain types of data that put the researcher into dilemma to interpret. The biggest challenge comes from the significance tests. Among nine types of discourse features, namely discourse markers, quotatives, slang, tags, vowing expressions, vulgar language, speech overlap, other-selection of next speakers, and back channeling utterances, for which a test of significance is calculated, the result for the first five does not show a significant relationship. For this reason, the researcher has found it difficult to generalize the results for a wider population.

The final difficulty comes from the frequencies in the quotative **ነው** *nəw* 'it is', other-initiated other-repair pattern of repairing strategies, other-repair, most sub-types of addressing terms, abrupt change of topic overlap, addition overlap, callback overlap, completion overlap, interfering topic overlap, and individual tokens of vulgar language. The figures appear to be too low to give meaning and imply either difference or similarity.

1.7. Operational Definitions of Terms

The following terms are used in the study with new additional qualities to represent concepts specifc to the context of the research as explained against each.

1. Age grading – the use of a linguistic item exclusively by a certain generation but not by the other
2. Communicative behaviors – all the habits, actions and preferences of a person when they communicate with others
3. Discourse feature – any of the fields of language use that discourse analysis deals with
4. Language change – a permanent replacement of a linguistic element by another for good by a speech community
5. Natural language – a language that is produced in real situations meant primarily for social interaction and exchanging information; not rehearsed as if in drama.
6. Socioeconomic status – a position of a person in a society defined by a combination of their social and economic conditions
7. Token – a linguistic element that is a member of a certain type of linguistic or functional elements
8. Variant – a linguistic element or form among a set of elements that is used as a variable in a study
9. Variation - differences between individuals or groups of people in the linguistic elements like phonology, lexis, morphology, syntax and discourse they use

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Nature of Language Variation

Variability is the nature of all languages and it occurs at all levels, be it phonology, discourse or grammar (Watt 2007, 3; Milroy and Milroy 1998, 34). People often express one thing in different ways. Some differences are unintentional and temporary while others are planned and permanent. A language provides a list of options from which the speaker chooses and uses deliberately or unintentionally. According to Watt (2007, 3), this existence of "a choice between two or more distinct but linguistically equivalent variants represents the existence of a linguistic variable" in a language.

Among many types of variability, it is the type of variation which is embodied in the system of the language that concerns the present research. Usually, this variation is not random; it is systematic because it is consistently related to identity, social background and other psychological characteristics of the speakers (Chambers 2003b, 8). Milroy and Milroy (1992, 1) state that linguistic variation, be it in big urban areas where many languages are spoken or in small speech communities, is not arbitrary; it is systematic for there are social factors that are responsible for it. Wolfram (2006, 336) divides factors that help to explain such variability into two: linguistic and social. The linguistic factors include the linguistic context and the way linguistic units are combined; the social factors consist of extra-linguistic context in which the language is used and other demographic characteristics of speakers like age and social class. Watt (2007, 5) mentions social network as additional social factor.

Now the question to be answered is if the social factors affect the variability at the same size or how they interact in the whole variability process. The cause and effect relationship between the social factors and the linguistic variants is not straightforward. Commonly more than one factor plays a role in making the language of one group different from that of the other (Wolfram 2006, 336).

When focusing on age as a factor of variation, differences among people of the same age in life experience, education, social status, and gender must not be forgotten because these may cause

considerable linguistic difference even within the age categories under investigation (Llamas 2007, 71). Furthermore, each social factor comprises other sub-factors in it (Milroy and Milroy 1998, 37-38).

2.2. Age as a Social Factor for Language Variation

Aging is a very important part of human life:

> It is the achievement of physical and social capacities and skills, a continual unfolding of the individual's participation in the world, construction of personal history, and movement through the history of the community and of society. If aging is movement through time, age is a person's place at a given time in relation to the social order: a stage, a condition, a place in history. Age and aging are experienced both individually and as part of a cohort of people who share a life stage, and/or an experience of history (Eckert 1998, 105).

Thus, age signals the position of individuals in human life as partly conditioned by the context of the society and it determines the attitude of other individuals towards them and their attitude towards others.

Language, being one of the ways in which people manifest their position as individual and as part of a society, is strongly connected with age. According to Llamas (2007, 69), the social, psychological, biological, cognitive and physical realities of a person that are determined by their age are reflected in and moderated by their language. The general communicative behavior, the phonology, the grammar, and the vocabulary of a person give a clue at what life stage the person is.

However, age is not well explored as a social category that influences language variation (Llamas 2007, 69). The common practice of dividing age into life stages and determining position of a person in the society by that stage is an oversimplification (Llamas 2007, 69). For Eckert (1998, 105) and Milroy and Gordon (2003, 38), age should be used as a factor for variation in its social nature, not in its chronological aspect. If change in individuals' language is the focus, chronological age is not efficient to explain it because chronological age only gives information on the position of individuals in a society as determined by the number; it does not take their social and biological development into consideration.

For this reason, many studies divide the life span into categories based on people's common life practices and proceed to describe linguistic differences in age. The psychological classification of development into childhood, adolescence, and adulthood is the common method in this approach (Eckert 1998, 107).

Variation due to age approached in this method is connected either with age grading or language change. When the manifestations of a certain language variable are structured into time periods, they give information about the evolution on specific individuals' language use as they transfer from one developmental phase to another; this is called age grading. But if the changes occurred in the community's linguistic culture, the process is called language change (Eckert 1998, 105; Llamas 2007, 73).

Meyerhoff (2006, 145) states that "if, as a rule, all speakers of a community use more tokens of one variant at a certain age and more tokens of another variant at another age, the variable is said to be age-graded." The change does not involve people of all ages in the community. It is limited to people of a certain age. The people do not take the tokens with them when they advance in age; rather they begin to use the language of the people of that age (Meyerhoff 2006, 145). A certain grammatical, lexical, phonetic or discourse item used by people of some age group disappears as the people grow older and it is replaced with a new item that characterizes the new age they reached (Holmes 1992, 183). This item appears to be consistent in occurrence in all generations (Milroy and Gordon 2003, 36).

In language change, the distinct linguistic behavior of people of an age group (life stage) persists regardless of their promotion to the next stage (Friðriksson 2008, 254; Llamas 2007, 73). The preceding age cohorts also adopt that new linguistic behavior their seniors are using. In other words, the evolution involves the whole community (Meyerhoff 2006, 145).

Language change occurs as a result of a competition between variants in which one wins over the other. Usually the variant that wins is the prestigious one. People use a certain variant deliberately or automatically because they like it and stop to use another because they do not like it. The deliberate regard of a certain variant as stylish is called overt prestige and the fact that people give a certain linguistic item a higher position without knowing that they do so is known as covert prestige (Aitchison 2001, 95, 96).

2.3. Other Factors for Language Variation

Though categorizing people into life stages during studying language variation is methodologically sound, realities of intragroup differences due to the other social variables must not be overlooked. The language used by people of the same age needs not be totally similar as the people may have different life experiences and social backgrounds that cause the intragroup linguistic differences to happen (Llamas 2007, 72).

Culture plays the scaffolding role in these intragroup differences and in the interaction between age and the other social factors. Societies differ from one another in their expectations from their members regarding gender-related roles. Besides "certain landmarks, such as coming of age across societies, are gender-specific, and family, legal, and institutional status are commonly different for males and females" (Eckert 1998, 108). The transfer from one life stage to the next does not also occur at the same age for men and woman in different ethnic groups. In general, there are differences in the correspondence between chronological age and social age for men and women depending on culture. Therefore, being in the same age category is not the sole condition for men and women to have totally similar linguistic behaviors.

Failure to make a distinction between gender and sex makes one fail to account for this fact. The linguistic differences between men and women are caused by gender differences, not by sex; sex only has an indirect contribution to gender and "gender-based variation occurs within, as well as between sex groups" (Eckert 1989, 247). Therefore, gender and sex should not be taken as parallel concepts when considering variation. Sex is a biological entity that cannot be taken as substitute for gender. Gender is a social construct and is not as simplistic as dividing people into male and female.

In addition, the relationship between gender and language variation goes beyond the customary prescriptive role divisions between men and women. Especially nowadays, as gender ideologies are changing and women are breaking the traditional role boundaries to enter what were formerly taken as a male zone, gender and its relationship with language variation requires a considerate observation (Eckert 1989, 247; Wodak and Benke 1998, 90-91).

Social class also has its own effect. Eckert (1998, 108), for instance, observes that people in the working class transfer earlier into the adult life stage than people in the middle class do. This

change in their social age impacts their involvement in the linguistic marketplace and this in turn affects their linguistic repertoire. Consequently, two persons of the same age may have different linguistic behaviors or people of different life stages may have similar linguistic behaviors due to the requirements of the social class they belong to.

One source of dilemma as to using social class as a factor to determine language variation is the determination of the boundary between the sub-categories. Meyerhoff (2006, 156) states that social class is "a measure of status which is often based on occupation, income and wealth, but also can be measured in terms of aspirations and mobility. These factors can then be used to group individuals scoring similarly on these factors into socioeconomic classes." But as there is no universally accepted system of scoring, the classification is observed to vary from context to context.

There is also a view that social class is, on the one hand, associated with a specific identity the members of a group build due to the similarities they have among themselves, and on the other hand, with the contrasts and conflicts members of a specific class have with people belonging to other classes from the perspective of their occupation, income, education etc. (Meyerhoff 2006, 156). This also makes the determination subjective and relative.

Initially, Karl Marx distinguished between the classes of the proletariat and the capitalists using the criteria of possession of resources or means of production. Then, Max Weber added power and prestige as other criteria to group people into classes (Ash 2003, 306). More recently, a middle class developed in Western societies that comprises of managers, government officials, teachers and so on whose identity is determined more by skills, education and qualification rather than property. This group introduced the cultural factor as a criterion for class division as the members of this group usually become distinct in their life, speech and occupation styles from people of the other types (Kerswill 2007, 52).

Nowadays, the binary distinction between the middle and the working classes is very common in various studies. In some studies, the working class is subdivided into upper vs. lower working classes. In others, more elaborate stratification is introduced that ranges from four (lower class, working class, lower middle class, and upper middle class) to eight levels (Ash 2003, 308-311;

Kerswill 2007, 54). But the upper or higher class is lacking from these classifications probably because it only has very few and scarcely distributed members.

The stratification in social classes is commonly based on a combination of various indicators including occupation, income, education, housing and neighborhood, membership in networks (including family, friendship, club, fraternity networks), manners, speech styles, or other observable behaviors (Ash 2003, 306-311; Kerswill 2007, 52, 54; Meyerhoff 2006, 156-159). But different scholars of language variation use them with varying degrees of emphasis. The choice and weight of the indicators depends on the realities of the societies studied and the objectives of the research (Ash 2003, 308). Though many researchers use a mixture of these criteria, some like Horvath (1985) and Lennig (1978) use occupation as the sole indicator. Their position is appealing because occupation is the function of some of the indicators like education, and the other indicators like income, housing and neighborhood, and membership in networks are the results of occupation.

The last dilemma about social class is whether it exists in all societies or not. The literature reviewed in this chapter has referred to societies with social class divisions, as it deals with Western societies, which have a long history of capitalism. In Ethiopia, it is not customary to talk about social classes. This is probably due to the country's socialist background and its policy of leveling off social and economic conditions in the population and to make the people think to belong to the same social class. But it does not mean that socioeconomic differences do not exist in the country at all because communities are normally divided into socioeconomic groups in any society if not at the level of social class (Ash 2003, 305). Therefore, in this study it is preferred to use the term 'socioeconomic grouping' to refer to the stratification of the society.

Socioeconomic grouping causes variation in people's language. Historically, the creation of class changed people's worldview. It made them to view the world and speak about things in it from the viewpoint of the difference between their class and that of others. Especially discriminations due to class caused speech differentiations and created different dialects and accents. The working class and the upper class began to develop their own social dialects (sociolects) (Kerswill 2007, 51). At later stages when people became conscious of those distinctive linguistic features, they associated them with their social class membership and made them their permanent identification (Meyerhoff 2006, 161).

Attitude towards linguistic items play an additional role on causing variation according to social class. People belonging to a community may have positive or negative attitudes to specific linguistic variants. When a variant is given a higher value, people of the higher social class start to use it frequently. As a result, it will become the standard variant. Once it is a standard variant, the people use it even in more frequency to endorse its prestigious position so that the class will be permanently associated with that variant (Meyerhoff 2006, 161).

Attitude towards specific linguistic variants and class membership have a symbolic relationship (Meyerhoff 2006, 161). When people change their social class due to educational, economic, social, and so forth improvements or losses in the course of their life, they change their speech to accommodate to the new class (Meyerhoff 2006, 157). This is regularly the case when people are transferred from a lower to a higher social class. However, in downward changes, speakers still may retain the speech style of their former higher class to indicate that they consider this change to be temporary, or that they do not accept their current position (Meyerhoff 2006, 158).

According to Meyerhoff (2006, 160), social class can also be associated with language change. Differing proportions of use of variants belonging to the same linguistic variable by different groups, like the prevalence of certain variants in the higher social class and popularity of the other variants in the lower social class, indicates that the variable is undergoing change. The change is evident only when the distribution of variants is equally patterned according to the age and social status of the speakers. If the frequency of a certain variant continuously increases from older to younger speakers belonging to a certain social class, it can be concluded that a change in progress is occurring.

2.4. The Effect of Psychological and Social Differences on Language Use

Most variation studies in which age is taken into account in its social meaning favor an emic approach. In this approach, people are categorized into developmental life phases according to their basic psychological make-up, their common life practices, and their social roles. The psychological development-based classification into childhood, adolescence, adulthood, and old age is one form of this approach (Kalat 2005, 182; Eckert 1998, 107, 110). This research also

uses the emic-based stratification; specifically it focuses on the two middle stages of human development, namely adolescence and adulthood.

Adolescence covers the early teens and has its own defining characteristics (Kalat 2005, 182). It is the period when people form their identity. People in this stage decide on the type of future carrier they do, the religious conviction they follow, and the political stand they hold. What is more, particularly in the early adolescence stage, people are emotionally forceful and as a result they engage in conflicts with their parents and other adults. The age is also characterized by high peer influence and scant sensitivity to the norms of the entire society (Llamas 2007, 71). These behaviors are further represented by institutions like the school where the adolescents are found in high concentration. Furthermore, adolescents emphasize physical attractiveness when they think or talk about themselves or others. Moreover, they consider themselves as unique, and they tend to perform activities that have high risks. This risk-taking behavior is aggravated by peer pressure; because adolescents fear being ridiculed by their peers if they fail, they set to do anything whatever dangerous it is (Kalat 2005, 184-185).

Adulthood covers more than half of a person's life span ranging from the late teens to retirement (Kalat 2005, 182). Unlike adolescents, adults are preoccupied with issues of intimacy and generativity. They are concerned with sharing their life with another person (specialy their spouse), forming a family, and contributing to the existence and sustainability of their family and the society as a whole. Adults who are successful with regard to these preoccupations feel proud of themselves; but those who are not get into despair, which in some cases persist even to their old age (Kalat 2005, 182).

As a result of the above psychological characteristics and social practices, the two age groups represent two separate linguistic life courses marked by different linguistic experiences. Adolescents create unique ways of communicating that stand in opposition with that of the other age groups and by doing so they express their identity. Together with their unique clothing styles, cosmetics, music, daily engagements, and habits like uses of narcotics, they develop unique linguistic styles that they think can show their uniqueness both as a group and as individuals and mark their social territory with other age groups. Language plays a key role also in their process of experiencing and reconciling of the "multiple emerging aspects of [their] life

in the development of communication and social skills" (Fortman 2003, 104). In other words, they exploit the potential of language to deal with their unique social situations.

Eckert (2003, 115) illustrates this fact with the case of immigrant adolescents in USA. These adolescents face multiple factors in addition to age that call for a strong measure of adjustment; their culture and their worldview should not only be defined by age, but also by space, ethnicity, class, gender, race, color etc. They should redefine the new world they join, make the transition from the old world to the new smoother, reconcile the new norms with the old ones they are accustomed to, determine their own roles in the new society etc. In this trial of them to adjust, they create new meanings and these new meanings cause permanent effects on the entire language. They also act as bridge to transfer those new meanings to the next new generation. With these new meanings they construct, they begin a new society because they carry them to adulthood when they also grow.

Adolescents also try to integrate their personal communicating characteristics to that of their peer groups (Llamas 2007, 71; Fortman 2003). They use language as the most important instrument to accomplish activities like bargaining customs and positions and building up solidarity and faith in the groups. They even show their uniqueness as a group (Eckert 2003, 113) via a unique use of their linguistic resources.

Thus "perhaps as a result, it is widely held that adolescence is the focal period of linguistic innovation and change" (Llamas 2007, 71). Eckert (2003, 115) strengthens Llamas claim saying:

> adolescents lead other age groups in linguistic change—both the "regular" change that would take place no matter what, such as sound change…—and quite probably in the coining of lexical items, discourse markers, intonation patterns, and so forth. It would be a mistake to think of adolescents as simply inventing new ways of saying the same things; by virtue of their transitional place in the life course, adolescents are in a particularly strong position to respond to change in the conditions of life, and in so doing bring about lasting social change.

To generalize, the new innovations adolescents introduce are not due to their covetousness for reproduction and not because their behavior is prone to delinquency as many think, but it is due to their need to establish their identity, to meet the requirements by the peer groups, to adjust to

new cultures and environments they join, and to cope with changes in their life and their relations with the others prompted by age. And this special role language has in their life makes them play a central role in re-forming the overall linguistic system.

Adults, in contrast, prefer the standard variety; they are conservative language users when compared to young people (cf. Williams and Kerswill 1999, 151-152, 162). Eckert (1998, 113) explains that the adults' conservative attitude is rooted in the imposition to use the standard variety at work places. As a result, adults, especially in the middle ages, are expected to use the largest amount of prestigious variants of a language because at that time they experience the highest social pressure for conformity (Llamas 2007, 72).

2.5. Linguistic Differences between Adolescents and Adults

Research has clearly shown that adolescents and adults differ from one another in their choice of specific discourse elements. Some differences represent linguistic change in progress and others age-graded variation. The discourse variables this section deals with include swear words, slang, labeling, quotatives, discourse markers, addressing terms, and discourse strategies. But to illustrate the extent to which adolescents are innovative and the extent to which they serve as agents of change, and the degree to which adults' discourse is dense, some phonological, lexical, syntactic and sociolinguistic elements are also cited.

Holmes (1992, 183) observes that swear (vulgar) words are most frequently used by teenagers. But when people grow older, have their own children, and mix with various people, the frequency of swear words they use decreases. Holmes (1992, 183) also shows that slang is widely used among adolescents but it is odd among adults. Eckert (2003, 114) and Reyes (2005) state that slang is one form of the innovation informal groups like those that are formed by adolescents are known for. Adolescents use slang to identify themselves to the adolescent culture which exists in opposition to the norms of the adult community. Slang marks how far the adolescents are from the general society.

Usually slang words are understood only in the group that creates them. However, those that are created by the adolescents of the lower social status are also adopted by adolescents of middle class. In some societies, the slang words created by the adolescents infiltrate into the standard variety (Eckert 2003, 114). This shows that in as much as using slang to demarcate their

territory, adolescents, especially those in the lower social status, can transfer it to the other groups and create effect on the entire language.

Adolescents are ahead of adults not only in the frequency of slang they use but also in the variety. Barbieri (2008, 60, 64, 65) compared the speech of younger speakers (15-25 years of age) and older speakers (35-60 years of age) of English and discovered that the younger speakers use "a wide variety of slang words, ranging from taboo or swear words to non-derogatory, or 'proper' … slang" (Barbieri (2008, 64). Examples include *fuck, shit, fucking, fucked, ass, asshole, shitty, damn,* and *bastard(s)*. The slang words *man* and *dude* are also used as address terms by the youth with a very high frequency.

Labeling is another unique behavior of adolescents. According to Eckert (2003, 114), adolescents coin words to name social phenomena and they introduce them to the wider day-to-day discourse. Nicknames are good examples of the category. Adolescents use the labels commonly for categorizing people, expressing what they observe on people, commenting on people, directing attention to other people, and characterizing people not around.

Regarding discourse organization, Cameron (1998, 70) explored the use of reporting or quotative verbs in Puerto Rican Spanish by four age groups (pre-teens, teens, people between 20-39 years of age, and people over 40 years). He found that speakers older than 20 years prefer verbs of direct report, like *say* and *think*, to speaker-centered constructions where the speaker is mentioned without a reporting verb, or freestanding constructions in which neither the speaker is mentioned nor a reporting verb is used. The latter two constructions are preferred by the teens. Generally, as age increases the use of verbs of direct reporting increases while the use of the speaker-centered and freestanding constructions decreases. Thus, a change is occurring towards the speaker-centered variant. But it is not clear why Cameron's study is limited to three types of quotatives. Perhaps Puerto Rican Spanish uses only these. But in English, researchers show that the number goes beyond.

Fox and Cheshire (2009) discovered that two innovative quotatives *be like* and *this is + subject* have a strong base among adolescents as compared to other age groups in London. Winter (2002, 20) confirmed that Australian adolescents use these quotatives but only with third person singular subjects. Cheshire et al. (2011, 173-174) add that the two quotatives are used by the

London adolescents but not by the adults. From the two quotatives, *be like* is the most frequent. The fact that the two are also used by children shows that new types of quotative are being introduced to English. Barbieri (2008, 77) and Tagliamonte and D'Arcy (2004, 507) substantiate that in America and Canada older speakers prefer the traditional words of reporting like *say, tell* and so on as devices of interpersonal involvement, but the younger ones favor the innovative ones such as *be like*. Dailey-O'Cain (2000, 68) strengthens Barbieri's finding that adolescents surpass adults in using *like* more frequently. Furthermore, Buchstaller et al. (2010, 193-194) prove that the ephemeral and innovative quotative *all* is giving way to the other innovative *like* in California. Thus though generally a shift into new quotative forms is occurring in the English speaking world, the use is conditioned by syntactic and pragmatic constraints in different places (Buchstaller et al. 2010, 202).

Erman (2001, 1337) reveals in her study of age-motivated differences in the use of discourse markers that:

> young speakers increasingly seem to be using [the] marker ['you know'] as a metalinguistic monitor with a modal function emphasizing the force of the speech-act and as a social monitor eliciting a reaction from the addressee(s); adults, in contrast, primarily use the marker to build up a text, and create coherence, the marker functioning as a textual monitor.

Erman (2001, 1337) asserts that the phrase *you know* is undergoing a change in the speech of adolescents: it is being grammaticalized into a pragmatic marker.

Barbieri (2008, 67) did a more comprehensive research than Erman and discovered that as people got older the number of variants of discourse markers they use decreases. Younger and older Americans are different in their choice of variants as well. Younger speakers choose the attention getter *hey* and the exclamatives *wow* more than any discourse marker as older speakers favor the interjection *gosh* and *oops* most. In addition, younger speakers use a wider variety of response tokens, with *right, no, nah* and *yeah* being the common ones, than the older speakers do. The older ones prefer *okay*. However, since the upper age limit of the younger group of participants of Barbieri's study goes beyond eighteen, the maximum age limit for the adolescent category, the result lacks preciseness to represent adolescents distinctly.

Barbieri (2008, 75) adds that *like* as a hedging expression is the most frequent discourse marker in the youth speech. Dailey-O'Cain (2000, 66) also found that adolescents use *like* as a focuser in a greater frequency than adults. Tagliamonte's (2005) research on what she called innovative discourse markers such as *like, just, and so* as well gives additional witness that adolescents dominate children and adults. Tagliamonte's remark that *like* is an innovative form makes sense because all the three studies that were done in a time span of 10 years agree that it is consistently favored by adolescents but not by adults.

Furthermore, Japanese adolescents use hedging expressions, a type of discourse markers, in higher frequency than adults do. By doing so, members of the group express their politeness and protect themselves from confrontation (Lauwereyns 2002, 257). This finding agrees with Barbieri's (2008) study on *like* and Erman's (2001) on *you know* that adolescents hedge more than adults do.

With regard to addressing terms, young speakers use second person pronouns more frequently than the older speakers do (Barbieri 2008, 68).

Moreover, the adults' use of discourse strategies is found out to excel that of adolescents in regularity, rate of occurrence and suppleness (Felton 2004, 35; Felton and Kuhn 2001, 151). In argumentative situations, adults use higher level discourse strategies when compared to adolescents:

> Adults use the directly offensive strategy of counterargument more than twice as often as teens. Moreover, in other conversational moves, such as Interpret and Clarify, adults are preparing the way for counterargument by directing and defining the partner's argument with the intent of weakening it. Such sequences, extending over multiple conversational moves, are less frequent among teens. Also less frequent among teens are defensive strategic sequences – notably, the key strategy of rebuttal (Felton and Kuhn 2001, 151).

Adults are also better in changing and modifying their strategies according to the discourse situation; but adolescents use similar strategies when arguing with both agreeing and disagreeing partners. For instance, adults leave counterarguments and pass to intensifying the strategies of developing their position further when partners agree with them but adolescents use counterargument in the same frequency with all types of partners (Felton and Kuhn 2001, 151).

Adults' effectiveness is also reflected in their use of modifiers. According to Macaulay (2002, 401-403), the frequency of using adverbs and adjectives is relatively high among adults when compared to adolescents. It is known that adjectives and adverbs make description and explanations more detailed, more sensory and clearer; thus adults' excellence in using these elements signals that they are effective in producing dense discourse.

Concerning the use of English non-standard forms, members of the so-called New York gang are observed to drop past markers and use multiple negations in higher frequency than adults do (Holmes 1992, 184; Llamas 2007, 71, 73). Regarding the reason for the differences in the use of non-standard forms, Holmes (1992, 184) and Milroy and Gordon (2003, 39) are of the opinion that adolescents use non-standard forms deliberately to mark solidarity with their friends, to establish separate group identities and to signal their unconformist attitude towards social norms.

Linguistic variation between adolescents and adults was also observed in phonology. Mathisen (1999, 110-117) discovers that adolescents exceed middle-aged adults in using innovative sound forms. In addition, Chambers (1995) reported that young people in South Ontario pronounce the letter <z> as *zee*. They imitate it from American TVs. But as they grow older, they replace it with *zed*, which is the adult norm in Canada.

Adolescents' impact on language variation goes beyond temporary alterations on discrete elements like *zee* to permanent changes on the whole language. According to the study of Roberts (2000), they played a significant role in the transformation of the Hawaiian English Pidgin into a Creole. Actually, the pidgin was created when immigrant children of Hawaiian, Chinese, Japanese and Portuguese native language speakers played together. But later, adolescents who knew that pidgin made it the identity marker of their peer group to distinguish themselves from the English-speaking adult society that dominated the area. By doing so, the adolescents promoted the pidgin to a creole.

Based on her broad-based research in America, Barbieri (2008, 77-79) gives a concluding report that there are differences in the day to day spoken lexico-grammar of different age groups where the younger generation favors fashionable and few but multifunctional items while the older generation prefers conventional and particularized elements. As the review in the preceding

paragraphs reveal, this pattern is overarching; it works not only for lexico-grammar but also for discourse and phonology.

But generally, the limited number of research results reviewed above implies that language variation from the point of view of linguistic developmental phases in life is not well researched Scholars of the field like Eckert (1998, 105) also share this view.

Adolescence suffers from this problem because of the wrong popular belief about it. Adolescence is often stereotypically related to delinquency and since their language is taken as a reflection of this behavior, it is not given the necessary attention. Thus there is still no consistent theoretical framework that helps to understand their linguistic and communicative behavior (Fortman 2003, 104). Fortman (2003, 104-105) suggests that there is a need to develop this framework with an insider perspective that looks into how membership to peer groups affects the language of the adolescents and how the language of the adolescents affects their self-esteem.

Llamas (2007, 71) also states that adulthood, the longest of all life stages, is uncritically regarded as homogenous, and the language of adults as the standard. Furthermore, in cases where the linguistic behavior of people of a certain life stage is studied, it is not related to the preceding or proceeding life stage that has strong relationship in contributing to it or in being affected by it.

2.6. Intersection of Social Class and Gender with Age

The age difference is not the only cause for linguistic variation between adolescents and adults; other social variables may interfere. The following subsections give evidence about the effects of social class and gender on the linguistic differences between the two age groups.

2.6.1. Age and Social Class

Bernstein (1971) introduced the phrases ‘restricted code’ and ‘elaborated code’ in his study of linguistic differences between working and middle class members. He stated that due to the impact of implicit role divisions in the family, members of the working class use a “restricted code”, that is, their language is implicit and indirect; it falls short of adjectives and adverbs; it is full of stereotypical expressions, commands and interrogatives; it confuses causes and effects; and it is known for expressions of “circularity” such as the one in tags. The language of members

of the middle class who are found to have negotiated the role divisions in their families, on the other hand, is free from the above paucity and thus, according to Bernstein's designation, it is an "elaborated code". This led Bernstein to the hypothesis that two adolescents may show variation in their language due to their different class membership. Or, in another view, an adolescent and an adult may use similar language forms when they belong to the same social class.

Though Bernstein's hypothesis is valued for its pioneering role, it needs to be checked further in different settings before concluding his claim as a universal fact. As expected, different researches were done subsequently and they came up with differing conclusions.

Kerswill (2007, 58) has mentioned a number of such studies that have verified the hypothesis. In addition, Wodak (1996) found that during retelling stories, members of the middle class emphasize accuracy, and only indirectly they add reflections of their own personal positions, whereas members of the working class personalize the story, adapt it to their context, and relate it to their experiences. In doing so, the working class members use direct methods for narrating while the middle class members employ complicated techniques of summarizing and factualizing. This variation in re-narrating a story was ascribed to the different socialization processes in the two classes. Bedisti (2004) presents similar results from a study of Greek children between 11-13 years of age who were made to describe pictures presented to them. The descriptions of middle class children were clear and direct while those of the working class children refer to things outside the task.

Within the Ethiopian context, there is also a study that confirms Bernstein's hypothesis. The progress of Amharic-speaking children with low and middle socio-economic backgrounds in the acquisition of phonemes was compared and finally it was discovered that the child with low socio-economic background is behind the one with middle socio-economic background in her mastery of Amharic phonemes (Kokeb 1981). The researcher ascribes this slow mastery of the phonemes by the child from the low socio-economic group to the low degree of her interaction with the adult family members and the consequent lack of input, correction, and encouragement she might get from them. The adults could not do these because of their low educational level, their low will and their busy schedule to pass time with the child, and their small number in the family (Kokeb 1981, 48-49). But the question if this is also true for adolescents on discourse items remains unsolved.

A study that does not confirm Bernstein's (1971) hypothesis and stands in opposition to Wodak's finding is that of Macaulay (2002). Macaulay found that middle class members of both the adolescent and adult age groups use more adverbs and adjectives than working class members do; however, they do so to express emphasis, to make their ideas clear, and to add tentativeness to their ideas, not to make reference direct and clear. To achieve these purposes, working class members add more detailed information instead of using adverbs and adjectives. This makes their speech objective, clear and easy to interpret. But the intensive use of evaluative adverbs (like *amazingly, awfully* etc.) and adjectives (like *bad, horrendous*) by middle class members makes their ideas biased and thus demanding to interpret. According to Macaulay (2002, 400-403, 411, 415), when working class members report events, they put their positions at the back and let their listeners draw their own conclusions. These methods have helped them to make their ideas more explicit than the middle class members do. To put it in Bernstein's terms, the working class uses 'elaborated code' and the middle class uses the 'restricted code'.

The other study that can be used as input in evaluating Bernstein's hypothesis is that of Cheshire. Cheshire (2005, 489, 490, 498) discovers that working class adolescents prefer bare noun phrases that are not marked for any social identity to refer to new discourse entities while middle class members tend to use expanded forms of the phrases. For example members of the working class would say *I like the set* as members of the middle class would prefer to say *another thing I like is the television set you bought* (Kerswill 2007, 59). In other words, members of the middle class prefer to make things explicit but the working class leave things for the listener to infer. This also substantiates Macaulay's (2002) conclusion that the speech of working class members is more "collaborative", objective and audience-oriented than the speech of middle class members and that of the middle class reflects their independence and speaker-orientedness. Therefore, it seems that it is not possible to reach a conclusion so far concerning Bernstein's theory.

Actually, the research has goes beyond the issues that concerned Bernstein. A research by Cameron (1998, 70) on quoting constructions reveals that class does not have an interfering role in the distribution of speaker-centered quotative across the age groups. However, reporting verbs are most frequently chosen by member of the lower class while the freestanding quotative is usually found in the speeches of younger speakers and members of the upper class. But as it is

explained in section 2.5, the study is not distinctly about adolescents and adults, and thus it does not have a function more than giving a clue on the topic.

The classes are also compared in their use of individual tokens. Macaulay (2006, 280) discovered that an intensifier *pure* is developing in adolescent working class as a new innovation in Glasgow and this makes up an insider norm that stands in contrast to the adult custom. In addition, a research on discourse extenders shows that the extender *and that* is used in more frequency by the working class, and *and stuff* and *and things* by the middle class. However, it is found out that it is impossible to draw a comprehensive pattern with regard to the use of English discourse extenders in general by adolescents of both social classes (Cheshire 2007, 164, 187).

Furthermore, social class and age influence the creation and spread of slang. Slang expressions have a transferable behavior from class to class in the adolescent life stage; the lower class is usually the origin and the middle class the recipient, as Eckert's (2003, 114) review of studies on slang testifies.

The case that slang is pervasive among the working class supports Kerswill's (2007), Kerswill and Williams's (1999), and Cheshire, Kerswill, and Williams's (2005) findings that members of the working class prefer to use forms that identify them with their immediate local peer group while the members of the middle class emphasize forms accepted as standard and used in the wider society. Similarly, Mallinson (2007, 156-160) approves that the speech of people with high social status is usually careful, regulated and formal.

The working class' preference to non-standard and innovative forms has a comprehensive nature; there are research evidences that show that the tendency is also reflected on phonological and grammatical features. For instance, the study of Eckert (1989, 245) on youths of both sexes in Detroit revealed that the youths from the working class are ahead of those in the middle class in adopting newly introduced sounds, that are not part of the adult speech norm. This class difference is especially obvious among the girls.

Meyerhoff (2006, 163-164) additionally shows that in New Zealand English, working class adolescents dominate and lead middle class adolescents in the change of syllable final intervocalic *t* into the non-standard glottal flap *t*. This finding is consistent with Mathisen's (1999, 112-113) conclusion that the lower social class is in the forefront in the process of

changing the same sound in England. Similarly, the deletion of sounds in the personal pronouns in Montreal French is commonly found with people belonging to the low social class, while people in the higher social class use the conservative forms (without deletion) which also represent the standard variety. Based on the data she cites and her observations on history, Meyerhoff (2006, 163) argues that in the long run, the innovative forms may develop into a new standard, as with the vowel *a* in English which initially was considered a Cockney variant but now is standard. Kerswill and Williams (2000:11) as well found out that working class adolescents in Reading and Milton Keyes use more non-standard grammatical forms than the middle class do.

This social class' role in affecting language change is further strengthened by the research done by Mees and Collins (1999, 198-200). Conducting a longitudinal study on young people who once belonged to the same social class in Cardiff at their respective ages of 10, 15 and 24 years, Mees and Collins found that individuals change their language over time irrespective of other members of the same cohort. The researchers ascribe this individual change in particular to a change in social class membership that is caused by economic or educational promotion. When individuals change their class, they adopt the linguistic behavior of members of that new class and begin to speak differently from those who remain in the former class. This shows that people inherently take social class as the formation of their identity and they use language as representation of this identity as opposed to the identity of others.

Like non-standard forms, stigmatized items are also issues of difference between the classes though the difference is not at the level of change in progress. For instance, Chambers (2003a, 266) and Milroy et al. (1994) show that in Glasgow where people as a custom replace the consonant *t* with the glottal stop *ʔ* in words like *butter, batting, Betty, forty, fitting* or *football* though they know the practice is stigmatized, speakers from the lower social status are ahead of speakers from the higher social status in the frequency of the replacement. Class is so strong in causing differences that it is even reflected in culturally imbedded forms.

2.6.2. Age and Gender

Regarding gender and age, Holmes' (1992, 183) review of former researches implies that teenagers of both genders use swear words in almost the same frequency. But at adulthood, the

difference between the two genders becomes great; the men use swear words more frequently than the women. The frequency is also conditioned by situational differences; while adult men use such words in same-sex contexts, adult women rarely do so in all contexts. It seems that men are more peer-oriented than women.

Regarding quotatives, the picture is not as simple as with swear words. Cameron (1998, 74) proves that there is no coherent generalizable relationship between males and females in their use of quotative constructions across age groups. Concerning the verbs of direct reporting, women exceed men in the adolescent age but men exceed women in the adult age. The freestanding quotative construction is used more by men than by women in all age groups. In the speaker centered quotative construction, women lead until the age of 19 years, are equal with men in the ages between 20-39 years, and fall to the level lower than men when they are 40 years old or above.

One issue to be taken into account about Cameron's research is that it does not show if a change is occurring and which gender is more active in causing the change. However, when the studies done by Tagliamonte, alone and with others, on quotatives at different periods in time are connected to each other, they show that the impact of gender on change process happens at different rates in different countries. In 1999, Tagliamonte and Hudson (1999, 160-161) found that in Britain, more females preferred *be+like* than males; males use *say* instead. But in Canada, no significant difference between genders in their use of the quotative was observed then. A difference was noticed only in *say* and *go*; most women favor *say* while men favor *go*. But, five years later Tagliamonte and D'Arcy (2004, 507) found that *be like* began to replace the old *say* in Canada and women adolescents were at the front in leading the change. A study done after another five years by the same researchers also showed the same result (Tagliamonte and D'Arcy 2009, 75-99).

This leading role of women is observed on discourse markers as well. In Tagliamonte and D'Arcy (2009, 75-99), adolescent women play the leading role in facilitating the change process in the hesitation marker *like* and the intensifier *so*. Furthermore, Lauwereyns (2002, 257) uncovered that Japanese female adolescents use hedging expressions more frequently than male adolescents and both genders of the adults do. Tagliamonte's (2005) research on what she called

innovative discourse markers (*like, just, so* etc.) as well gives additional witness that female adolescents lead male adolescents and all adults.

By implication, the research on quotatives and discourse markers indicate that women are more active in picking and using innovative features than men if the features are part of a language change. They like to consistently update themselves on items that are acceptable by the wider society or that are advancing quickly to that status.

The other focus of researchers concerning discourse markers is comparing the age groups in their preference of discrete tokens. For example, Barbieri's (2008, 67) study on the exclamative *gosh* brings forth that the token is more frequent in women's speech than in men's. And Cheshire and Williams (2002, 230, 235) compares the orientations of male and female adolescents in relation to *so* and *but*, when the markers occur at turn-final positions. The finding is that males use the discourse markers to demonstrate referential meaning like contrast and result as the females do to communicate affective meaning. This implies that boys are concerned more with the epistemic aspect of their discourse as the females are more worried about the affective side of their talks.

But it is not possible to reach a similar working conclusion so far on some discourse features like discourse extenders, and the use of adjectives and adverbs. Norrby and Winter (2001, 3) reveal that girls and boys use discourse extenders, a subset of discourse markers, in Australian English and Swedish almost equally. However, Cheshire (2007, 187) has found out that she cannot draw a comprehensive pattern with regard to the use of English discourse extenders in general by adolescent boys and girls. These two findings may show that gender has no power in affecting differences in these discourse features. In addition, the difference in conclusions between the two creates a thought that further research is needed.

Research on adverbs and adjectives by Macaulay (2002, 401-403) shows that middle class male adults and working class female adolescents use the items more frequently than middle class female adults and working class male adolescents do. In addition, the difference between the two genders in the adolescence age is lower than the difference between them in the adult age group. However, since Macaulay's major focus is on social class, his finding does not clearly decipher which gender dominates in each age group.

The other interest area of research is the manner how people introduce new information in conversations. Cheshire (2005, 490) found out that female adolescents use bare noun phrases in greater frequency than boys do when they introduce new information in dialogues. Boys prefer to use the expanded forms of the nouns because they want to make things explicit. Similar findings are presented in Kerswill (2007, 60). He states that women prefer collaborative type of discourse development with indirect suggestion of own opinions while men are less collaborative and they straightforwardly express their positions. Both discoveries imply that females are audience-centered and males are speaker-centered; females put high demand on their audience for interpreting their talk but males take the responsibility for the clarity of their speech.

Some researchers try to verify myths about the communicative behaviors of the two genders. Eckert and McConnel-Ginet (2003, 115) state that context determines who dominates who in mixed-gender interactions; men talk a lot in formal situations and women do so in informal contexts. Again according to Coates (2007, 64), the myth that women talk more is disproved because in many situations males are observed doing more of the talk. Generally, gender cannot determine alone at what length people talk; situational differences and traditional social statuses attached to the genders are the key players that condition the tendencies.

The final area research has interested in about the genders is the preference concerning standard language. Generally, it is observed that men tend to use non-standard and local forms more frequently than women do. For instance, Watt and Milroy (1999, 30, 41) uncovered that men of all social classes in Newcastle, England, prefer non-standard pronunciation. The same applies to adolescents in Milton Keyes and Reading according to Cheshire, Kerswill and Williams (2005, 146). Milroy and Milroy (1998, 38) show that among men and women in the ages between 18-25 years in Belfast, 76% of the men use the non-standard pronunciation, in which *ð* in words like *mother* is deleted as none of the women use it. According to Schilling-Estes and Wolfram (1994, 298), and Chambers (2003a, 267-268), and Sundgren (2009, 118-124), English and Swedish speaking women consistently prefer standard and prestigious syntactic and phonological variants when compared to men who belong to the same social group with them. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the relationship between gender and the preference to standard language is generally predictable.

There are different reasons provided for this. First it is discovered that young men are more influenced by peer pressure to use non-local forms than women do. Young women, in contrast, have the liberty to choose what to say because female peer groups are more tolerant (Wodak and Benke 1998, 94, 96; Trudgill 1972; and Lippi-Green 1989).

Second, men's preference to local forms is higher because they are inclined to forming a local identity. However, women define their identity with the super-ordinate tier of the society and thus emphasize forms accepted as standard by the wider population (Milroy and Milroy 1998, 38; Kerswill 2007, 60). By using standard forms, they subconsciously show that they are sensitive to social expectations concerning language use (Chambers 2003a, 268). According to Holmes (1999, 167), "language is an important means by which women assert their authority and position [in the society], a form of symbolic capital for women."

In addition, due to the influence of the traditional role division between the two genders, women especially of the working class are engaged in interactive types of works, such as the position of clerk, janitor and teller, and they represent their family during talks with school people, landlords and bank officials. Eckert and McConnel-Ginet (2003) complements the truthfulness of the claim saying that in the western society, women are usually engaged in the types of jobs that require the use of standard language. For this reason they are accustomed to use the standard forms (Chambers 2003a, 269-270).

Similar to the case with regard to innovative quotatives and discourse markers, women use innovative phonological items during language change to a greater degree than men. For example, in New Zealand English, high rising terminal tones are an innovation used by the younger generation, and women are three times higher in using it than men (Britain 1992, 89). What is important to note concerning this finding is that women accommodate changes if the changes are towards the standard variety; they do not use innovative forms if they are local (Wodak and Benke 1998, 100).

But the researchers claim these findings are not conclusive. They warn that the case is not as simplistic as it seems, and that more research is needed. They argue that there are many evidences that men also surpass females in using certain innovative sounds where a change is occurring towards the standard variety (Eckert 1989, 248, 264-265; Wodak and Benke 1998, 95).

Therefore, the case is not mere being a male or a female; there are other reasons that influence the choice. For example, in Puerto Rico, it is observed that social networks and professions most probably play a role in determining women's inclination to accommodating changes or resisting innovations (Wodak and Benke 1998, 100).

When also commenting on gender's effect on language variation in general, Eckert (1989, 253) strongly claims that "gender does not have a uniform effect on linguistic behavior for the community as a whole." Though Cameron (1998, 44-45) and Eckert (1989) accept that there is variation among men and women in the ways they use language to express their identity, they are not convinced that there is consistent women or men communicative behavior that persists in all life stages. They do not accept Chamber's (2003a, 267) idea of predictability.

To generalize, it has become difficult to draw a reliable and clear gender pattern in many of the items studied. The present body of knowledge indicates that further research is needed. The researches should also take other factors like situations, traditions, social networks, and professions into consideration since, unlike the other social factors, gender roles are easily intercepted by and are susceptible to these external influences.

2.7. Theoretical Framework

According to Trappes-Lomax (2004, 134), discourse can be analyzed either linguistically or communicatively. The linguistic approach is interested in studying discourse as a level above the sentence, its linguistic components, and the relationship between the components. It considers discourse merely as text. The communicative approach, in contrast, is interested in discourse as a unit of meaning in relation to its social context, and in the social reasons that dictate the choice of a certain linguistic element in a certain communicative setting. In other words, the linguistic approach is form-oriented while the communicative approach is function-oriented.

This research adopts the communicative or functionalist stance especially that of the Systemic-Functional Linguistics, in approaching the discourse variability across age cohorts. Data collection, analysis and interpretation are designed according to the following principles of the Systemic Functional Linguistics:

The researcher views “language as a form of functional behavior which is related to the social situation in which it occurs, as something that we do purposefully in a particular social setting” (Berry 1977, 1), or with the words of Halliday (1994, xviii) “the way it [language] is organized is functional with respect to these needs – it is not arbitrary.” According to Halliday (1994), the rules of grammar have a natural relationship to their meanings; each and every item of grammar is inspired by a social and cultural function. Systemic Functional Linguistics answers the question which bits of organization are called for by which functional requirements, and it reveals the variation in patterning due to change in social situation. In other words, it acknowledges the variable nature of language which is inspired by factors outside the language. The variation may be permanent and uncontrollable, or temporary and controllable (Butler 2006, 701; Berry 1977, 1).

Thus, language is approached as an instrument of communication in this study. It is also taken for granted that the communicative needs people have make them develop the language forms they use. Therefore, the form of language is important only when it has a communicative application. Form is strongly linked with meaning; it is not autonomous.

In the functional approach to language, interpretation and understanding of the language people produce is strongly determined by the social, contextual and cultural factors. In other words, the consideration of the qualities attached to the communicators and the situation where the communication takes place is essential to the interpretation of their discourse. Therefore, this research takes these factors as the focal object of analysis (Butler 2006).

The research also acknowledges the variable, flexible and changing nature of language which is the orientation of functionalist theories. There is variability due to the socio-cultural differences of the speakers even in one language. Language also changes over time and from context to context. Language is said to be flexible in the sense that meanings of words are entrenched in the contexts they are used. Categories found in a language are not abstract but come out from the discursive constraints and the needs of the users (Butler 2006).

Berry’s (1977, 116) approach to Systemic Functional Linguistics identifies six types of contextual meaning: ideational (experiential), logical, attitudinal, interpersonal, textual, and background meanings. The ideational (experiential) function is the transmission of a referential

or semantic meaning concerning personal experiences, thoughts and environment (Trask and Stockwell 2007, 293). Logical meaning is "the kind of [meaning] which provides information about the way in which mini-situations are related within a maxi-situation" (Berry 1977, 117). Attitudinal meaning is the evaluation or feeling of the speakers about the thesis (Berry 1977, 125) but interpersonal meaning is the process of creating and sustaining relationships between participants (Trask and Stockwell 2007, 293). And textual meaning is concerned with the creation of relationship between linguistic items. As a result of the creation of the relationship different parts of the text are coherently and cohesively combined and they are connected to the situation in which the discourse is produced (Trask and Stockwell 2007, 293). Background meaning is the information we derive about one's place of origin, age and social background from the grammar, lexis, and phonology they use (Berry 1977, 123).

Background meaning is the meaning that is unintentional or it is not under the control of the speaker. It is also related to the speaker's permanent identity. Social factors like age are categorized under this type of meaning as the speaker cannot plan them at all. Though Berry (1977) relates background meaning to the lower levels of the language structure (grammar, lexis, phonology and graphology), the relationship can also be extended to discourse. For example, the variation between speakers motivated by their age differences is not under their control. That means, if a certain linguistic behavior is caused by age, it cannot be altered or manipulated, according to the communicative context.

Generally, variation in language use provides clues about the social background of speakers regarding age, gender, socioeconomic status and so on (Berry 1977, 123) because the social position of the speakers determines their choice of the linguistic items they use. Therefore, this study tries to understand the discourse of the people from the perspective of their background. To be specific, the elements of discourse in question will be analyzed mainly whether they are reflections of age differences, and secondly how other social factors such as socioeconomic status, gender and religion internally restructure the linguistic variation attached to age differences. In other words, it is tried to reveal a person's unintentional identity based on their intentional forms and meanings.

These facts about language lead us to a conclusion that language study must draw on only naturally produced language because only natural language can accommodate all of the facts. That is what this research is planned to do.

For Halliday (1994, xv), discourse analysis is done for two purposes: helping to understand the meaning of a given text, and appraising the text. The aim of my research embraces both.

As long as the study is a comparison between the language uses of different generations, it falls in the variationist category. Therefore, its theoretical base is established from the variationist perspective as well. However, in variation studies, there is no full-fledged theory developed so far since the issues are scattered and difficult to capture in an inclusive model. There exist only individualistic beliefs about language and society. Nonetheless, all are based on a set of principles most of which have their roots in functional theories of language (Milroy and Milroy 1998, 33; Coulmas 1998, 7-8). The researcher also has adopted these views to guide the research and thus adhers to the following principles that act as a framework for this study:

1. Language is the medium with which members of a community relate to one another. Since language is an instrument of communication between people it should not be described as if it is independent of its user. The function of language for communication cannot be understood if its relationship with society is ignored (Coulmas 1998, 7).
2. For the members to communicate, their code should not be "completely congruous". In other words, linguistic communities are not necessarily homogeneous (Coulmas 1998, 7).
3. Language is naturally variable and this variability is observed at all levels of the language including discourse (Milroy and Milroy 1998, 33; Watt 2007, 3).
4. Variabilities in language imply social differences between people (Chambers 2003b, 7).
5. Most of the variabilities in language are rule-governed and principled, not arbitrary. The variants are among the available options found in a language that the users choose from (Watt 2007, 3; Milroy and Milroy 1998, 33). In other words, "linguistic variation is not random but rather is shaped by social and linguistic factors. One of the goals of any sociolinguistic study is an account of the influence of these factors" (Gordon 2007, 19).
6. Studies in variation are concerned with distinguishing between the factors related to the society and the language that determine the existence of one form and the absence of the other in a certain language variety. They determine the meaning and the allocation of the

variants in the whole language variety. To achieve this, they explore the relationship between the system in which the variants occur, the social factors that determine the occurrence of the variants, and the behaviors of the language users based on variables like age, socioeconomic status, gender etc. (Watt 2007, 5).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

3.1 Research Design

Language variation is usually studied using a quantitative method, which limits itself to counting frequencies of discrete items, like sounds, words and morphosyntactic elements, and drawing visual representations of their distribution. This study, however, adopts a mixed design, i.e. the combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches.

The quantitative approach is mainly comparative in nature. First, it measures the extent to which the choice of discourse features is determined by the independent variable, age. Then it quantifies the extent to which the moderating variables, namely gender, socioeconomic status and religion, cause variation in the participants' choice of discourse features within the adolescent and adult age groups, and to what extent these factors affect the difference and similarity between the two age groups in their choice of the discourse features.

The qualitative approach focuses mainly on six issues:

1. Identifying, listing and categorizing the variants of each discourse feature in the age groups;
2. Identifying the variants favored by each age group;
3. Explaining the reasons of speakers in the two age groups for choosing one variant and not the other;
4. Discussing the most frequent variants each age group uses;
5. Explaining the uses (functions) of the discourse features and the extralinguistic factors (such as the assumptions and assessments of the speaker, the relationship between the interlocutors, the structure of the information of the talk, and cultural issues) that scaffold the uses in each age group; and
6. Revealing the general communicative behaviors of the two age groups like the level of interaction among them and the perception one age group has about the other, as well as the implications of the differences in their discourse about these behaviors.

The qualitative approach is needed because the quantitative method naturally fails to help capture these facts (Garrett 2007, 119-120).

The research involves the collection and analysis of free speech through recording of conversations in natural situations. In addition, to understand the accurate sense of the participants' natural language, the researcher conducts interviews, in which the participants reflect on their general communicative behaviors.

3.2 Research Site

The research site is Kombolcha town, located in the South Wollo Zone of the Amhara Regional State. The dominant mother tongue spoken in the town is Amharic. The town is inhabited by 58, 667 people among whom 94.77 % speak Amharic as mother tongue (Central Statistical Agency 2010). The remaining five percent are native speakers of Tigrinya (1.95 %), Sidama (1.76%), Oromo (0.5 %), Afar (0.16 %) and other Ethiopian languages (0.86 %). Thus, it is rare to find residents who have another mother tongue than Amharic in the area.

The town is not a big commercial center to attract many people from other parts of the country. Therefore, the people are less mixed ethnically. On the other hand, it is not as such small that the residents are not similar in their socioeconomic status. In addition, since all the towns in the vicinity of the town have their own high schools, adolescents who live in the town are also born there. From religion point of view, unlike most towns that have the above features, relatively high sizes of Christian and Muslim communities live in the town. Thus it is an ideal place to observe the impact of age as the main variable, and gender, socioeconomic status and religion as interfering variables on linguistic variation in Amharic with very less disruptive interference of extraneous factors like ethnicity.

3.3 Participants of the Study and Sampling Procedures

The participants of the study are twenty-seven adolescents and twenty-seven adults, fifty-four in total, selected using the purposive technique of sampling. The selection was made in three steps. First a preliminary discussion was made with acquaintances, teachers, school principals, and relatives to nominate potential participants of the study. Then those who were nominated to be possible participants were informally interviewed for collecting demographic data (their age,

friendship groups, income, education etc.). Finally, among the interviewed ones those who were found to be appropriate for the study based on the demographic information collected were identified and further persuaded to take part in the research.

The proportions for different genders, socioeconomic groups and religions are not even because the selection of the participants was made based on their friendship groups and people do not select friends necessarily based on sex, socioeconomic status and religion. The detailed proportions regarding gender, social status and religion are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Distribution of the participants of the study across social variables

	Adolescent				**Adult**				**Total**
	Male		**Female**		**Male**		**Female**		
	LSG	*MSG*	*LSG*	*MSG*	*LSG*	*MSG*	*LSG*	*MSG*	
Christian	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	24
Muslim	4	4	6	2	4	3	4	3	30
Total	27				27				54

Only the people who have been living in the area since their early childhood were selected to avoid a different socialization in another speech community. With regard to age, the adolescent group contains people of 14-17 years of age while the adult group contains people aged 20 to 60, twenty-three of them being in their thirties and fourteen.

The high schools found in the town are the major sources for selecting the adolescent participants. The adult participants were selected from different professions and residential situations because it was impossible to get a sample of adults who are native to the place in the same work place and in the same residential area. Even in some cases different individuals were picked from different situations and made to come together for a conversation based on their former school and childhood networks. The complete profile of the participants is given in Appendix 1.

3.4 The Criteria for Deciding Socioeconomic Grouping

Since it is not common to identify people in terms of social class in Ethiopia, the researcher couldn't find any documented criteria that help him to classify the participants to groups of such kind. Even there is some doubt about the existence of social class in the country. However,

though it cannot be pronounced to the level of social class, in different communities there are implicit inter-family boundaries that are specially connected with the livelihood of the people. Livelihood is also understood as the function of occupation. For this reason, the researcher has classified the participants into socioeconomic groups based on their occupations. He formed his own criteria based on Horvath (1985) and Lennig (1978) who exclusively used occupation to classify societies into social classes. The socioeconomic classification used for this research and the criteria are shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2 Socioeconomic classification schemes

Socioeconomic Grouping	**Occupations**
The Middle Socioeconomic Group	Professionals and skilled workers who are generally labeled as white collar workers: proprietors, accountants, real estate agents, pharmacists, managers, officials (salaried and self-employed), clerks, salesmen, secretaries, teachers, computer technicians, merchants, small business owners, doctors, lawyers, stockbrokers, CEOs, the clergy etc.
The Lower Socioeconomic Group	Less skilled and Unskilled manual workers who are generally labeled as blue collar workers: craftsmen, foremen, dishwashers, service workers, small shopkeepers, operatives, laborers, artisans, truck drivers, metal workers, factory workers, welders, masoners, carpenters, electricians, cashiers, maids, waitresses, plumbers, permanently unemployed persons, guards, mechanics etc.

3.5 Instruments of Data Collection

Data was collected using two instruments: tape-recording conversations and interview.

Conversational data were collected using tape-recording. Same-age casual conversations of the participants in informal occasions were recorded using a mini digital voice recorder. A total of 280 minutes long conversational data were collected from the adolescents and 239 minutes from the adults. On average each adolescent and each adult was recorded while talking for 10.37 and 8.85 minutes, respectively.

An interview that is made of semi-open and open items was conducted for two purposes. The first is obtaining the demographic and ethnographic information about the participants like their

age, religion and socioeconomic status. The information helps the researcher to put the participants in the right group. The second is eliciting information about the participants' general communicative behaviors, their observation of the differences of their discourses from the members of the other age group, the level of interaction between the two age groups, and the perceptions one group has about the other. This helps the researcher to grasp areas of differences in communicative behaviors that cannot be easily inferred from the recorded conversations and to understand the possible reasons behind the differences in their discourse.

3.6 Procedures of Recording the Conversations

The recording of the conversations was made following planned procedures. First, orientation was given to the participants about the reason of the recording, the confidentiality of the data, and the length of the recording. They were also told to be as relaxed as possible and to talk as freely as possible since natural language is required for the research.

Second, arrangements were made with the participants as to when and where to conduct the recordings and the length of the recordings. Care was taken that the time was convenient for the participants. Silent places that are liked by the participants and that are not easily exposed to other people's interference were selected. Most of the adolescents' conversations were recorded in empty classrooms and cafeterias. The sites used for recording the adults' speeches were places the people usually meet for social or work reasons like offices, laboratories, lounges, homes and verandas in the neighborhood used for coffee ceremony etc. Coffee, tea, 'kolo' (roasted cereal), soft drink and cakes were served to the participants to make their stay and meeting interesting.

Third, one member of a group who would be involved in a conversation was told to stir the conversation and ensure the continuity of the talk in case the participants stop to talk due to boredom or any other reason before enough was recorded. The length of one conversation was determined with a formula that a conversant spoke at least for 10 minutes on average. The researcher made sure that the other participants were not aware that that one member is given the responsibility of stirring the conversation.

Finally, the recorder was turned on and put amidst the participants as they began to talk. The researcher stayed in a place near enough to the place of recording to follow up the process and

far enough not to interfere in the freedom of the conversants and disturb the naturalness of the setting.

3.7 Transcription Procedures

The conversational language samples were transcribed using the conventions developed by Du Bois, et al. (1993) and Burridge and Florey (2002, 170) on the majority. But in cases where the established symbols and methods did not work, new conventions were used.

The transcription of most of the recordings was done in three rounds. In the first round, the utterances were written into papers. The transcription was made chunk by chunk and the recording was rewound two to three times to listen to each chunk again and again till certainty was reached about what the speakers say, and about what the speeches mean where it was necessary. In the second round, listening was made to check and refine the transcription. In the third round, notations of overlapping and identification of the uses of selected discourse features were made by listening to the recordings again.

3.8 Methods of Data Analysis

The conversation data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively using the procedures of discourse analysis and conversation analysis. The whole analysis work followed eleven steps but the steps were not rigidly linear. The researcher swayed between a number of steps but with purpose and for good effect. The steps are the following.

1. Each of the instances of the discourse features on which the study focuses and that are found in the language sample transcribed were identified and coded.
2. The variants of each discourse feature were identified and the two age groups were compared with regard to their choices of the variants.
3. The raw frequency of the tokens of each discourse feature in each participant's speech was counted. The frequencies of the tokens were aggregated per discourse feature for each participant. For discourse features that do not have tokens, the instances are counted.
4. The aggregated raw frequencies of all of the discourse features except patterns of repairing strategies were changed into rates per 1000 words spoken. This was done to stabilize the differences in talkativeness between the subjects and make the frequency

amenable for comparison. The rated frequency for patterns of repairing strategies is calculated out of 100 troublesome utterances because this gives more sense than calculating it per number of words spoken. The existence of the repairs is more dependent on the existence of troublesome utterances than the number of words spoken.

5. Two-way ANOVA was calculated to determine the significance of the relationship between the age groups in each of the discourse features. However, significance test was not calculated for discourse features that have very low frequency of occurrence since this is meaningless.
6. The raw frequencies of the types or instances of each discourse feature were aggregated per age groups as well as per gender, socio- economic group and religion within each age group.
7. Percentages were calculated to make the frequencies viable for comparison. Any two frequencies are counted to be different from one another if their difference is at least 3.
8. The extent to which age, the independent variable, determines the choice of discourse features was explored.
9. The extent to which the moderating variables, namely gender, socioeconomic status and religion, cause variability within each age group in each discourse feature was examined.
10. The effect of these factors in modifying the effect of age on choice of each discourse feature was investigated.
11. The two age groups were compared with regard to the most frequent variants they use. When two variants were compared within an age group, their frequency was first changed into percentage per the sum total of frequencies of all discourse variants in the same age group. In addition to the frequency, in some cases, the meanings and uses of the variants were discussed qualitatively.
12. The uses of the discourse features and the distribution of the uses across the age groups were qualitatively explained.
13. The interview data were analyzed for the level of interaction that exists between the two age groups, and the perceptions one group has about the other, the areas of differences that cannot be easily inferred from the conversations and the possible reasons behind the differences in the discourses.

3.9 Mechanisms of Controlling Validity and Reliability of the Results

The following strategies were used to control the validity and reliability of the results.

1. The participants were selected with a great care so that they represent the speech community under study.
2. Large amount of data was collected to increase the possibility of the occurrence of the discourse elements under study. The participants were also allowed to talk for a long time and were left by their own so that they become relaxed. This minimized the impact of their self-consciousness on the naturalness of the conversations.
3. The analysis and interpretation of the qualitative data was highly reliant on context. This increases meaningfulness of the result.
4. The conversational data was explored in-depth to capture each and every point relevant to the discourse features in question.
5. The data were treated from different perspectives. The researcher was not limited to age factor. All possible elements of the background of the participants that act on their language and the elements of the situation in which the language was being used were considered so that it is possible to answer the questions of why and how of the discourse elements scrutinized.

3.10 Ethical Considerations

Every effort was made to observe all the ethical requirements of research relevant to this study. First of all, permission was sought from the schools and institutions from which the informants were selected. Then only those who were willing were involved in the research. It was also explained to the participants that the research was done for academic purposes and the information they gave was used only for the explained reason. What is more, the process of the collection of the data was made clear to them; modifications were made on the aspects of the process on which they had preservations. In addition, names of the participants are not indicated in the research paper to protect their privacy. Pseudonyms are used in substitute.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the conversational and the interview data. The discourse features which are said to vary according to age are the main organizing tools for the presentation. These features are discourse markers, quotatives, slang, repair strategies, tags, addressing terms, vowing expressions, vulgar language, speech overlap, other-selection of next speakers and backchanneling utterances. The quantitative and the qualitative analyses for each feature are presented in turn.

4.1. Discourse Markers

4.1.1. Types of Discourse Markers and their Variants

Discourse markers are extra-syntactic linguistic items that help speakers to manage and qualify their discourse; they have little ideational meaning. Trillo (2006, 641) classifies them as 'operative' and 'involvement' from their function point of view. Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1997, 94) also view the markers "as forms which establish textual as well as interactional or interpersonal relations"; this totally coincides with the dual classification of Trillo. When discussing discourse markers, this research adopts the terminology this later classification uses. Textual discourse markers signal shifts, openings and closings of topics, connect segments of discourse, show inclusion etc. The interpersonal ones tell the mood of verbs or actions, evoke responses from listeners, express the relationship between speakers and listeners, and reflect the emotions, attitudes and positions of speakers (Trillo 2006, 639-641; Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 81-82, 153, 154; Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1997, 94; Norrby and Winter 2001, 1; Erman 2001, 1337; McCarthy 1991, 134). The markers that fall into each category of function are given below. The subclassification is made based on Ramos (2010, 67), Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1997, 94) and Trillo (2006, 641). One problem with the classification of Amharic discourse markers is that one item can give many different functions in different contexts and thus can apear in different functional categories. For example, the marker ኧ *i* has about nine functions, three of which go into the textual category and six into the interpersonal class.

Textual discourse markers include the following types of items.

1. Conjunctions and conjunctive adjuncts. Conjunctions are connectors like **እና** *ɨnna* ‘and’, **ወይም** *wəjɨm* ‘or’, **ግን** *gɨn* ‘but’, and **ስለዚህ** *sɨləzzih* ‘therefore’; and conjunctive adjuncts are adverbial and prepositional phrases which relate clauses and segments of clauses and have a function similar to that of conjunctions. Examples include **ከዚያ በኋላ** *kəzzija bəhʷala* ‘then after’ and **በመጀመሪያ** *bəməʤəmmərija* ‘in the beginning’.
2. Continuatives. They are words and non-verbal sounds that ensure the continuity of an interaction by showing that the listener is following the speaker. Items such as **ህ** *hɨ* (similar to ‘hm’ in function), **እህ** *ɨhɨ* (similar to ‘ahh’ in function), and **አሀ** *aha* (similar to ‘aha’ in function) fall in this category.
3. Discourse extenders like **ምናምን** *mɨnamɨn* ‘and stuff’, **ምን ብለናል** *mɨn bɨlənall* (a phrase used to represent a name of an action in a list not said) and **ምኑን ምኑን** *mɨnun mɨnun* (equivalent to ‘this and that’ in function)
4. Pause markers. They are called also inserts, fillers or hesitators. Instances include **እንትን** *ɨntɨn* ‘what is the name’, **ያው** *jaw* ‘(similar to ‘like’ in function), and **ይሄ** *jɨhe* ‘this’, and **ማለት** *maləṯ* ‘I mean’.
5. Focus or highlight adverbial particles. They include items like **ሁሉ** *hullu* ‘even’, **እሳ** *ɨssa* ‘even’, **እራሱ** *ɨrasu* ‘even’, **ያውም** *jawɨm* ‘even’ and **እንኳ** *ɨnkʷa* ‘even’.
6. Speech framing markers. They are items that are used to begin and close speech or discourse. Examples include **ልንገርሽ** *lɨngərɨʃ* ‘let me tell you’ (SG, F), **በነገራችን ላይ** *bənəgəraʧʧin laj* ‘by the way’, **እኔ እምለው** *ɨne ɨmmɨləw* ‘I have an idea’, and **እየው** *ɨjəw*, ‘look’ (SG, M)

Interpersonal discourse markers include the following types of items.

1. Exclamations. Items that express emotion like **ሂድ** *hid* ‘really’, **ሲላ** *sila* (equivalent to ‘hah’ in function), and **በለው** *bələw* ‘my goodness’ fall in this class.
2. Hedging expressions. Instances include **ምናልባት** *mɨnalbat* ‘perhaps’ and **ለምን መሰለህ** *ləmɨn məsələh* ‘I think the reason is’.
3. Vocatives and attention getters such as **እኧ** *ɨə* (an attention getter similar to ‘hey’), **ስማ** *sɨma* ‘listen’ (SG, M) and **እሺ** *ɨʃʃi* ‘yes’.

4. Alarms. The tokens**ተመልከት·** *təməlkət* ‘look’ (SG, M) and **እይ** *ɨj*‘look’ (SG, M) are good examples.
5. Comment adjuncts. They are items that reflect speaker’s attitude and assessment to what they say and hear. Examples include **እማ.ገርምህ** *ɨmmigərmɨh* ‘for your (SG, M) wonder’, and **ሲ.ገርም** *sigərm* ‘what a wonder’.
6. Response tokens. This class includes minor clauses that have speech functions and serve as answer to a question and acknowledgment to a statement or that show that one is undertaking a command or accepts an offer (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 144). Examples include **አዎ** *awo* ‘yes’ (a positive response to a yes/no question), **አቤት·** *abet* ‘yes’ (a response to a call), **አደለም** *adəlləm* ‘no’ (expression of objection), **አይ** *aj* ‘no’ (a negative response to a yes/no question), and **እምቢ** *ɨmbi* ‘no’ (expression of refusal).
7. Involvement (hearer-appeal) markers. This subcategory includes reaction eliciting markers and markers that make the listener share the feeling of the speaker. It includes the questions like **አየ.ኸው**? *ajjəhəw* ‘you (SG, M) see?’, **ታ·ቂያለሽ**? *tak'ijallə∫ʼ* ‘you (SG, F) know?’ and **ይገባሃል**? *jɨgəbahall* ‘did you (SG, M) get my idea?’.
8. Markers of invitation to speak and instigation to continue to speak. This subclass includes partiles such as **እ**? *ɨ* and **ኧ**? *ə* (particles used to encourage a speaker to continue to speak when they incline to discontinue).
9. Requests for repair like **አ**? *a* (equivalent to ‘huh?’ and ‘eh?’ in function),

All in all, 194 textual and 355 interpersonal tokens of discourse markers occur in the conversations. The complete list is given in Appendix 6. The distribution among the age groups is also shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Distribution of variants of discourse markers across the age groups

Discourse Markers	**Adolescents**		**Adults**	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**
Textual Discourse Markers	145	38.26	148	39.47
Interpersonal Discourse Markers	234	61.74	227	60.53
Total	379	100	375	100

As the table shows, there is no significant difference between the adolescents and the adults in the number of variants they use. But the variety of interpersonal discourse markers both age groups use is greater than that of textual discourse markers.

4.1.2 Distribution of Discourse Markers

One aspect of the research is the examination of the distribution of the discourse markers across the age groups. The other is the extent to which the distribution is shaped up by three other social markers, namely gender, socioeconomic grouping and religion. For this reason, in this section the frequencies of the discourse feature in each age category, each gender, each socioeconomic group and each religion are presented, and comparisons across and within the age categories are made to determine the leaders and to infer the roles of the other three social factors in the differences and similarities between the age categories.

Table 4 Distribution of discourse markers across the two age groups

Age Category	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Discourse Markers**					
			Textual Discourse Markers			**Interpersonal Discourse Markers**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**	**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
Adolescent	27	34799	4190	120.41	51.88	2636	75.75	51.61
Adult	27	31049	3468	111.70	48.12	2205	71.02	48.39
Total	54	65848	7658	232.11	100	4841	146.77	100
			Textual discourse markers, p =0.464; Interpersonal discourse markers, p=0.604; All discourse markers, p= 0.983					

As the above table demonstrates, a greater size of each of the two categories of discourse markers is used by adolescents than is used by adults. This frequency reveals that the adolescents lead the adults in both types of discourse markers. However, the tests do not imply that the differences are statistically significant.

Among the two types, the textual ones have the higher use, 120.41 and 111.70 by adolescents and adults, respectively when compared to the interpersonal category that amounts to 75.75 for adolescents and 71.02 for adults. Both age groups use textual discourse markers in greater amount.

Table 5 Distribution of discourse markers across the genders

Age Category	Gender	N	Total no of Words	Discourse Markers					
				Textual Discourse Markers			Interpersonal Discourse Markers		
				Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	Male	14	15805	1779	112.56	47.00	1236	78.20	51.47
	Female	13	18994	2411	126.93	53.00	1400	73.71	48.52
	Total	27	34799	4190	239.49	100	2637	151.91	100
Adult	Male	13	16172	1913	118.29	53.09	1068	66.04	46.35
	Female	14	14877	1555	104.52	46.91	1137	76.43	53.65
	Total	27	31049	3468	222.81	100	2205	142.47	100

As Table 5 depicts, female adolescents use a greater size of the category of textual discourse markers than the male adolescents do. The opposite is true for the adults. Male adults use more textual discourse markers than their female counterparts do. This reveals that female adolescents favor textual discourse markers more than the males do as it is the males who lead in the adult age group. This inconsistency across the age groups indicates that gender has no predictive power on the difference between the two age groups with regard to textual discourse markers. The data also reveals that females contribute the higher proportion when the adolescents lead the adults.

The frequencies of the interpersonal discourse markers the male and female adolescents use do not show significant difference from one another. However, female adults use the majority of the whole feature found in the conversation of the age group. In general, the two genders of the adolescent age group do not exhibit difference in their use of interpersonal discourse markers while it is the females who lead in the adult age group. The additional implication is that gender has no meaningful influence on the difference between the two age groups.

Table 6 Distribution of discourse markers across socioeconomic groups

Age Category	Socio-economic Group	N	Total no of Words	Discourse Markers					
				Textual Discourse Markers			Interpersonal Discourse Markers		
				Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	LSG	15	18554	2237	120.57	50.08	1542	83.11	55.24
	MSG	12	16245	1953	120.22	49.92	1094	67.34	44.76
	Total	27	34799	4190	240.77	100	2637	150.45	100
Adult	LSG	14	14731	1552	105.36	47.29	1127	76.51	53.67
	MSG	13	16318	1916	117.42	52.71	1078	66.06	46.33
	Total	27	31049	3468	222.78	100	2205	142.57	100

As it is presented in Table 6, adolescents from both the LSG and MSG use textual discourse markers almost in equal frequency. But when the LSG and the MSG of the adults are compared, it is the MSG who uses the majority. By implication, there is little difference between the two socioeconomic groups of the adolescent age cohort with regard to textual discourse markers but the MSG leads the LSG in the adult age cohort. Generally, socioeconomic grouping does not have a significant contribution to differences between the age groups.

The LSGs of both the adolescents and adults use the greater size of the category of interpersonal discourse markers when compared to the MSG. By implication, members of the LSG surpass their MSG counterparts in both age groups. Therefore, LSG plays the key role in making adolescents lead the adults in their use of the feature. In addition, the data indicates that socioeconomic grouping has an impact on the differences between the two age groups.

Table 7 Distribution of discourse markers across the two religions

Age Category	Religion	N	Total no of Words	Discourse Markers					
				Textual Discourse Markers			Interpersonal Discourse Markers		
				Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	Christian	11	16084	2036	126.59	52.38	991	61.61	41.21
	Muslim	16	18715	2154	115.10	47.62	1645	87.90	58.79
	Total	27	34799	4190	241.69	100	2637	149.51	100
Adult	Christian	13	17934	2087	116.37	52.50	1157	64.51	44.67
	Muslim	14	13115	1381	105.30	47.50	1048	79.91	55.33
	Total	27	31049	3468	221.67	100	2205	144.42	100

According to Table 7, Christian adolescents and adults use most of the textual discourse markers when compared to the Muslims. By implication, first, Christians play the greater role in enabling adolescents lead adults in their frequent use of textual discourse markers, and second, religion predicts the relationship between the age categories in their use of the feature.

On the other hand, Muslim adolescents use the majority of the interpersonal sub-category as the Christians use the rest of it. This shows that the Muslims lead the Christians and they give the adolescents the greater help when they lead the adults. The same pattern is found in the adult data. Therefore, religion has a consistent place across the age groups with respect to interpersonal discourse markers.

4.1.3. The Most Frequent Discourse Markers

The first three most frequent textual discourse markers used by the adolescents are **ምናምን** *mɨnamɨn* (equivalent to 'and stuff' in function), **እና** *ɨnna* 'and', and **ግን** *gɨn* 'but' with raw occurrences of 509, 370 and 330, and a relative frequency of 12.15%, 8.83% and 7.88% of the total, respectively. For the adults the first is **እና** *ɨnna* 'and', the second, **አሁን** *ahun* 'now' (pause marker), and the third, **እ** *ɨ* 'mh' (hesitation marker), with frequencies of 421, 274 and 194 covering 12.14%, 7.90%, and 5.6% of the whole subcategory, respectively. The two age groups have only **እና** *ɨnna* 'and' among the three in common and this implies that they have a difference in the textual discourse markers they favor most.

The interpersonal discourse markers that stand first to third in the adolescent corpus are **እኮ** *ɨkko* 'truly' (398 instances – 15.09% of all), **አዎ** *awo* 'yes' (expression of agreement) (273 instances – 10.35% of all) and **ኧረ** *ərə* (a phrase used to mark emphasis) (241 instances – 9.14% of all), respectively. But the adult order brings **አዎ** *awo* 'yes' (expression of agreement) first with 378 instances (17.14% of all), **እኮ** *ɨkko* 'truly' second with 272 instances (12.34% of all), and **አዎ** *awo* 'yes' (a positive response to a question) third with 176 instances (7.98% of all). Therefore, the two age groups coincide in their use of two of the three most frequent interpersonal markers. This indicates that there is similarity between adolescents and adults in tokens of interpersonal discourse markers they favor most.

4.1.4. Summary

The results are summarized as follows. First of all, there is little difference between the age groups in the variety of discourse markers they use. But adolescents lead adults in the amount of both the textual and interpersonal discourse markers. Females and Christians play the dominant role in this adolescents' lead in textual discourse markers as there is no socioeconomic group that plays such role. However, it is the LSG and Muslims who make the greater contribution for the adolescents to surpass the adults in their use of interpersonal discourse markers. From a general perspective, gender and socioeconomic grouping have no effect on the relationship between the two age groups with regard to textual discourse markers as religion has. On the other hand, socioeconomic grouping and religion affect the relationship between the age groups in their use of the interpersonal discourse markers but gender does not. Finally, there is a difference between the age groups in the tokens of textual discourse markers they favor most but there is no in the interpersonal ones.

4.2. Quotatives

4.2.1. Types of Quotatives

Quotatives are words or phrases that are used to introduce voices or speeches and thoughts of others directly (Winter 2002, 5, 7; Coates 2007, 64). There are three discourse quotatives used in the corpus. They are:

1. **አለ** *ala* 'said'
2. **ነው** *nəw* 'it is', and
3. Null quotative.

Null quotative is the absence of any visible quotative form; the listener is expected to understand that the speaker quotes based on the context.

4.2.2. Distribution of Quotatives

This section presents the frequency of the quotatives **አለ** *ala* 'said', **ነው** *nəw* 'it is' and the null quotative in each age category and the other social categories within each age group and the implications of the distribution.

Table 8 Distribution of quotatives across the two age groups

Age Category	N	Total no of Words	Quotatives											
			All Quotatives			አለ *alə* 'said'			ነው *nəw* 'it is'			Null Quotative		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	27	34799	678	19.48	46.14	535	15.37	45.83	4	0.12	48.00	139	3.99	47.28
Adult	27	31049	706	22.74	53.86	564	18.17	54.17	4	0.13	52.00	138	4.45	52.72
Total	54	65848	1384	42.22	100	1099	33.54	100	8	0.25	100	277	8.44	100
			p=0.289			p=0.268			p=0.736			p=0.556		

Table 8 shows that when the two age groups are compared in their use of quotatives in general, the figure for the adults is greater than the figure for the adolescents. This implies that adults like to quote other people more than adolescents do. However, the test does not show a significant difference.

Adults use the majority of all the three quoatives. In other words, adults lead adolescents in each of the three types of quotatives. Nonetheless, the tests for all the three do not prove that the differences are statistically significant.

Table 9 Distribution of quotatives across the genders

Age Category	Gender	N	Total no of Words	Quotatives								
				አለ *alə* 'said'			ነው *nəw* 'it is'			Null Quotative		
				Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	Male	14	15805	214	13.54	44.48	0	0	0	35	2.22	28.87
	Female	13	18994	321	16.90	55.52	4	0.21	100	104	5.47	71.13
	Total	27	34799	535	30.44	100	4	0.21	100	139	7.69	100
Adult	Male	13	16172	355	21.95	60.97	2	0.12	48.00	90	5.57	63.30
	Female	14	14877	209	14.05	39.03	2	0.13	52.00	48	3.23	36.70
	Total	27	31049	564	36.00	100	4	0.25	100	138	8.80	100

As Table 9 depicts, among the instances of **አለ** *alə* 'said' used by the adolescents, the fewer are used by the males. Females use more of the feature. Among the adults, males use **አለ** *alə* 'said' in greater degree than the females do. That means the males make the greater help for the adults as they surpass the adolescents. The fact that different genders lead in different age groups testify that gender has little predictive power on the relationship between the age groups.

The quotative **ነው** *nəw* 'it is' is favored only by the females of the adolescents. Females use the entire feature. Females also dominate the adult age group. This again implies that females contribute the greater portion for the adults in their lead. It also proves that gender predicts the difference between the age cohorts.

Among the adolescents, females use the greater number of the null quotatives when compared to the males. Females use more of the feature. Among the adults, the males use the null quotative in greater degree than the females. Therefore, the males make the greater help for the adults as they surpass the adolescents. The fact that different genders lead in different age groups testify that gender has little predictive power on the relationship between the age groups in null quotatives.

Table 10 Distribution of quotatives across socioeconomic groups

Age Category	**Socio-economic Group**	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Quotatives**								
				አለ *ələ* **'said'**			**ነው** *nəw* **'it is'**			**Null Quotative**		
				Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**	**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**	**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
Adolescent	LSG	15	18554	277	14.93	48.46	3	0.16	72.73	66	3.56	44.22
	MSG	12	16245	258	15.88	51.54	1	0.06	27.27	73	4.49	55.78
	Total	27	34799	535	30.81	100	4	0.22	100	139	8.05	100
Adult	LSG	14	14731	368	24.98	67.53	3	0.20	76.92	97	6.59	72.42
	MSG	13	16318	196	12.01	32.47	1	0.06	23.08	41	2.51	27.58
	Total	27	31049	564	36.99	100	4	0.26	100	138	9.10	100

According to Table 10, the LSG of the adolescents uses the quotative **አለ** *ələ* in a lower degree than the MSG does. The pattern is reversed among the adults: the LSG uses the greater amount. This implies that the LSG contributes more than the LSG does to make the adults lead the adolescents. The leaders in the two age groups are not the same and this indicates that socioeconomic grouping has very low predictive power on the difference between the age groups.

The table also presents that the sweeping majority of the quotative **ነው** *nəw* 'it is' is used by the LSG of the adolescents. The LSG also dominates the adult age group. This implies that the LSG contributes the greater contribution for the adults to lead the adolescents. It also proves that socioeconomic grouping predicts the difference between the age cohorts.

The MSG of the adolescents uses the null quotative to a greater degree than the LSG does. It is clearly seen that the MSG is at the head. But the LSG leads in the adult age category. The LSG is

far ahead of the MSG in the frequency of the feature it uses. Two implications are derived from the data. First, the LSG plays the significant role in enabling the adult age cohort to be in the leading position. Second, socioeconomic grouping does not predict the relationship between the two age groups.

Table 11 Distribution of quotatives across the two religions

Age Category	**Religion**	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Quotatives**								
				አለ *alə* 'said'			**ነው *nəw* 'it is'**			**Null Quotative**		
				Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**	**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**	**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
Adolescent	Christian	11	16084	296	18.40	59.03	1	0.06	27.27	83	5.16	63.31
	Muslim	16	18715	239	12.77	40.97	3	0.16	72.73	56	2.99	36.69
	Total	27	34799	535	31.17	100	4	0.22	100	139	8.15	100
Adult	Christian	13	17934	242	13.49	35.46	4	0.22	100	46	2.57	26.80
	Muslim	14	13115	322	24.55	64.54	0	0	0	92	7.02	73.20
	Total	27	31049	564	38.04	100	4	0.22	100	138	9.59	100

As it is observed in Table 11, Christian adolescents use the greater amount of the instances of **አለ** *alə* 'said' and the Muslims the lesser. But among the adults the Muslims choose to use majority of the quotative as Christians use the minority. This implies that Muslims play the greater role in enabling the adults to be ahead of the adolescents. But religion in general appears to have low predictive power on the relationship.

As it is presented also in the table, Muslim adolescents use the majority of the **ነው** *nəw* 'it is' quotative when compared to the Christians. Unlike the adolescents, Christian adults surpass Muslims; they use the entire quotative. Two implications are derived from these data. First, Christians make the greater contribution for the adults when they surpass the adults. Second, religion does not have a consistent place in the differences between the two age groups.

The Christians use the greater amount of the instances of the null quotative found in the adolescent corpus. It is clearly seen that the Christians are in the lead. But the Muslims lead in the adult age category. The group uses almost three fourth of the whole instances of the quotative. Two implications are derived from the data. First, the Muslims play the significant role in enabling the adult age cohort to be in the leading position. Second, religion does not predict the relationship between the two age groups.

4.2.3. Uses of the Quotatives

4.2.3.1. The Null Quotative

Adolescents use the null quotative in eleven contexts and adults in six. By implication, adolescents lead the adults in using the feature in a variety of contexts. Each context is explained in detail below.

First, both adolescents and adults use the null quotative when they quote their interlocutors. In the extracts (1) and (2) below, Dawit (the adolescent) uses a null quotative when he repeats the words of Abdulfetah to seek confirmation, and Etenat (the adult) does the same when she repeats the words of her husband for the same purpose. Both participants compensate the absence of a quotative by using a rising intonation.

(1) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 478-480)

a. Abdulfetah: …**ትንሽ ትንሽ። ለወደፊቱ እሆናለሁ።።**
ɨtinnɨʃ ɨtinnɨʃ ləwədəfitu ɨhonalləhu
little little for:future:DEF 1SG:become.IPFV:AUX:1SG
‘ little. I will be so in the future.’

b. Dawit: "**እሆናለሁ።።**" Ø **አ**?
ɨhonalləhu a
1SG:become.IPFV:AUX:1SG QUOT be.NEG.PFV.3SG.M.IMPR.NPST
‘“I will be.” Ø Isn’t it?’

c. Abdulfetah: **አዎ**
awo
yes
‘Yes’

(2) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, line 356)

Etenat: "**መጥቻለሁ**?" Ø **እሺ።።**
mət'ɨʧʧalləhu ɨʃʃi
come.PFV:1SG.CVB:AUX:1SG QUOT ok
‘ “I have come?” Ok.’

Second, adolescents use the null quotative when they think their listeners can understand the person whom they quote based on their knowledge of the social roles of the person. In extract (3) below, where Betel, the adolescent, quotes a dialogue between a teacher and students, the teacher has a role of ordering and directing, while the students have a role of reacting to the teacher’s order and direction. Therefore, she takes for granted that if her listeners know that it is

the teacher who said **አንሱ** *ansu* ‘remove it’, they can easily understand that it is the students who said **አናነሳም** *annanəsam* ‘we don’t remove it’.

(3) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, lines 998-1002)

Betel፡ **ጀማል ሲነግረኝ እንዴት እንደሚያስቀኑ**
ʤəmal sinəgrəɲ indet ɨndəmijask'ənu
Jemal as:3 SG.M:tell:3SG.M:1SG.IO how COMP:COMP:3PL:CAUS:envy:3PL
አልኩሽ፡፡ እንትናቸውን ‹‹ማትስ አምና
alkuʃ ɨntɨnaʧʧəwɨn matɨs amna
say.PFV:1SG:2SG.F.IO INDFPRO:3PL.GEN:ACC Maths last_year
እኛ ስንፈተን ማትስ በወረቀት ነበር ስሩ
ɨɲɲa sɨnnɨffəttən matɨs bəwərək'ət nəbbər sɨru
we while:2PL:PASS:examine Maths with:paper be.PFV:3SG.M.PST do:2PL.IMP
ተብሎ… ከዛ ወጣን እና" አሉ ሁሉም ውሀ…
təbɨlo kəzza wət't'an ɨnna alu hullum wɨha
PASS:say:3SG.M.CVB then_after go_out.PFV:1PL and say.PFV:3PL all:FOC water
ውስጥ ነከሩት ያንን ወረቀት፡፡… ግርግዳው ላይ ልጥፍ
wɨst' nəkkərut jannɨn wərək'ət gɨrgɨddaw laj lɨt'ɨf
in soak.PFV:3PL:3SG.M.OBJ that.3SG.M:ACC paper wall:DEF on Fix.IDEO
አርገውት ሰይድ ባዮሎጂ "አንሱ"፡፡ Ø
argəwɨt səjɨd bajoloʤi ansu
make:3PL.CVB:3SG.M.OBJ Seid Biology pick_up:2PL.IMP QUOT
"አናነሳም፡፡" Ø
annanəsam
NEG:1PL:pick_up.IPFV:NEGCOMP QUOT
‘How lucky they are as Jemal told me. “When we were taking Maths exam last year, we were told to do the exam, and then,” they said, they immersed the paper in water. … they fixed it on the wall and Seid Biology Ø, “remove it.” Ø “We don’t remove it.”’

Third, adolescents use the null quotative if who speaks can be inferred from the pattern (if people’s speech has a pattern and the speakers have permanent role each in the conversation, or if the relationship between the speakers is already known (e.g. one is a guest and the other a host). In this case, the name is also dropped.

The pattern in extract (4) below is that a student is creating havoc during exam time and is being treated by the policemen that he takes his exam in an isolated place. Therefore, what the policemen and the student would say is predictable from their relationship. That is why Betel, the adolescent, uses many null quotatives in the story she narrates.

(4) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, line 1084)

Betel: "አንዱ ልጅ በጣም ዱርዬ ነው።" አለ። "እና ብቻውን
andu liʤ bət'am durijje nəw alə inna biɬɬawiɲ
One:DEF boy very hooligan be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST say.PFV:3SG.M and alone:3SG.M
አስቀምጦ 'ተፈተን' አለው።
ask'əmmiṫ'o təfətən aləw
CAUS:sit:3SG.M.CVB PASS:examine.2SG.M.IMP say.PFV:3SG.M:3SG.M.IO
ተኝቶ ተኝቶ 'አልፈተንም'
təɲɲiṫo təɲɲiṫo aliffəttənim
sleep:3SG.M.CVB sleep:3SG.M.CVB NEG:1SG:PASS:examine.IPFV:NEGCOMP
ብሎ። ፌደራል ናቸው እኮ።" አስቢው አስራ
biṫlo fedəral naɬɬəw iṫkko assiṫiw asra
say:3SG.M.CVB federal be.PFV:3PL.NPST truly think:3SG.F.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ ten_plus
ምናምን ዘጠኝ ናቸው ምናምን እንደዝህ ይዘው እነሱ ምንም
miṅamiṅ zət'əɲ naɬɬəw miṅamiṅ indəzziṫ jizəw iṅnəsssu miṅiṁ
something nine be.PFV:3PL.NPST and_stuff like:here catch:3PL.CVB they nothing
አይመስላቸውም። "ተፈተን" Ø:: ኧ
ajməslaɬɬəwiṁ təfətən ə
NEG:3SG.M.IMPR:feel.IPFV:3PL.OBJ:NEGCOMP PASS:examine.2SG.M.IMP QUOT er
"ኧረ እኔ ምኑን አውቀው ነው
ərə iṅe miṅun awk'k'ew nəw
DM I what:DEF:ACC know:1SG.CVB:3SG.M.OBJ be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
እምሰራው?" Ø:: "ኧረ አልሰራልህም።" ምናምን
iṁmisəraw ərə alsəralliḣim miṅamiṅ
REL:1SG:do:3SG.M.OBJ QUOT DM NEG:1SG:do.IPFV:for:2SG.M:NEGCOMP and_stuff
ብሎት ከዛ "እንካ እንካ" ብሎ
biṫlot kəzza iṅka iṅka biṫlo
say:3SG.M.CVB:3SGM.IO then_after here_you_are here_you_are say:3SG.M.CVB
ሰጠው አንድ መልስ ሳይሰራ። ከዛ በኋላ "እህ!
sət't'əw and məls sajsəra kəzza bəhʷala iṅi
give.PFV:3SG.M:3SG.M.IO one answer COMP:NEG:3SG.M:do from:that after Eh!
ስራ እንጂ" ምናምን Ø:: "አዬ በቃ ሰራሁኝ" Ø:: "እንካ
siṙa inʤi miṅamiṅ aje bək'k'a sərrahuɲ iṅka
do.2SG.M.IMP please and_stuff QUOT ah enough do.PFV:1SG QUOT here_you_are
ስራ።" ምናምን ብሎ "እንግዲህ አጨቅጭቀኝ
siṙa miṅamiṅ biṫlo iṅgiḋih aɬ'ɬ'ək'ɬ'iḳ'əɲ
do.2SG.M.IMP and_stuff say:3SG.M.CVB now NEG:2SG.M::nag.2SG.M.IMP:1SG.OBJ
ካልሆነ ልውጣልህ" Ø:: "ሂድ
kalhonə liẇt'alliḣ hid
if:NEG:become:3SG.M 1SG.SBJV:go_out:for:2SG.M QUOT go.2SG.M.IMP
ውጣ" አለው።
wiṫ'a aləw
go_out.2SG.M.IMP say.PFV:3SG.M:3SG.M.IO

He said, "some boy is a hooligan." "He made him sit alone and told him 'do the exam'. He slept and said, 'I don't do it'". They are federal policemen. More than ten or nine policemen forced him but the student does not care about that. Ø "Do the exam." Err Ø "I know nothing. How can I do it?" "I do not do it" and stuff, he said. Then he said, "Here you (SG, M) are. Here you (SG,

M) are" and gave him the exam paper back without answering any question. Then after, Ø "Ah!, please do" and stuff Ø "Ah! Enough. I did." He said, "Here you (SG, M) are, do." and stuff. "Do not nag me now or let me leave the room for you (SG, M)." He said, "leave the room."'

Fourth, when reporting a conversation, both adolescents and adults use a quotative for the first speaker quoted but not for the second (specially, the one who responds to the first speaker) because their listeners understand that it is a quotation based on their knowledge of adjacency pairs.

In the extract below (5), Betel uses **ስትል** *sɨttɨl* 'when she says', the inflected form of **አለ** *alə* 'said', when quoting a woman asking about the whereabouts of a boy but uses a null quotative when quoting the person who gives the response to the woman's question. The context tells that Betel quotes a response to the woman's question though the quotation is not accompanied by a quotative.

(5) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, line 226)

Betel:	"**ሳሚ**	**የት**	**ሄዶ**	**ነው**?"	**ስትል**	"**ካንቲኒ**"	Ø
	sami	jət	hedo	nəw	sɨttɨl	kantini	
	Sami	where	go.3SG.M.CVB	be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST	when:3SG.F:say	Kantini	QUOT

'When she said, "Where did Sami go?" "Kantini." Ø'

Guday also uses **ስትለው** *sɨttɨləw* 'when she tells him', the inflected form of **አለ** *alə* 'said', when quoting the woman who presents a request but the null quotative when quoting the agent who declines to accept the request (see extract (6)).

(6) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.17, line 213)

Guday: …**ከዛ**	**በቃ**	**ይጨንቃት**				**እና**	**ከደላላ**	**ጋ**
kəzza	bək'k'a	jɨʧ'ənk'at				ɨnna	kədəllala	ga
then_after	enough	INCP.3SG.M.IMPR:get_anxious:3SG.M:3SG.F.OBJ				and	COM:agent	with
ትደውል	**እና**	**ደላላው**	**"እርዳኝ"**		**ስትለው**			
tɨdəwwɨl	ɨnna	dəllalaw	ɨrdaɲ		sɨttɨləw			
INCP.3SG.F:call	and	agent:DEF	help.2SG.M.IMP:1SG.OBJ		when:3SG.F:say:3SG.M.IO			
"**ልረዳሽ**		**አልችልም**"						
lɨrədaʃ		alʧʧɨlɨm						
PROS:1SG:help:3SG.F.OBJ		NEG:1SG:be_able.IPFV:NEGCOMP						
የላካት		**ደላላ**	**ማለት**	**ነው**።።				
jəlakat		dəllala	maləṭ	nəw				
REL:send.3SG.M:3SG.F.OBJ		agent	INF:say	be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST				
"**ልረዳሽ**		**አልችልም**።።"				Ø	…	
lɨrədaʃ		alʧʧɨlɨm						
PROS:1SG:help:3SG.F.OBJ		NEG:1SG:be_able.IPFV:NEGCOMP				QUOT		

'Thenafter, because she was anxious, she called her agent to say "help me." But "I can't help

you (SG, F)". Ø "I can't help you (SG, F)." Ø'

Fifth, adults tend to use the null quotative when it is possible to infer who said the quoted material based on the sentences preceding the quotation. As it is illustrated in extract (7), when Zubeda says **ጅቡ·ቲ ልንሄድ መርከብ እየጠበቅን ነው** *ʤɨbuti lɨnnɨhed mərkəb ɨjjət'əbbək'ɨn nəw* 'we are waiting for a ship to go to Djibouti', the listeners understand that she is quoting people who are smuggled based on her preceding explanation that other people leave the smuggled people at the banks of Awash river promising that a ship will come to take them to Djibouti.

(7) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, line 82)

Zubeda፡ "**ጅቡ·ቲ … አሁን መርከብ መጥቶ ይወስዳችኋል፡፡**
ʤɨbuti ahun mərkəb mət'to jɨwəsdaʧʧɨh^{w}al
Djibouti now ship come:3SG.M.CVB 3 SG.M:take.IPFV:2PL.OBJ:AUX
ደርሳችኋል" ይሉ እና አዋሽ ዳር አፍሰዋቸው
dərsaʧʧɨh^{w}al jɨlu ɨnna awaʃ dar affɨssəwaʧʧəw
reach.PFV:2PL:AUX INCP.3PL:say:3PL and Awash bank spill:3PL.CVB:3PL.OBJ
ይመለሳሉ፡፡ ከዛ አንድ… አንድ ጊዜ ላይ ሌሊት…
jɨmməlləsallu kəzza and and gizze laj lelit
3PL.IPFV:return:AUX:3PL then_after one one time on night
ያገኟቸዋል፡፡ ሲያገኟቸው "ምን እየሰራችሁ
jagəɲ^{w}aʧʧəwal sijagəɲ^{w}aʧʧəw mɨn ɨjjəsərraʧʧɨhu
3PL:meet.IPFV:3PL:3PL.OBJ:AUX when:3PL:find:3PL:3PL.OBJ what PROG:do:2PL
ነው?" ሲባሉ "ጅቡ·ቲ ልንሄድ መርከብ እየጠበቅን
nəw sibbalu ʤɨbuti lɨnnɨhed mərkəb ɨjjət'əbbək'ɨn
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST as:3PL:PASS:say:3PL Djibouti PROS:1PL:go ship PROG:wait:1PL
ነው፡፡" Ø
nəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST QUOT
'"You (PL) have reached Djibouti, a ship will come to take you (PL)." Taking them to Awash and telling them that they have reached Djibouti, they returned. Then some night other people got them there and asked them, "what are you (PL) doing?"; Ø "we are waiting for a ship to go to Djibouti."'

Sixth, adolescents drop a quotative when they repeat a quotation. In extract (8) Minas does not use a quotative in (c) because (c) is a repetition of (a).

(8) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.6, lines 311-312, 320)

a. Minas፡ "***መጀመሪያ ነበር" አለ "መጥኖ መደቆስ ኋላ ምን***
mədʒəmmərija nəbbər alə mət'tɨno mədək'k'os h^{w}ala mɨn
first be.PFV:3SG.M.PST say.PFV:3SG.M measure:3SG.M.CVB INF:grind later what
ያደርጋል ድስት· ጥዶ ማልቀስ" ብሏል፡፡
jadərgal dɨst t'ɨdo malk'əs bɨl^{w}al
3SG.M:do.IPFV:AUX pot put_on_fire፡3SG.M.CVB INF:cry say.PFV:3SG.M.CVB:AUX
'One had to prepare the ingredients of a sauce first. It has no value to complain after beginning to cook.'

b. Salman፡ **እስቲ ድገሚው ድገሚው ድገሚው።።**
ɨsti dɨgəmiw dɨgəmiw dɨgəmiw
please repeat:3SG.F.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ repeat:3SG.F.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ repeat:3SG.F.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ
'Please repeat it. Repeat it. Repeat it.'

c. Minas፡ "**መጀመሪያ ነበር መጥኖ መደቆስ ኋላ ምን**
mədʒəmmərija nəbbər mət'ɨno mədək'k'os hʷala mɨn
first be.PFV:3SG.M.PST measure:3SG.M.CVB INF:grind later what
ያደርጋል ድስት ጥዶ ማልቀስ።።" ∅
jadərgal dɨst t'ɨdo malk'əs
3SG.M:do.IPFV:AUX pot put_on_fire፡3SG.M.CVB INF:cry QUOT
'One had to prepare the ingredients of a sauce first. It has no value to complain after beginning to cook.'

Seventh, adolescents use the null quotative if they extend or add to a story involving a conversation begun to be narrated by another speaker, or if they quote the same person the first speaker quoted on the same issue. It is taken for granted that the quotative the first speaker uses can also work for the extension or the addition. As shown in extract (9) below, when Kelemework adds another quotation to Tsega's, the source being Beza speaking on reducing body weight, she does not use a quotative because the quotative Tsega uses also works for her.

(9) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, lines 292-296)

a. Tsega: **የቤዛ ሲያስጠላ እሷ እማ**
jəbeza sijast'əlla ɨssʷa ɨmma
GEN:Beza as:3 SG.M:CAUS:hate she FOC
'Beza's is very bad.'

b. Betel: **ቤዛ የታ**?
beza jətʷa
Beza when.3SG.F
'Who is Beza?'

c. Tsega: "'**እናቴ መድሀኒት ግዢልኝ የውፍረት ኧረ ተይ ኧረ**
ɨnnate mədhanit gɨʒillɨn jəwɨfrət ərə təj ərə
mother:1SG.GEN medicine buy:2SG.F:for:1SG GEN:fat፡ness DM please DM
ተይ አልቅሼም ቢሆን አስገዛለሁ።።"
təj alk'ɨʃʃem bihon asgəzzalləhu
please cry:1SG.CVB:FOC COMP፡3SG.M:become 1SG:CAUS: buy.IPFV:AUX:1SG
ትላለች።።
tɨlalləʧ
3SG.F:say.IPFV:AUX:3SG.F
'" 'Mother, a medicine for me, please.' I will cry and have the medicine bought for me."'

d. Kelemework: **እሷ እማ ቤተክርስቲያን ሄዳ**
ɨssʷa ɨmma betəkɨrɨsttijan heda
she FOC church go:3SG.F.CVB
'She went to church and –'

e. Kelemework: "**እንደዚህ ብታቀጥነኝ አቅጥነህ**
ɨndəzzih bɨttak'ət'nəɲ ak't'ɨnəh

like:this.3SG.M if: 2SG.M:CAUS:be_thin:2SG.M:1SG.OBJ CAUS:be_thin:2SG.M.CVB
ብጠብቀኝ **የሚቀጥለው** **አመት አራት ብር**
bɨt't'əbbɨk'əɲ jəmmik'ət't'ɨləw amət aratt bɨr
if: 2SG.M:wait:2SG.M:1SG.OBJ next year four Birr
እሰጣለሁ"… Ø
ɨsət'alləhu
1SG:give.IPFV:AUX:1SG QUOT
'Ø "I will give four Birr next year if you (SG) make me thin"… '

Eighth, as one corrects a quotation said by somebody else, they do not use a quotative. If the quotative is said by the former speaker, the one who corrects leaves it. Adults do this. Firew's phrase on line (d) in extract (10) is a correction to the second clause of Ali's sentence on line (a). Firew does not use a quotative because Ali has used before him.

(10) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.8, lines 127-130)

a. Nuri: "**እንኳን ዘንቦብሽ** **እንዲያውም ጤዛ ነሽ**" **አለ፡፡**
ɨnk^{w}an zənbbobbɨʃ ɨndijawɨm t'eza nəʃ alə
even rain:3SG.M.CVB:2SG.F.upon:2SG.F already dew be.PFV:2SG.F.NPST say.PFV:3SG.M
'Even before it rained on you, you (SG, F) are dewy. You (SG, F) become too dewy when it rains.'

b. Firew: **እ**?
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

c. Nuri: **እ**?
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

d. Firew: "**እንዲያውም እንዲያው ነሽ**" Ø
ɨndijawɨm ɨndijaw nəʃ
already so be.PFV:2SG.F.NPST QUOT
'You (SG, F) are dewy even before it rained on you. Ø'

Ninth, when quoting a person for the first time, both age groups use a quotative but they use the null quotative when quoting the same person for a second time. Tsega, the adolescent, uses a null quotative in the second quotation of extract (11) because it is understood that she is quoting the same mother she mentioned earlier. The adult Zubeda also uses the same method. See extract (12).

(11) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, line 331)

Tsega፡ "**ኧረ ድፍት** **ያርግሽ**" **ምናምን**
ərə dɨffɨtt jargɨʃ mɨnamɨn
DM put_up_side_down.IDEO 3SG.M.SBJV:make.3SG.M:2SG.F.OBJ and_stuff
ትላታለች **እናቲቱን**:: "**ይዞሽ**

tɨlatallәʧʧ ɨnnatitun jizoʃ
3SG.F:say.IPFV:3SG.F.IO:AUX:3SG.F mother:SGV:DEF:DAT grab:3SG.M.CVB:2SG.F.OBJ
ይሂድ እንዳው አንቺስ በሞት·ሽ" Ø
jɨhid ɨndaw anʧʧis bəmotʃ
3SG.M.SBJV:go DM you:SG.F:FOC COMP:die:2SG.F QUOT
‘ “I wish you (SG, F) die,” and stuff she says to her mother. Ø “ I wish you (SG, F) die”’

(12) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, line 55)

Zubeda፡ "**ልደው·ልላቸው፡፡"** **ነው** **ያለው** **አሊ፡፡**
lɨdəwwɨlɨllaʧʧəw nəw jaləw ali
1SG.SBJV:dial:for:3PL be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:say:3SG.M.OBJ Ali
"**ልደው·ልላቸው፡፡** **እኔ ብኖር ጥሩ ነበር፡፡"** Ø
lɨdəwwɨlɨllaʧʧəw ɨne bɨnor t'ɨru nəbbər
1SG.SBJV:dial:for:3PL I if:1SG:exist good be.PFV:3SG.M.PST QUOT
‘“Let me call them” is what he said. Ø “Let me call them. It is good if I also go with you (PL).”’

Tenth, adolescents leave a quotative if they quote a person who is already a subject of their discussion. As shown in extract (13) below, before Kelemework says a quotation, she and the other conversant were discussing about one of their notorious classmates. She leaves the quotation because her listener can understand that she quotes the same person who is the subject of the talk.

(13) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, line 720)

Kelemework፡ **ብት·ናገሪ** **አበቃልሽ፡፡ "** **ማን ስለሆንሽ**
bɨttɨnnaggəri abək'k'allɨʃ mann sɨləhonʃ
if:2:speak:2SG.F CAUS:finish.PFV:3SG.M:for:2SG.F who as:become:2SG.F
ነው **አንቺ?"** **ምናምን** Ø
nəw anʧi mɨnamɨn
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST you:SG.F and_stuff QUOT
‘If you (SG, F) say anything, that is your (SG, F) end. Ø “Who are you (SG, F) after all?” and stuff.’

Eleventh, adolescents drop quotatives when who would say what is known from general knowledge. As it is shown in extract (14), Samuel does not use a quotative because it is known that the ones who are nominated for monitoring the class of students and who say **እኔ እኔ** *ɨne ɨne* ‘me me’ are all students.

(14) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, line 1361)

Samuel፡ ***መ·ኒተር ምናምን ሲመረጥ*** **"እኔ እኔ"** Ø
munɨtər mɨnamɨn sɨmmərət' ɨne ɨne
monitor and_stuff when:3SG.M:PASS:elect I I QUOT

አያስጠላህም?
ajast'əllaħim
NEG:3SG.M:CAUS:hate.IPFV:3SG.M.IMPR:2SG.M.OBJ:NEGCOMP
‘ When class monitor is elected, don’t you (SG) hate Ø, ‘me me’?’

Twelfth, adolescents leave quotatives when they quote sayings, proverbs etc. Kelemework does the same as extract (15) shows. Adults do not use the null quotative in this way.

(15) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, line 371)

Asmelash: **ምክረው** **ምክረው**
mɨkərəw mɨkərəw
advise.2SG.M.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ advise.2SG.M.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ
እምቢ ካለ **መከራው** **ይምከረው**… Ø
ɨmbi kalə məkəraw jɨmkərəw…
no if:exist:3SG.M sufferring:his 3SG.M.SBJV:advise:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ
‘Ø Give him your (SG) advice; if he refuses to accept, let him learn from his troubles.’

Thirteenth, members of both age groups use the null quotative, when they think it is enough if they mention the name or if they give an identification of the person they quote. The adolescent Lydia uses **ማማ** *mami* ‘Ethiopian version of ‘mama’’, and the adult Habiba says **ይሄ እሚያማርረው** *jɨhe ɨmmijammarrɨrəw* ‘the one who grumbles’ to refer to the people they quote. For this reason, they do not use a quotative. Refer to extract (16) and (17) below.

(16) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4., line 15)

Lydia: **ማማ እንዳውም** "**ካለፍሽ** **በጥሩ ሁኔታ** **ካለፍሽ**
mammi indawɨm kalləfʃ bət'ɨru huneta kalləfʃ
Mami as_a_matter_of_fact if:pass:2SG.F in:good condition if:pass:2SG.F
አንደኛ **ከወጣሽ** **ላፕቶፕ**" Ø
andəɲɲa kəwət't'aʃ lap top
first if:stand:2SG.F laptop
‘Mami Ø “if you (SG, F) pass, if you (SG, F) pass successfully, laptop.”’

(17) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, line 291)

Habiba: **እውስጥ ገባ** **ብለሽ** **እኔ አሁን ያየሁት** **ይሄ**
ɨwɨst' gəba bɨləʃ ɨne ahun jajjəhut jɨhe
inside enter.ATT say:2SG.F.CVB I now REL:see:1SG:3SG.M.OBJ this:3SG.M
እሚያማርረው **ምንም** **አይነት ነገር** **ሳይኖረው**
ɨmmijammarrɨrəw mɨnɨm ajnət nəgər sajnorəw
REL:3SG.M:grumble:DEF nothing kind thing COMP:NEG:3SG.M:have:3SG.M.IMPR:3SG.M.OBJ
እንዳው **ነበር** **ታጥቦ** **የተሰቀለ**
ɨndaw nəbəbr tat'bo jətəsək'k'ələ
DM be.PFV:3SG.M.PST PASS:wash:3SG.M.CVB REL:PASS:hang:3SG.M
ቢጃማ **እሚመስል** **ዝም** **ብሎ** **ያን**

bidʒama ɨmmiməsɨl zɨmm bɨlo jan
pyjama REL:3SG.M:resemble quiet.IDEO say:3SG.M.CVB that.3SG.M:ACC
አስቀምጦ "ገበያ አጣሁ" Ø እስኪ
ask'əmmɨt'o gəbəja at't'ahu ɨski
put:3SG.M.CVB market lose.PFV:1SG QUOT please
'When you (SG, F) observe it carefully, the one who grumbles has supplied something similar to a pair of used pijamas but Ø "there is no demand".'

4.2.3.2. The Quotative ነው 'it is'

Both adolescents and adults use **ነው** *nəw* 'it is' for paraphrased quotations. Extracts (18) and (19) illustrate this fact.

(18) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.7, line 574)

Lily: **የለም። ካደረግሽ መሉ ለመሉ ነው መደረግ**
jəlləm kadərrəgʃ mulu ləmulu nəw məddərəg
NEG.exist.PFV:3SG.M:NEGCOMP if:do:2SG.F all in_all be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST INF:do
ያለበት። ያ እማ ያም ሆነ ይህ
jalləbbət ja ɨmma jam honə jɨh
COMP:have_to.3SG.M that.3SG.M FOC that.3SG.M:FOC become.PFV:3SG.M this:3SG.M
ማንኛውም ሃይማኖት "አለባበሳችሁን አስተካክሉ" ነው እንጂ
mannɨɲɲawɨm hajmanot alləbabəsaʧʧɨhun astəkaklu nəw ɨndʒi
any religion dressing_style:2PL.GEN:ACC correct:2PL.IMP be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST but
ማንም የወጣ አለባበስም ሆነ ጸጉር ስታይልም ሆነ
mannɨm jəwət't'a alləbabəsɨm honə s'əgur stajlɨm honə
nobody strange wearing_style:FOC become.PFV:3SG.M hair style:FOC become.PFV:3SG.M
አይቻልም። ግን ያው የእምነት እና የአመለካከት
ajʧʧalɨm gɨn jaw jəɨmnət ɨnna jəammələkakət
NEG:3SG.M.PASS:be_able.IPFV:NEGCOMP but that:itself GEN:faith and GEN:attitude
ጉዳይ ስለሆነ ነው።።
guddaj sɨləhonə nəw
affair because:become:3SG.M be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'No, there is no. If you (SG, F) do it, you (SG, F) should do it completely. Any way in any religion it is, "wear properly"; unique wearing style is not allowed in any religion. But it is a matter of faith and view.'

(19) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 3.8, lines 279-280)

a. Nuri: **"እ ባኤላ አሹቅ እየበላሁ ያደክበትን እ**
ɨ baela aʃuk' ɨjjəbəllahu jaddəkkubbətɨn ɨ
DM bean sauted_and_parboiled PROG:eat:1SG REL:grow:1SG:in:3SG.M:ACC DM
ነው እንዴ እምትጠይቀኝ? ቅልጥም
nəw ɨndde ɨmmɨtɨt'əjjɨk'əɲ k'ɨlt'ɨm
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST Q COMP:2SG.M:ask.IPFV:2SG.M:1SG.IO marrow_bone
የመጠጥኩበትን ነው የነገርኩህ አዩ"
jəmət't'ət'kubətɨn nəw jənəggərkuh ajjə

REL:suck:1SG:in:3SGM:ACC be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:tell:1SG:2SG.M.IO Aye

አሉ·ት·	**አሉ·።**
alut	alu
say.PFV:3SG.H:3SG.M.IO	say.PFV:3PL

'Er it is said he said, "Do you (SG, M) ask me about the time I passed eating beans? I tell you about (SG, M) the time I passed eating meat."'

b. Awol፡ "**ከዛ** **በፊት·** **ብኖርም** **አልኖርኩ·ም።**" **ነው·** ።

kəzza	bəfit	bɨnorɨm	alnorkum	nəw
from:that before	if:1SG:live:FOC	NEG:live.PFV:1SG:PFV:NEGCOMP		be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST

'It is "I have lived but I did not live a meaningful life"'

4.2.4. Summary

To put in a nutshell, adults are ahead of adolescents in the frequency of all the three quotatives, **አለ** *ələ* 'said', **ነው·** *nəw* 'it is', and the null quotative. But the difference between the two age groups in **አለ** *ələ* 'said' is wider than the difference between them in the other two quotatives. The major contributors in adults' lead in **አለ** *ələ* 'said' and in the null quotative are males, the LSG and Muslims; and in **ነው·** *nəw* 'it is' females, the LSG and Christians. When the social factors in general are considered, gender and socioeconomic grouping are found to have a weak predictive power on the relationship between the two age groups in their choice of **አለ** *ələ* 'said' and the null quotative; but the opposite is true with regard to **ነው·** *nəw* 'it is'. Religion does not have a consistent place in the differences between the two age groups regarding the use of all the three variants of the quotative system.

Moreover, the null quotative has more uses in the conversations of the adolescents than in that of the adults. Nonetheless, the quotative **ነው·** *nəw* 'it is' has the same type of use in the conversations of the two age groups.

4.3. Slang

4.3.1. Types of Slang and the Variants

Linguistic items that are identified as slang are "informal and often ephemeral … forms" that are created and disseminated by a specific social group of people; after their creation, they may either remain the identity of the members of the group who created them or are spread out and used by the whole community (Trask and Stockwell 2007, 261); mostly slang is unsteady (Richards and Schmidt 2002, 490). All in all, 85 tokens of slang are used by the participants of

this study. Adolescents use eighty one of the whole as adults use only ten. By implication, adolescents lead the adults in the variety of slang expressions they use.

The expressions are classified into the following eight groups based on the way they came to existence as slang.

1. Loan words

   They are words that are borrowed from different foreign languages. Some are used in combination with Amharic words to become part of the grammar. But some are used in new meanings different from the meanings they have in the source language. Adolescents use all the nine slang words found in the list in Appendix 7 as adults use only three of them.

2. New derivatives

   Some slang forms do not exist in the standard vocabulary of Amharic at all. They are derived from words that have already existed as standard forms following the Amharic word formation rules. Adolescents use all such forms derived from the corpus as adults use none of such tokens. The forms are listed in Appendix 7.

3. New diminutive

   The word included in this category is **ኣ** *a* 'isn't it?'. It is a short version of a word **ኣደለም** *adəlləm* 'isn't it?' formed by cancelling the last two of its syllables. Only adolescents use it.

4. Existing forms with meaning extensions and new qualities

   These forms exist in the Amharic vocabulary but when used as slang they take new senses or add new qualities. All of them are used only by the adolescents. The complete list of terms that fall in this category are given in Appendix 7.

5. Existing forms with new meanings

   This category includes forms that have already existed but now are used with new meanings that are not related to the common meanings the forms have from the beginning. Adolescents use twenty-two and adults two of the twenty three tokens that fall in this category. The complete list is given in Appendix 7.

6. Newly created forms

   There are new slang expressions that are neither derived from existing words nor borrowed from other languages but are newly created by the users. As the list given in Appendix 7 depicts, eighteen of such expressions exist in the corpus. Adolescents use fourteen as adults use only two.

7. Dialect form

   The circumfix **አል…ትኝም** *al…tɨɲɨm* is a dialect form of **አል…ትም** *al…tɨm* added to verbs to form their negative version. It is transported from a speech community at Western part of the Amhara region. Only adolescents use this form.

8. Expressions adopted from films

   Some slang expressions are imitated from film stars; they exist in phrase form and most of them are used to create humor. Phrases of such nature used in the recordings are "**እ** **አይባልም** *ɨ ajbbalɨm* 'do not say "huh?"'; **እኔን ነው**? *ɨnen nəw* 'are you (SG, M) talking to me?'; **ወደ ገደለው ግባ** *wədə gəddələw gɨba* 'come to the point'; and **ብርቅ ነው እንዴ**? *bɨrk' nəw ɨnde* 'it is not exceptional'. Only adolescents use all the items of the list.

Adolescents' lead in all the categories of slang indicate that the discourse feature is where adolescents clearly exhibit their extreme flexible handling of language and language's potential to be creative.

4.3.2. Distribution of Slang

Slang is the typical discourse feature on which one expects that the two age groups show difference. Sections 2.5 and 2.6 show that adolescents, men and the lower socioeconomic group stand out in their use of the feature in different languages. What the present data tells about the distribution of Amharic slang across the social factors under question is discussed in this section.

Table 12 Distribution of slang across the age groups

Age Category	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Slang**			**P**
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**	p=0.00
Adolescent	27	34799	378	10.86	90.58	
Adult	27	31049	35	1.13	9.42	
Total	54	65848	413	11.99	100	

The data in Table 12 shows that adolescents use most of the slang while adults use only about one-tenth of the feature. All adolescents use slang but among twenty-seven adults, only nine use it. This shows that adolescents by far surpass the adults in slang use. The significance test also proves the existence of this difference.

Table 13 Distribution of slang across the genders in the two age groups

Gender	**Adolescents**					**Adults**				
	N	**Total no of Words**	**Slang**			**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Slang**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**			**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
Male	14	15805	200	12.65	57.45	13	16172	14	0.87	38.16
Female	13	18994	178	9.37	42.55	14	14877	21	1.41	61.84
Total	27	34799	378	22.02	100		31049	35	2.28	100

As Table 13 demonstrates, out of the slang used by adolescents, the majority is by the males. This shows that males are more informal than females. With regard to the adults, however, females exceed the males. This implies that gender does not have a consistent effect on slang use across the age groups. But the males of the adolescent age group contribute the greater proportion for the age group to exceed the adult category.

Table 14 Distribution of slang across socioeconomic groups

Socioeconomic Group	**Adolescents**					**Adults**				
	N	**Total no of Words**	**Slang**			**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Slang**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**			**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
LSG	15	18554	248	13.37	62.56	14	14731	17	1.15	51.11
MSG	12	16245	130	8.00	37.44	13	16318	18	1.10	48.89
Total	27	34799	378	21.37	100	27	31049	35	2.25	100

As Table 14 shows, among the adolescents, the LSG uses more than half of the slang and the MSG less. Therefore, the LSG leads. In other words, the LSG is more informal than the MSG. However, among the adults, the difference between the two socioeconomic groups is very low. This suggests that socioeconomic group does not have a meaningful impact on the differences between the age categories in their use of slang. However, the LSG plays the greater role in determining the adolescents' lead.

Table 15 Distribution of slang across the two religions

Religion	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Slang			N	Total no of Words	Slang		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
Christian	11	16084	148	9.20	42.81	13	17934	30	1.67	81.46
Muslim	16	18715	230	12.29	57.19	14	13115	5	0.38	18.54
Total	27	34799	378	21.49	100	27	31049	35	2.05	100

Table 15 depicts that in the adolescent age cohort the greater proportion, 57.19%, of the slang is used by the Muslims but 42.81% by the Christians; and most, 81.46%, of such language taken from the adult corpus is used by the Christians but 18.54% by the Muslims.

By implication, with regard to the choice of slang, in the adolescent group, the Muslims take the leading position but in the adult group, the Christians do. In other words, the role of religion in determining differences between adolescents and adults is not uniform. Nonetheless, Muslims' role in enabling adolescents to lead the adults is higher.

4.3.3. The Most Frequent Slang Expressions

The first three most frequent slang expressions used by the adolescents are **ተመቸ** *təməʧʧə* 'it is suitable', **አሪፍ** *arif* 'fantastic', and **ደበረ** *dəbbərə* 'it is detestable' with a raw frequency of 51, 45 and 38 (13.49%, 11.91%, and 10.05% of all the slang), respectively. Among the slang expressions that occur in the adults' conversations, **አሪፍ** *arif* 'fantastic' is the most frequent with twenty-three (65.71%) occurrences.

The contexts in which **ተመቸ** *təməʧʧə* 'it is suitable', **አሪፍ** *arif* 'fantastic', and **ደበረ** *dəbbərə* 'it is detestable' are used are discussed below.

4.3.3.1. አሪፍ *arif* 'fantastic'

The slang "**አሪፍ**" *arif* 'fantastic' is one of the most frequent slang expressions in the conversations of both age groups. Its pervasive application by the adolescents and its unique use by the adults show that the word has some special position in the Amharic vocabulary. Unlike many slang words, it has a long history in Amharic. Many people are not aware that it is still slang. This type of slang is called basic slang.

It has two variants: **አሪፍ** *arif* and **ሀሪፍ** *harif*. There is no difference between the age groups in their preference for these variants.

In addition to its high frequency, the word has a wide variety of meanings. Adolescents use it in four meanings while the adults use it in three. This demonstrates that adolescents lead the adults in the use of the word in a variety of meanings. The meanings are discussed one by one below.

First, both adolescents and adults use it as an adjective to express their positive attitude, approval and love towards something like status in education, preparation for exam, interests, performance in a certain job, idea etc. The word occurs with this meaning in extracts (20) and (21) below.

(20) Extract (Adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 6-11)

a. Hayat፡ **ትምህርት አሪፍ**
tɨmɨhɨrt arif
learning fantastic
ነው እባክሽ።።
nəw ɨbakkɨʃ
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST actually
ምንም አይልም::
mɨnɨm ajlɨm
nothing NEG:3 SG.M:say.IPFV:NEGCOMP
'Learning is very good. It is not bad.'

b. Hallima፡ **አሪፍ ነው።።**
arif nəw
fantastic be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
It is good.

c. Lydia፡ **የፈተና ዝግጅት እንዴት**
jəfətəna zɨgɨdʒdʒɨt ɨndet
GEN:exam preparation how
ነው?
nəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'How is the preparation for exam?'

d. Hayat፡ **ጥሩ ነው።።**
t'ɨru nəw
good be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'It is good.'

e. Hallima፡ **ጥሩ ነው።።**
t'ɨru nəw
good be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'It is good.'

f. Hallima፡ **አሪፍ ነው**
arif nəw
fantastic be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
ያው እያጠናን
jaw ɨjjat'ənnan
that:itself PROG:study:1PL
ነው።።
nəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'It is very good. We are studying.'

(21) Extract (Adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, lines 24-29)

a. Habiba፡ **አዎ።። ኧረ በጣም ብታዩ።። እነሰይድ ታረቀኝ በጣም**
awo ərə bət'am bɨttaji ɨnnəsəjɨd tarək'əɲ bət'am
yes DM very if:2SG.F:see:2SG.F DET.3PL:Seid Tarekegn very
ብታዩ የሪፎርም ስራ በደንብ መረጃ በደንብ
bɨttaji jəriform sɨra bədənb mərrədʒa bədənb
if:2SG.F:see:2SG.F GEN:reform work well information well
እያደራጁ ይዘዋል።።

ɨjjaddəradʒʒdʒu jɨzəwal
PROG:organize.IPFV:3PL keep.PFV:3PL:AUX
'Yes. Seid Tarekegn and others have organized documents of the reform work very well.'

b. Zubeda: **እህ**
ɨhɨ
aha
Aha

c. Habiba: **እ**?
ɨ
Eh
Eh?

d. Zubeda: **አሪፍ ነበር ማለት ነው።።**
arif nəbbər malət nəw
fantastic be.PFV:3SG.M.PST INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'It means it was fantastic.'

Second, both adolescents and adults use it as a concluding comment in conversations. Hayat (the adolescent) says **አዎ ብቻ አሪፍ ነው ሁሉም ነገር** *awo bɨʧʧa arif nəw hullum nəggər* 'Yes. Everything is fantastic' and Zubeda (the adult) says **አሪፍ ነው** *arif nəw* 'it is fantastic' just to conclude a talk; here the two women do not want to express the goodness of something. See extracts (22) and (23).

(22) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, line 60)

Hayat: …**አዎ ብቻ አሪፍ ነው ሁሉም ነገር።።**
awo bɨʧʧa arif nəw hullum nəggər
yes anyhow fantastic be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST all:FOC thing
'Yes. Anyhow everything is fantastic.'

(23) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, line 44-46)

a. Meselech: **አይ ካየናቸው ተቋማት በጣም ጥሩ ነው።።**
aj kajjənaʧʧəw təkʷamat bət'am t'ɨru nəw
no among:see:1PL:3PL.OBJ institutions very good be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
ሂደዋል ጥሩ።።
hidəwall t'ɨru
advance.PFV:3PL.CVB:AUX well
'It the best among the organizations we observed in fact. They have a progress.'

b. Habiba: **በጣም ጥሩ ነው።።**
bət'am t'ɨru nəw
very good be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'It is very good.'

c. Zubeda: **አሪፍ ነው።።**
arif nəw
fantastic be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'It is fantastic.'

Third, adolescents use it to describe the good performance of something/somebody on activity. For example, Muktar uses it to refer to Temesgen's excellent performance on singing and dancing. Extract (24) shows this.

(24) Extract(adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, line 1116)

Muktar፡ **ተመስገንም** … **እሷ እኮ እንትን ላይም አርቲስት እንትን**
təməsgənɨm ɨsʷa ɨkko ɨntɨn lajɨm artist ɨntɨn
Temesgen:FOC she truly INDFPRO on:FOC artist INDFPRO
ዘፈን እና እንትን ላይ ሀሪፍ ናት።። እስክስታም ላይ
zəfən ɨnna ɨntɨn laj harif nat ɨskɨstam laj
song and INDFPRO in fantastic be.PFV:3SG.F.NPST dancing:FOC on
'Temesgen as well … is, indeed, fantastic in singing and-. Also in traditional dancing.'

Fourth, adolescents use it to describe a process of doing something in a clever (cunning) way. In extract (25) below Muktar refers to Samuel's tactful way of making him hold the microphone at the demonstration at Ginbot 20 celebration (The Holiday of the Downfall of the Military Dicatorship Regime in Ethiopia).

(25) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, line 1184)

Muktar፡ **በሀሪፍ እምታሲዘኝ እኔን ነው እሺ**?
bəharif ɨmmɨttasizəɲ ɨnen nəw ɨʃʃi
with:tact REL:2SG.M:CAUS:catch:1SG.OBJ I:ACC be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST ok
'You (SG, M) make me take the microphone tactfully, ok?'

Fifth, adults give it the meaning 'accurate and enough'. When Geremew in extract (26) qualifies the word **ኢንፎርሜሽን** *informeʃɨn* 'information' with **አሪፍ** *arif*, he means 'it is accurate'.

(26) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, line 61)

Geremew፡ **ግን አንተ አየህ ብዙ ብዙ … አሪፍ አሪፍ ኢንፎርሜሽን**
gɨn antə ajjəh bɨzu bɨzu arif arif informeʃɨn
but you:SG.M see.PFV:2SG.M much much accurate accurate information
ነበረህ::
nəbbərəh
have.PFV:PST:3SG.M.IMPR:2SG.M.OBJ
'But you (SG, M) see you (SG, M) had a lot of …accurate information.'

4.3.3.2. ተመቸ *təməʧʧə* 'it is suitable'

The slang **ተመቸ** *təməʧʧə* which can primarily be translated as 'it is suitable' is a verb used by both age groups to describe states of feeling good towards something. The specific meanings it carries in different contexts are discussed each below.

First, people of both age groups use it to express that they like or they feel good about something. The adolescent Dawit in extract (27) uses **ከሚመቸኝ ጸባይ** *kəmmimməʧʧəɲ s'əbaj* 'among your (SG, M) behaviors I like' to express that he likes Samuel's action of nominating himself as a class monitor.

(27) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, line 1364)

Dawit፡ "**እኔን**" **ማለት አባቱ ይሙት ከሚመቸኝ**
ɨnen malət abbate jɨmut kəmmimməʧʧəɲ
I:ACC INF:say father:1SG.GEN 3SG.M.SBJV:die from:REL:3SG.M:suit:3SG.M.IMPR1SG.OBJ
ጸባይ ምንድን ነው? እጅህን አውጥተህ እኔ
s'əbaj mɨndɨn nəw ɨʤʤɨhɨn awt'ɨtəh ɨne
behavior what be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST hand:GEN2SG.M.GEN:ACC raise:2SG.M.CVB I
ማለትህ።። …አንደኛ ጸባይ።።
malətɨh andəɲɲa s'əbaj
NMLZ:say:2SG.M.GEN first behavior
'You know what I like among your (SG, M) behaviors? You (SG, M) raise your (SG, M) hand and say "Me Me". … the best behavior.'

Illham, the adult, also uses the word's negative form to express bad attitude of a person towards another. Extract (28) displays this.

(28) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.12, lines 301-302)

a. Simeneh፡ **እንጂ የጸባይ ምናምን አደለም?**
ɨnʤʤi jəs'əbaj mɨnamɨn adəlləm
but GEN:conduct and_stuff be.NEG.PFV.NPST:3SG.M:NEGCOMP
'It is not because of his behavior and stuff?'

b. Illham: **አይ አይ ብቻ አይመቸውም መሰል።።**
aj aj bɨʧʧa ajɨmməʧʧəwɨm məssəl
no no anyhow NEG:3SG.M:suit.IPFV:3SG.M.IMPR:3SG.M.OBJ:NEGCOMP seem.PFV
ሲያየው አይመቸውም።።
sijajəw ajɨmməʧʧəwɨm
when:see:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ NEG:3SG.M:suit.IPFV:3SG.M.IMPR:3SG.M.OBJ:NEGCOMP
'No No. I think he doesn't feel good about him. He does not feel good when he sees him.'

Second, adolescents use it to refer to the goodness of something. In extract (29), Hayat uses the word to express that the behavior of their teachers is not favorable to her.

(29) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, line 51)

Hayat፡ **በናትሽ ያው አንዳንድ ቲቸሮች በጣም ይደብራሉ።።**
bənnatɨʃ jaw andand tɨʧəroʧʧ bət'am jɨdəbbɨrallu
for:mother:2SG.F.GEN that:itself some teachers very 3PL:depress.IPFV:3PL
ጸባያቸው ምናምን አይመችም።።
s'əbajaʧʧəw mɨnamɨn ajɨmməʧʧɨm
behavior:3PL.GEN and_stuff NEG:3SG.M.IMPRsuit.IPFV:NEGCOMP
'For your (SG, F) mother's sake like some teachers are uninteresting. Their behavior is not

favorable.’

Third, others use it to express the excellent performance of somebody on an activity. As presented in extract (30), Nuredin describes the promoter of a certain program prepared in the town as **የሚመች ልጅ** *jəmmimməʃʃ liʤ*; it means “he did well”.

(30) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, line 86)

Nuredin: **እና ያው ይወዱታል በጣም። አስተዋዋቂውም በጣም**
ɨnna jaw jɨwəddutall bət'am astəwawak'iwɨm bət'am
and that:itself 3PL:like.IPFV:3PL:3SG.M.OBJ:AUX very promoter:DEF:FOC very
የሚመች ልጅ ነው።።
jəmmimməʃʃʃ liʤ nəw
COMP:REL:suit:3SG.M boy be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
‘And like they like him very much. The promoter does very well.’

4.3.3.3. ደበረ *dəbbərə* ‘it is detestable’

The slang **ደበረ** *dəbbərə* which can generally be translated as ‘it is detestable’ is used by both adolescents and adults in nine specific meanings. Adolescents use it in all the nine meanings, but the adults only in one of the nine. Therefore, the adolescents lead the adults in using the word in varied meanings. Each meaning the word has, the context that determines the meaning, and the age group that favors each meaning are explained in detail below.

First, adolescents use the word to express their dislike to different things like teachers, classes, people etc. In the following dialogue (extract (31)), Kelemework reveals her hatred to her class using the word because of the detestable behavior, unattractive relationships, and bad intragroup communication that characterize the class.

(31) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, line 765)

Kelemework: **በቃ ምንድን ነው? እኔ ሁሉም ደብረውኛል።። ደሞ**
bək'k'a mɨndɨn nəw ɨne hullum dəbbɨrəwɨɲɲall dəmmo
enough what be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST I all:FOC depress.PFV:3PL:1SG.OBJ:AUX also
ሁሉም ነው ደሞ እሚልሽ።። እነሀና
hullum nəw dəmmo ɨmmilɨʃ ɨnnəhanna
all:FOC be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST also COMP:3SG.M:say:3SG.F.IO DET.3PL:Hana
ምናምን ስጠይቃቸው ይኸ ክላስ አስጠልቶናል
mɨnamɨn sɨt'əjjɨk'aʃʃəw jɨhə kɨlas ast'əllɨtonall
and_staff when:1SG:ask:3PL.OBJ this class CAUS:hate.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR:1PL.OBJ:AUX
ምናምን ነው እሚሉ።።
mɨnamɨn nəw ɨmmilut
and_staff be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST COMP:3PL:say:3PL
‘I have disliked everything. Everybody has a similar feeling. When I asked Hana and the others, they say that they dislik the class.’

Second, the adolescents use it to express the feeling of depression. As it is shown in extract (32) Hayat tells that she was relieved from the depression she experienced when she is out with her friends for tea. The phrase **አእምሮአችንን ዘና እናርግ** *aɨmɨrʷaʧʃɨnɨn zəna ɨnnarg* 'let's relax our mind' used by Lydia presents itself as an antonym to the slang word and this contrast makes clear that the word undoubtedly refers to depression.

(32) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 533, 535-537)

a. Hayat: **ዛሬ ወይኔ የዛሬው ቀን ደስ አይልም**?
zare wəjne jəzarew k'ən dəss ajlɨm
today alas GEN:today:DEF day happy.IDEO NEG:3PL:say.IPFV:NEGCOMP
'Wow! Is's the day good?'

b. Lydia: **በጣም**!
bət'am
very
'Of course.'

c. Hayat: **በጣም ደብሮኝ ነበረ። አሁን ሻይ ቡና**
bət'am dəbbɨroɲ nəbbərə ahun ʃaj bunna
very depress:3SG.M.IMPR.CVB:1SG.OBJ be.PFV:3SG.M.PST now tea coffee
ስንል ቀለለኝ በናትሽ። እ ኦኬ
sinnɨl k'əllələɲ bənnatɨʃ ɨ okke
when:1PL:say get_light.PFV:1SG for:mother: 2SG.F.GEN er ok
'I was depressed very much. Now when I have been out with you, I feel light. Er ok.'

d. Lydia: **አሁን እኮ ወደ ጥናት ስለምንገባ ትንሽ አእምሮአችንን**
ahun ɨkko wədə t'ɨnat sɨləmɨnnɨgəba tɨnnɨʃ aɨmɨrʷaʧʃɨnɨn
now truly into study because:COMP:1PL:enter little mind:1PL.GEN:ACC
ዘና እናርግ ብዬ ነው
zəna ɨnnarg bɨjje nəw
relax.IDEO 1PL.SBJV:do say:1SG.CVB be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'Because we will begin to study sooner, I thought it is good to relax our mind first.'

The third application of the word is to express lack of favorableness. This is also found in adolescents' conversation. Lydia rejects Hallima's proposal to go to the bazaar by telling that the day is not favorable for the activity because they have a class in the afternoon. Extract (33) presents the evidence.

(33) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 353-357)

a. Hallima: **ለምን ዛሬ ባዛር አንገባም ግን**?
ləmɨn zare bazar angəbam gɨn
why today bazaar NEG:1PL:enter.IPFV:NEGCOMP but
'Why don't we go to the bazaar today afterall?'

b. Hayat: **ባዛር**?
bazar
bazaar

‘Bazaar?’

c. Hallima: **ለምን አንገባም**?
ləmɨn angəbam
why NEG:1PL:enter.IPFV:NEGCOMP
‘Why don’t we go?’

d. Lydia: **አይ ዛሬ ይደብራል።።**
aj zare jɨdəbbɨrall
no today 3SG.M.IMPR.depress.IPFV:AUX
‘No. Today it is not favorable.’

e. Hayat: **ዛሬ ይደብራል።። ትንሽ ይቅርብን።።**
zare jɨdəbbɨrall tɨnnɨʃ jɨk'rɨbbɨnn
today 3SG.M.IMPR.depress.IPFV:AUX some 3SG.M.SBJV:remain:against:1PL
‘The day is not favorable. It is preferable for us not to go.’

The fourth is that the word is used with the meaning ‘have lack of happiness’ in the adolescent corpus. Hayat, as presented in extract (34), expresses her mother’s loss of happiness using the word **ስለሚደብራት** *sɨləmmidəbbɨrat* ‘because she does not feel happy’, a derivative from **ደበረ** *dəbbərə*, when she is left to drink coffee alone.

(34) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, line 779)

Hayat: **እኔ በናትሽ ብቻዋን ስለሚደብራት**
ɨne bənnatɨʃ biʧʧawan sɨləmmidəbbɨrat
I for:mother:2SG.M.GEN alone:3SG.F because:COMP:3SG.M.IMPR:depress:3SG.M:3SG.F.OBJ
ቁጭ ብለን ነው እምንጠጣው አብረን።።
k'uʧʧ bɨlən nəw ɨmmɨnnɨt'ət't'aw abrən
sit.IDEO say.1PL.CVB be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST COMP:1PL:drink:3SG.M together
‘Because she does not feel happy when she drinks coffee alone, we sit and drink together.’

Fifth, adolescents use the word to express a feeling of physical discomfort and pain. The following extract (35) demonstrates that Yeshihareg uses the word **ሲደብረው** *sidəbbɨrəw* ‘when not feeling comfortable’ to express the bad incident that happens to her stomach after eating food. The word **ሲደብረው** *sidəbbɨrəw* ‘when not feeling comfortable’ is derived from **ደበረ** *dəbbərə* by the addition of the conjunctive prefix **ሲ-** *si* ‘when’ and the person and object suffix **-ኧው** *əw* ‘he’

(35) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, line 779)

Yeshihareg: **ምግብ ምናምን በልቶሽ ደሞ ሆድሽን**
mɨgɨb mɨnamɨn bəltəʃ dəmmo hodɨʃɨn
food and_staff eat.2Sg.F.CVB also stomach:2SG.F.GEN:ACC
ሲደብረው
sidəbbɨrəw

when:1SG.M.IMPR:depress:3SG.M.OBJ
'When you are not comfortable at your stomach after having a meal'

The sixth meaning as well is used by the adolescents. Yeshihareg wants to express that she feels angry when she says **ይደብረኛል** *jɨdəbbɨrəɲɲal* 'I feel angry' in extract (36). She develops the feeling when a teacher cancels her right answer to a question and asks another question in its place. Her use of its synonym **እሚያበሳጨኝ** *ɨmmijabbəsaʧ'ʧ'əɲ* 'become angry' in the same context but another sentence confirms that **ደበረ** *dəbbərə* has the stated meaning in her discourse.

(36) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 678-679)

a. Lily: **አዎ ሀ። አሁን ከእንደገና ሌላ ጥያቄ ስሪ ቢልሽ**
awo ha ahun kəndəgəna lela t'ɨjjak'e sɨri bilɨʃ
yes DM now again other question do:2SG.F.IMP if-3SG.M:say:2SG.F.IO
ምንድን ነው?
mɨndɨn nəw
what be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'Yes. If he makes you answer another question, what happens?'

b. Yeshihareg: **እኔ ይደብረኛል። ትቼው**
ɨne jɨdəbbɨrəɲɲall tɨʧʧew
I 3SG.M.IMPR.depress.IPFV:1SG.OBJ:AUX leave:1SG.CVB:3SG.M.OBJ
ነው እምገባው። አንድ ጥያቄ ሰርቼ
nəw ɨmmɨgəbaw and t'ɨjjak'e sərɨʧʧe
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST COMP:1SG:enter:3SG.M one question do:1SG.CVB
ስሳሳት እራሱ በጣም ነው
sɨssasat ɨrasu bət'am nəw
when:1SG:make_error FOC very be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
እሚያበሳጨኝ። አንድ ሰርቼ
ɨmmijabbəsaʧ'ʧ'əɲ and sərɨʧʧe
COMP:3SG.M.IMPR:make_angry:3SG.M:1SG.OBJ one do:1SG.CVB
'I feel angry. I ignore the question and go to my seat. Let alone answering another question, I become angry when I lose the answer of the first question.'

The seventh application of the word is to express that one fails to feel honored. This is also found in adolescents' conversation. Minas disapproves Salman's beating of a girl by telling him that he fails to feel less honored when he beats a woman because she is not as strong as men. Extract (37) presents the evidence.

(37) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.6, lines 207-208)

a. Salman: **ይሄ ደሞ አንተ የሴት አሽቃባጭ ነህ።**
jɨhe dəmmo antə jəset aʃk'abaʧ' nəh
this also you.SG.M GEN:female pretentious_supporter be.PFV:2SG.M.NPST
ምን አረክ? **ብመታት**
mɨn arəku bɨmətat

what do.PFV:1SG if:1SG:beat:3SG.F
'You are pretentious. Is it wrong to beat her?'

b. Minas: ኧረ አይደብርህም እንዴ?
ərə ajdəbbɨrɨhɨm ɨnde
DM NEG:3SG.M.IMPR:depress:2SG.M.OBJ:NEGCOMP Q
'Don't you feel dishonored?'

c. Sulman: ሴት መማታት አሁን ጀግንነት መሰለህ እንዴ?
set məmmatat ahun ʤəgnɨnnət məssələh ɨnde
female NMLZ:beat now bravery seem.PFV:3SG.M:for_you Q
'You think it is a sign of bravery to beat a woman?'

The eighth application is to express failure to be thoughtful or considerate and this also is found in the adolescents' conversation. Sulman wants to express that his friends are not thoughtful and thus uses the interrogative form **አይደብራችሁም?** *ajdəbbɨraʧʧɨhum* 'aren't you thoughtful' in extract (38) when they eat a food of the highest delicacy with a money coming from another person who himself eats the food of the lowest quality. Sulman's use of the synonym of the word **አታስቡም** *attassɨbum* 'aren't you thoughtful' in the same context but in another line confirms that **ደበረ** *dəbbərə* has the stated meaning in that discourse.

(38) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.6, lines 662-664)

a. Sulman: እራሱ ጥብስ ሳይበላ እናንተ ጥብስ።
ɨrasu t'ɨbs sajbəla ɨnantə t'ɨbs
himself roasted_meat when:NEG:1SG.M:eat you.PL roasted_meat
አይደብራችሁም?
ajdəbbɨraʧʧɨhum
NEG:3SG.M.IMPR:depress:2PL.OBJ:NEGCOMP
'You eat 'tibs' but he doesn't. Aren't you thoughtful?'

b. Minas: እና
ɨnna
and
Then what?

c. Sulman: አይሸምማችሁም? አታስቡም?
ajʃəmmɨmaʧʧɨhum attassɨbum
NEG:3SG.M:be_ashamed:2SG.M.OBJ:NEGCOMP NEG:2PL:think:2PL:NEGCOMP
You shoul feel considerate. You should be thoughtful.

The last meaning of the word is 'to feel sad' and it is the only meaning the word carries in the adult corpus. Sinishaw, as demonstrated in extract (39), used the derived word **ይደብራል** *jɨdəbbɨral* 'you feel sad' to represent the feeling he and his wife develop due to lack of children.

(39) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.15, line 150)

Sinishaw: አም። እንደዚህ ስድስት ሲሆንህ ያለልጅ

awo ɨndəzzih siddist sihonih jaləlɨʤ
yes like:this six when:3SG.M.IMPR:become:2SG.M.OBJ without:child
ስትሆን ትንሽ እንትኑ ይደብራል።።
sittɨhon tɨnniʃ ɨntɨnu jɨdəbbirall
when:2SG.M.become some INDFPRO:DEF 3SG.M.IMPR.depress.IPFV:AUX
ማለት በተለይ ለምሾት ጥሩ አልነበረም።።
maləṭ bətələj ləmiɲot t'ɨru alnəbbərəm
INF:say especially for:Mignot good NEG:be.PFV:3SG.M.PST:NEGCOMP
'Yes. When you are childless at this age, you feel sad. Especially for Mignot it was not good.'

4.3.4. Slang Expressions and Their Standard Synonyms

To illustrate the extent to which adolescents prefer slang more than adults do, ten slang expressions are selected from the conversations of the adolescents and discussed in comparison with their standard synonyms that are found in the adult corpus.

The first is **አሪፍ** *arif* 'fantastic'. In most cases where **አሪፍ** *arif* 'fantastic' is possible to use, adults prefer to use **ጥሩ** *t'iru* 'good'. This shows that they have little interest in the word. Compare the choices of Shiferaw (the adult) and Hafiza (the adolescent) in extracts (40) and (41) below.

(40) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, line 526)

Hafiza: **አሪፍ አይዲያ**።።
harif ajdija
fantastic idea
'A fantasic idea'

(41) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, line 292)

Shiferaw: **አሁን ሁለት ሰዎች ይለያያሉ**።። **ለምን ይለያያሉ**?
ahun huləṭṭ səwoʧ jɨlləjajjallu ləmɨn jɨlləjajjallu
now two men 3PL:separate.IPFV:AUX:3PL why 3PL:separate.IPFV:AUX:3PL
ምናምን።። **ጥሩ አሳብ ነው የሰጠሽኝ አንቺ**።።
mɨnamɨn t'ɨru assab nəw jəsəṭ'əʃɨɲ anʧiʧi
and_stuff good idea be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:give:3SG.F:1SG.IO you:SG.F
'Now two people separate. Why do they separate, and stuff. You (SG, F) gave a good idea'

The word **ምርጥ** *mɨrt'* which literally means 'chosen' is the other slang adolescents use but adults do not. The adults like Meselech prefer the standard word **ቆንጆ** *k'onʤo*, whose primary meaning is 'beautiful'. In the following conversations, both **ምርጥ** mɨrt' and **ቆንጆ** *k'onʤo* idiomatically mean 'smart' or 'good'. Look extracts (42) and (43).

(42) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, line 197)

Hafiza: **ምርጥ ሸሚዝ ጫማ ወላሂ።።**
mirt' ʃəmiz ʧ'amma wəllahi
smart shirt shoe I_swear_to_Allah
'Smart shirt, shoe, I swear to Allah'

(43) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, line 230)

Meselech: **ቆንጆ ቆንጆ እቃዎች አሉ።።**
k'ondʒo k'ondʒo ik'awoʧʧ allu
good good articles exist.PFV:3PL
'There are good articles.'

Next, for the slang **ዴች** *deʧʧ*, which means 'ten' in Italian, found in the adolescents' speeches, the adults have the word **አስር** *assɨr* 'ten'. Etenat from the adult group and Kelemework from the adolescent group are compared below (extracts (44) and (45)).

(44) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, line 1146)

Kelemework: **እንዳው ጉድ ነው።። አይቲ ደሞ ዴች ዴች ነው**
ɨndaw gud nəw ajti dəmmo deʧʧ deʧʧ nəw
DM what_a_wonder be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST IT again ten ten be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
አሉ እማሚሰጠው።።
alu ɨmmisət'əw
say.PFV:3PL REL:3SG.M:give:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ
'What a wonder! It is said IT teacher gives ten points.'

(45) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, line 1064)

Etenat: **አስር ብር ስጪው እና የመለሱትን**
assɨr bɨrr siʧ'iw ɨnna jəməlləsutɨn
ten Birr give:2SG.F.IMP:3SG.M.IO and REL:give_a_change:3PL:3SG.M.OBJ:ACC
ይመልሱ።።
jiməllɨsu
3PL.SBJV:give_a_change.3PL
'Give him ten Birr and let them give him the change whatever it is.'

Moreover, the adolescents use the word **ጨቈጨ** *ʧ'uʧ'e* to refer to small children but the adults choose the standard synonym **ትንሽ** *tɨnnɨʃ*. Tsega and Shiferaw represent the two groups respectively in this difference of choice as shown in extracts (46) and (47) below.

(46) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, lines 486-488)

a. Kelemework: **ትላልቆች ናቸው አነስ አነስ ያሉ**
tilallik'oʧʧ naʧʧəw anəss anəss jalu
big:PL be.PFV:3PL.NPST small.ATT small.ATT REL:say:3PL
ነው?
nəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'Are they big or small?'

b. Betel: **ሴቶቹ የሚሊኒየም ተማሪዎች ናቸው። ወንዶቹም በነሱ ሌቭል ናቸው በቃ።።**
setoʧʧu jəmilinijəm təmariwoʧʧ naʧʧəw wəndoʧʧu bənnəsu levil naʧʧəw bək'k'a
females:DEF GEN:millennium students be.PFV:3PL.NPST males:DEF:FOC at:they level be.PFV:3PL.NPST enough
'The girls are from Millennium school. The boys are their equals.'

c. Tsega: **ጨጨሙ ቤቶቹ ዘጠኝ ናቸው። ሚሊኒየም ሚሊኒየም ሚሊኒየም ሚሊኒየም ናቸው።።**
ʧ'uʧ'e betoʧʧu zət'əɲ naʧʧəw milinijəm milinijəm milinijəm milinijəm
small houses:DEF nine be.PFV:3PL.NPST millennium millennium millennium millennium
millennium be.PFV:3PL.NPST
'The small ones are ninth graders. They are from Millennium school.'

(47) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, line 465)

Kedija: **እሀ ትንሽ ልጅ እኮ ናት።።**
ɨhhɨ tɨnnɨʃ lɨʤ ɨkko nat
ah small child truly be.PFV:3SG.F.NPST
'Ah! She is a little child.'

Furthermore, in contexts where adolescents use **ምን ጣጣ አለው** *mɨn t'at'a alləw*, literraly 'no nuisance', the adults prefer to use **ምን አሻህ** *mɨn aʃʃah*, literally 'don't be concerned', and **ችግር የለም** *ʧɨgɨr jəlləm*, literally 'no problem'. Compare Leyla's (the adolescent) speech in extract (48) with Shiferaw's and Awol's (both adults) in extracts (49) and (50). Both groups mean 'it is no wrong if…' or 'do not worry' in using all the three expressions.

(48) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, line 354)

Leyla: **እንዴ ምን ጣጣ አለው ለባዛሩ እንደዛ ሆና ብትሄድ እሳ?**
ɨnde mɨn t'at'a alləw ləbazaru ɨndəzza hona bɨttɨhed ɨssa
ah what nuisance have.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR.NPST:3SG.M.OBJ for:bazaar:DEF like:that.3SG.M become:3SG.F.CVB if:3SG.F:go FOC
Ah!'What is wrong if she goes to the bazaar wearing that way?'

(49) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, line 1074)

Kedija: **ኧረ ምን አሻህ አቦ! እንካ።። የተረፈውንም ተወው።።**
ərə mɨn aʃʃah abbo ɨnka jətərrəfəwɨnɨm təwəw
please what concern.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR:2SG.M.OBJ please here_you_are REL:remain:3SG.M:DEF:ACC:FOC leave.2SG.M.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ

‘Do not worry, please. Here you (SG, M) are. Take the change as well.’

(50) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.8, line 379)

Awol: **እ ችግር የለም**።።
ɨ ʧiggɨr jəlləm
er problem NEG.exist.PFV:3SG.M:NEGCOMP
‘Er do not worry.’

What is more, adolescents use the slang verb **አይገልጸውም** *ajgəls'əwɨm*, literally ‘…does not describe it’, in situations where intensifiers like **በጣም** *bət'am* ‘very’ as degree markers, can do the function the slang is meant for. It is a new introduction to Amharic discourse. Adults prefer **በጣም** *bət'am* ‘very’ instead. Look the extracts (51) and (52) below.

(51) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 829-830)

a. Dawit: **ምርጥ ጎል ነው ደሞ**።።
mɨrt' gol nəw dəmmo
chosen goal be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST again
‘It a fantastic goal.’

b. Muktar: **ምርጥ ጎል ብቻ አይገልጸውም**።። **እና ወደ የቡድን**
mɨrt' gol biʧʧa ajgəls'əwɨm inna wədə jəbudɨn
chosen goal only NEG:3SG.M:express.IPFV:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ:NEGCOMP and into GEN:team
‘It is beyond a fantanstic goal. And to the team’

(52) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, lines 64-65)

a. Samuel፡ **አዎ ምን እኔ ሰላም እኔ እኮ ገንዘቤን እኮ ሙጥጥ**
awo mɨn ɨne səlam ɨne ɨkko gənzəben ɨkko mut'ɨt't'
yes what I Selam I truly money:1SG.GEN:ACC truly finish.IDEO
ነው ያረኩት… በናትህ።።
nəw jarəkkut bənnatɨh
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST COMP:make:1SG:3SG.M.OBJ for:mother: 2SG.M.GEN
‘Yes, I have spent all my money… for your (SG, M) mother’s sake.’

b. Geremew፡ **በጣም በጣም**
bət'am bət'am
very very
‘Of course.’

Again, the slang **ግግም** *gɨggɨm* ‘unreasonably determined’ is favored by the adolescents like Hayat but the adults like Etenat use the standard word **ጥብቅ** *t'ɨbbɨk'k'*, which literally mean ‘tighten’. Both words refer to persistence. Look extracts (53) and (54) below.

(53) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 167, 172)

a. Hallima: **የሆነ** **ለታ ባዛር** **የገባን** **ለታ ደሞ** **የሆነ** **ሰካራም**
jəhonə ləta bazar jəgəbban ləta dəmmo jəhonə səkkaram
that_happened day bazaar REL:enter:1PL day also that_happened drunkard
ነጃትን **አልለቅም** **ብሎ** **ይዞ**
nəʤatɨn alləkˈɨm bɨlo jɨzo
Hayat:ACC NEG:1SG:release.IPFV:NEGCOMP say:3SG.M.CVB catch:3SG.M.CVB
'Some day before now when we went to the bazaar some drunken man grabbed Hayat and refused to let her go.'

b. Hayat: **እውነቱን** **እኮ** **ነው።።** **በቃ** **ግግም**
ɨwnətən ɨkko nəw bəkˈkˈa gɨggɨm
true:1SG.GEN:ACC truly be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST enough perstist.IDEO
ብሎብን "**ምን ሆነህ** **ነው**?" Ø
bɨlobbɨn mɨn honəh nəw
say:3SG.M.CVB:against:1PL what become:2SG.M.CVB be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST QUOT
"**አቅሻለሁ**" Ø **ምናምን።።**
akˈɨʃalləhu mɨnamɨn
1SG:know.IPFV:2SG.F.OBJ:AUX:1SG QUOT and_stuff
'I tell you the truth. He was stubborn. Ø "What is wrong with you (SG, M)?" Ø "I know you (SG, F)." and stuff.'

(54) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, line 992)

Etenat: "**ወየት ትሕዳላችሁ**?" Ø **ጥብቅ** **ታረጋቸዋለች።።**
wəjət tɨhədallaʧʧɨhu tˈɨbbɨkˈkˈ tarəgaʧʧəwaləʧʧ
where 2PL:go.IPFV:AUX:2PL QUOT tighten.IDEO 3SG.F:make.IPFV:3PL.OBJ:AUX:3SG.F
'Ø "Where are you (PL) to go?" She didn't allow them to go.'

In addition, the satirical words **ኮብላይ** *koblaj* and **አስኮብላይ** *askoblaj*, which literally mean 'the one who runs away' and 'the one who helps people to run away', respectively are common among the adolescents; the words refer to the people who are trafficked and the traffickers. But the adults use the formal phrases **ህገወጥ የሰዎች ዝውውር** *jəhɨggəwətˈ jəsəwoʧʧ zɨwɨwwɨr* ('human trafficking'), **ደላላ** *dəllala* 'agent', and **በህገወጥ መንገድ እንዲሄዱ** *bəhɨggəwətˈtˈ məngəd ɨndihedu* 'to go in an illegal way'. Extracts (55), (56) and (57) display the case.

(55) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, line120)

Nuredin: **እና** **ይቅርታ ጋራጅ** **አልፈልግም።።** **በቃ** **ለየት** **ያለ**
ɨnna jɨkˈrta garaʤ alfəlligɨm bəkˈkˈa ləjjətt jalə
and sorry garage NEG:1SG:want.IPFV:NEGCOMP enough differ.ATT REL:say:3SG.M
ስራ **አሁን እንትን** **ብንሰራ** **እ** **አርፎ** **ቁጭ** **ብሎ**
sɨra ahun ɨntɨn bɨnsəra ɨ arfo kˈuʧˈʧˈ bɨlo
job now INDFPRO if:1PL:do er be_still:3SGM.CVB sit.IDEO say:3SGM.CVB
እሚበላበት **አሁን** **ኮብላይ**
ɨmmibbəllabbət ahun koblaj

REL:3SG.M:eat:from:3SG.M now fugitive
‘Sorry, I don’t want a garage job but a special job like human trafficking, er a job that pays much but requires little effort.’

(56) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, line 514)

Zubeda: **የህገወጥ የሰዎች ዝውውር**
jəhɨggəwət'ɨ' jəsəwoʧʃ ziwɨwwɨr
GEN:illegal GEN:people traficking
‘Human trafficking’

(57) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, line 580)

Habiba: **አንድ ሰው ሁለት ሰው መልምለው ለዛ ለደላላ ለዋናው ደላላ**
and səw hulətt səw məlmɨləw ləzza ləḍəllala ləwannaw dəllala
one person two people recruit:3PL.CVB for:that.3SG.M for:agent for:main:DEF agent
ካስረከቡ የሆነ ኮሚሽን የሚታሰብላቸው ስላለ
kasrəkkəbu jəhonə komiʃɨn jəmmittassəbɨllaʧʃəw sɨlallə
if:hand_over:3PL some commission REL:COMP:3 SG.M:PASS:allot:for:3PL as:exist:3SGM
በየመንደሩ የቤት ሰራተኛ አይቀር ባለትዳር
bəjjəməndəru jəbet sərratəɲɲa ajər balətɨdar
at:every:village:DEF GEN:house maid NEG:3 SG.M:remain.IPFV married
አይቀር እየደለሉ እና በቃ በህገወጥ መንገድ እንዲሄዱ
ajk'ər ɨjjədəlləlu ɨnna bək'k'a bəhɨggəwət'ɨ' məngəd ɨndihedu
NEG:3SG.M:remain.IPFV PROG:broker:3PL and enough in:illegal way COMP:3PL:go:3PL
ነው።።
nəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
‘Because they get money if they recruit one or two people and handover to the broker, they go door to door and encourage even maids or married women to go in illegal ways.’

Additionally, adolescents use the slang **ማጨናነቅ** *maʧ'ʧ'nanək'* ‘to make oneself worried or anxious’ and its derivatives but the adults choose to use the standard words **ማስፈራራት** *masfərarat* ‘to threaten’ and **መጨነቅ** *məʧ'ʧ'ənək'* ‘to be worried or anxious’ and their derivatives. The evidences are given in extracts (58), (59) and (60).

(58) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, line 642)

Nuredin: **ያንተ… ትልቅ ሁነው እኮ ወደ ስልሳ አምስት ያሉ ሰዎች**
jantə tɨllɨk' hunəw ɨkko wədə sɨlsa ammɨst jallu səwoʧʃ
GEN:you old become:3PL.CVB truly about sixty five REL:exist:3PL people
ማለት ነው በቃ ራሳቸውን ያጨናንቃሉ።።
malət nəw bək'k'a rasaʧʃəwɨn jaʧ'ʧ'ənanɨk'allu
INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST enough themselves:ACC 3PL:CAUS:be_worried.IPFV:AUX:3PL
ሞት የመጣባቸው በቃ ሁልጊዜ እማያስቡት
mot jəmət't'abaʧʃəw bək'k'a hulgizze ɨmmijassɨbut
death COMP:come.3SG.M:onto:3PL enough always REL:3PL:think:3PL
‘Elderly people, people of about sixty five, make themselves worried. They always think that death is near.’

(59) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, line 624)

Kedija: **ዝም ብላ ነው ኡባህ። ልታስፈራራሁ**
zɨm bɨla nəw ubah lɨttasfərrarrahu
quiet.IDEO say:3SGF.CVB be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST Ubah PROS:3SG.F:frighten:2SG.H.OBJ
ነው።።
nəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'Ubah doesn't mean it. She is to threaten you (H).'

(60) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, line 684)

Kedija: **አትጨነቂ እቴናት እንግዲያ**
attɨʧ'ʧ'ənək'i ɨtenəʃ ɨngɨdija
NEG:2SG.F:be_worried:2SG.F.IMP Etenal if_that_is_so
'Do not worry Etenat if that is so.'

Finally, the slang **ማማር** *mamar* 'be beautiful' and its derivatives are used by the adolescents to express love to something. But adults favor **ደስ ትልሻለች** *dəs tɨlɨʃallәʧʧ* 'you become happy with it' or **ደስ ይላል** *dəss jilall* 'it makes one happy'. Both the slang and the standard forms mean 'to be pleasing' but what makes **ማማር** *mamar* 'be beautiful' a slang is that in normal circumstances it is not used in the same context with **ደስ ትልሻለች** *dəs tɨlɨʃallәʧʧ* 'you become happy with it' or **ደስ ይላል** *dəs jilall* 'it makes one happy'. Look the examples in extracts (61), (62) and (63).

(61) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 3.4, line 841)

Lydia: **እቤቱ እማይሄድ ልጅ**
ɨbetu ɨmmajhed lɨʤ
into:home:3SG.M.GEN REL:NEG:3SG.M:go boy
አያምራችሁም? **በጣም**
ajamraʧʧɨhum bət'am
NEG:3SG.M:look_good.IPFV:3SG.M.IMPR:2PL.OBJ:NEGCOMP very
ነው እሚመቸኝ።።
nəw ɨmmimməʧʧəɲ
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:3SG.M:suit:3SGM:1SG.OBJ
'Isn't a boy who doesn't go to his home pleasing? I like this type of boy.'

(62) Extract (adults) Ref. Appendix 4.9, line 783)

Ubah: **አሁን እኛ ጋ ያላት ስርአት። ጧት እኔ ወደጫት**
ahun ɨɲɲa ga jallat sɨrɨʔat t'ʷat ɨne wədəʧ'at
now we with REL:have:3SG.M.IMPR:3SG.F.OBJ good_behavior morning I into:chat
ተራ ስሄድ...።። ወላሂ! ቤት ስታሰናዳ
təra sɨhed wəllahi bet sɨttassənadda

stall when:1SG:go I_swear_to_Allah home when:3SG.F:prepare:3SGF

ደስ ትልሻለች።።

dəss tiliʃallətʃʃ

happy.IDEO 3SG.F:say.IPFV:2SG.F.OBJ:AUX:3SG.F

'She behaves when she comes our home. When I go to the chat stall in the morning…. I swear to Allah! She is pleasing when she arranges home.'

(63) Extract (adults) Ref. Appendix 4.13, line 50)

Meselech: **አቀባበላቸውም ደስ ይላል።።**

ak'k'əbabəlatʃʃəwɨm dəss jɨlall

reception:3PL.GEN:FOC happy.IDEO 3SGM:say.IPFV:AUX

'The way they welcome us is pleasing.'

The tag marker **አ** *a* (short for of **አይደለ** *ajdəllə* 'isn't it?') occurs exclusively in the adolescent conversations. But adults prefer to use the standard variants like **አይደል** *ajdəll*, **አደል** *adəll* and **አደለ** *adəllə*. Nonetheless, all mean 'isn't it?'. Extract (64) and (65) are the evidences.

(64) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.7, lines 795-796)

a. Lily: **እኔ አሁን በተለይ ሁሉንም ያስፈረመ ኤ**

ɨne ahun bətələj hullunɨm jasfərrəmə e

I now especially all:ACC:FOC REL:CAUS:get_signed:3SG.M A

ነው አ እሚሰጠው?

nəw a ɨmmissət't'əw

be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST REL:3SG.M:PASS:give:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ

'Especially anyone who has got all the signatures is given an A, isn't it?'

b. Yeshihareg: **አዎ።።**

awo

yes

Yes.

(65) Extract (adults) Ref. Appendix 4.11, lines 41-43)

a. Woinareg: **ኖ ኖ ኖ።። እኔ ክርስቲያን ስለሆንኩኝ… አሰላሙ አለይኩም ማለት**

no no no ɨne kɨrɨstijan sɨləhonkuɲ assəlamu aləjkum malət

no no no I Christian when:1SG:go peace_be_upon_you INF:say

እኮ የእግዚአብሄር ሰላምታ ነው አደለ?

ɨkko jəʔɨgziʔabɨher səlamta nəw adəllə

truly GEN:God greeting be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST

'No, no, no. Because I am a Christian err assalamu aleykum is a greeting, isn't it?'

b. Farris: አዎ።።

awo

yes

Yes

c. Kemal: አዎ።።

awo

yes

Yes

4.3.5. Summary

To generalize, adolescents lead adults in the variety and frequency of slang expressions they use and this shows their obsession with slang. The adults rather prefer standard forms where they have the opportunity to use slang. Adolescents create slang using eight methods, namely borrowing, deriving new forms using affixes, forming diminutives, attaching new qualities to existing forms and extending their meanings, giving new meanings to existing forms, creating new forms, appropriating dialect forms, and adopting expressions from films. They exploit the creative and flexible nature of language to produce slang. Males, the LSG and Muslims contribute the greater amount for the adolescents to be in the leading position in the frequency of slang. Nevertheless, all the three social factors, gender, socioeconomic grouping, and religion, do not predict the relationship between the two age groups with regard to this discourse feature. Similarly, adolescents lead adults in the number of slang expressions they favor most.

4.4. Repair Strategies

4.4.1. Types of Patterns of Repairing Strategies

Repairing strategies are the mechanisms speakers and/or listeners use to solve difficulties of hearing, speaking and understanding. Repairing strategies have two components: repair initiation and repair solution. Repair initiation is the action of indicating a problematic utterance and motivating others or getting oneself motivated to improve or change the utterance. Repair solution is the action of trying to improve or change the problematic utterance (Bolden 2012, 100; Bolden 2011, 238). There are four patterns of repair found out so far (Bolden 2012, 100-101; Bolden 2011, 238):

1. Self-initiated self-repair – the speaker himself/herself identifies the problem and accomplishes the repairing.
2. Self-initiated other repair - the speaker himself/herself identifies the problem but the listener does the repairing.
3. Other-initiated self-repair – the listener identifies part of the discourse that is problematic for hearing or understanding and requests a repairing, but the speaker does the repairing.
4. Other-initiated other-repair – the listener does both the identification and repairing of the problem found in the speaker's discourse.

The patterns found in the conversations used for this research are self-initiated self-repair (SISR), other-initiated self-repair (OISR), and other-initiated other-repair (OIOR).

4.4.2. Distribution of Patterns of and Roles in Repairing Strategies

The distribution of repairing strategies is treated from four perspectives. The first is counting the occurrences of the patterns of repairing strategies; the second is determining the frequencies of the roles in creating trouble in communication; the third is deciding on the number of times the choice of roles of initiating repair occur; and the fourth is settling the repetitiveness of the choice of roles of doing the repair. Therefore, frequencies of the instances of all the four categories are discussed in this section in turn.

Table 16 Distribution of patterns of the repairing strategies across the age groups

Age category	**Total No of trouble-some utterances**	**Patterns of Repairing Strategies**								
		SISR			**OISR**			**OIOR**		
		Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents	519	422	81.31	48.41	75	14.45	53.74	8	1.54	87.01
Adults	434	376	86.64	51.59	54	12.44	46.26	1	0.23	12.99
Total	953	798	167.95	100	129	26.89	100	9	1.77	100
		p=0.239			p=0.453			p=0.965		

Table 16 indicates that adults use majority of the cases of SISR as adolescents use a lesser amount. Majority of the cases of OISR and OISR, however, goes to the adolescents. This implies that adults lead in SISR; and adolescents lead in OISR and OIOR.

Among the patterns used by both age groups, SISR accounts for the majority in frequency in both age groups (81.31 by the adolescents and 86.64 by the adults). This indicates that it is the first choice of both age groups. SISR being the first in choice implies that both groups monitor their speech; they identify the problem and repair it by themselves. They do not wait others to tell them that their speech has a problem or to correct it for them.

However, the statistical tests do not show that the relationship between the age groups in all the three patterns is statistically significant.

Table 17 Distribution of patterns of the repairing strategies across the genders

Age Category	**Total No of Trouble-some Utterances**	**Patterns of Repairing Strategies**								
		SISR			**OISR**			**OIOR**		
		Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents										
Male	285	222	77.90	47.68	50	17.54	62.16	4	1.40	45.02
Female	234	200	85.47	52.32	25	10.68	37.84	4	1.71	54.98
Total	519	422	163.37	100	75	28.22	100	8	3.11	100
Adults										
Male	270	237	87.78	50.88	32	11.85	46.89	0	0	0
Female	164	139	84.76	49.12	22	13.42	53.11	1	0.37	100
Total	434	376	172.54	100	54	25.27	100	1	0.37	100

As can be seen in Table 17, female adolescents use the greater proportion of SISR than their male counterparts do. This implies that female adolescents lead their male counterparts. However, the two genders of the adults use SISR almost in equal amount. The fact that there is no clear pattern shown exhibits that gender has no meaningful predictive power on the relationship between the age groups in their use of patterns of repairing strategies.

Majority of the OISR in the adolescent corpus is used by the males. Among the adults, the females use the majority. The adolescent males and the adult females dominate the two age groups each. This indicates that the males contribute the greater proportion for adolescents to lead the adults. In addition, the fact that the different genders lead in different age groups indicates that gender does not play a role in affecting the differences among the age groups.

Among the adolescents, the females use the majority of OIOR. In the adult group, females use the whole of the feature. By implication, females make the higher contribution for the

adolescents to lead the adults and gender plays a role in determining the relationship between adolescents and adults.

Table 18 Distribution of patterns of the repairing strategies across socioeconomic groups

Age category	**Total No of trouble-some utterances**	**Patterns of Repairing Strategies**								
		SISR			**OISR**			**OIOR**		
		Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents										
LSG	238	191	80.25	49.40	34	14.29	49.48	5	2.10	66.25
MSG	281	231	82.21	50.60	41	14.59	50.52	3	1.07	33.75
Total	519	422	162.46	100	75	28.88	100	8	3.17	100
Adults										
LSG	165	140	84.85	49.17	24	14.55	56.62	0	0	0
MSG	269	236	87.73	50.83	30	11.15	43.38	1	0.37	100
Total	434	376	172.58	100	54	25.70	100	1	0.37	100

As can be seen in Table 18, the two socioeconomic groups of both the adolescents and the adults use SISR almost in equal amount. This implies that there is no difference between the LSG and MSG in both age groups with regard to the use of SISR and that socioeconomic grouping does not have a predictive power.

The LSG and MSG do not show a difference in their use of OISR. However, among the adults, the LSG uses the majority of this pattern of repairing strategies. The fact that there is little difference between the LSG and MSG of the adolescents indicates that socioeconomic grouping does not have a predictive power on the relationship.

With regard to OIOR, the LSG of the adolescents uses 66.25% as the MSG uses the rest 33.75%. Among the adults, the MSG uses the entire pattern. By implication, LSG makes the higher contribution for the adolescents to lead the adults but socioeconomic grouping in general has no effect on the relationship.

Table 19 Distribution of patterns of the repairing strategies across the two religions

Age Category	Total No of troublesome Utterances	Patterns of Repairing Strategies								
		SISR			OISR			OIOR		
		Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents										
Christian	271	216	79.71	48.97	42	15.50	53.80	5	1.85	60.46
Muslim	248	206	83.07	51.03	33	13.31	46.20	3	1.21	39.54
Total	519	422	162.78	100	75	28.81	100	8	3.06	100
Adults										
Christian	295	257	87.12	50.44	35	11.86	46.46	1	0.34	100
Muslim	139	119	85.61	49.56	19	13.67	53.54	0	0	0
Total	434	376	172.73	100	54	25.53	100	1	0.34	100

As Table 19 presents, the difference between Christian and Muslim adolescents in their use of SISR is almost negligible. A similar pattern is drawn from the data for the adults as well. The difference between the percentages is below one. Generally, there is no leader religion in both age groups; no religion makes a special contribution for adults to lead adolescents; and religion has no predictive power on the differences between the age groups concerning SISR.

Among the adolescents, Christians use the majority of OISR. But among the adults, it is Muslims who use most of the pattern. Therefore, Christians play the greater role as adolescents lead adults in the use of this pattern. However, religion does not have a consistent pattern that it does not predict the relationship between the two age groups.

Adolescents' choice of OIOR has a similar pattern to their choice of OISR. The table depicts that the Christians use more of the strategy than the Muslims do. But among the adults it is the Christians who use all of the strategy. This indicates that Christians make the lion's share of the contribution for the adolescents to lead the adults. The case that Christian adults use the entire OIOR pattern also implies that religion has a meaningful contribution for the difference.

The frequency of the patterns of repairing strategies is equal to the number of utterances troublesome to understand and listen. The number of utterances troublesome to understand and listen the participants create in turn is determined by the extent of care speakers take for their speech and their awareness of their listeners. Adolescents and adults in general are different from one another with regard to this issue. Tables 20-23 demonstrate the actual data.

Table 20 Distribution of troublesome utterances across the age groups

Age category	**N**	**Total No of Words**	**Troublesome Utterances**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**
Adolescents	**27**	34799	519	14.91	51.61
Adults	**27**	31049	434	13.98	48.39
Total	**54**	65848	953	28.89	100
			p=0.272		

Table 20 depicts that majority of the troublesome utterances are made by adolescents; adults produce lower amount of such utterances. This implies that adolescents create more utterances that are difficult to understand or listen than the adults do. In other words, adults' speeches are less problematic than the speeches of adolescents. However, the statistical test does not show the difference is statistically significant.

Table 21 Distribution of troublesome utterances across the genders

Age category	**No**	**Total No of Words**	**Troublesome Utterances**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**
Adolescents					
Male	14	15805	285	18.03	59.41
Female	13	18994	234	12.32	40.59
Total	27	34799	519	30.35	100
Adults					
Male	13	16172	270	16.70	60.25
Female	14	14877	164	11.02	39.75
Total	**27**	31049	434	27.72	100

Table 21 shows that adolescent males produce more of the utterances that need repairing than the females do. And male adults produce the majority of such utterances when compared to their female counterparts. This implies that the males play the key role in making the adolescents lead the adults in producing utterances that need repair. In addition, the fact that males lead in both age groups suggests that males are careless when producing their utterances as they are compared to the females in both age groups, and that gender predicts the relationship between the two age groups.

Table 22 Distribution of troublesome utterances across socioeconomic groups

Age category	No	Total No of Words	Troublesome Utterances		
			Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents					
LSG	15	18554	238	12.83	42.58
MSG	12	16245	281	17.3	57.42
Total	27	34799	519	30.13	100
Adults					
LSG	14	14731	165	11.20	40.45
MSG	13	16318	269	16.49	59.55
Total	**27**	31049	434	27.69	100

According to Table 22, most of the troublesome utterances found in the adolescent corpus are made by the MSG. The same pattern is observed among the adults. This indicates that the MSG is in the lead in producing troublesome utterances in both age groups and contributes the greater proportion for the adolescents to lead the adults. The data also shows that socioeconomic grouping has a predictive power on the relationship between the age groups with respect to the discourse feature.

Table 23 Distribution of troublesome utterances across the two religions

Age category	N	Total No of Words	Troublesome Utterances		
			Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents					
Christian	11	16084	271	16.85	55.98
Muslim	16	18715	248	13.25	44.02
Total	27	34799	519	30.10	100
Adults					
Christian	13	17934	295	16.45	60.81
Muslim	14	13115	139	10.60	39.19
Total	**27**	31049	434	27.05	100

As Table 23 shows, Christian adolescents produce majority of the troublesome utterances when compared to the Muslims. The same pattern is observed in the conversations of the adults; the Christians produce most of the utterances. In both age groups the Christians lead in producing such utterances. Therefore, religion has a uniform effect in the difference across the age groups and Christians contribute more than Muslims do for the adolescents to lead the adults.

In the conversation used for the study, the troublesome utterances are followed by repairing. As it is explained in section 4.4.1, the strategy of repairing troublesome utterances has two components: repair initiation and repair solution. The two age groups are compared with respect to the roles they prefer to take with regard to initiating repair and doing the repair and tables 24-27 and the follow-up texts deal with these roles.

Table 24 Distribution of roles in repairing strategies across the age groups

Age category	**No**	**Total No of trouble-some utterances**	**Roles in Repairing Strategies**								
			Other initiation			**Self-repair**			**Other repair**		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents	27	519	96	18.50	45.80	497	95.76	49.15	8	1.54	87.01
Adults	27	434	95	21.89	54.20	430	99.08	50.85	1	0.23	12.99
Total	54	953	191	40.39	100	527	194.84	100	9	1.77	100

Majority of the other-initiation strategy found in all conversations recorded is used by adults. This shows that adults rely more on other-initiation than adolescents do to repair their utterances. In other words, adolescents are better than adults in identifying their own problems without the help of others.

With regard to the role of repairing, self-repair is chosen by both age groups almost equally. But adolescents' role of repairing other's problem accounts for more than four-fifth of the total and that of the adults covers only less than one-fifth of it. This shows that other-repair is more rampant among adolescents than among adults.

Table 25 Distribution of roles in repairing strategies across the genders

Age category	**No**	**Total No of trouble-some utterances**	**Roles in Repairing Strategies**								
			Other initiation			**Self-repair**			**Other repair**		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents											
Male	14	285	57	20.00	54.54	272	95.44	49.82	2	0.70	21.47
Female	13	234	39	16.67	45.46	225	96.15	50.18	6	2.56	78.53
Total	27	519	96	36.67	100	497	191.59	100	8	3.26	100
Adults											
Male	13	270	47	17.41	37.30	269	99.63	50.37	1	0.37	100
Female	14	164	48	29.27	62.70	161	98.17	49.63	0	0	0
Total	27	434	95	46.68	100	430	197.80	100	1	0.37	100

As Table 25 depicts, the male adolescents use the majority of the other-initiation strategy; but the females dominate in the adult age group; they use 62.70% of the strategy. Therefore, females contribute the greater proportion for the adults to lead the adolescents. The fact that different genders lead in each age group also shows that age has no effect on the difference between the age groups.

The genders do not show difference with regard to self-repair in both age groups. This indicates that gender has no role in enabling any age group to lead the other and in affecting the difference between the age groups.

The female adolescents use more than three-forth of the other-repair strategy. But the males dominate in the adult age group; they use all of the strategy. By implication, females contribute the greater proportion for the adolescents to lead the adults. Moreover, the fact that different genders lead in each age group shows that gender has no effect on the difference between the age groups.

Table 26 Distribution of roles in repairing strategies across socioeconomic groups

Age category	**No**	**Total No of trouble-some utterances**	**Roles in Repairing Strategies**								
			Other initiation			**Self-repair**			**Other repair**		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents											
LSG	15	238	46	19.33	52.07	225	94.54	49.41	2	0.84	28.19
MSG	12	281	50	17.79	47.93	272	96.80	50.59	6	2.14	71.81
Total	27	519	96	37.12	100	497	191.34	100	8	2.98	100
Adults											
LSG	14	165	75	45.46	85.94	164	99.39	50.13	0	0	0
MSG	13	269	20	7.44	14.06	266	98.89	49.87	1	0.37	100
Total	27	434	95	52.90	100	430	198.28	100	1	0.37	100

Table 26 shows that the LSG of the adolescents and the adults do majority of other-initiation in the respective age groups. This has two implications. The first is that the LSG is the major contributor for the adults in their lead concerning other-initiation. Second, socioeconomic grouping has power to determine the relationship between adolescents and adults.

In both age groups there is no a leading socioeconomic group with regard to self-repair. Therefore, socioeconomic grouping does not affect the relationship.

The MSG of both the adolescent and adult age groups use above two-third and all of the other-repair strategy, respectively. Thus the same group makes the greater help for the adolescents when they lead the adults. In addition, the data implies that socioeconomic grouping has power to determine the difference between the age groups.

Table 27 Distribution of roles in repairing strategies across the two religions

Age category	**No**	**Total No of trouble-some utterances**	**Roles in Repairing Strategies**								
			Other initiation			**Self-repair**			**Other repair**		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescents											
Christian	11	271	33	12.18	32.42	258	95.20	49.7	3	1.11	35.46
Muslim	16	248	63	25.40	67.58	239	96.37	50.3	5	2.02	64.54
Total	27	519	96	37.58	100	497	191.57	100	8	3.13	100
Adults											
Christian	13	295	64	21.70	49.32	292	98.98	49.92	1	0.34	100
Muslim	14	139	31	22.30	50.68	138	99.28	50.08	0	0	0
Total	27	434	95	44.00	100	430	198.26	100	8	0.34	100

As it is seen in Table 27, adolescent Muslims lead the Christians by using almost two-third of the other-initiation strategy found in the age group's conversation as there is no difference among the two religions of the adult age cohort. This indicates that religion has no meaningful role in affecting the difference between adolescents and adults.

There is no difference between the religions with regard to self-repair. But concerning other-repair, a difference exists. Muslim adolescents cover almost two-third and Christian adults all of the strategy used by the respective age groups. This indicates that Muslims play the major role in adolescents lead but absence of consistency across the age groups shows that generally religion lacks power in affecting the difference.

4.4.3. Mechanisms of Initiating Others to Repair Their Speeches

The participants use nine mechanisms to initiate others to repair their speeches. Adolescents use all of these mechanisms while adults use only five. This implies that adolescents by far exceed

the adults with regard to the variety of methods of repair initiation. These ways are discussed in detail below.

4.4.3.1. Open class

This mechanism incorporates the use of the interjections እ? *ɨ*, አ? *a*, or ኧ? *ə* that do the function of 'huh?' and 'eh?' of the English language, and the question ምን? *mɨn* 'what?'. The mechanism does not indicate the repairable part but shows that the whole of what is heard is not clear or unbelievable and thus it instigates repetition.

a. እ? *ɨ*, አ? *a*, and ኧ? *ə* (equivalent to 'huh?' and 'eh?' in function)

This method has two uses. The first one is to show one's inability to hear the speech of the other and to request them for repetition, and the other is to show one's wonder when listening to something unbelievable. Both uses are found in the adolescents' conversations while it is only the first that is found in the adults'.

Among the adolescents, Shemsedin says አ? *a* 'huh?' to indicate that he fails to hear what Nuredin says and to request him to say it again. Among the adults, Etenat is quoted using እ? *ɨ* 'huh?' for the same purpose. This is presented in extract (66) and (67).

(66) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, line 80)

a. Nuredin: **በተለይ አብሶ ፋሲል ደ ቀሬ**
bətələj abɨso fasil də k'əɸ'o
Especially notably Fasil de Kecho
'Especially Fasil De Kecho.'

b. Shemsedin: አ?
a
huh
Huh?

c. Nuredin: **ፋሲል ቀሬ። አማሀ**
Fasil k'əɸ'o ammaha
Fasil Kecho Amaha
'Fasil Kecho. Amaha'

(67) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, lines 345-347)

a. Tewabe: **ወጥ አይወዲ።**
wət' ajwəddi
sauce NEG:3SG.M:like.IPFV
'He doesn't like 'wot'.'

b. Etenat: እ?

ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

c. Tewabe፡ **አይወዲ።።**
ajwəddi
NEG:3SG.M:like.IPFV
'He doesn't like.'

As it is observed in extract (68), Dawit uses **እ**? *ɨ* to indicate to Samuel that he is surprised to hear what Samuel says and that he wants him to repeat it if it is true. Dawit is an adolescent.

(68) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 406-408)

a. Samuel: **ልንገርህ**… **ሁለት ሰው የደረሰው**
lingərih hulətt səw jədərrəsəw
1SG.SBJV:tell:2SGM.IO two people REL:reach:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ
አቃለሁ።። **የአጎቴ** **ማለት ነው** **ላፕቶፕ**
ak'alləhu jəʔaggote maləṯ nəw laptop
1SG:know.IPFV:AUX:1SG GEN:uncle:1SG.GEN INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST laptop
ደርሶታል።።
dərsotal
reach.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR:3SG.M.OBJ:AUX
'Let me tell you (SG, M). … I know two people who won the prize. My uncle has won a laptop.'

b. Dawit: **እ**?
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

c. Samuel: **የሚገርምህ** **ነገር።። እ የእህቴ** **ደሞ**
jəmmigərmɨh nəgər ɨ jəʔɨhɨte dəmmo
REL:COMP:3SG.M.IMPR:surprise:2SG.M.OBJ thing er GEN:sister:1SG.GEN again
እህቴ **ቲቸሯ** **ደብረ ዘይት ነው** **ያለችው።።**
ɨhɨte tiʧərʷa dəbrə zəjɨt nəw jalləʧʧɨw
sister:1SG:GEN teacher:3SGF.GEN Debre Zeit be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:exist:3SG.F
የእህቴ **ቲቸር መኪና ደረሳት።።**
jəʔɨhɨte tiʧər məkina dərrəsat
GEN:sister:1SG.GEN teacher car reach.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR:3SG.F.OBJ
'Again what surprises you (SG, M) is that er the teacher of my sister who lives at Debre Zeit has won a car.'

b. Saying **ምን**? *mɨn* 'what? '

This is the verbal counterpart of the interjections **እ**? *ɨ*, **አ**? *a*, and **ኧ**? *ə* and it is found only in the conversations of the adolescents. Adolescents use it to show their inability to hear what another

person says and their desire to hear the utterance again. Leyla is an example as shown in extract (69).

(69) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 271, 273-274)

a. Berhane፡ **አሁን እዚህ ቁጭ ብለን ቆሎ እየቆረጠምን ለሻይ**
ahun ɨzzih k'uʧ' bɨlən k'olo ɨjjək'orət't'əmɨn ləʃaj
now here sit.IDEO say:1PL.CVB roasted_cereal PROG:crunch:1PL for:tea
የወጡ የመስሪያ ቤት ሰራተኞች መሰልን፡፡
jəwət't'u jəməsrija bet sərratəɲɲoʧʧ məsəln
REL:be_out:3PL GEN:working house workers resemble.PFV:1PL
'When we are eating 'kollo' here, we look like office workers who are on a tea break.'

b. Leyla፡ **ምን**?
mɨn
what
'What?'

c. Hafiza ፡ **እ**?
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

d. Berhane፡ **እንደዚህ ቁጭ ብለን እንትን ስናወራ**
ɨndəzzih k'uʧ' bɨlən ɨntɨn sɨnnawəra
like:this.3SG.M sit.IDEO say:1PL.CVB INDFPRO when:1PL:talk
'When we are sitting here and chatting'

4.4.3.2. Partial repetition of the utterance of the speaker and request for completion.

Adolescents are the sole users of this method. In extract (70), Muktar repeats the first word of Hailu's sentence and then says **ምንድነው ያልከው**? *mɨndɨnnəw jalkəw* 'what?' because he hears something he does not accept. As can be seen in line (c), understanding Muktar's intention that he asks for repetition, Haile modifies his sentence to fill Muktar's lack of knowledge.

(70) Extract(adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 1029, 1033-1034)

a. Hailu፡ **የኮምቦልቻ ውስጥ አርቲስት ለራሱ ይመጣል፡፡**…
jəkombolʧʧa wɨst' artist ləɾasu jɨmət'al
GEN:kombolcha in artist FOC 3SG.M:come.IPFV:AUX
'The artist in Kombolcha will come….'

b. Muktar፡ **የኮምቦልቻ ምንድን ነው ያልከው**?
jəkombolʧʧa mɨndɨn nəw jalkəw
GEN:kombolcha what be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:say:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ
የኮምቦልቻ ምንድን ነው ያልከው?
jəkombolʧʧa mɨndɨn nəw jalkəw
GEN:Kombolcha what be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:say:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ
'Kombolcha's what? Kombolcha's what?'

c. Hailu፡ **ኮምቦልቻ ውስጥ እኮ አንድ አርቲስት አለ፡፡**
kombolʧʧa wɨst' ɨkko and artist alə

Kombolcha in truly one artist exist.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'There is an artist in Kombolcha.'

4.4.3.3. Probing questions

Probing questions are those that ask for specificity of general information given. Questions like **እኔ**? *ɨne* 'me?', **የኔ**? *jəne* 'mine?' and **ማን**? *mann* 'who?' are probing questions.

a. Asking the question **እኔ**? *ɨne* 'me?' and **የኔ**? *jəne* 'mine?'

Both the adolescents and the adults use this type of question to check whether the previous speaker is addressing them or not. Shemsedin says **እኔ**? *ɨne* 'me?' to check if it is him that Nuredin asks. Etenat also asks **የኔ**? *jəne* 'mine?' to know if Tewabe's word in line (a) is directed towards her. Look extracts (71) and (72).

(71) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 5-7)

a. Nuredin: **አሁን ማለት· ነው· እየው· ፈተና እንደኑ·**
ahun mələt nəw ɨjəw fətəna ɨndet
now INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST look.2SG.M.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ examination how
አሁን ፊዚክስ ስንት· ታመጣለህ አሁን?
ahun fiziks sɨnt tamət'alləh ahun
now Physics how_much 2SG.M:bring.IPFV:AUX:2SG.M now
'Look, how much do you score on physics exam?'

b. Shemsedin: **እኔ**?
ɨne
I
Me?

c. Nuredin: **እ::**
ɨ
yes
'Yes.'

(72) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, lines 325-327)

a. Tewabe: **በተሰቦችሽ**
bətəsəboʧɨʃ
family:PL:2SGF.GEN
'Your (SG, F) family members'

b. Etenat: **የኔ**?
jəne
GEN:I
'Mine?'

c. Tewabe: **እ**
ɨ
yes
'Yes.'

b. Asking the question **ማ**? *ma* ‘who?’

This method is used by both age categories as displayed in extracts (73) and (74). Hayat uses it to check whether what Hallima said is directed towards her, and Etenat utters it to make Kedija clarify her question.

(73) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 545-547)

a. Hallima: **አንቺ ጓደኛ እንደው ወይኔ! እንደው ትገርሚያለሽ።**
anʧʧi gʷaddəɲa ɨndəw wəjne ɨndəw tɨgərmijalləʃ
you:SGF friend DM alas DM 2SG.F:surprise.IPFV:2SG.F:AUX:3SG.F
‘That is a pity. I did not expect this from you (SG, F) as a friend.’

b. Hayat: **ማ**?
ma
who
‘Who?’

c. Hallima: **አንቺ ነሽ አ።**
anʧʧi nəʃ a
you:SGF be.PFV:2SG.F.NPST DM
‘You (SG, F)!’

(74) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, lines 322, 324)

a. Kedija: **ለቀቁት እንዴ? እሱን? እኛ**
ləkˈkˈəkˈut ɨnde ɨssun ɨɲɲ
release.PFV:3PL:3SG.M.OBJ Q he:ACC we
‘Did they allow to be independent?’

b. Etenat: **እነማ?**
ɨnnəma
DET.3PL:who
‘Who?’

4.4.3.4. Mirror questions

Mirror question is formed by converting what another person says into an interrogative form with an intention of requesting a confirmation from them. Both age cohorts use it. Among the adolescents, Nuredin’s question **ፍላጎቱ አለህ**? *fɨllagotu allәh* ‘do you (SG, M) have the desire?’ is the repetition of the preceding sentence of Shemsedin, as demonstrated in extract (75).

(75) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 11-12)

a. Shemsedin: **በቃ እ ስልህ ትምርቱ ፍላጎቱ**
bəkˈkˈa ɨ silɨh tɨmɨrtu fɨllagotu
enough er when:1SG:say:2SG.M.IO learning:DEF interest:DEF
አለኝ እኔ።።
allәɲ ɨne

have.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR.NPST:1SG.OBJ I
'Er I mean I have the interest in the subject.'

b. Nuredin: **ፍላጎቱ አለህ**?
fɨllagotu alləh
interest:DEF have.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR.NPST:2SG.M.OBJ
'Do you (SG, M) have the interest in the subject?'

As it is also observed in the following dialogue (extract (76)), Shiferaw repeats the first two words of Tewabe's sentence in line (a) in rising intonation to make it a question which asks for a confirmation.

(76) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, lines 68-72)

a. Tewabe: **የዘሩ ዘመዲ እንዲያይሆን እያልኩ ነው**
jəzəru zəmədi ɨndijajhon ɨjjalku nəw
GEN:Zeru relative COMP:NEG:3SG.M:become PROG:say:1SG be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'What if he is Zeru's relative'

b. Aberash: **ባልቴት መቼም**
baltet məʧem
old_woman when:FOC
'Old woman actually-'

c. Tewabe: **እይው**
ɨjɨw
look:2SG.F.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ
'Look'

d. Kedija: **የዘሩ ዘመዲ**?
jəzəru zəmədi
GEN:Zeru relative
'Zeru's relative?'

e. Tewabe: **አዎ የዘሩ እኮ አባት** <x**ብትቆጣ ግድ የለኝ**::x>
awo jəzəru ɨkko abbat bɨttɨk'k'ot't'a gɨdd jelləɲ
yes GEN:Zeru truly father if:3SG.F:get_angry care NEG.have.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR:1SG.OBJ
'Yes, Zeru's father –. I don't care if she is angry at me.'

4.4.3.5. Direct confrontation and order for repair

a. Direct confrontation

Unlike adults, some adolescents directly express their objection to the other's ideas and by this method they initiate other speakers to repair their speech. Using **እ**! *ɨ*, Shemsedin opposes Salhadin saying the information found in line (a) and by doing so he initiates a repair. See extract (77).

(77) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 318-321)

a. Salhadin፡ **አሁን… ምን እሚለው ዘ ኪንግ ኦፍ ፋይተር**
ahun mɨn ɨmmiləw zə kiŋg of fajtər
now what REL:3SG.M:say:3SGM the king of fighter
እሚለውን ፊልም አይተኸዋል?
ɨmmiləwɨn film ajtəhəwall
REL:3SG.M:say:3SG.M:ACC film see.PFV:2SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ:AUX
'…Have you (SG, M) watched the film entitled The King of Fighter?'

b. Shemsedin፡ **እ**!
ɨ
no
'No.'

c. Nuredin፡ **ዘ ኪንግ ኦፍ ፋይተር**?
zə kiŋg of fajtər
the king of fighter
'The King of Fighter?'

d. Shemsedin፡ **አደለም።። እንደሱ አደለም።።**
adəlləm ɨndəsu adəlləm
be.NEG.PFV.NPST:3SG.M:NEGCOMP like:that be.NEG.PFV.NPST:3SG.M:NEGCOMP
'No. It is no like this.'

b. Direct order for repair

Some adolescents directly order their friends to repair their faulty utterances as adults do not do this at all. Shemsedin is an example as it is observed in extract (78). He orders Salhadin by saying **አስተካክል** *astəkakɨl* 'correct it'.

(78) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 317, 323-324)

a. Salhadin፡ **አሁን… ምን እሚለው ዘ ኪንግ ኦፍ ፋይተር**
ahun mɨn ɨmmiləw zə kiŋg of fajtər
now what REL:3SG.M:say:3SGM the king of fighter
እሚለውን ፊልም አይተኸዋል?
ɨmmiləwɨn film ajtəhəwal
REL:3SG.M:say:3SG.M:ACC film see.PFV:2SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ:AUX
'…Have you (SG, M) watched the film named The King of Fighter?'

a. Shemsedin፡ **አስተካክል**።።
astəkakɨl
Correct.2SG.M.IMP
'Correct it.'

b. Salhadin፡ **እንትን**
ɨntɨn
INDFPRO
'Something'

c. Shemsedin፡ **ዘ ኔም ኦፍ ዘ ኪንግ**
the name of the king
zə nem of zə kiŋg

‘The Name of the King.’

4.4.3.6. Giving the correct version in question form

When adolescents recognize a problem on utterances of the people they talk with, they give the correct version of the erroneous part, add **ማለት·ህ ነው**? *malətɨh* ‘do you (M) mean…?, **ማለት·ሽ ነው**? *malətɨʃ* ‘do you (F) mean…? or **ማለት· ነው**? *malət nəw* ‘does it mean…?’, and expect the people to confirm. Kelemework is a case in point as demonstrated in extract (79).

(79) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 87- 89, 95-96)

a. Hafiza: **እሚቀጥለው ሳምንት· እኮ እንትን ነን።።**
ɨmmik'ət't'ɨləw sammɨnt ɨkko ɨntɨn nənn
REL:3SG.M:proceed:3SG.M week truly INDFPRO be.PFV:1PL.NPST
‘Next week we take errrr’

b. Berhane: **ምን**?
mɨn
what
‘What?’

c. Hafiza: **ማት·ሪክ ነን።።**
matrik nənn
matriculation be.PFV:1PL.NPST
‘We take matriculation exam.’

d. Asmelash: **ቀጣዩ አመት· ማለት·ሽ ነው**?
k'ət't'aju amət malətɨʃ nəw
proceeding:DEF year NMLZ:say:2SGM.GEN be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
‘Do you (SG, F) mean next year?’

e. Hafiza: **የስ።።**
jəss
yes
‘Yes.’

4.4.3.7. Asking for explanation and clarification

Adolescents ask other speakers to explain and clarify what they say because the utterance is vague. Leyla asks the question in line (b) with an intention of motivating Hafiza to clarify what she means by **ስፔሻል ፉዳችሁ ምንድነው**? *speʃal fuddaʧʧɨhu mɨndɨnnəw* ‘what is your (PL) favorite food?’. Extract (80) carries the information.

(80) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 110-112)

a. Hafiza: **ስፔሻል ፉዳችሁ ምንድን ነው**?
speʃal fuddaʧʧɨhu mɨndɨnn nəw
especial food:2PL.GEN what be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
‘What is your (PL) favorite food?’

b. Leyla: **እንደ·ት·**?
ɨndet

how
'What do you mean?'

c. Hafiza: **በቃ እንደው … መብላት መመገብ የምትፈልጉት ምግብ**
bək'k'a ɨndəw məblat məmməgəb jəmɨtfəlligut mɨgib
enough DM INF:eat INF:eat REL:COMP:2PL:want:2PL:3SG.M.OBJ food
ምንድን ነው?
mɨndɨnn nəw
what be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'What is the type of food you (PL) want to eat?'

Among the adults, Shiferaw asks what **ግምብ ጥብስ** *gɨmb t'ɨbs*, literally 'stone wall roast', is after Geremew uses the phrase to refer to the case that certain people who do not have money to pay for bedroom perform sexual intercourse behind fences. Look extract (81).

(81) Extract(adults) (Ref. Appendix 3.14, lines 459-461)

a. Geremew: **ግምብ ጥብስ::**
gɨmb t'ɨbs
block roasted_meat
'stone wall roast'

b. Shiferaw: **ምንድን ነው ግምብ ጥብስ**?
mɨndɨnn nəw gɨmb t'ɨbs
what be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST block roasted_meat
'What is 'stone wall roast'?'

c. Geremew: **ግምብ ጥብስ ማለት** …
gɨmb t'ɨbs malət
block roasted_meat INF:say
'Stone wall roast means'

4.4.3.8. Prompting questions

Adolescents also ask questions with clues to make speakers add what is missing in their speech, or to make them specify general ideas present in their speech. As it is shown in extract (82), Leyla poses the question in line (e) because Hafiza uses the vague term **ያቺ ጓደኛየ** *jaʧʧɨ gʷaddəɲɲaje* 'that friend of mine' when talking about one of her friends. The clue is the mentioning of the name **ሀናን** *hanan* 'Hanan'.

(82) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 338-343)

a. Hafiza: **እባክህ ያቺ ጓደኛዬ ደሞ**
ɨbakkɨh jaʧʧɨ gʷaddəɲɲaje dəmmo
truly that:SG.F friend:1SG.GEN again
በጣም እንትን ብላለች።…
bət'am ɨntɨn bɨlalləʧʧ
very INDFPRO say.PFV:3SG.F:AUX:3SG.F
'that friend of mine, she is very-'

b. Berhane: **ማ**?
ma
who
'Who?'

c. Leyla: **ሀኒ**
hani
Hani
'Hani'

d. Hafiza: **ያቺ**
jaʧʧi
that:SGF
'That'

e. Leyla: **ሀናን ናት**?
hanan nat
hanan be.PFV:3SG.F.NPST
'Is it Hanan?'

f. Hafiza: **ሀናን። ምን ሀያት**?
hanan mɨn hajat
Hanan what Hayat
'Hanan. It is not Hayat.'

The same is true with adults. In extract (83) below, Awol sends the double question in line (b) to Firew to initiate him to make specific whom he is talking about in his sentence in (a). The clue is **እሷ**? *ɨssʷa* 'she?'.

(83) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.8, lines 105-107)

a. Firew: **ታደረገም ቀላል ነው።።**
tadərrəgəm k'əllal nəw
if:do:3SG.M:FOC easy be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'It is easy to handle if he has done it.'

b. Awol: **ማ**? **እሷ**?
ma ɨssʷa
who she
'Who? She?'

c. Nuri: **እሱ።።**
ɨssu
he
'He'

4.4.3.9. Redirecting by explaining the required thing and giving the correct version

Berhane's question in extract (84) line (a) is misunderstood by Asmelash. Asmelash understands as if Berhane is referring to the goods presented for sale and said what is found in (e) in response. Thus Berhane redirects Asmelash's response by specifying what he requires from him as it is found in (f).

(84) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 381-387)

a. Berhane: **ባዛሩ ርካሽ ነው**?
bazaru rɨkkaʃ nəw
bazaar:DEF cheap be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'Was the bazaar affordable?'

b. Hafiza፡ መግቢያ?
məgbija
entrance
‘Entrance?’

c. Berhane: መግቢያ አደለም። ለኑሮ ዋጋ
məgbija adəlləm lənuro waga
entrance be.NEG.PFV.NPST:3SG.M:NEGCOMP for:livelihood cost
ርካሽ ነው ወይ ባዛር?
rɨkkaʃ nəw wəj bazar
cheap be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST Q bazaar
‘It is not about entrance. About the cost of living at the bazaar.’

d. Hafiza: አዎ
awo
yes
‘Yes.’

e. Asmelash: <xሸረx> እውጭ የምገዛውን እቃ በቅናሽ
ərə ɨwɨʃʃ' jmmɨggəzawɨn ɨk'a bək'ɨnnaʃ
DM outside REL:COMP:2SG.M:buy:2SG.M፡3SG.M.OBJ article in:discout
ታገኛለህ እዛ።
tagəɲɲalləh ɨzza
2SG.M:find.IPFV:AUX:2SG.M there
‘You (SG, M) find the cost of goods there to be lower than their cost in the regular market.’

f. Berhane: እኔ ኑሮ ነው። እቃ አልጠየኩህም።
ɨne nuro nəw ɨk'a alt'əjəkuhɨm
I livelihhood be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST article NEG:ask.PFV:1SG:2SG.M.OBJ:NEGCOMP
‘I did not ask about the cost of goods but about living.’

g. Asmelash: ኑሮ እዛ እንደውም ሸረ ሳይወደድ
nuro ɨzza ɨndəwɨm ərə sajwwəddəd
livelihood there as_a_matter_of_fact DM COMP:NEG: 3 SG.M:become_expensive
አይቀርም ብለዋል።
ajk'ərɨm bɨləwall
NEG:3 SG.M::remain.IPFV:NEGCOMP say.PFV:3PL:AUX
‘It is said, “the cost of living may be high there.”’

4.4.4. Reasons of Other-Repair

Other-repair is practiced by both age groups but its frequency is higher in adolescents’ conversations. The reasons for other-repair that can be inferred from the contexts are discussed below.

The first one is forgetting. Betel repairs Tsega’s utterance because she thinks that because Tsega forgets the information, she cannot repair the utterance by herself. The evidence is extract (85) below.

(85) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, lines 195-196)

a. Tsega: **ሀይሚ "እመጣለሁ" ብላለች። በቀደም ሶስት ሰው**
hajmi ɨmət'alləhu bɨlalləʧʧ bək'əddəm sost səw
haimi 1SG:come.IPFV:AUX:1SG say.PFV:3SG.F:AUX:3SG.F last_time three people
አምስት ነን ምናምን። ፋጡማ፣እኔ፣ ሜላት።
ammist nənn mɨnamɨn fat'uma ɨne melat
five be.PFV:1PL.NPST and_staff Fatuma I Melat
'Haimi has said, "Iwill come." Last time we were three or five or so. Fatuma, me, Melat.'

b. Betel: **አራት ነን። ሜላት በቃ።**
aratt nənn melat bək'k'a
four be.PFV:1PL.NPST Melat enough
'We were four. Melat. Finished.'

The second is lack of the knowledge of the correct information. Extract (86) indicates that Tsega repairs Betel's utterance because she is sure about the correct word Betel wants to say and she does not want to bother Betel by nagging her to remember the correct form; rather she wants to help her in directly providing the term.

(86) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, lines 373-375)

a. Betel: **እንትን ኤስ ኤም ኤስ ምናምን እሚል አላየሽም እኛ ቤት**
ɨntɨn es em es mɨnamɨn ɨmmil alajjəʃɨm ɨɲɲa bet
INDFPRO SMS and_stuff REL:3SG.M:say NEG:see.PFV:2SG.F:NEGCOMP we home
ወረቀት በቀደም? እንደውም ትጠቀማላችሁ እንዴ?
wərək'ət bək'əddəm ɨndəwɨm tɨt'ək'k'əmalaʧʧɨhu ɨnde
paper last_time as_a_matter_of_fact 2PL:PASS:use.IPFV:AUX:2PL Q
ምናምን እያልሽኝ?
mɨnamɨn ɨjjalʃɨɲ
and_stuff PROG:say:2SG.F:1SG.IO
'Didn't you see a paper on which the acronym SMS is written or so at our home? You (SG, F) asked me if we use it.'

b. Tsega: **እንትን ነው አ። ኢ ኤም ኤስ።**
ɨntɨn nəw a i em es
INDFPRO be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST DM EMS
'EMS.'

c. Betel: **እኮ።**
ɨkko
of course
'Of course.'

The third is refusal. Hafiza directly repairs Berhane because she understands that he is firm on the idea and thus does not repair himself. Line (c) testifies that he is not ready to correct himself and other-correction is mandatory. Extract (87) represents this act.

(87) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 137-139)

a. Berhane፡ **ከሀያ ክፍል በኋላ**
kəhaja kɨfɨl bəh^{w}ala
from:twenty part after
'After episode twenty'

b. Hafiza፡ **ሀያ አደለም።። ከሁለት ወይም ከሶስት**
haja adəlləm kəhuləttt wəjɨmm kəsostt
twenty be.NEG.PFV.NPST:3SG.M:NEGCOMP from:two or from:three
'It is not twenty. After two or three'

c. Berhane፡ **ጽጽ።። ኧኸ! ብዙ ብዙ አልፎት ነው**
no əhə bɨzu bɨzu alfot nəw
no huh uh! a_lot a_lot pass:3SG.M.CVB:3SG.M.OBJ be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
እንትን የተባለው።። የእውነት ብዙ አልፎታል።።
ɨntɨn jətəbaləw jəʔɨwnət bɨzu alfotal
INDFPRO REL:PASS:say:3SG.M truly a_lot pass.PFV:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ:AUX
'No. No. It is after many episodes.'

The fourth is that the trouble source makes the error because they hold the troublesome expression as integral part of their communication behavior and the one who makes the other-repair understands that other-repair is the only option. As it is read in extract (88) below, Hafiza is motivated to repair Berhane because Berhane uses the name of a teacher when he talks about him and she disapproves this type of addressing the teacher. She appears to prefer calling the teacher by the honorary name 'Gashe'.

(88) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 237-239)

a. Berhane: **በተለይ ስንዴው**
bətələj sɨndew
especially Sindew
'Especially Sindew.'

b. Hafiza: **እ ጋሼ?**
ɨ gaʃʃe
er Gashie
'Er Gashie?'

c. Leyla: **አዎ።።**
awo
yes
'Yes.'

The fifth is maintaining tone. In extract (89), Salhadin repairs Sultan as Sultan is trying to turn out the conversation into a serious one while Salhadin wants to maintain the comicalness of their conversation.

(89) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 462-464)

a. Nuredin: **ማን ነው ስሟ? ማን ነው?**
mann nəw sɨm^{w}a mann nəw
who be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST name:3SGF.GEN who be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'What is her name? What is it?'

b. Sultan: **ዘሪቱ ዘሪቱ**
zeritu zeritu
Zeritu Zeritu
'Zeritu. Zeritu.'

c. Salhadin: **ማሪቱ**
maritu
Maritu
'Maritu.'

The sixth is sluggishness to respond. In extract (90), as Kerrima requests Rabiya to confirm if she said **መላጨት** *məllaʧʼət* 'to be shaved', Rabiya slowed down to respond; for this reason Kemeriya made the repair for her by saying **አዎ። ይላል መላጨት አዎ** *awo jilall məllaʧʼət awo* 'Yes. It recommends shaving.' Adults also do so. Simeneh repairs Illham as Illham became sluggish to reply to Moges's request for repair. Extract (91) is the evidence.

(90) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.7, lines 566, 568-569)

a. Rabiya: **አለበለዚያ መላጨት።።**
aləbələzzija məlləʧʼat
otherwise NMLZ:PASS:shave
'Otherwise, to be shaved.'

b. Kerrima : **መላጨት**?
Məllaʧʼət
NMLZ:PASS:shave
'To be shaved?'

c. Kemeriya: **አዎ። ይላል**
awo jilall
yes 3SG.M:say.IPFV:AUX
መላጨት አዎ።
məllaʧʼət awo
NMLZ:PASS:shave yes
'Yes. It recommends shaving.'

(91) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.12, lines 20-22)

a. Illham: **እኔ እስፕራይት።።**
ine ɨsprajt
I Sprite
'For me Sprite.'

b. Moges: **እስፕራይት**?
ɨsprajt
Sprite
'Sprite?'

c. Simeneh: **አዎ ።።**
Awo
yes
'Yes.'

4.4.5. No Repair

There are fourteen cases where adolescents do not give a repair though the initiation is made; but with the adults this occurs only thrice. This indicates that adolescents lead the adults in ignoring initiations for repair.

The cases where the request for repair is ignored and the possible reasons for the act of ignoring are discussed below with that of the adolescents being in the beginning.

The first reason is fear of interrupting. Samuel ignores Abdulfetah's persistent initiation for repair for a possible reason that he does not want to interrupt the song played on his mobile phone. This is displayed in extract (92).

(92) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 181-187)

a. Samuel: **የምቶዱት እና የምታፈቅር ልዩ ዘፋኝ ቴዎድሮስ**
jəmmtodut inna jəmmtafək'ir lijju zəfaɲ tewodros
REL:COMP:2PL:like:2PL:3SG.M.OBJ and REL:COMP:2:love unique singer Tewodros
ታደሰ አሁን ኧ ተጋብዟል።። እስቲ ድምጹን
taddəsə ahun ə təgabz^{w}al isti dɨms'un
Taddesse now er PASS:invite.PFV:3SG.M:AUX let voice:3SGM.GEN:ACC
እንስማው።።
ɨnnɨsmaw
1PL.SBJV:listen:1PL:3SG.M.OBJ
'Tewodros Tadesse, the unique artist whom you (PL) love, er is now invited. Let's listen to his voice.'

b. Dawit: **በቃ ዝም በሉ።።**
bək'k'a zɨm bəlu
enough quiet.IDEO say:2PL.IMP
'Keep quiet.'

c. Abdulfetah: **ቴዎድሮስ ታደሰ ማለት**
tewodros taddəsə maləṯ
Tewodros Taddesse INF:say
'Tewodros Tadesse means – '

d. Samuel: **ይዝፈን ይዝፈን ይዝፈን።። ይዝፈን።።**
jɨzfən jɨzfən jɨzfən jɨzfən
3SG.M.SBJV:sing 3SG.M.SBJV:sing 3SG.M.SBJV:sing 3SG.M.SBJV:sing
'Let him sing. Let him sing. Let him sing. Let him sing.'

e. Dawit: **ኧረ**
ərə
please
'No.'

f. Abdulfetah: **ቴድሮስ ካሳሁን ማለት ነው**?
Tedros kasahun maləṯ nəw
Tedros Kassahun INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'Does it mean Tedros Kassahun?'

g. Samuel: **ዝም በል ይዝፈን።።**
zɨmm bəl jɨzfən
quiet.IDEO say.2SGM.IMP 3SG.M.SBJV:sing
'Keep quiet. Let him sing.'

The second is to avoid bad reactions. As it is shown in extract (93), Samuel ignores Muktar's initiation for repair to avoid bad reactions from Muktar. It seems that he spoke something that offends Muktar and he does not want to offend him further by saying the utterance again.

(93) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 267-269)

a. Samuel: **አንተ እና አንተን ይወክላል። ሁለታችሁን**
anttə inna anttən jɨwəkkɨlall huləttaʧʃɨhun
you:SGM and you:SGM:ACC 3SG.M:represent.IPFV:AUX two:2PL:ACC
ላይወክል ይችላል።
lajwəkkɨl jɨʧʃɨlall
PROS:NEG:3SG.M:represent 3SG.M:able.IPFV:AUX
'It represents you (SG, M) and you (SG, M). It may not represent you (PL) two.'

b. Muktar: **ማን እና ማን ይወክላል**? **እኔ እና እሱን**?
mann ɨnna mann jɨwəkkɨlall ɨne ɨnna ɨssun
who and who 3SG.M:represent.IPFV:AUX I and he:ACC
'Who and who? Me and him?'

c. Samuel: **ዩኒቨርሲቲ ከገባህ በኋላ**
univərsiti kəgəbbah bəh^{w}ala
university after:enter:2SGM after
'After you (SG, M) join university'

The third is using time as repairer. Lydia does not respond to Hallima's initiation because Hallima's need for repair is not due to failure to understand or listen; it is due to unbelief. Lydia appears to think that time helps Hallima to believe and thus does not need to repair. Look extract (94) below.

(94) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 576-578, 588-590)

a. Hallima: **እንድታስተዋውቂኝ ነው አ!**
ɨndɨttastəwawwɨk'ɨɲ nəw a
COMP:2SG.F:introduce:2SG.F:1SG.OBJ be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST DM
'I want you (SG, F) to introduce me to him'

b. Lydia: **ማን ነው ቆይ እሱ**?
mann nəw k'oj ɨssu
who be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST wait.2SG.M.IMP he
'Wait, who is he?'

c. Hallima: **አንድ ልጅ አለ። ሚኪ እሚባል ልጅ**
and lɨʤ allə miki ɨmmibal lɨʤ
One boy exist.PFV:3SG.M.NPST Miki REL:3SG.M:PASS:say boy
አታቂውም?
attak'iwɨm
NEG:2SG.F:know.IPFV:2SG.F:3SG.M.OBJ:NEGCOMP
'There is a boy. Don't you (SG, F) know a boy called Miky?'

d. Lydia: **ሴቶች ግን ይበዙበታል።**
setoʧʃˁ gɨn jibəzubbətal
women but 3PL:be_too_many.IPFV:3PL:unto:3SG.M:AUX

‘A lot of women are interested in him.’

e. Hallima: **እ**?
ɨ
huh
‘No’

f. Hayat: **አዎ ቆንጆ ስለሆነ**
awo k'onjjo siləhonə
yes handsome because:become:3SGM
‘Yes, because he is handsome.’

The fourth is priority problem. As it is seen in extract (95) below, when Leyla initiates a repair on Hafiza’s utterance, Asmelash interferes by posing a different type of initiation for repair for the same utterance. Now Hafiza ignores Leyla’s initiation because she finds Asmelash’s initiation more urgent and appealing than Leyla’s, and responded to it.

(95) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 89-96)

a. Hafiza: **ማትሪክ ነን።።**
matrik nənn
matriculation be.PFV:1PL.NPST
‘We take matriculation exam.’

b. Leyla: **እሚቀጥለው አመት**
ɨmmik'ət't'ɨləw amət
REL:3SG.M:proceed:3SG.M year
‘Next year’

c. Hafiza: **ሌት ተቀን መወጠር አለብን**?
let tək'ən məwət't'ər alləbbɨnn
night with:day INF:tighten have_to.1PL
‘We should work had day and night.’

d. Berhane: **ማትሪክ**?
matrik
matriculation
‘Matriculation exam?’

e. Hafiza: **ማትሪክ።።**
matrik
matriculation
‘Matriculation exam.’

f. Leyla: **ማትሪክ**?
matrik
matribulation
‘Matriculation exam?’

g. Asmelash: **ቀጣዩ**
k'ət't'aju
proceeding:3SG.M.DEF
አመት ማለትሽ
amət maləti∫
year NMLZ:say:2SGM.GEN
ነው?
nəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
‘Do you (SG, F) mean next year?’

h. Hafiza: **የስ።።**
jəss
yes
‘Yes.’

The fifth is boredom. In extract (96), Hafiza again ignores Berhane’s initiation possibly because she is bored of repairing her utterances repeatedly for him. He is used to expecting repair from her.

(96) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 349-351

a. Hafiza: **በቃ… ደሞ ባለፈው ለታ ባዛር ደሞ ብታያት**
bək'k'a dəmmo balləfəw ləta bazar dəmmo bittajat
enough again last day bazaar again if:2SG.M:see:3SG.F.OBJ
የለበሰችው … ሱሪ
jələbbəsəʧʧw surri
REL:wear:2SG.F:3SG.M.OBJ trousers
'… if you (SG, F) saw, the trousers she wore last time at the bazzar'

b. Berhane: **እ? ሱሪ?**
ɨ surri
huh trousers
'Huh? Trousers?'

c. Hafiza: **ጸጉርዋን እንትን ኧረ በለው! እኔ በቃ ባላሰብኩት**
s'əgur^{w}an ɨnttin ərə bələw ɨne bək'k'a balassəbekut
hair:3SGF.GEN:ACC INDFPRO DM my_goodness I enough in:NEG:expect:1SG:3SGM.OBJ
መልክ አገኘኋት፡፡ ‹‹እንዴት የኔ የኔ ጓደኛ
məlk agəŋŋəh^{w}at ɨndet jəne jəne g^{w}addəŋŋa
appearance meet.PFV:1SG:3SG.F.OBJ how GEN:I GEN:I friend
ነች?›› እስከማለት ድረስ
nəʧʧ ɨskəmaləṭ dɨrəs
be.PFV:3SG.F.NPST unto:NMLZ:say until
'Her hair, my goodness! I found her in a manner I did not expect. I thought "How? Is she my friend?"'

The sixth is change of topic. Sultan does not repair his utterance though Shemsedin requests him to do so because Nuredin interferes and raises another topic and Shemsedin shifts his attention to the new topic. If the topic is changed, there is no obligation to repair utterance on the old topic. Extract (97) presents this case.

(97) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 3-5)

a. Sultan: … **ምን ትላላችሁ**?
mɨn tɨlallaʧʧɨhu
what 2PL:say.IPFV:AUX:2PL
'…what do you (PL) say?'

b. Shemsedin: **ምን ክረምትን**?
mɨn kirəmttɨn
what summer:ACC
'What? Summer?'

c. Nuredin: **አሁን ማለት ነው እየው ፈተና እንዴት አሁን**
ahun maləṭ nəw ɨjəw fətəna ɨndet ahun
now INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST look.2SGM.IMP:3SGM.OBJ exam how now
ፊዚክስ ስንት ታመጣለህ አሁን?
fiziks sɨnt tamət'alləh ahun
Physics how_much bring:2SG.M:AUX:3SGM now
'Now, look, how much do you (SG, M) score on physics exam?'

d. Shemsedin: **እኔ**?
ɨne
I
Me?

The seventh is end of conversation. Among the adults, Habiba ignores Meselech's initiation because they want to end the conversation and go to other businesses. Conversations especially between friends may end abruptly like this. If conversations are going to end soon, interlocutors are not obliged to do a repair on their utterances. They are immuned from this obligation. Extract (98) illustrates this.

(98) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 206-211)

a. Zubeda: **ኧረ ይሄን**
ərə jɨhenn
please this:3SG.M:ACC
ቆሎ ብሉ፡፡
k'olo bɨlu
roasted_cereal eat:2PL.IMP
'Eat this 'kollo'.'

b. Habiba: **እ**?
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

c. Zubeda: **ብሉ እንጂ፡፡**
bɨlu ɨndʒi
eat:2PL.IMP please
'Please eat.'

d. Meselech: **እየበላን ነው፡፡**
ɨjjəbəllan nəw
PROG:eat:1PL be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'We are eating.'

e. Habiba: **በጣም… ሰአት መጥቶ**
bət'am səʔat mət'to
very time come:3SGM.CVB
'He came in a very… time –

f. Meselech: **ኧ**?
ə
huh
'Huh?'

The eighth is indirect ways of solving the problem. In extract (99) Simeneh ignores Illham's request for repair of his question because Moges' interfering utterance indirectly answers Illham's request. In extract (100) Yeshihareg's as well was ignored by Kerrima because of the same reason.

(99) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.12, lines 110-112)

a. Simeneh: **ፈትነሻል**? **እ**?
fəttinəʃal ɨ
invigilate.PFV:2SG.F:AUX huh
'Did you (SG, F) invigilate? Huh?'

b. Illham: **እ**?
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

c. Moges: **ኢልሃም እማ ተፈታኝ ነበረች አደል**?
ilham ɨmma təfəttaɲ nəbbərəʧʃ adəl

Illham FOC examinee be.PFV.PST:3SG.F be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR. NPST
'Illham was a candidate, isn't it?'

(100) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.7, lines 406-408)

a. Kerrima: **እኔ ደሞ መከለስ አይሆንልኝም።።**
ɨne dəmmo məkəlləs ajhonɨlliɲɲɨm
I again NMLZ:revise NEG:3SG.M:become.IPFV:for:1SG:NEGCOMP
እንዴት እንደሚሆንልሽ ንገሪኝ እስቲ።።
ɨndet ɨnddəmmihonɨlliʃ nɨgəriɲ ɨsti
how COMP:COMP:3SG.M:become:for:2SG.F tell:2SG.F.IMP:1SG.IO please
'I cannot do a revision. Tell me how you (SG, F) do it, please.'

b. Yeshihareg: **እ?**
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

c. Rabiya: **መከለስ ምናምን እ**
məkəlləs mɨnamɨn ɨ
NMLZ:revise and_stuff eww
'Revision and stuff. Eww!'

The ninth is negligence. Minas and Etsub have ignored the respective requests due to negligence. No other reason can be inferred from the context. Two extracts, (101) and (102), one from each age category, are presented below as samples.

(101) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.6, lines 457-458)

a. Minas: **አንጣው አንጣው።። ጅል።። ይኸው እዝህ።።**
ant'aw ant'aw ʤɨl jɨhəw ɨzzɨh
bring.2SG.M.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ bring.2SG.M.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ foolish this:3SG.M.itself here
ጫፉን አትንካ።።
ʧ'afun attɨnka
tip:3SG.M.GEN.:ACC NEG:2SG.M:touch.2SG.M.IMP
'Give me. Give me. Fool. Here it is. Don't touch its tip.'

b. Salman: **እ?**
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

(102) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.15, lines 73-74)

a. Etsub: **ካለው ችግር አንጻር በጣም ይከብዳል።።**
kalləw ʧɨggɨr ans'ar bət'am jɨkəbdal
from:REL:exist:3SG.M problem direction very 3SG.M:be_difficult.IPFV:AUX
'Because of the problem, it is a bit difficult.'

b. Tesfaw: **እ?**
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

4.4.6. Summary

Both age groups prefer SISR to the other two patterns of repairing strategies. When the age groups are compared to each other in their use of SISR, adults are in the leading position. But all the three social factors, gender, socioeconomic grouping and religion, do not play a role in determining the relationship. In OISR adolescents lead. Males and Christians contribute the greater proportion for the age group to be in this position. However, gender, socioeconomic grouping and religion in general have no a consistent effect on the difference between the two age groups. In OIOR adolescents lead. Females, the LSG and Christians make the higher contribution for the age category to lead the adults. But unlike the cases in SISR and OISR, in OIOR, gender and religion have the power to determine the relationship as socioeconomic grouping does not.

The adults rely more on other initiation to repair troublesome utterances they make than the adolescents do. Females, the LSG and Muslims play the greater role in enabling adults to lead the adolescents in their use of other initiation. And socioeconomic grouping has a power to predict the relationship between the age groups as gender and religion have no.

On the contrary, it is the adolescents who lead adults in their use of a variety of mechanisms of initiating others to repair their utterances and the number of reasons for doing it. All their reasons are rooted in the interlocutor who is the source of the trouble. The interlocutors delay to do self-repair, or forget information, or lack the knowledge of the correct information, or refuse to correct themselves, or hold the troublesome utterances as the integral part of their communication behavior.

The adolescents lead the adults in ignoring requests for repair. Their reasons for no repair are fear of interrupting the speaker, avoiding bad reaction, using time as repairer, priority problem, boredom, change of topic, end of conversation, indirect ways of solving the problem, and negligence.

Other-repair is more rampant among adolescents than among adults. Females, the MSG and Muslims play the greater role in enabling the adolescents to lead the adults. In addition, socioeconomic grouping has a power to predict the relationship in this discourse feature between the age groups as gender and religion have no.

4.5. Question Tags

4.5.1. Types of Question Tags and their Variants

Question tags are short interrogative forms that are added at the end of clauses. They are formed based on the information given in the preceding clause. The clause that precedes the tag is called an anchor (Tottie 2006, 283).

Tags are classified into two based on their functions: epistemic modal and affective (Tottie 2006, 298). Epistemic modal tags reflect the need of the speaker to have clarification on their doubts from a listener and to reveal uncertainty. But affective tags serve as politeness markers. They are used to involve the listener.

Affective tags are further classified into three: facilitative, softening, and challenging tags. Facilitative tags are the ones that are used to involve the listener in the interaction as the softening ones are to reduce the harshness of directives, criticisms etc. Challenging ones are those that compel the listener to respond to or to acknowledge unconstructive speeches directed towards them (Tottie 2006, 298).

Both age groups involved in the study use twenty tokens of tags. The tokens are classified into five groups:

1. Tags formed from verb to be's – a) **አደል** *adəl*, b) **አደለ** *adəllə*, c) **አይደል** *ajdəl*, d) **አይደለ** *ajdəllə*, e) **አደለም** *adəlləm*, f) **አ** *a*, g) **እማ** *ɨmma*, h) **አልነበር** *alnəbbər*, i) **አልነበረ** *alnnəbbərə*, j) **አልነበረም** *alnnəbbərəm*, and k) **እማደል** *ɨmmadəl*;
2. Tags formed from existential auxiliaries - a) **የለ** *jəllə*, 'don't/doesn't …?' and b) **የለም** *jəlləm*, 'don't/doesn't …?';
3. Interrogative form of the verb of the preceding clause - **ይገባል**? *jɨgəbal* 'is it understandable?';
4. Combination of tag markers given in number one or two above with the question marker **እንዴ** *ɨnde* - a) **አደለም እንዴ** *adəlləm ɨnde*, 'isn't it?' b) **አደል እንዴ** *adəl ɨnde* 'isn't it?' c) **አደለ እንዴ** *adəllə ɨnde* 'isn't it?' d) **አይደለ እንዴ** *ajdəllə ɨnde* 'isn't it?' e) **የለ እንዴ** *jəllə ɨnde* 'don't/doesn't …?'; and

5. Combination of the interrogative form of the verbs of the preceding clause and the question marker **እንዴ** *ɨnde* - **አያስፈልገንም እንዴ**? *ajasfəlliɨgənɨm ɨnde* ‘don’t we need …?’

Variants 1a to 1g and 1k in the list are all mean the same (‘isn’t it?’) and can be used interchangeably. All tags except the one found in number three are negative, and 1h, 1i and 1j are past forms (‘wasn’t’ it?). The tag in 1f is a short form of 1e and it is a slang form. The tag in 1g is a non-standard form. It is a short form of 1k.

The following eleven variants, 55% of all, are used by the adolescents and the adults in common.

አደል *adəl* ‘isn’t it?’
አደለ *adəllə* ‘isn’t it?’
አይደል *ajdəl* ‘isn’t it?’
አደለም *adəlləm*‘isn’t it?’
እማ *ɨmma* ‘isn’t it?’
አልነበር *alnəbbər* ‘wasn’t’ it?
የለ *jəllə* ‘doesn’t …?’
አደለም እንዴ *adəlləm ɨnde* ‘isn’t it?’
አደል እንዴ *adəl ɨnde* ‘isn’t it?’
አደለ እንዴ *adəllə ɨnde* ‘isn’t it?’
የለ እንዴ *jəllə ɨnde* ‘doesn’t …?’

Among the eleven, five are used exclusively by the adolescents as four exclusively by the adults. In other words, the number of variants in which the age groups exhibit differences are nine (45% of all). Below is the complete list.

አ *a* ‘isn’t it?’
አይደለ *ajdəllə* ‘isn’t it?’
አልነበረ *alnnəbbərə* ‘wasn’t’ it?
አልነበረም *alnnəbbərəm* ‘wasn’t’ it?
አይደለ እንዴ *ajdəllə ɨnde* ‘isn’t it?’
የለም *jəlləm* ‘doesn’t …?’
እማደል *ɨmmadəl* ‘isn’t it?’
Interrogative form of the verb of a preceding clause and **እንዴ** *ɨnde*
Interrogative form of the verb of a preceding clause

For two groups that are part of a same community, this difference is big. However, it is unclear why some variants except **አ** *a* are chosen by one age group and not by the other; but the fact that **አ** *a* is not chosen by the adults is most probably because it is a slang.

4.5.2. Distribution of Question Tags

The distribution of the two types of question tags across the age groups, the genders, the socioeconomic groups and religions is presented in tables 28-31 below.

Table 28 Distribution of question tags across the age groups

Age Category	N	Total no of Words	Tags					
			Epistemic Modal			Affective		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	27	34799	29	0.83	53.89	70	2.01	54.47
Adult	27	31049	22	0.71	46.11	52	1.68	45.53
Total	54	65848	51	1.54	100	122	3.69	100
			Epistemic modal tags, p=0.491; Affective tags, p=0.982; All tags, p=0.623					

As shown in Table 28, the greater number of the epistemic modal tags is used by the adolescents. In the same way, majority of the affective tags are used by adolescents. This means the adolescents favor both types of tags more than the adults do. Nevertheless, these differences are not statistically significant.

Table 29 Distribution of question tags across the genders

Age Category	N	Total no of Words	Tags					
			Epistemic Modal			Affective		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent								
Male	14	15805	13	0.82	49.40	38	2.40	58.68
Female	13	18994	16	0.84	50.60	32	1.69	41.32
Total	27	34799	29	1.66	100	70	4.09	100
Adult								
Male	13	16172	13	0.80	56.74	30	1.86	55.69
Female	14	14877	9	0.61	43.26	22	1.48	44.31
Total	27	31049	22	1.41	100	52	3.34	100

Table 29 depicts that both genders of the adolescent age group use almost equal amounts of the epistemic modal tags. There is no difference in their choice of the feature. But for the adults the pattern is different. Males use the higher number of this type of tags than the females do. The implication is that gender does not have a significant influence on the relationship between the two genders. There is also no gender that makes a special contribution for the adolescents when they lead the adults.

In addition, concerning the affective tags, it is the male adolescents who use the greater size when compared to the females. In the same way, male adults use the majority of the feature and the females use the lesser amount. In both age groups the males lead. This indicates that gender predicts the difference between the two age categories with regard to affective tags. It also implies that the males play the greater role in enabling adolescents to surpass the adults.

Table 30 Distribution of question tags across socioeconomic groups

Age Category	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Tags**					
			Epistemic Modal			**Affective**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**	**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
Adolescent								
LSG	15	18554	15	0.81	48.50	43	2.32	58.29
MSG	12	16245	14	0.86	51.50	27	1.66	41.71
Total	27	34799	29	1.67	100	70	3.98	100
Adult								
LSG	14	14731	13	0.88	61.54	23	1.56	46.71
MSG	13	16318	9	0.55	38.46	29	1.78	53.29
Total	27	31049	22	1.43	100	52	3.34	100

As Table 30 depicts, the LSG and the MSG of the adolescent age category use the epistemic modal tags almost at equal rate. Yet for the adults, the difference between the sub categories is significant, with the LSG using the greater proportion of the feature and the MSG the smaller. In other words, the LSG leads. The inconsistency of the pattern across the age groups shows that socioeconomic group does not have a role in determining relationship between adolescents and adults in the use of the epistemic modal tags.

As the same table presents, the higher number of the affective tags extracted from the conversations of the adolescents is used by the LSG. Therefore, the LSG leads the MSG and it contributes the greater proportion when the adolescents lead the adults. The pattern is reversed with the adults. The MSG uses the majority and the LSG the smaller size of this class of tags. In general, the inconsistency suggests that socioeconomic grouping does not have a predictive power on the relationship between adolescents and adults.

Table 31 Distribution of question tags across the two religions

Age Category	N	Total no of Words	Tags					
			Epistemic Modal			Affective		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent								
Christian	11	16084	19	1.18	69.00	27	1.68	42.21
Muslim	16	18715	10	0.53	31.00	43	2.30	57.79
Total	27	34799	29	1.71	100	70	3.98	100
Adult								
Christian	13	17934	13	0.73	51.41	31	1.73	51.95
Muslim	14	13115	9	0.69	48.59	21	1.60	48.05
Total	27	31049	22	1.42	100	52	3.33	100

Table 31 presents that Christian adolescents use the greater proportion of the epistemic modal tags as Muslim adolescents use the remaining smaller size. Therefore, the Christians make the greater contribution in adolescents lead. However, there is no leader religion in the adult category. This proves that religion has no a consistent effect across the two age groups.

As far as affective tags are concerned, Muslim adolescents produce the greater number than the Christians do. By implication, Muslims make the greater contribution for the adolescents to lead the adults. Nevertheless, Christians surpass the Muslims in the adult age group. The fact that different religions lead in different age groups indicates that religion has weak predictive power on the relationship.

4.5.3. Uses of Question Tags

Tags have seven different uses in the adolescent corpus but eleven in that of the adults. The fact that tags serve four more purposes for adults shows that adults use them in more diversified contexts than the adolescents do. The details are presented below.

First, as it is shown in extracts (103) and (104), speakers of both age groups use tags with the intention of seeking approval or confirmation from former speakers about the accuracy of the ideas they said. Mostly the tags used for this use (function) are followed by agreement responses like **አዎ** *awo* 'yes' or another type of positive or supportive explanations.

(103) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 196-197)

a. Muktar፡ **ነገ ሰላማዊ ሰልፍ አለ እማ**?

nəgə səlamawi səlf allə ɨmma

tomorrow peaceful demonstration exist.PFV:3SG.M.NPST be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR. NPST

'There is a demonstration tomorrow, isn't it?'

b. Hailu፡ **አዎ።።**
awo
yes
'Yes.'

(104) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, lines 415-416)

a. Geremew፡ **የጫት ቤት ይበዛል።።** **አደለ እንዴ**?
jəʧ'at bet jɨbəzal adəllə ɨnde
GEN:chat house 3SG.M:be_too_much.IPFV:AUX be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST Q
እሚታይ አደለ እንዴ?
ɨmmittaj adəllə ɨnde
REL:3SG.M:PASS:see be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST Q
'There are a lot of chat houses. Isn't it? It is clear to everybody, isn't it?'

b. Shiferaw፡ **በጣም በጣም በጣም በጣም።።**
bət'am bət'am bət'am bət'am
very very very very
'Of course.'

The other use question tags give in the adolescents' and adults' conversations is requesting tentative positive confirmation. The speaker expects only positive confirmation because they use tag as a way of bridging to their next point and as a method of involving the listener. If the confirmation is negative, the speech stops there because the negative response signals that the listener does not have an interest to listen. Look extracts (105) and (106) where the responses to the tags are all positive.

(105) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 709-710)

a. Berhane፡ **ባለፈውም የሳኩትን ልንገራችሁ።። እዚህ ቱቶር**
balləfəwɨm jəsakkutɨn lɨngəraʧʧɨhu ɨzzih tutor
last_time:FOC REL:laugh:1SG:3SG.M.OBJ:ACC 1SG.SBJV:tell:2PL.IO here tutor
ጀምረው አልነበር ያንድ ላምስት ቡድን?
jəmmɨrəw alnəbbər jand lammɨst budɨn
begin:3PL NEG:be.PFV:3SG.M.PST GEN:one to:five group
'Let me tell you (PL) what makes me laugh last time. They began a tutoring here in one-to- five scheme, wasn't it?'

b. Leyla፡ **አዎ።።**
awo
yes
'Yes.'

(106) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, line 304-305)

a. Geremew፡ **ትናንትና የባቢን ልደት አልነበረ**?
tɨnantɨnna jəbbabbi lɨdət alnəbbərə
yesterday GEN:Babi birthday NEG:be.PFV:3SG.M.PST
'Yesterday was Babi's birthday, wasn't it?'

b. Samuel፡ **አዎ።።**
awo
yes
'Yes.'

Third, both age groups use tags to express a propositional meaning. The speaker who uses the tag for this function does not expect a response from the listener because they are not asking a question; rather they are making a propositional meaning. If they expect a response, it should be a positive one. None of the speakers in extracts (107) and (108) expect a response and thus no one responds to them.

(107) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, line 429)

Asmelash፡ **ግን አንተ አሁን በጣም ጥሩ ነገር ታገኛለህ ስትባል**
gin antə ahun bət'am t'ɨru nəgər tagəɲalləh sɨttɨbal
but you:SGM now very good thing 2SG.M:find.IPFV:AUX:2SG.M when:2SG.M:PASS:say
ልብህ ይንጓል አደለ?
lɨbbɨh jɨg^{w}ag^{w}ag^{w}g^{w}all adəllə
heart:2SGM.GEN 3SG.M:expect.IPFV:AUX be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
ያላየኸውን ነገር ደስ
jalajjəhəwɨn nəgər dəss
REL:NEG:see:2SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ:ACC thing happy.IDEO
ይልሃል።።
jɨlɨhall
3SG.M.IMPR:say.IPFV:2SG.M.OBJ:AUX
'But if you (SG, M) are told that you (SG, M) get something good, you (SG, M) become eager, isn't it? You (SG, M) like something you (SG, M) didn't experience.'

(108) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, line 4)

Shiferaw፡ **አንድ ብቻ ነው እምንፈልገው አደል**?
and bɨʧʧa nəw ɨmmɨnfəlligəw adəl
one only be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:1PL:want:3SG.M be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
ቆይ እናመጣለን።።
k'oj ɨnnaməṭ'allən
wait.2SG.M.IMP 1PL:bring.IPFV:AUX:1PL
'What we need is only one, isn't it? Wait, we bring.'

Fourth, only adolescents use tags for checking understanding of their listeners. In extract (109) Tsega explains the location of a certain place and adds the tag **አደለ**? *adəllə* 'isn't it?' to check whether or not Betel is able to recreate the image of the place.

(109) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.3., line 584-585)

a. Tsega፡ **ውሀ … ይዤ ውሀ የቀዳንበት አለ**
wɨha jɨhe wɨha jək'əddanɨbbət allə
water this:3SG.M water REL:fetch_water፡1PL:from:3SGM exist.PFV:3SG.M.NPST

አደለ ወደታች አለ
adəllə wədətaʧʸ allə
be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR. NPST downwards exist.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
አደለ ቤቶች?
adəllə betoʧʸ
be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST houses
'Isn't there a place from where we fetched water, down there, at the houses?'

b. Betel: እ :: አዎ አዎ።
ɨ awo awo
yes yes yes
'Yes. Yes yes.'

Fifth, both adolescents and adults use tags to express that they have listened to or understood the previous speaker. The tag may or may not be followed by a response. If there is a response, it is a positive one. In extract (110) below, Dawit repeats Muktar's confession and adds a tag. Knowing that in using the tag Dawit is confirming his own accurate listening or understanding, Muktar is not bothered to respond.

(110) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 504-505)

a. Muktar: … የዘጠንኛ ዓመት ክፍል ተማሪ ነኝ።
jəzəṭ'əniŋa amət kɨfɨl təmari nəɲ
of:ninth year grade student be.PFV:1SG.NPST
'I am a ninth grade year student.'

b. Dawit: ...የዘጠንኛ አመት ክፍል አመት ተማሪ ነህ አ?
jəzəṭ'əniŋa amət kɨfɨl amət təmari nəh a
GEN:ninth year grade year student be.PFV:2SG.M.NPST be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
'You (SG, M) are a ninth year grade student…, isn't it?'

In the same way Kemal wants to check if he has understood Moges' question saying the idea of the question and adding a tag **አደል?** *adəl* 'isn't it?'. Extract (111) displays the evidence.

(111) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.11, lines 386-389)

a. Moges: ተማሪዎች እንዴት ነው? በደንብ ይከታተላሉ?
təmariwoʧʸ ɨndet nəw bədəmb jɨkkətattəlallu
students how be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST well 3PL:follow.IPFV:AUX:3PL
'Do students follow their lessons well?'

b. Kemal: ኧረ እንዴት ብሎ? ሰፈር ውስጥ እየው።
ərə ɨndet bɨlo səfər wɨst' ɨjəw
DM how say:3SG.M.CVB village in look.2SG.M.IMP:3SG.M.OBJ
'Not at all. Look what happens in their residence areas.'

c. Moges: አሰስመንት ምናምን አሳልፍ
assəsmənt mɨnamɨn asallɨf
assessment and_stuff CAUS:pass.2SG.M.IMP
'Adding marks to assessment results to make students pass'

d. Kemal: አሰስመንት ምናምን ይኸን ምን

assəsmənt mɨnamɨn jɨhənn mɨn
assessment and_stuff this:3SG.M:ACC what
ትለዋለህ **አደል?**
tɨləwalləh adəll
2SG.M:say.IPFV:2SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ:AUX:2SG.M be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
'You (SG, M) ask me, "what is your (SG, M) opinion about adding marks to assessment results to make students pass", isn't it?'

Requesting tentative denial as a prerequisite to something that follows is the sixth function. The speaker expects a negative response because he can tell the next idea only if the listener expresses in the response that he does not accept or know. Only adults apply tags for this purpose. Samuel's question tag below (extract (112)) has this intention.

(112) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, line 239)

Samuel: **ሰውየው** **ያለውን** **ሰምተህል**
səwjjəw jaləwɨn səmtəhall
man:SGV:DEF REL:say:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ:ACC hear.PFV:2SG.M.CVB:AUX
አደል?
adəl
be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
'You (SG, M) have heard what the man said, isn't it?'

Seventh, both adolescents and adults use tags when they want to make their speech tentative or when they want to hedge. In extracts (113) and (114), Kerrima, the adolescent, and Geremew, the adult, try to make their sentences less assertive by adding the tag markers **አ**? *a* 'isn't it?'and **አደል**? *adəl* 'isn't it?'.

(113) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.7, lines 47-49)

a. Kerrima: **ሂስት'ሪ** **እንዲያሳልፈን** **እንግዲህ** **አላህ**
histri ɨndijasallɨfən ɨngdih allah
history COMP:3SG.M:CAUS:pass:3SG.M:1PL.OBJ now Allah
እንዲያሳልፈን **ዱአ** **ማድረግ**
ɨndijasallɨfən duʔa madrəg
COMP:3SG.M:CAUS:pass:3SG.M:1PL.OBJ prayer INF:do
ነው **አ**?
nəw a
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
'It is good to pray that God passes us History, isn't it?'

b. Lily: **አዎ።።**
awo
yes
'Yes.'

c. Kemeriya: **አዎ።።**
awo

yes
'Yes.'

(114) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, line 7)

Geremew: **መድአ ቤት መሰለ** **አደል**?
mədi?a bet məssələ adəl
shisha house look_like.PFV:3SG.M be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR. NPST
'It looks like a house where drug is smoked, isn't it?'

Eighth, both adolescents and adults use tag to add a criticism mood to a propositional meaning. Salman's (the adolescent) sentence with tag in extract (115) line (d) carries this mood. Also in extract (116), Zubeda (the adult) adds **አልነበር**? *alnəbbər* 'wasn't it?' to her sentence found in line (b) to express her criticism of Meselech's defiance of the agreement that anyone shall go to the bazaar only with department members.

(115) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.6, lines1-4)

a. Waitress: **ተጋቢኖው በዳቦ ይሁንልህ**?
təgabinow bədabbo jɨhunɨllɨh
tegabino:DEF with:bread 3SG.M.SBJV:become:for:2SG.M
Shall the tegabino be accompanied with bread?

b. Sulman: **አዎ**።
awo
yes
'Yes.'

c. Waitress: **ትርንጎ**
tɨrɨngo
Tiringo
'Tiringo.'

d. Salman: **እኧ "በዳቦ" እያልካት አደለ**?
ɨə bədabbo ɨjjalkat adəllə
ah with:bread PROG:say:1SG:3SG.F.IO be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
'Ah you are telling her that it is accompanied with bread, isn't it?'

(116) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, lines 316, 328-339)

a. Meselech: **ተዝናናን**።…
təznnannan
get_entertained.PFV:1PL
'We entertained ourselves. …'

b. Zubeda: **አይ በስራ ሂደት ተባብለን** **አልነበር**?
aj bəsɨra hidət təbabɨlən alnəbbər
no by:work process say_to_each_other:1PL.CVB NEG:be.PFV:3SG.M.PST
'Ah, we agreed that it would be by department, wasn't it?'

c. Habiba: **የሰፈር ጓደኛ ሌላ ፕሮግራም ቅዳሜ እና እሁድ**
jəsəfər g^{w}adəɲɲa lela pɨrogɨram k'ɨdame ɨnna ɨhud
GEN:neibourhood friend other program Saturday and Sunday

ነው እሚያዘው።።
nəw ɨmmijjazəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST COMP:3 SG.M:PASS:arrange:3SG.M
'A person makes an arrangement with a neighborhood friend in the weekends.'

d. Meselech፡ ቅዳሜ እና እሁድ አይመችም አ።።
k'ɨdame ɨnna ɨhud ajmməʧʧɨm a
Satunday and Sunday NEG:3SG.M.IMPR:suit.IPFV: NEGCOMP DM
'The weekends are not convenient.'

Ninth, only adults use tags as instrument of sustaining attention of interlocutors and maintaining coherence between ideas. In most cases where the participants use tag for this function, they do not pause to see the response; they continue to speak. Nuri is the typical adult in exploiting this function of tags as it is observed in extract (117).

(117) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.8, line 348)

Nuri፡ አረጋሽን ቤት· አለ እማ? ይቺ ቀይ
arəggaʃɨn bet allə ɨmma jɨʧʧi k'əj
Aregash:ACC house exist.PFV:3SG.M.NPST be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST this:3SG.F fair
አረጋሽ።። በነአሸቱ ኢሳያስ ቤት· በላይ? እዛ ተሰቶ
arəggaʃ bənnəʔɨʃətu isajjas bet bəlaj ɨzza təsətto
Aregash with:DET.3PL:Eshetu Esayas house above there PASS:give:3SG.M.CVB
ሰርታል።። ተመልከት።።
sərt^{w}al təməlkət
do.PFV:3SG.M.CVB:AUX look.2SGM.IMP
'There is Aregash's home, isn't it? That Aregash with fair complexion. Above the home of Eshetu Isayas' family. He was given a land there and he has built a house. Look.'

Tenth, only adults use tag to express their doubts on what they said. Awol says **አደል**? *adəl* 'isn't it?' because he is not sure about the issue on which he expresses his agreement. Look extract (118) below.

(118) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.8, lines 161-165)

a. Firew፡ ኡስማን አደለም እንዴ ስሙ·?
Usman adelləm ɨnde sɨmu
Usman NEG:be.NPST:3SGM:NEG Q name:3SGM.GEN
'Isn't Usman his name?'

b. Awol፡ አዎ።። ኡስማን እሸቱ?
awo usman ɨʃətu
yes Usman Eshetu
'Yes. Usman Eshetu?'

c. Firew፡ እ።።
ɨ
yes
'Yes.'

d. Awol፡ አዎ።። አደል?

awo adəl
yes be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR. NPST
'Yes. Isn't it?'

e. Firew: **ኡስማን ነው አዎ። ልክ ነህ።**
usman nəw awo lɨkk nəh
Usman be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST yes correct be.PFV:2SGM.NPST
'Yes, it is Usman. You (SG, M) are right.'

Eleventh, adults use tags as a way of hesitation, buying time till remembering what to say. In extract (119), Kemal uses **አደለ?** *adəllə* 'isn't it?' to fill the gap when he cannot remember the name of a certain position of power in the former feudal government of the country.

(119) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.11, lines 93-95)

a. Kemal: …**ነገር ግን ምን አገባች? ይሄ ዱሮ በሃይለስላሴ**
nəgər gɨn mɨn agəbaʧʧ jɨhe duro bəhajlesɨllase
thing but what marry.PFV:3SG.F this:3SG.M in_the_past during:Haile_Sellasie
እንትን አለ አደለ?
ɨntɨn allə adəllə
INDFPRO exist.PFV:3SG.M.NPST be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR. NPST
'…But do you know who she got married to? In the past during the reign of Hailesilassie, there was something, isn't it?'

b. Farris: **ጭቃሹም?**
ʧʼɨk'a ʃum
village_headman
'Chika shum (village head man).'

c. Kemal: **ሹም እሚባሉ አሉ። አዎ። ምስለኔ እሚባል።**
ʃum ɨmmibalu allu awo mɨsləne ɨmmibal
officer REL:3PL:PASS:say:3PL exist.PFV:3PL yes district_officer REL:3SG.M:PASS:say
'There were people with power yes. They were called Mislene (district officer).'

Twelfth, only adults use tag as a way of making others involve in a talk. The response to the tag is expected to be a supportive one. A case in point is Shiferaw as shown in extract (120).

(120) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.16, line 1)

Shiferaw: **እጹቤ ልጅ ልትወልጂ ነው**
is'ube lɨʤ lɨttɨwəldʒi nəw
Etsube baby PROS:2SG.F:give_birth:2SG.F be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
አይደል?
ajdəl
be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
'Etsube, you (SG, F) are going to give birth, isn't it?'

4.5.4. The Most Frequent Question Tags

Among the tags the adolescents use, the most frequent ones are **አ** *a* 'isn't it?' (30 instances – 30 % of all) and **አደል** *adel* 'isn't it?' (24 instances – 24 % of all). But among the adults **አደል** *adel*

‘isn’t it?’stands out of all tags in frequency (30 instances – 40.54 % of all). This shows that the adolescents mostly favor the slang **አ** *a* ‘isn’t it?’ as the adults prefer **አደል** *adel* ‘isn’t it?’. Among the standard variants, **አደል** *adel* ‘isn’t it?’ dominates in the conversations of both age groups. The fact that **አ** *a* ‘isn’t it?’ takes the first position in the adolescent corpus proves that it is an innovative tag.

4.5.5. Summary

The results explained in the preceding subsections indicate that there is a big gap between the age groups in their choice of variants of question tags. The number of variants both groups do not use in common is beyond expectation when the two age groups are considered to be a subset of one speech community. Adolescents stand out in two things. First, they use greater number of tokens than adults do. Second, they use the only innovative form **አ**? *a* ‘isn’t it?’, the short form of **አደለም** *adelləm* ‘isn’t it?’. However, concerning the variety of uses, adults lead.

Adolescents favor both epistemic modal and affective tags more than adults do. This shows that they like to develop discourse cooperatively more than adults do. But the three social factors have differing levels of impact on the choice of the age groups to the two types of tags. Christians make the higher contribution for adolescents to lead the adults in the epistemic modal tags but the males, the LSG and Muslims play the greater role in enabling them to surpass the adults in their use of affective tags. In addition, gender, socioeconomic grouping and religion have little predictive power on the relationship in the use of the epistemic modal tags. And gender predicts the difference between the two age categories with regard to the affective tags as socioeconomic grouping and religion do not.

4.6. Addressing Terms

4.6.1. Types of Addressing Terms

Addressing terms are the forms that speakers use to designate a person to who they talk. They consist of all the proper names, nick names, kinship names, professional titles, pronouns and so on used for calling a person, for showing them that they are being talked to etc. They reflect the social status of the interlocutors, type of relationship that exists between them etc. In other

words, they mainly do interpersonal functions (Aliakbari and Tony 2008, 1-2; Yui 2012, 61; Meyerhoff 2006, 77).

Seven types of addressing forms are identified in the corpus. They are:

1. Second person pronouns - This category includes the feminine **አንቺ** *anʧiʃijje* 'you', the masculine **አንተ** *anttə* 'you' and the honorific **አንቱ** *antu* 'you' forms. The endearment varieties for the first two forms like **አንተዬ** *anttəjje* and **አንቺዬ** *anʧiʃijje* are also identified. The endearment forms are formed by adding the suffix **-ዬ** *-jje* to the pronouns.
2. Proper names – They are institutionalized names in their full or diminutive forms; they can be used with titles or without. Diminutives used in the corpus include **ሳሚ** *sami* (for **ሳሙኤል** *samuʔel* 'Samuel'), **አበሬ** *abərre* (for **አበራሽ** *abərraʃ* 'Aberash'), **ሱልሜ** *sulmme* (for **ሱልማን** *sulman* 'Sulman', **ቀለም** *k'ələm* (for **ቀለመወርቅ** *k'ələməwərk'* 'Kelemework'), **ጸዲ** *s'ədi* (for **ጸደይ** *s'ədəj* 'Tsedey'), **አንሾ** *anʃo* (full name **አንሻ** *anʃa* 'Ansha'), **አህሜ** *ahme* (for **አህመድ** *ahmed* 'Ahmed'), and **አህሚ** *ahmi* (for **አህመድ** *ahmed* 'Ahmed') etc. The diminutives have also an endearment connotation.

   Other endearment variants are formed by adding the suffixes **-ዬ** *-jje*, **-ሽ** *-ʃ*, **ኤ** *-e* and **-ዋ** *-wwa* individually or in combination to the full proper names or their diminutive forms. Some diminutives make changes on the word final sounds when they add the suffixes. Examples of endearments formed in this way and taken from the corpus include **አበርዬ** *abərrɨjje* 'Aberye' (for **አበራሽ** *abərraʃ* 'Aberash'), **ሱልሚዋዬ** *sulmmiwwajje* 'Sulmiwaye' (for **ሱልማን** *sulman* 'Sulman'), **እጹቤ** *ɨs'ube* 'Etsube' (for **እጹብ** *ɨs'ub* 'Etsub'), and **ተስፍሽ** *təsfɨʃ* Tesfish (for **ተስፋው** *təsfaw* 'Tesfaw'). The only title used in the corpus is **ጋሽ** *gaʃ* (similar to 'Sir'in function).
3. Terms of intimacy - This type of addressing terms includes nicknames, endearment names, house names and pet names. Examples include **እናት** *ɨnnat*, literally 'mother', **ማሬ** *mare* literally 'my honey', and **የኔ ቆንጆ** *jəne k'onʤʤo*, literally 'my beautiful one'. The endearment forms that are formed by the additions of **-ዬ** *-jje* and **-ዋ** *-wwa* separately or in combination to these addressing terms include **እናትዋዬ** *ɨnnatwwajje* (root **እናት**

ɨnnat ‘mother’), **እናትዬ** *ɨnnatjje* (root **እናት** *ɨnnat* ‘mother’), and **ሆድዬ** *hodɨjje* (root **ሆድ** *hod* ‘stomach’).

4. Descriptive phrases - These address terms are the ones that are formed by collocating nouns with adjectives, adjectives with nouns, nouns with other nouns, and possessive pronouns with nouns. But the instances found in the corpus are all bare nouns. Examples include **ጓደኛዬ** *g^{w}addəɲaje* ‘my friend’, **ወንድሜ** *wənddɨmme* ‘my brother’, **ሰዎች** *səwoɬɬ* ‘men’, **ሁለታችሁን** *huləttaɬɬɨhun* ‘you (PL) two’, **አዬ** *ajje* (used to address only males), **ጎበዝ** *gobəz* ‘gentlemen’, **ጓደኛ** *g^{w}addəɲa* ‘friend’, and **ሰዎችዬ** *səwoɬɬɨjje* (endearment variety of **ሰዎች** *səwoɬɬ* ‘men’ created by the addition of the suffix **ዬ** *-jje).*
5. Zero addressing terms – This category is concerned with the absence of the above four types of addressing forms and the use of attention getters like **እ** *ɨ* and **እኧ** *ɨə* (having the function of ‘hey’) in their place.
6. Mixed addressing terms – It is concerned with the use of two or three of the above five forms together like in **አንቺ ሰውዬ** *anɬɬi səwjje* ‘you (F) man’ **አንተ ልጅ** *anttə lɨʤ* ‘you (M) boy’.
7. Pseudonyms – They are invented humorous proper names given temporarily during the conversations. Pseudonyms found in the corpus are **አቶ ገደራ** *ato gədərra* ‘Mr. Gedera’and **ሽብሩ** *ʃɨbbɨru* ‘Shibiru’. The second one is adopted from an Amharic comedy.

There are two contexts in which the participants of the study apply addressing terms: as pronominals and as vocatives.

4.6.2. Distribution of Addressing Terms

The different social groups of the participants are compared to one another via the frequencies of the above seven types of addressing. The frequencies, the comparisons and their implications are presented in this section.

Table 32 Proportion of addressing terms in each age group

Age Category	N		Addressing Terms							
			Proper Names	**Second Person Pronouns**	**Terms of Intimacy**	**Descriptive phrase**	**Zero Addressing Terms**	**Pseudonyms**	**Mixed Addressing Terms**	**Total**
Adolescent	27	N	134	201	13	14	0	2	3	367
		%	36.51	54.77	3.54	3.82	0	0.54	0.82	100
Adult	27	N	111	114	1	6	5	0	0	237
		%	46.84	48.10	0.42	2.53	2.11	0	0	100

Table 32 indicates that second person pronouns are the top majority of all addressing terms adolescents use while proper names are the second. The majority of the addressing forms the adults use are also second person pronouns and the second most frequent are proper names. This indicates that both adolescents and adults like to address one another using **አንተ** *anttə* 'you' (M) and **አንቺ** *antʃi* 'you' (F) and proper names.

Table 33 Distribution of addressing terms across the age groups

Age Category	N	Total No of Words	Addressing Terms								
			Proper Names			**Second Person Pronouns**			**Terms of Intimacy**		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	27	34799	134	3.85	51.82	201	5.78	61.16	13	0.37	92.50
Adult	27	31049	111	3.58	48.18	114	3.67	38.84	1	0.03	7.50
Total	54	65848	245	7.43	100	315	9.45	100	14	0.40	100
			p=0.598			p=0.037					

Age Category	Addressing Terms											
	Descriptive phrase			**Zero Addressing Terms**			**Pseudonyms**			**Mixed Addressing Terms**		
	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	14	0.40	67.80	0	0	0	2	0.06	100	3	0.09	100
Adult	6	0.19	32.20	5	0.16	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	20	0.59	100	5	0.16	100	2	0.06	100	3	0.09	100

Table 33 shows that adolescents use majority of all the proper names, the second person pronouns, the terms of intimacy, and the descriptive phrases; they also use all of the pseudonyms and the mixed addressing terms found in the entire corpus. By implication, adolescents lead the

adults in all these six types of addressing terms. Adults lead only in one, i.e. zero addressing terms; they use the entire discourse feature.

The fact that adolescents lead in six categories of addressing terms out of seven indicates that adolescents give people recognition and honor individualities than the adults do. On the other hand, adults are ahead of adolescents in blurring the identity of people and promoting anonymity in their discourses by minimizing the use of addressing terms in their speeches. Their lead in zero addressing terms indicates their reservation to single out people whom they address as a sign of politeness. The fact that adolescents use the majority of the terms of intimacy also implies that they create greater intimacy among themselves than adults do.

Table 34 Distribution of addressing terms across the genders

Age Category	**N**	**Total No of Words**	**Addressing Terms**								
			Proper Names			**Second Person Pronouns**			**Terms of Intimacy**		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent											
Male	14	15805	58	3.67	47.85	139	8.80	72.97	0	0	0
Female	13	18994	76	4.00	52.15	62	3.26	27.03	13	0.68	100
Total	27	34799	134	7.67	100	201	12.06	100	14	0.68	100
Adult											
Male	13	16172	34	2.10	28.85	68	4.21	57.67	0	0	0
Female	14	14877	77	5.18	71.15	46	3.09	42.33	1	0.07	100
Total	27	31049	111	7.28	100	114	7.30	100	1	0.07	100

Age Category	**Addressing Terms**											
	Descriptive phrase			**Zero Addressing Terms**			**Pseudonyms**			**Mixed Addressing Terms**		
	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent												
Male	13	0.82	94.25	0	0	0	2	0.06	100	3	0.19	100
Female	1	0.05	5.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14	0.87	100	0	0	0	2	0.06	100	3	0.19	100
Adult												
Male	6	0.37	100	2	0.12	37.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Female	0	0	0	3	0.20	62.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	0.37	100	5	0.32	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 34 shows that adolescent males use the greater number of two categories of addressing terms, namely the second person pronouns and the descriptive phrases, and all of the pseudonyms and the mixed addressing terms found in the adolescent corpus. They lead their female counterparts in these four types of addressing terms. The females lead the males only in two types of addressing terms, namely the proper names and the terms of intimacy. In conclusion, the males play the higher role in enabling the adolescents surpass the adults in four types of addressing terms but the females do so only in two.

The table also presents that adult males use most of the second person pronouns, and all of the descriptive phrases found in the adult corpus. They lead their female counterparts in these two types of addressing terms. The females lead the males in three types of addressing terms: proper names, the terms of intimacy and zero addressing terms that the age group uses. They also play the greater role in enabling the adults surpass the adolescents in zero addressing terms.

In general, gender has a power to predict the relationship between adolescents and adults in four of the seven types of addressing terms, namely proper names, second person pronouns, terms of intimacy, and descriptive phrases. It lacks power only in three – zero addressing terms, mixed addressing terms and pseudonyms.

Table 35 Distribution of addressing terms across socioeconomic groups

Age Category	**N**	**Total No of Words**	**Addressing Terms**								
			Proper Names			**Second Person Pronouns**			**Terms of Intimacy**		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent											
LSG	15	18554	102	5.50	73.63	130	7.01	61.60	12	0.65	91.55
MSG	12	16245	32	1.97	26.37	71	4.37	38.40	1	0.06	8.45
Total	27	34799	134	7.47	100	201	11.38	100	13	0.71	100
Adult											
LSG	14	14731	72	4.89	67.17	57	3.87	52.58	1	0.07	100
MSG	13	16318	39	2.39	32.83	57	3.49	47.42	0	0	0
Total	27	31049	111	7.28	100	114	7.36	100	1	0.07	100

Age Category	Addressing Terms											
	Descriptive phrase			Zero Addressing Terms			Pseudonyms			Mixed Addressing Terms		
	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent												
LSG	10	0.54	68.35	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.16	100
MSG	4	0.25	31.65	0	0	0	2	0.12	100	0	0	0
Total	14	0.79	100	0	0	0	2	0.12	100	3	0.16	100
Adult												
LSG	4	0.27	69.23	4	0.27	81.82	0	0		0	0	0
MSG	2	0.12	30.77	1	0.06	18.18	0	0		0	0	0
Total	6	0.39	100	5	0.33	100	0	0		0	0	0

Table 35 shows that the LSG adolescents use the greater number of the proper names, the second person pronouns, the terms of intimacy, and the descriptive phrases, and all of the mixed addressing terms found in the adolescent corpus. In other words, they lead the MSG in five types of addressing terms. The MSG adolescents lead only in one; they use all of the pseudonyms. None of the groups use zero addressing terms. This indicates that the LSG plays the higher role in enabling the adolescents surpass the adults in five of the types of addressing terms, and the MSG does so in one.

The table also presents that the LSG adults use most of the proper names, the second person pronouns, the descriptive phrases, and the zero addressing terms as well as all of the terms of intimacy found in the adult corpus. Both the LSG and the MSG do not use pseudonyms and a mixture of the addressing terms at all. The data implies that the LSG leads the MSG in five of the seven types of addressing terms. Second, the LSG contributes the greater proportion for the adults to lead the adolescents in zero addressing terms.

On the whole, socioeconomic grouping has a power to predict the relationship between adolescents and adults in four of the six types of addressing terms, namely proper names, second person pronouns, terms of intimacy, and descriptive phrases, but it lacks power in three – zero addressing terms, mixed addressing forms and pseudonyms.

Table 36 Distribution of addressing terms across the two religions

Age Category	N	Total No of Words	Addressing Terms								
			Proper Names			Second Person Pronouns			Terms of Intimacy		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent											
Christian	11	16084	27	1.68	22.70	67	4.17	36.81	3	0.19	26.39
Muslim	16	18715	107	5.72	77.30	134	7.16	63.19	10	0.53	73.61
Total	27	34799	134	7.40	100	201	11.33	100	13	0.72	100
Adult											
Christian	13	17934	63	3.51	48.95	76	4.24	59.38	1	0.06	100
Muslim	14	13115	48	3.66	51.05	38	2.90	40.62	0	0	0
Total	27	31049	111	7.17	100	114	7.14	100	1		100

Age Category	Addressing Terms											
	Descriptive phrase			Zero Addressing Terms			Pseudonyms			Mixed Addressing Terms		
	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent												
Christian	9	0.56	67.47	0	0	0	2	0.12	100	2	0.12	70.59
Muslim	5	0.27	32.53	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.05	39.41
Total	14	0.83	100	0	0	0	2	0.12	100	3	0.17	100
Adult												
Christian	3	0.17	38.64	3	0.17	53.12	0	0	0	0	0	0
Muslim	3	0.27	61.36	2	0.15	46.88	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	0.44	100	5	0.32	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

According to Table 36, Christian adolescents use the greater proportions of the descriptive phrases, and the mixed addressing terms as well as all of the pseudonyms found in the adolescent corpus. They lead Muslims and play the higher role in enabling the adolescents surpass the adults in these three types of addressing terms. However, Muslims use the greater proportions of the proper nouns, the second person pronouns, and the terms of intimacy. They help the adolescents more than Christians do to lead the adults in these three terms of addressing. None of the groups use zero addressing terms.

The table also presents that Christian adults use the higher size of all the second person pronouns, and the zero addressing terms as well as all of the terms of intimacy found in the adult

corpus. In other words, they lead Muslims in three of the six types of addressing terms. But Muslims lead Christians only in one of the six addressing forms; they use majority of the descriptive phrases. Both religions do not use pseudonyms and a mixture of the addressing terms and they do not show difference in their use of proper names. By implication, Christians contribute the greater proportion for the adults to lead the adolescents in zero addressing terms.

In general, religion has no power to predict the relationship between adolescents and adults in any type of addressing terms.

4.6.3. Choice of Variants of Addressing Terms

Both age groups use the endearment variants **አንተጄ** *anttəjje* and **አንቺዬ** *antʃiʃijje*. In addition, middle-aged male adults who are friends for a long time and the male adolescents address one another with a feminine form of 'you', **አንቺ** *antʃiʃi*. However, the common pattern is that **አንቺ** *antʃiʃijje* 'you' (F) is used to address the females and **አንተ** *anttə* 'you' (M) the males. They use the pronouns in a unique way to show intimacy as it is a culture to do so.

The adults tend to address the elderly people (Nuri and Tewabe), except their parents, with the honorary form of 'you' **አንቱ** *antu*. Even a woman (Kedo) addresses her husband (Firew) who is older than her using this honorary pronoun. But mothers and fathers are addressed as **አንተ** *antə* 'you' (M) and **አንቺ** *antʃiʃi* 'you' (F) however old they are.

Both age groups with no exception use proper names to address one another. The difference is on the use of titles. Adolescents use all the proper names without titles because there is no person who deserves this privilege amongst them while adults add honorary titles to some names. The use of the titles is affected by age differences between the conversants. Some participants call the elderly with their names by adding titles. For example, Awol, a middle-aged man, addresses Nuri, an elderly man, as "**ጋሽ ኑሪ**" *gaʃ nuri* (Gash Nuri). The title **ጋሽ** *gaʃ* is an Amharic equivalent for the English 'Sir'. It is used when addressing older people, teachers and people of higher social status.

However, some adults drop the title and compensate the honorary meaning lost by using an honorary pronoun **አንቱ** *antu* 'you' (SG) as addressing term and by adding honorary suffix **-ኡ** *u*

to verbs when talking to or about the elderly. Kedija, a middle-aged woman talking to Tewabe, an elderly woman, is a case in point. Look extract (121).

(121) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, lines 723-727)

a. Tewabe: **አሁን ብናረጅ ስንት አገር አቃጥለናል?**
Ahun bɨnnarəʤ sɨnt agər ak'k'at'lənal
now if:1PL:get_old how_many place burn.PFV:1PL:AUX
'Before I was such old, I have done a lot of things.'

b. Aberash: **ስንት አገር አቅንተው ነው ያረጀሁት።።**
sɨnt əgər ak'ɨntəw nəw jarəʤʤəhut
how_many place develop:2SG.H.CVB be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST COMP:get_old: 2SG.H
'You (H) got old after you (H) had achieved a lot of things.'

c. Aberash: **ቀልድ ነው እንዴ?**
k'əld nəw ɨnde
joke be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST Q
'Is it a joke?'

d. Tewabe: **ኧ**
ə
huh
'Huh!'

e. Kedija: **ኧረ አንቱ ገና ነሁ ተዋቤዋ አልሀምዲሊላ በሉ።።**
ərə antu gəna nəhu təwabewwa alhamdililla bəlu
DM you:SG.H yet be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST Tewabewa praise_be_to_God say:2SG.H.IMP
ወላሂ።።
wəllahi
I_swear_to-Allah
'You (H) are not so old, Tewabewa. Thank God. I swear to Allah.'

Adolescents use five tokens of all the six terms of intimacy 13 times as adults use only one term once. The adolescents are also in the forefront in creating new forms by adding affixes to the existing term **እናት** *ɨnnat*, literally 'mother'. Therefore, they lead the adults in using a variety of such addressing terms, and in using them creatively.

They also use six tokens, i.e., the majority, of the descriptive phrases as adults use only three. This shows that adolescents are ahead of the adults in using a variety of descriptive terms for addressing others. The only endearment descriptive phrase **ሰዎችዬ** *səwoʧʧɨjje* is also used by adolescents and by implication the adolescents emphasize creating friendlier atmosphere among themselves than adults do.

Adolescents' versatile use of addressing terms is evidenced by their act of mixing different forms. They mix second person pronouns and descriptive phrases to create new ways of designating their friends. This gives additional implication about their creativity.

4.6.4. Summary

Adolescents lead adults in using proper names, second person pronouns, terms of intimacy, descriptive phrases, pseudonyms and mixed addressing terms. Adults lead only in the use of zero addressing terms. These show, on one hand, that adolescents give people recognition and they honor individuality more than the adults do. On the other hand, adults are ahead of adolescents in using addressing terms that blur the identity of people and that promote anonymity. Adolescents' lead in the use of terms of intimacy and endearment forms of descriptive phrases also shows that they create greater intimacy and friendly atmosphere among themselves than adults do.

The three social factors have differing levels of impact on the distribution of each type of addressing terms. The study on proper names and terms of intimacy gives two implications. First, females, the LSG and Muslims contribute the greater proportion for adolescents' lead. Second, gender and socioeconomic grouping have a predictive power on the relationship between the age groups but religion does not have. Concerning second person pronouns, males, the LSG and Muslims make the higher contribution for adolescents' lead; gender and socioeconomic grouping predict the relationship but religion does not. Regarding descriptive phrases, males, the LSG and Christians make the higher contribution for adolescents' lead; gender and socioeconomic grouping have a predictive power on the relationship as religion does not have. With regard to zero addressing terms, females, the LSG and Christians contribute more for adults' lead. Concerning mixed addressing terms, males, the LSG and Christians contribute more than their counterparts do for adolescents' lead.

Adolescents are also unique in three other areas. The popularity of addressing males using the feminine form of 'you', **አንቺ** *antʃi,* among the adolescents than it is among the adults shows adolescents' informality and the sense of intimacy that exists among them. Adolescents' formation of new terms of intimacy by affixation and by mixing addressing terms of different

categories also implies their versatility and creativity. Furthermore, the adolescents lead the adults in using a variety of terms of intimacy and descriptive phrases.

4.7. Vowing Expressions

4.7.1. Types of Vowing Expressions

This discourse category is concerned with expressions that traditionally people say to make a serious promise and to show that what they say is a truth. Vowing ranges from making bad wishes for oneself and loved ones to saying formulaic oath expressions.

Vowing expressions used by both the adolescents and adults fall into three categories.

1. Bad wishes (VBW) – Such expressions found in the corpus include **ሙች** *muʧ* 'I swear on your (SG, F) death', **አባቢ ይሙት** *abbabi jɨmut* 'I swear on Ababbi's (a term used to address one's father) death', **አባቱ ይሙት** *abbate jɨmut* 'I swear on my father's death', and **እናቱ ትሙት** *ɨnnatte tɨmut* 'I swear on my mother's death'
2. Religious terms (VRT)– The following religious expressions of vowing are identified from the recordings: **ማርያምን** *mariamɨn* 'I swear to Mary', **እግዚአብሄርን** *ɨgziʔabɨherɨn* 'I swear to God'), **ጌታን** *getan* 'I swear to Lord', **ክርስቶስን** *kɨrɨstosɨn* 'I swear to Christ', **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* 'I swear to Allah', **ወላሂ ለአዚም** *wəllahi ləʔazim* 'I swear to Allah and His name', **ወላሂ ላል** *wəllahi lal* 'I swear to Allah', **ወላሂ ነብዬን** *wəllahi nəbɨjjen* literally ''I swear to Allah and to my Prophet', and **ወላሂ ቢላሂ** *wəllahi billahi* 'I swear to Allah, the Creator'. The last four are emphatic versions of the vowing expression **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* 'I swear to Allah'
3. Declaration of seriousness or truthfulness (VDST) – Such expressions found in the corpus include **በእውነት** *bəʔɨwnət*, **በእውነቱ ነው** *bəʔɨwnəte nəw*, **እውነቱን ነው** *ɨwnəten nəw*, **ውነቱን ነው** *wɨnəten nəw*, **እውነት** *ɨwnət*, **ውነት** *wɨnət*, **የእውነቱን ነው** *jəʔɨwnəten nəw*, **ከሀቅ** *kəhak'k'*, and **የእውነት** *jəʔɨwnət*, which can all idiomatically be translated as 'I tell you the truth'; **ከምሬ ነው** *kəmmɨrre nəw* and **ከምር** *kəmɨrr* , which both can idiomatically be translated as 'I am serious'; and **የሀቅ** *jəhak'k'* 'I tell you the fact'.

4.7.2. Distribution of Vowing Expressions

Vowing in general and each type in particular are not distributed evenly across the social categories. The preferences for them are differing. Tables 37-40 display the frequencies and the discussions of the meanings the frequencies give.

Table 37 Distribution of vowing expressions across the age groups

Age Category	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Vowing Expressions**											
			All			**VBW**			**VDC**			**VRT**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**	**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**	**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**	**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
Adolescent	27	34799	262	7.52	84.12	46	1.32	95.65	57	1.64	74.89	159	4.57	84.94
Adult	27	31049	44	1.42	15.88	2	0.06	4.35	17	0.55	25.11	25	0.81	15.06
Total	54	65848	306	8.94	100	48	1.38	100	74	2.19	100	184	5.38	100
			p=0.01			p=0.163			p=0.250			p=0.017		

As Table 37 depicts, the majority of the vowing expressions are used by adolescents. Adults use few. This indicates that adolescents are the dominant users of vowing expressions. The significance test also reveals that the difference exists. Adolescents want to add strength to their speech by using these additional techniques; telling the bare truth alone does not satisfy them. This may be because of the impact that youngsters are not trusted by others that they tell a truth and are serious about their promises. They vow in order to increase their acceptability. The other possible reason is that since adolescent communication is full of fierce antagonisms, jeering and direct rejections, they accompany their statements with vowing to prevent these unnecessary responses from friends. But adults rely on the validity of information and logic, not on vowing, to make others accept their ideas and promises. The communication of adults is also usually free from antagonisms, jeering and rejections; adults express their opposition and disapprovals so tactfully that speakers are not preoccupied with fears of disqualification of their ideas; therefore, they do not need to add vowing to their speeches.

Specific types of vowing are also investigated and the result depicts that adolescents use the sweeping majority of the bad wishes (VBW), expressions that declare the seriousness of the promise or the truthfulness of the idea said (VDST), and religious terms (VRT). In all the three types adolescents clearly lead the adults. The test for VRT shows that the relationship is statistically significant, but for VBW and VDST, it does not.

Table 38 Distribution of vowing expressions across the genders

Age Category	N	Total no of Words	Vowing Expressions											
			All			VBW			VDST			VRT		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent														
Male	14	15805	161	10.19	66.13	42	2.66	92.68	15	0.95	30.06	104	6.58	69.41
Female	13	18994	101	5.32	33.87	4	0.21	7.32	42	2.21	69.94	55	2.90	30.59
Total	27	34799	262	15.41	100	46	2.87	100	57	3.16	100	159	9.48	100
Adult														
Male	13	16172	13	0.80	27.78	0	0	0	6	0.37	33.33	7	0.43	26.22
Female	14	14877	31	2.08	72.22	2	0.13	100	11	0.74	66.67	18	1.21	73.78
Total	27	31049	44	2.88	100	2	0.13	100	17	1.11	100	25	1.64	100

According to Table 38, adolescent males exceed females in their use of expressions of vowing in general. The opposite is true for adults. The difference is also big, between 72.22% for females and 27.78% for males. Thus adolescent males and adult females are the dominant users of vowing expressions. That means there is no consistency among the age groups. The other implication is that male members contribute the larger portion for the adolescents to surpass the adults.

Concerning VBW, male adolescents use the majority when compared to the females. Among the adults, females use all of the VBW. By implication, the males contribute the greater part of the feature for adolescents to lead the adults. In addition, gender has no power to predict the relationship between the two age groups in their use of VBW.

With regard to VDST, in both age groups females use the majority. The implications are that first, females give the greater help for adolescents to lead the adults, and second, gender has a predictive power on the relationship between the age groups.

Males use the majority of VRT found in the adolescent corpus. That means they contribute the greater part for adolescents when they lead the adults. Among the adults, females use almost three-fourth of the feature. The fact that different genders lead in different age groups imply that gender has no predictive power on the relationship between the two age groups in their use of VRT.

Table 39 Distribution of vowing expressions across socioeconomic groups

Age Category	N	Total no of Words	Vowing Expressions											
			All			VBW			VDST			VRT		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent														
LSG	15	18554	165	8.89	59.83	26	1.40	53.23	19	1.02	30.36	120	6.47	72.94
MSG	12	16245	97	5.97	40.17	20	1.23	46.77	38	2.34	69.64	39	2.40	27.06
Total	27	34799	262	14.86	100	46	2.63	100	57	3.36	100	159	8.87	100
Adult														
LSG	14	14731	28	1.90	65.97	1	0.07	53.85	5	0.34	31.48	22	1.49	89.22
MSG	13	16318	16	0.98	34.03	1	0.06	46.15	12	0.74	68.52	3	0.18	10.78
Total	27	31049	44	2.88	100	2	0.13	100	17	1.08	100	25	1.67	100

Table 39 demonstrates that the LSG of the adolescent age cohort uses three fifth of all the vowing expressions as the MSG uses only two fifth. The LSG favors these expressions more than the MSG does. In the adult age cohort, still the LSG surpasses the MSG. By implication, the LSG prefers to add strength to their speech and seriousness to their promise by swearing more than the MSG does. Therefore, socioeconomic grouping has a consistent position across the age cohorts. In addition, the LSG contributes the majority for the adolescent age group when they are ahead of the adult age group.

Concerning VBW, in both age groups the LSG uses the majority when compared to the MSG. Therefore, first, the LSG contributes the greater part for adolescents so that they can lead the adults. Second, socioeconomic grouping has predictive power on the relationship between the two age groups in their use of VBW.

With regard to VDST, in both age groups the MSG uses the majority; the LSG is behind. This indicates that the MSG gives the greater help for adolescents when they lead the adults. In addition, it indicates that socioeconomic grouping has a predictive power on the relationship.

The LSG uses the majority of VRT found in conversations of each of the age cohorts. Two facts are inferred from the data. First, the LSG contributes the greater part for adolescents to lead the adults. Second, socioeconomic grouping has predictive power on the relationship between the two age groups in their use of VRT.

Table 40 Distribution of vowing expressions across the two religions

Age Category	N	Total no of Words	Vowing Expressions											
			All			VBW			VDST			VRT		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent														
Christian	11	16084	133	8.27	54.55	40	2.49	88.61	45	2.80	81.40	48	2.98	33.45
Muslim	16	18715	129	6.89	45.45	6	0.32	11.39	12	0.64	18.60	111	5.93	66.55
Total	27	34799	262	15.16	100	46	2.81	100	57	3.44	100	159	8.91	100
Adult														
Christian	13	17934	9	0.50	15.77	2	0.11	100	7	0.39	33.91	0	0	0
Muslim	14	13115	35	2.67	84.23	0	0	0	10	0.76	66.09	25	1.91	100
Total	27	31049	44	3.17	100	2	0.11	100	17	1.15	100	25	1.91	100

As it is depicted in Table 40, most of the expressions of vowing in general are used by adolescent Christians; the adolescent Muslims lag behind; but among the adults it is the Muslims who use the majority. To generalize, with regard to the choice of the expressions, in the adolescent group the Christians take the leading position but in the adult group the Muslims do. Therefore, religion has no consistent influence on the difference between the two age groups. The additional implication is that the Christians' contribution for the adolescents to lead the adults is greater than that of the Muslims.

Concerning VBW, Christian adolescents use the majority. Among the adults also, Christians use all of the vowing expressions of this category. This suggests that the Christians contribute the greater part for adolescents to lead the adults. It also hints that gender has a strong predictive power on the relationship between the two age groups.

VDST has a different pattern. Among the adolescents, Christians use the majority of it but among the adults, Muslims use the greater number. Christians help the adolescents more than Muslims do to lead the adults. Nonetheless, religion lacks consistency in affecting the relationship between the two age groups.

Adolescent Muslims use the greater number, and adult Muslims all of VRT. Muslims of both age groups use their allegiance to their religion to be trusted by others more than the Christians do. By implication, Muslims make the greater contribution when adolescents lead the adults. The data also shows religion's strong predictive power on the relationship between the age groups.

4.7.3. Uses of Vowing Expressions

Vowing expressions are observed to give twelve types of uses: complementing an expression of wonder, increasing the seriousness of an idea or claim, convincing listeners who do not accept an idea, strengthening a promise, affirming a decision to do something, supporting argument, expressing admiration or other high emotions, motivating people or making pressure on them to do something, expressing strong refusal, strengthening a wish, complementing a wish or a blessing (similar to 'amen'), and strengthening agreement. Adolescents use nine of them and adults use five. By implication, adolescents use vowing expressions for more varied purposes than adults do. The detailed explanation of the uses is given below.

The first is complementing an expression of wonder. Only adolescents strengthen or complement their listener's wonder towards what they say with vowing expressions. For example, as it is shown in extract (122), Lydia tells what a certain young man requested her to do for him. As Hayat is surprised about the young man's request as it is read on line (b), Lydia says a word of oath found in line (c) to complement Hayat's wonder.

(122) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 155-157)

a. Lydia: "**ባለፈው እዛ ባዛር ላይ ያየኋትን ጓደኛሽን**
balləfəw ɨzza bazar laj jajjəh^{w}atɨn gʷaddəɲɲaʃɨn
last_time there bazaar at REL:see:1SG:3SG.F.OBJ:ACC friend:2SG.F.GEN:ACC
ካላስተዋወቅሽኝ" **ብሎ ድርቅ**
kalastəwawwək'ʃɨɲ bɨlo dɨrrɨk'
if:NEG:CAUS:introduce:2SG.F:1SG.OBJ say:3SGM.CVB persist.IDEO
አይልብኝም!?
ajlɨbbɨɲɲɨm
NEG:3SG.M:say.IPFV:against:1SG: NEGCOMP
'He said, "introduce me to your (SG, F) friend whom I saw there at the bazaar last time" and he insisted.'

b. Hayat: **ኧረ በናትሽ**?
ərə bənnatɨʃ
DM for:mother:2SGF.GEN
'For your (SG, F) mother's sake.'

c. Lydia: **ከምር**!
kəmɨrr
from:serious
'I tell you the truth.'

The second is increasing the seriousness or strength of an idea or claim. By using a vowing expression both age groups can show their seriousness about something they say. They show that

their claim is not ordinary; it is strong; it needs attention; and it is significant. Hayat's **ሙች** *muʧ* 'I swear on your (SG, F) death' in extract (123) in line (b) has this use.

(123) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, line 397-398)

a. Lydia፡ **በናታችሁ አልጣፈጣችሁም እንዴ ወጡ**?
bənnataʧʧihu alt'affət'aʧʧihum ɨnde wət'u
for:mother:2PL.GEN NEG:taste_good.PFV:3SG.M:2PL:NEGCOMP Q sauce:DEF
በላ በላ አርጉ እንጂ፡፡
bəla bəla argu ɨnʤi
eat.ATT eat.ATT do:2PL.IMP please
'For your (PL) mother's sake, doesn't the 'wot' has a good taste? Please eat.'

b. Hayat፡ **ኧረ እየበላን ነው፡፡ ሊድየ ሙች በጣም**
ərə ɨjjəbəllan nəw lidjje muʧ bət'am
DM PROG:eat:1PL be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST Lydye die:2SGF.IMP very
ነው እሚጥመው፡፡ በጣም፡፡
nəw ɨmmit'məw bət'am
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST COMP:3 SG.M:taste_good:3SG.M very
'We are eating. Lydye, I swear on your (SG, F) death, it is very tasty. Very tasty.'

The word **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* 'I swear to Allah' in Kedija's speech, line (d) below (extract (124)) has the purpose of increasing the seriousness or strength of her claim that her son is decent.

(124) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, lines 1090-1093)

a. Aberash፡ **አ አ ያቺንስ**
a a jaʧʧɨnɨs
uh oh that:3SGF:ACC:FOC
አላምናትም፡፡
alamnatɨm
NEG:1SG:trust.IPFV:3SG.F.OBJ:NEGCOMP
'Uh oh I do not trust that one.'

b. Kedija፡ **በናትዎት፡፡ እኔም**
bənnatɨwot ɨnem
for:mother:2SG.H.GEN I:FOC
አላምናት
alamnat
NEG:1S G:trust.IPFV:3SG.F.OBJ
እኮ አበሬ፡፡
ɨkko abərre
truly Abere
'For your (H) mother's sake. I also don't rust her, Aberie.'

c. Aberash፡ **ያቺ ይቺስ**
jaʧʧi jɨʧʧɨs
that:3SGF this:3SGF:FOC
ያቺን
jaʧʧɨn
that:3SGF:ACC
ተያት፡፡
təjat
leave:2SG.F.IMP:3SG.F.OBJ
'Forget that one.'

d. Kedija፡ **ይሄ ጨዋ**
jɨhe ʧ'əwa
this.3SG.M decent
ነው
nəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
ወላሂ፡፡
wəllahi
I_swear_to_Allah
'This one is decent, I swear to Allah.'

The third is convincing listeners who do not accept an idea. Adolescents convince their listeners who do not accept their ideas using vowing expressions. They understand the listeners' rejection of an idea from their response, their request for swear, or their act of making fun out of the idea. In extract (125), it is seen that Hailu says **እግዚአብሄርን** *ɨgziʔabherɨn* 'I swear to God' because Abdulfetah is making fun out his idea that the future purpose he wants first to achieve is to have his own job. He uses the vowing expression to make his listener accept his idea.

(125) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 51-53)

a. Hailu: **እኔ ግን ማለት ነው የወደፊት አላማዬ እ መጀመሪያ**
ɨne gin malət nəw jəwədəfit alamaje ɨ məʤəmmərija
I but INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST GEN:future purpose:1SG.GEN er first
ለራሴ እሚሆን ስራ መስራት ነው።።
lərase ɨmmihon sɨra məsrat nəw
for:myself REL:3SG.M:become job NMLZ:do be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'But my future goal is er first to have a job of my own.'

b. Abdulfetah: **‹እ› አይባልም**
ɨ ajbbalm
er NEG:3SG.M:PASS:say.IPFV:NEGCOMP
'Do not say 'er'.'

c. Hailu: **እግዚአብሄርን እውነቱን ነው።።**
ɨgziʔabherɨn ɨwnətən nəw
I_swear_to_God true:1SG.GEN:ACC be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'I swear to God. I tell you the truth.'

Adults do the same using vowing expressions. In the next dialogue (extract (126)), Meselech laughs because she does not believe the seriousness of Zubeda's idea that Meselech's going to the bazaar alone would be discussed formally in their meetings meant for evaluating daily accomplishments. Zubeda says **እውነት** *ɨwnət* 'I tell you the truth' to show Meselech that she means it.

(126) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, lines 335 -336)

Zubeda: **ይሄ እንኳ በውሎ ግምገማ መታየት አለበት።።** (Meselech: (laugh)) **እውነት**
jɨhə ɨnkʷa bəwɨlo gɨmgəma məttajət allәbbət ɨwnət
this:3SG.M even at:full_day evaluation INF:PASS:see have_to.3SG.M truly
'This must be discussed at the day-end evaluation session. I tell you the truth.'

The fourth is strengthening a promise. Only adolescents use vowing expressions for this purpose. In extract (127), Hallima says **እውነት** *ɨwnət* 'I tell you the truth' because Hayat cannot believe her promise to cook 'shiro wat' (an Ethiopian sauce made of powder of roasted pea and other seasonings) for her and for Lydia. She says the vow word to strengthen her promise.

(127) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 393-396)

a. Hallima: **ሽሮ እማ እሰራላችኋለሁ።።**
ʃiro ɨmma ɨsərallaʧʧih^{w}alləhu
Shiro FOC 1SG:cook.IPFV:for:2PL:AUX:1SG
'I will cook 'shiro' for you (PL).'

b. Hayat: **ኧረ**
ərə
sure
'I don't believe'.

c. Hallima: **እውነት**
ɨwnət
truly
'I mean it.'

d. Hayat: **ይኸ እማ ደስ ይላል ማለት ነው።።**
jɨhə ɨmma dəss jɨlall malət nəw
this:3SG.M FOC happy.IDEO 3SG.M:say.IPFV:AUX INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'That means this is very good.'

The fifth is affirming a decision to do something. Only adolescents affirm their decision to do something using vowing expressions. Below in extract (128) it is seen that Hailu vows to St Mary to show that he is determined to prepare a party when he and his fiends pass to grade 10.

(128) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, line 27)

Hailu: **ማርያምን አስረኛ ክፍል በገባን።።**
marjamin assrəɲa kɨfɨl bəgəbban
Mary:ACC tenth grade COMP:enter:1PL
'I swear to Mary, I am looking forward to getting into grade ten.'

The sixth is supporting argument. This use of vowing expressions is found in the adolescents' talks. Muktar uses **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* 'I swear to Allah' in line (c) to add a power to his claim that those who play pool are not idle people. The vowing expression is meant to replace evidence and reasoning. Extract (129) below carries the example.

(129) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 237-239)

a. Muktar: **ቆይ እሚውሉት ልንገርህ።። እነዛ…**
k'oj ɨmmiwɨlut lɨngərɨh ɨnnəzza
wait.2SG.M.IMP REL:3PL:pass_day:3PL:3SG.M.OBJ 1SG.SBJV:tell:2SG.M.IO those
ያ ባለፑል ቤት ገቢ እሚያገኘው ከማን
ja baləpul bet gəbi ɨmmijagəɲəw kəmann
that owner:pool house income REL:3SG.M:get:3SG.M.OBJ from:who
ነው? ስራ ከሚሰሩት።።
nəw sɨra kəmmisərut
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST job from:REL:3PL:work:3PL:3SG.M
'Wait, let me tell you (SG, M), they pass the day. From where does that pool house owner

get his income? From those who work.'

b. Hailu፡ ኖ፡፡ ስ ስራ እማይሰሩ ናቸው ደሞ እዛ እሚገቡት፡፡
no si siɨra ɨmmajsəru naʧʧəw dəmmo ɨzza ɨmmigəbut
no work job REL:NEG:3PL:do:3PL be.PFV:3PL.NPST again there REL:3PL:enter:3PL
ከቤት እየሰረቁ፡፡ ናቸው፡፡
kəbet ɨjjəsərrək'u naʧʧəw
from:home PROG:steal:3PL be.PFV:3PL.NPST
'No. It is those who are idle who go there. They steal money from their parents.'

c. Muktar፡ ወላሂ ሊሰሩ ነው፡፡ ወላሂ
wəllahi lisəru nəw wəllahi
I_swear_to_Allah PROS:3PL:do:3PL be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST I_swear_to_God
ወላሂ ጋቢዎን ይሰራሉ፡፡
wəllahi gabiwon jɨsərallu
I_swear_to_God gabion 3PL:do.IPFV:AUX:3PL
'I swear to God, it is to do job. I swear to God, I swear to Allah they do 'gabion.''

The seventh is expressing admiration or other high emotion. Dawit, the adolescent, says **አባቱ ይመ፡ት፡** *abbate jɨmut* 'I swear on my father's death' to show his appreciation of the downtown Kombolcha that is decorated for the festival ahead. This is displayed in extract (130).

(130) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, line 884)

Dawit፡ አባቱ ይመ፡ት፡፡ በለው፡፡ ፈካ ብሎ
abbate jɨmut bələw fəka bɨlo
father:1SG.GEN 3SG.M.SBJV:die my_goodness brighten.ATT say:3SG.M.CVB
'I swear on my father's death, my goodness, it is beautiful.'

None of the adults use vowing expressions for this purpose.

The eighth is motivating people or making pressure on them to do something. Only the adolescents use vowing expressions for this function. Betel, in extract (131) below, laughs in rejection of Tsega's proposal for Betel and Kelemework to have a picture with their teacher and in response Tsega says **እግዚአብሄርን**! *ɨgziʔabɨherɨn* 'I swear to God' to pressure Betel to accept the proposal.

(131) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, lines 156-159)

a. Tsega፡ … አርጋችሁ ተነሱ፡፡
argaʧʧɨhu tənəsu
do:2PL.CVB PASS:have_picture:2PL.IMP
'Take a picture having (inaudible speech).'

b. Kelemework: (**የማይሰማ ንግግር**)
(inaudible speech)

c. Tsega፡ እግዚአብሄርን!
ɨgziʔabɨherɨn
I_swear_to_God
'I swear to God.'

d. Betel፡ ጭራሽ?
ʧʼirraʃ
completely
'Do you really mean it?'

The ninth is expressing strong refusal. Only the adults express their strong refusals to another person using vowing expressions. In extract (132), Tewabe says **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* 'I swear to Allah' to stop Aberash nagging her to eat more 'kolo' (roasted cereal).

(132) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, lines 932-933, 938-941)

a. Aberash፡ ቆሎ ብሉ
k'olo biłu
roasted_cereal eat:2SG.H.IMP
እንጂ ከዝህ፡፡ ጥርስ…
ɨndʒi kəzzɨh tʼɨrs
please from:this.3SG.M tooth
'Eat 'kollo' from here. Teeth'

b. Tewabe፡ በቃኝ
bək'k'aɲ
be_enough.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR:1SG.OBJ
በቃኝ
bək'k'aɲ
be_enough.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR:1SG.OBJ
'I have eaten enough.'

c. Kedija፡ ኧረ
ərə
DM
አለን፡፡
allənn
have.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR.NPST:1PL.OBJ
'We have.'

d. Aberash፡ ጨምሩበት፡፡
ʧʼəmmɨrubbət
add:2SG.H.IMP:on:3SG.M
'Add on it.'

e. Tewabe፡ ወላሂ፡፡
wəllahi
I_swear_to_Allah
'I swear to Allah'.

f. Aberash፡ ጨምሩበት፡፡
ʧʼəmmɨrubbət
add:2SG.H.IMP:on:3SG.M
'Add on it.'

The tenth is strengthening a wish. Vowing expressions serve this function only in adults' conversations. As is seen in extract (133) below, Firew adds **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* 'I swear to Allah' to his wish that God helps Ahmed in his problem; he does this to show his deep desire that the wish be fulfilled.

(133) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.8, lines 28-29)

a. Firew፡ ኧረ ወላሂ ይርዳህ እንጂ … ምን
ərə wəllahi jɨrddah ɨndʒi mɨn
DM I_swear_to_Allah 3SG.M.SBJV:help:2SG.M.OBJ unless_otherwise what
ታረጋለህ?
tarəgalləh
2SG.M:do.IPFV:AUX:2SG.M
'I swear to Allah, unless God helps you (SG, M)…, what can you (SG, M) do about it?'

b. Mahmud፡ እኸ ምን ይደረጋል?

ɨə mɨn jɨddərrəgal
Hum what 3SG.M.SBJV:PASS:do:AUX
'Hum, I can do nothing.'

The eleventh application of vowing expressions is complementing a wish or a blessing given by someone else. Only adults use it for this purpose. Nuri's "**ወላሂ**" *wəllahi* 'I swear to Allah' in extract (134) below is a complement to Firew's wish that the village be safe.

(134) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.8, lines 535-536)

a. Firew፡ **አቦ ጢስ አይጢስ።።**
abbo t'is ajt'is
Truly smoke NEG:3SG.M.SBJV:smoke
'I pray God protects you.'

b. Nuri፡ **ወላሂ።።**
wəllahi
I_swear_to_Allah
'I swear to Allah.'

The twelfth use is strengthening agreement. Adolescents strengthen their agreements to other people's ideas by accompanying the agreement expression with a vowing expression. As it is indicated in extract (135), Kemeriya gives her agreement to Kerrima's idea by saying "**ወላሂ**" *wəllahi* 'I swear to Allah'.

(135) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.7, lines 273-274)

a. Kerrima: **አዎ።። ከመምህር ለራሱ አንዳንዱ ፍቅር የለሽም**
awo kəməmɨhɨr lərasu andande fɨk'ɨr jəlləʃɨm
yes from:teacher FOC sometimes love NEG.have.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR:2SG.F.OBJ:NEGCOMP
እንደው።። እማያንኳላፍት ሞልቷል።።
ɨndəw ɨmmijankəlaffɨt molt^{w}al
DM REL:3SG.M:maul be_full.PFV:3SG.M.CVB: AUX
'Yes. Sometimes you (SG, F) have no love to teachers. There are a lot of teachers who maul.'

b. Kemeriya: **ወላሂ አዎ።።**
wəllahi awo
I_swear_to_Allah yes
'I swear to Allah, yes.'

4.7.4. Choice of Variants of Vowing Expressions

Adolescents in general and Muslims in particular use more long and emphatic forms of vowing expressions than the adults do. Among four of such expressions three are used by the adolescents and one by the adults. While adults use **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* 'I swear to Allah' in most instances, adolescents add other terms to it like **ለአዚም** *ləʔazim*, **ላል** *lal*, and **ቢላሂ** *billahi*.

The adolescents also use two vowing phrases together like **ወላሂ ቢላሂ ከምር** *wəllahi billahi kəmmɨr* ‘I swear to Allah, the Creator. I am serious.’ as the adults do not. Extract (136) exemplifies this case.

(136) Extract (adolescent) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, line 666)

Hayat: **አዎ በናትሽ፡፡** **ወላሂ** **ቢላሂ** **ከምር፡፡** **እንዳው ማዘጋጀት** **እማ**
awo bənnatiʃ wəllahi billahi kəmɨrr ɨndaw mazzəgadʒət ɨmma
yes for:mother:2SGF.GEN I_swear_to_Allah the_Creator from:serious DM INF:prepare FOC
ይኖርብናል፡፡ … **ሀሎዬ**
jɨnorɨbbɨnnal halojje
3PL:have_to.IPFV:3PL:AUX Halloye
‘Yes, for your (SG, F) mother’s sake. I swear to God, the Creator. I am serious. We should organize. … Halloye.’

4.7.5. The Most Frequent Vowing Expressions

In the adolescent corpus, **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* ‘I swear to Allah’ stands first in frequency with 103 instances (39.31% of all the vowing expressions), **በእውነት** *bəʔɨwnət* ‘I tell you the truth’ second with 33 instances (12.60% of all the vowing expressions) and **እናቴ ትሙት** *ɨnnate tɨmut* ‘I swear on my mother’s death’ third with 22 instances (8.40% of all the vowing expressions). The pattern in the adult corpus is almost similar. **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* ‘I swear to Allah’ is first with 24 occurences (54.55% of all the vowing expressions) and **በእውነት** *bəʔɨwnət* ‘I tell you the truth’ and **እውነቴን/ውነቴን ነው** *ɨwnəten nəw wɨnəten nəw* ‘I tell you the truth’ are second with 7 occurences (15.91% of all the vowing expressions) each. This shows that there is little difference between the two age groups in the vowing expressions they mostly use. The fact that **ወላሂ** *wəllahi* ‘I swear to Allah’ is first for both age groups indicates that their members emphasise their allegiance to religion in affirming the truthfulness of their ideas and the seriousness of their promises.

4.7.6. Summary

Adolescents are ahead of adults in the amount of vowing expressions they use. The same phenomenon is found with regard to individual types of the discourse feature. These indicate that adolescents depend on vowing to make others accept their ideas and promises as adults rely on the validity of information and logic. The possible reason for vowing to be high among the adolescents is the fact that others do not trust youngsters that they tell a truth or they are serious about their promises. Thus the adolescents vow in order to increase their acceptability. The other

possible reason is that since adolescent communication is full of fierce antagonisms, jeering and direct rejections, they accompany their statements with vowing to prevent these unnecessary responses from friends. But the adults vow less since the communication of adults is usually free from antagonisms, jeering and rejections; adults express their opposition and disapprovals so tactfully that speakers are not preoccupied with fears of disqualification of their ideas that they do not need to add vowing to their speeches.

The impact of the three social factors on the distribution is various. Males, the LSG and Christians contribute greatly for adolescents to lead the adults in the use of vowing expressions in general. But from general point of view, gender and religion have no predictive power on the difference between the age groups while socioeconomic grouping has.

With regard to bad wishes, the contribution of males, the LSG and Christians for adolescents to lead the adults is greater than that of females, the LSG and Christians. When the social factors are considered in a general way, socioeconomic grouping and religion have a predictive power on the difference between the age groups while gender has no.

Concerning expressions of declaring seriousness or truthfulness, females, the MSG and Christians contribute the lion's share for adolescents to lead the adults. And generally, gender and socioeconomic grouping have a predictive power on the difference between the age groups in this sub-category of vowing expressions while religion has no.

Regarding religious terms, specifically males, the LSG and Muslims contribute more for adolescents to lead the adults. From the general point of view, socioeconomic grouping and religion have a predictive power on the difference between the age cohorts while gender has no.

VRT shows a unique behavior among the three types of vowing expressions. First, the highest size of the VRT and the greater number of variants of the VRT in the conversations of both age groups indicate that both age groups emphasize their allegiance to religion to affirm the truthfulness of their ideas and the seriousness of their promises. Second, its highest frequency in the conversations of the Muslims than in that of the Christians indicates that Muslims of both age groups use their allegiance to their religion to be trusted by others more than the Christians do. Third, adolescent Muslims use long, emphatic and compound vowing expressions as the other groups do not.

The last two findings are that vowing expressions have more varied uses in adolescent conversations than in that of adults, and there is little difference between the two age groups in the vowing expressions they favor most.

4.8. Vulgar Language

4.8.1. Types of Vulgar Language and the Variants

Vulgar language encompasses words and phrases that are used to convey strong anger, annoyance, and bad attitude towards people. They are vulgar in the sense that they do not create good feeling on the listener and make the speaker appear rude. The total number of tokens of vulgar expressions picked from the corpus is fifty and one. Adolescents use forty of them as adults use fourteen. This implies that adolescents lead the adults in using a great variety of vulgar expressions. The list is given Appendix 8.

4.8.2. Distribution of Vulgar Expressions

Fifty-one vulgar expressions in totality occur in speeches of different social groups in different frequencies. Tables 41-45 present these frequencies and are followed by comparative discussions of the frequencies.

Table 41 Distribution of vulgar expressions across the age groups

Age Category	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Vulgar Expressions**			**P**
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**	
Adolescent	27	34799	70	2.01	76.72	p=0.279
Adult	27	31049	19	0.61	23.28	
Total	54	65848	89	2.62	100	

Looking into Table 41 reveals that more than three fourth of the vulgar language is used by adolescents and less than a quarter by adults. But the test does not show the relationship to be statistically significant.

The proportion between those who use the language and those who do not also proves that the adolescents are more interested in using vulgar language than the adults. The data is shown in Table 42 below.

Table 42 Proportion of users of vulgar expressions in each age group

Age Category	Users of Vulgar Language	N	%
Adolescent	Those who use vulgar expressions	14	51.85
	Those who do not use vulgar expressions	13	48.15
	Total	27	100
Adult	Those who use vulgar expressions	6	22.22
	Those who do not use vulgar expressions	21	77.78
	Total	27	100

The majority of the adults do not use vulgar language while among the adolescents it is only 48.15% who do not use such language. This proves that adults are reserved with regard to the use of bad language.

Table 43 Distribution of vulgar expressions across the genders

Gender	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Vulgar Expressions			N	Total no of Words	Vulgar Expressions		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
Male	14	15805	58	3.67	85.35	13	16172	12	0.74	61.16
Female	13	18994	12	0.63	14.65	14	14877	7	0.47	38.84
Total	27	34799	70	4.30	100	27	31049	19	1.21	100

It is presented in Table 43 that male adolescents by far exceed the females in the use of vulgar language; the gap amounts the difference between 85.35% and 14.65%. Therefore, male adults use the majority of such language when they are compared with their female counterparts. Three implications are derived from the data. First, females of both age groups are more polite than their male counterparts. Second, the males contribute the greater proportion for adolescents to lead the adults. Third, gender has a strong predictive power on the relationship between the age groups.

Table 44 Distribution of vulgar expressions across socioeconomic groups

Socio-economic Group	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Vulgar Expressions			N	Total no of Words	Vulgar Expressions		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
LSG	15	18554	50	2.70	68.70	14	14731	18	1.22	95.31
MSG	12	16245	20	1.23	31.30	13	16318	1	0.06	4.69
Total	27	34799	70	3.93	100	27	31049	19	1.28	100

As Table 44 shows, in both age groups, the LSG uses most of the vulgar language used by the respective age group. The MSG is more polite in both age groups. Therefore, socioeconomic grouping has a uniform pattern across the age groups and thus predicts the relationship. In addition, the LSG's contribution for the adolescents to lead the adults is greater than that of the MSG.

Table 45 Distribution of vulgar expressions across the two religions

Religion	**Adolescents**					**Adults**				
	N	**Total no of Words**	**Vulgar Expressions**			**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Vulgar Expressions**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**			**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
Christian	11	16084	32	1.99	49.50	13	17934	3	0.17	12.23
Muslim	16	18715	38	2.03	50.50	14	13115	16	1.22	87.77
Total	27	34799	70	4.02	100	27	31049	19	1.39	100

As it is depicted in Table 45, in the adolescent corpus almost equal amount of the vulgar language is used by Christians and Muslims. However, among the members of the two religions of the adults, Muslims use the majority. By implication, there is no leader among the adolescents yet Muslims take the leading position in the adult group. Therefore, religion does not have a uniform effect on differences between the age groups in vulgar language.

4.8.3. Uses of Vulgar Expressions

Vulgar expressions used in the corpuses of both age cohorts serve nine purposes. These purposes are labeling, insulting, cursing, expressing hatred and sadism, rejecting and denigrating, confronting and objecting, criticizing, commanding and rebuking, and appreciating. Adolescents use vulgar language for all the nine purposes but adults for six. The adolescents exceed the adults by three purposes. Therefore, vulgar language has a diversified application in adolescents' conversations than in adults'. The details are discussed below.

4.8.3.1. Labeling

Vulgar language is used by both adolescents and adults for labeling other people. Adolescents label their age mates, both present and absent, based on their behaviors and speech styles using words and expressions that have vulgar quality. Samuel designates his friends **ሆዳም** *hodam* 'ravenous' when they eat all the 'kolo' (roasted cereal) served to them. Later he gives to two of his friends a label **ገበሬ** *gəbəre* 'savage' because he does not like their talk. The other labels used

by adolescents are ጀዝባ *ʤəzbba* ‘stupid’, and ጅል *ʤɨl* ‘foolish’. Generally, the labels are so strong that they might offend if the participants were not intimate friends.

Basically, one expression of labeling is used by the adults. It is ዘልዛላ ባለጌ *zəlzalla balәge* ‘rude, uncultivated, disrespectful’. It is used by Ubah to label her daughter who is disobedient and disrespectful to her grandmother.

In general, adolescents exceed adults by three labels. They also use most of the labels for people talking with them while the adults use the labels for people not around. This shows that adolescents’ use of these expressions is more offensive than the adults’ use.

4.8.3.2. Insulting

The insulting expressions used by the adolescents are ገበሬ *gəbəre* ‘savage’, መፋቂያ *məfak'ija* ‘scraper’, አንተ ጅል *antə ʤɨl* ‘you (SG, M) fool’ and የሸርሙጣ ልጅ *jəʃərmut'a lɨʤ* ‘son of a prostitute’. All are rooted in the preceding speech and actions of the ones insulted. Samuel insults Hailu as ገበሬ *gəbəre* ‘savage’ because Hailu interrupts his talk. He insults the same boy as መፋቂያ *məfak'ija* ‘scraper’ after a simulated interview in which Hailu expresses that his job is lumbering, which involves scraping wood. Minas insults Sulman as የሸርሙጣ ልጅ *jəʃərmut'a lɨʤ* ‘son of a prostitute’ since Salman refused to eat meat slaughtered by a Christian. All the four insults are used against people with who the talk is made.

The insulting words the adults use are ጎደሎ *godəlo* ‘crippled’, ቂንጥራም *k'int'ram* ‘uncircumsized’, ጅል *ʤɨl* ‘fool’, and ቶፋ *tofa* ‘ugly’. Two of them are used against people with whom the talk is made.

Firew uses ጎደሎ *godəlo* ‘crippled’ against a woman who he understands as argumentative. He also insults his son as ቂንጥራም *k'int'ram* ‘uncircumsized’, but it is not serious. The son is taking care of the recorder used for this research and Firew is aware of the existence of the recorder later. He asks the son about it; the son confirms that he is recording their talk. It is at this time that he insults him. The word ጅል *ʤɨl* ‘foolish’ is said by the people found in stories narrated by Nuri. It is used by intelligent characters against those who are not thoughtful in the sight of the

intelligent ones. In addition, Kedo uses **ቶፋ** *tofa* ‘ugly’ against her big daughter as a strategy of appeasing the cry of her little daughter who was being taken care of by the big one.

The adolescents insult directly anyone who is there with them. But all adults directly insult only their children. Therefore, the adolescents seem to be less polite than the adults.

4.8.3.3. Cursing

Among the adolescents, Samuel says a word of curse **ይፋቅህ** *jɨfak'ɨh* ‘let He (i.e. God) scrape you (SG, M)’ when Hailu tells that his job is lumbering in the simulated interview they do for fun. Again only one expression of curse is used by the adults. Nuri quoted himself saying **አፈር ብላ አባክ** *afər bɨla abbakk* ‘I wish you (SG, M) die’ to a person who wishes bad to himself. He said this curse objecting the bad wish. It is a paradox. The curse is made to prevent an ominous word said on oneself. The difference is that the adolescent makes the word of curse towards a person with whom he talks while the adult quotes the curse made in a different context.

4.8.3.4. Expressing Hatred and Sadism

Lydia, the adolescent, says **ምናባቱ** *mɨnabbatu* ‘what a rubbish person he is’ to express her hatred towards Hayat’s boy friend because he is creating problem on the relationship.

The phrases used by the adults in this function are **የታባክ** *jətabbakk* ‘what a rubbish person you (SG, M) are’ and **ምናባቷ** *mɨnabbatu^{w}a* ‘what a rubbish person she is’. They are variants of the same form and they express hatred. Nuri says **የታባክ** *jətabbakk* ‘what a rubbish you (SG, M) are’ to express his tentative delight in a person’s bad experience as a result of his refusal to obey Nuri’s advice. Kedo said **ምናባቷ** *mɨnabbat^{w}a* ‘what a rubbish person she is’ about her big daughter to appease the cry of the little daughter pretending that she is by the little daughter’s side and expressing her hatred to the big one because the big harmed the little one.

Generally, as the adolescents use only one variant of this word of hatred, adults use the word in both of the variants. This implies that adults are in the lead with regard to language of hatred and sadism.

4.8.3.5. Rejecting and denigrating

Both age groups have also used other vulgar expressions that express rejection and denigration. The ones used by the adolescents are:

a. **ዝም በል እንጂ።። ምንድነው ይመርህ አይመርህ አያገባኝም** *zɨmm bəl ɨnʤʤi mɨnddɨnnəw jɨmərɨh ajɨmərɨh ajagəbaɲɨm* ‘shut your (SG, M) mouth. I do not care whether you (SG, M) like it or not’. Muktar says this when Hailu comments that he does not like the topic they are talking about.

b. **ኧረ አልሰማህም** *ərə alsəmahɨm* ‘I do not accept your (SG, M) idea’. It is a phrase used by Salman to express his rejection of Sulman’s idea directly.

c. **ኤጅ** *eʤ* ‘go away’. It is a word used to express one’s amazement to what an interlocutor says. Yeshihareg says this to show her amazement to Kerrima’s expression of her change on her habit of passing the afternoons including the lunch time in the library.

The expressions do not make the listener feel good and they make the speaker appear rude. For this reason they are not recommended in formal contexts.

The adults use four: **ሂድ በል እንግዲህ ተህ ግዲም** *hid bəl ɨngɨdih təh gɨdim*, ‘please go away from here’ **ወይድ** *wəjɨd*, ‘go away’ **ወግድ** *wəgɨd* ‘go away’ and **ሀዱ እምከዱበት** *hɨdu ɨmmɨkkədubbət* ‘get out of here’. All reflect a bad attitude to those the expressions are directed to. If they were not used in intimate contexts, and for positive intents and good ends, they would have become causes of conflicts.

By implication, adults surpass the adolescents in the number and variety of expressions they use for expressing rejection and denigration.

4.8.3.6. Confronting and objecting

Only adolescents use vulgar expressions in this use. For example, as it is seen in extract (137), when Asmelash says something unacceptable, Berhane directly confronts him and falsifies his idea saying **ዝም በል ዝም በል** *zɨm bəl zɨm* bəl ‘Shut your (SG, M) mouth. Shut your (SG, M) mouth’. The expression is rude tolerated only among intimate friends.

(137) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 227-233)

a. Asmelash፡ **ቤተሰብ ባናስቸግር ጥሩ ነው።።**
betəsəb bannastʃʃəggɨr t'ɨru nəw
family if:NEG:1PL:CAUS:be_in_problem good be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'It is good if we do not become a burden on our families.'

b. Hafiza፡ **ምንም ይሁን ምን እንደ?**
mɨnɨm jɨhun mɨn ɨndet
whatever 3SG.M.SBJV:become what how
'Whatever it is. How?'

c. Berhane፡ **ለምን**?
ləmɨn
why
'Why?'

d. Hafiza፡ **አደለም።።**
adəlləm
be.NEG.PFV.NPST:3SG.M:NEGCOMP
'No.'

e. Berhane፡ **ባለመግባት**
baləməgbat
by:NEG:NMLZ:enter
'By not going to the bazaar.'

f. Asmelash፡ **አዎ።። እኔ አሁን ካልገባሁኝ ብዬ።።**
awo ɨne ahun kalggəbbahuɲ bɨje
yes I now if:NEG:enter:1SG say:1SG.CVB
'Yes. I do not force them to pay for me.'

g. Berhane፡ **ዝም በል።።** **ዝም በል።።** **ካልገባሁ**
zɨm bəl zɨm bəl kalggəbbahu
quiet.IDEO say:2SG.M.IMP quiet.IDEO say:2SG.M.IMP if:NEG:enter:1SG
ብለህ **አትልም።።**
bɨləh attɨlɨm
say:2SG.M.CVB NEG:2SG.M:say.IPFV:NEGCOMP
'Shut your (SG, M) mouth. Shut your (SG, M) mouth. You (SG, M) do not force them to pay for you (SG, M).'

4.8.3.7. Criticizing

Almost five expressions of criticism are used by adolescents. The expressions constitute the majority of the vulgar language this age group uses. In other words, adolescents use vulgar language mostly for criticizing wrong behaviors, actions and speech. These expressions are **ሲቅለበለብ** *sik'lləbəlləb* 'as he is talking garrulously', **ምናባቱ** *mɨnabbatu* 'what a rubbish person he is', **አታስብም**? *atassɨbɨm*, 'aren't you (SG, M) thoughtful?' '**እ**' **አይባልም** *ɨ ajɨbbalm* 'do not say 'huh?', and **አፉን መክፈቱ** *afun məkfətu* 'he becoming mouthy'.

Nuredin says **ሲቅለበለብ** *sik'llәbәllәb* ‘as he is talking garrulously’ to show his disapproval of Shemsedin’s manner of speaking. Kerrima uses the term **መልከስከስ** *mәlkәskәs* ‘going around unwanted places’ to show her disapproval of students who come to school out of school time without purpose. In extract, (138), Samuel says **አታስጠሉ** *atast'әllu* ‘do not behave badly’ to criticize Hailu and Muktar dwelling on a topic and because he needs a change.

(138) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 67-71)

a. Hailu፡ **ኤሊኮፍተር መስራት እምችል ብሆን**
elikoftər məsrat ɨmmɨʧʃil bɨhon
helicopter INF:do COMP:1SG:be_able if:1SG:become
‘If I am able to make a helicopter’

b. Muktar፡ **በወረቀት ነው በምን**?
bəwərək'ət nəw bəmɨn
with:paper be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST with:what
‘With paper or what?’

c. Hailu፡ **በሆነ ይሁን ብቻ መሰራቱ**
bəhonə jɨhun bɨʧʃa məssəratu
with:become:3SG.M.IMPR 3SG.M.SBJV:become only NMLZ:PASS:do:3SG.M
ነው እሚፈለገው።።
nəw ɨmmiffəlləgəw
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:3 SG.M:PASS:want:3SG.M
‘Whatever the material is what is important is that it is made.’

d. Muktar፡ **እህ! መጀመሪያ ጥቅም ላይ መዋል አለበት አ ከተሰራ**
ɨhɨ məʤəmərija t'ɨk'ɨm laj məwal alləbbət a kəttəsərra
uh uh! first utilization on INF:be_put have_to.3SG.M DM after:PASS:do:3SGM
በኋላ።። በወረቀት ሰርተኸው ጥቅም ላይ
bəhʷala bəwərək'ət sərtəhəw t'ɨk'ɨm laj
after with:paper do:2SG.M.CVB:3SG.M.OBJ utilization on
አይውልም ለምሳሌ።።
ajwɨlɨm ləmɨssale
NEG:3SG.M:be_put.IPFV:NEGCOMP for_example
‘No! After it is constructed it should be functional. If you (SG, M) construct it with a paper, it cannot be functional, for example.’

e. Samuel፡ **አታስጠሉ** **እስቲ እናንተ ደሞ**
atast'әllu ɨsti ɨnnantə dəmmo
NEG:2PL:CAUS:hate.IPFV:2PL.IMP please you.PL again
‘Do not behave badly, please.’

The other expressions with a criticism function are **አታስብም**? *attassɨbɨm* ‘Aren’t you (SG, M) thoughtful?’ (by Hailu and Muktar), ‘**እ አይባልም** *ɨ ajɨbbalɨm* ‘Do not say ‘huh?’’ (by Abdulfetah) and **አፉን መክፈቱ** *afun məkfətu* ‘he becoming mouthy’ (by Kelemework). The expression ‘**እ አይባልም** *ɨ ajɨbbalɨm* ‘do not say ‘huh?’’ has a humorous sense since it is taken

from a comedy. Etsub, the adult, uses **የተኮፈሰ** *jətəkoffəsə* ‘puffed’. All these words and phrases do not create comfort on the listener’s side if not used among friends and adolescents.

4.8.3.8. Commanding and rebuking

Only adolescents use expressions of this function. When Samuel wants to silence one of the conversants saying something not appropriate, he said **ዝም በል** *zɨm bəl* ‘shut your (SG, M) mouth’. This has a command function with an offensive sense. Betel rebuked Tsega by saying **ሂጅ ወደዛ** *hiʤ wədəzza* ‘go away with it’ when Tsega said that there is a killer spirit in a certain place they are planning to go for a picnic. Betel said this because she is offended by Tsega’s wrong belief. Kelemework also reports that she said **አትጨማለቅ** *atɨʧ'ʧ'əmaləkʼ* ‘do not behave badly’ to somebody who tried to tease her. Again, Kerrima reports somebody saying **ቀጥ ብላችሁ ውጡ** *k'ət't' bɨlaʧʧɨhu wɨt't'u* ‘get out of the compound soon’ when he was forcing them out of a school compound.

4.8.3.9. Appreciating

Vulgar language is unbelievably used for appreciation. Lydia said **እንዴት አባቱ እንደሚያምር** *ɨndet abbatu ɨndəmijamɨr* ‘It is a fabulous film’ for a film. It is a new use. Adults do not use this expression or any other expression with a similar use.

4.8.4. The Most Frequent Vulgar Expressions

The expression **ጅል** *ʤɨl* ‘fool’ has the highest frequency among all the vulgar expressions in the adolescent conversations. It occurs 14 times (20% of all). Though the term is found in the conversations of the adults, its frequency is very low. In addition, there is no another variant that has a noticeable frequency in the adult corpus.

4.8.5. Summary

Adolescents are found to lead adults in vulgar language in two perspectives. First, more adolescents than adults are found to use vulgar language. Second, the adolescents use the greater size of the vulgar language found in the whole recording. The social factors have also their own effect on the preference of the age groups to the feature. Males and the LSG contribute the greater proportion for the adolescents to be in the leading position. In the same way, gender and socioeconomic grouping have a power to predict this relationship as religion does not have.

What is more, while adults prefer to use vulgar language against people who are not around, adolescents use most of these expressions against people with whom they talk. This, combined with the fact presented in the preceding paragraph, proves that adolescents are more impolite than adults.

Adolescents lead the adults also in using a great variety of vulgar expressions and using the feature for a variety of purposes.

4.9. Speech Overlap

4.9.1. Types of Overlap

Overlap is an aspect of turn taking that refers to the condition in which two or more speakers speak together at a time in a conversation. Though overlapping is normal in natural conversations, long and recurrent overlap is a sign of failure to apply turn allocation rules (Sacks et al. 1974, 700-701; 704, 705). Overlap can be classified based on the factors that motivated its occurrence. Generally, nine types of overlap are identified in all the conversations recorded for this study.

1. Abrupt change of topic overlap (ACTO). This is an overlap created as one of the speakers abruptly begins another topic with an intention to make a change on the theme when others are still talking on the former topic.
2. Addition overlap (AO). This type of overlap occurs when one begins to talk after they have already finished a sentence and at the same time another speaker begins to talk because they thought the former speaker has finished.
3. Call back overlap (CBO). After the previous speaker selects the next speaker, they begin to speak without waiting the selected speaker to do their role. In other words, the first speaker recalls the opportunity they gave to the next speaker and overlaps with the selected speaker. This is what is called call back overlap.
4. Completion overlap (CO). One speaker embarks to finish the speech another speaker has already begun as the second speaker is still speaking and thus overlap occurs. This overlap is called completion overlap.
5. Interfering topic overlap (ITO). An ITO occurs when a short lived topic is raised in the middle of a talk on the first topic. The first topic may or may not continue after the interference of the short lived topic.

6. Lack of tolerance overlap (LTO). This type of overlap is created when the second speaker begins to speak without waiting till the first speaker finishes their turn.
7. Predicting turn relevance overlap (PTRO). It is an overlap that happens when one predicts that the speech of a speaker is near to end and begins to talk before the first speaker finishes.
8. Coincidence overlap (CIO). This is an overlap that happens when two speakers begin to speak at the same time after a pause, or in the beginning of a conversation, or when the preceding speaker does not select the next speaker and the other two speakers think they have the right to speak next.
9. Right override overlap (ROO). A speaker selects the next speaker and stops speaking; but as the selected speaker begins to talk, a third speaker not selected also begins to talk and thus an overlap occurs. This type of overlap is called right override overlap.

4.9.2. Distribution of Overlap

The extent to which the distribution of the above nine types of overlap are affected by age, gender, socioeconomic status and religion is explained in detail based on the data presented in Tables 46-51 below.

Table 46 Distribution of speech overlap across the age groups

Age Category	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Speech Overlap**			**P**
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**	
Adolescent	27	34799	1776	51.04	59.65	p=0.024
Adult	27	31049	1072	34.53	40.35	
Total	54	65848	1848	85.57	100	

Table 46 demonstrates that adolescents do more of the speech overlap than the adults do. This clearly suggests that adolescents are in the front in overlapping their speeches. They are hasty to speak. The significance test proves the significance of this difference.

Table 47 Distribution of each type of speech overlap across the age groups

Age Category	N	Total No of Words	Types of Overlap											
			ACTO			AO			CBO			CO		
			Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	27	34799	15	0.43	93.48	284	8.16	63.45	7	0.20	86.96	19	0.55	90.16
Adult	27	31049	1	0.03	6.52	146	4.70	36.55	1	0.03	13.04	2	0.06	9.84
Total	54	65848	16	0.46	100	430	12.86	100	8	0.23	100	21	0.61	100

Age Category	Types of Overlap														
	ITO			LTO			PTRO			ROO			CIO		
	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%	Raw N	Rated N	%
Adolescent	9	0.26	50	786	22.59	57.23	87	2.50	51.87	28	0.81	59.56	541	15.55	61.61
Adult	8	0.26	50	524	16.88	42.77	72	2.32	48.13	17	0.55	40.44	301	9.69	38.39
Total	17	0.52	100	1310	39.47	100	159	4.82	100	45	1.36	100	842	25.24	100

The above table depicts that both adolescents and adults commit all the nine types of overlap. This implies that there is no difference with regard to the variety.

When put in order from the highest to the lowest, LTO, CIO and AO stand first to third, respectively in both age groups. Therefore, the top causes of overlap for both age groups are lack of tolerance, coincidence, and speakers' drive to add after they give clue that they have finished their turn. Generally, there is no difference between these two age cohorts with regard to the cause of overlap.

Those who overlap most are the ones who talk a lot. The correlation coefficient for the adolescents between number of words and raw number of overlaps is 0.654, and for the adults, it is 0.404. Therefore, length of talk and number of overlaps for the adolescents are strongly directly related and for the adults they are moderately directly related to each other.

Table 48 Proportion of types of speech overlap in each age group

Age Category	N	Total no of Words		Types of Overlap			
				ACTO	**AO**	**CBO**	**CO**
Adolescent	27	34799	Raw N	15	284	7	19
			Rated N	0.43	8.16	0.20	0.55
			%	0.84	15.98	0.39	1.08
Adult	27	31049	Raw N	1	146	1	2
			Rated N	0.03	4.70	0.03	0.06
			%	0.09	13.62	0.09	0.17

Age Category	Types of Overlap						
		ITO	**LTO**	**PTRO**	**ROO**	**CIO**	**Total**
Adolescent	Raw N	9	786	87	28	541	1776
	Rated N	0.26	22.59	2.50	0.81	15.55	51.05
	%	0.51	44.25	4.90	1.59	30.46	100
Adult	Raw N	8	524	72	17	301	1072
	Rated N	0.26	16.88	2.32	0.55	9.69	34.52
	%	0.75	48.9	6.72	1.59	28.07	100

Table 48 shows that LTO and CIO are the first two types of overlap used in greater frequency by both adolescents and adults. The other types have insignificant frequency. This testifies that there is no difference between adolescents and the adults with regard to the causes of speech overlap.

Table 49 Distribution of speech overlap across the genders

Gender	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	**Total no of Words**	**Speech Overlap**			**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Speech Overlap**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**			**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
Male	14	15805	741	46.88	46.25	13	16172	384	23.75	33.93
Female	13	18994	1035	54.49	53.75	14	14877	688	46.25	66.07
Total	27	34799	1776	101.37	100	27	31049	1072	70.00	100

As Table 49 presents, the females do not have equals in both age groups in overlapping their speech with that of their interlocutors. This makes gender have a predictive power on the relationship. Female adolescents are also the major players in making the age cohort lead the adults in this discourse feature.

Table 50 Distribution of speech overlap across socioeconomic groups

Socio-economic Group	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Speech Overlap			N	Total no of Words	Speech Overlap		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
LSG	15	18554	1019	54.92	54.09	14	14731	521	35.37	51.16
MSG	12	16245	757	46.61	45.91	13	16318	551	33.77	48.84
Total	27	34799	1776	101.53	100	27	31049	1072	69.14	100

Table 50 depicts that the LSG of the adolescent age cohort does most of the overlap when it is compared to the MSG. However, among the adults, the two groups overlap their speech almost in a similar proportion. This indicates that socioeconomic grouping lacks consistency in its role of affecting variation in speech overlap between the two age groups. It also proves that the LSG makes the lion's share of the contribution for the adolescents to lead the adults in speech overlap.

Table 51 Distribution of speech overlap across the two religions

Religion	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Speech Overlap			N	Total no of Words	Speech Overlap		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
Christian	11	16084	946	58.82	57.01	13	17934	471	26.26	36.43
Muslim	16	18715	830	44.35	42.99	14	13115	601	45.83	63.57
Total	27	34799	1776	103.17	100	27	31049	1072	72.09	100

Table 51 presents that most of the speech overlaps are done by Christian adolescents and Muslim adults. In other words, among the adolescents, Christians lead but among the adults, the Muslims do. Though the influence of religion in general across the age groups is not uniform, the role Christians play in adolescents' lead is higher.

4.9.3. Summary

In general, adolescents surpass adults in committing overlaps. Females, the LSG and Christians contribute the greater proportion for them. When the social factors are considered from general point of view, gender has a predictive power on the relationship while socioeconomic grouping and religion do not. But there is no difference between the age groups with regard to the variety of the causes of overlap; for both age groups, lack of tolerance, coincidence and addition are the first three dominant causes of overlap. What is special about overlaps is that length of talk and

number of overlaps for the adolescents are strongly directly related and for the adults they are moderately directly related to each other.

4.10. Other-Selection of Next Speakers

4.10.1. Types of Selection Strategies

One aspect of discourse analysis is speaker selection. Speakers can be selected in two ways: self-selection and other-selection. As self-selection refers to the case in which speakers nominate themselves for taking over the turn to speak from the previous speaker, other-selection is the condition in which the previous speaker nominates who should speak next (Sacks et al 1974, 703).

Participants of the research have used ten strategies of selecting next speakers some of which are used in combination. They are:

1. Directed question (DQ) – It involves asking a question and then mentioning the name or any identification of the one supposed to answer the question or vice versa, or asking a question and then using a structure that singles out one participant who is supposed to answer among the group who are involved in the talk. For example, the question **ገብቶሻል?** *gəbtoʃal* 'did you (F) understand?' that is used in a group in which only one female is found does not refer to anyone but to that female participant.
2. Direct calling by name and attracting attention to a talk (DC)
3. Directed invitation (DI) – It is either an imperative or a declarative form that contains the name or some identification of a person who is invited to talk.
4. Confirmation question (CQ) – It is concerned with asking the previous speaker a question without mentioning their name to confirm one self's understanding or the surety of the idea heard.
5. Question for repetition (QR) – This is a strategy where the listener asks a previous speaker to repeat their idea because the listener fails to hear or understand. The name of the previous speaker is not mentioned.
6. Completion statement or phrase (CS) – It is the use of a statement or a phrase that completes what the previous speaker began to speak and that forces them to say 'yes' or 'no' in confirmation.

7. Checking the listener's understanding, attention or acceptance, or asking for their confirmation (CUA)
8. Follow up question (FQ) – The question that is termed so is the one that a person uses to ask a previous speaker for a reasoning, an explanation, an addition and so on based on what the speaker said. A name of the person who is invited to talk is not mentioned.
9. A question to who it is addressed is known from the preceding exchanges, the physical context and history (QPE). The QPE group comprises of all questions that do not fall in the 'directed', 'follow-up', 'confirmation' or 'repetition' question categories.
10. Suggestive form that encourages others to continue to speak (SF) – It is a way of encouraging people who stopped to speak. The encouragement utterance may be in imperative, interrogative or statement form or it may be an interjection.

4.10.2. Distribution of Other-Selection of Next Speakers

The other-selection method as a whole has different levels of preference by different social groups, except age. This difference tells different things about the groups in relation to the strategy. Tables 52-55 carry the real data.

Table 52 Distribution of other -selection of speakers across the age groups

Age Category	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Current Speaker Selecting Next Speaker**			**P**
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**	
Adolescent	27	34799	601	17.27	48.52	0.287
Adult	27	31049	569	18.32	51.48	
Total	54	65848	1170	35.59	100	

As Table 52 demonstrates, adolescents and adults use other-selection almost in equal frequency. There is no difference between them in their choice of the strategy. The test also does not show that the difference between the age groups is significant.

Table 53 Distribution of other-selection of speakers across the genders

	Adolescents					**Adults**				
Gender	**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Current Speaker Selecting Next Speaker**			**N**	**Total no of Words**	**Current Speaker Selecting Next Speaker**		
			Raw N	**Rated N**	**%**			**Raw N**	**Rated N**	**%**
Male	14	15805	277	17.53	50.68	13	16172	265	16.39	44.51
Female	13	18994	324	17.06	49.32	14	14877	304	20.43	55.49
Total	27	34799	601	34.59	100	27	31049	569	36.82	100

In Table 53, it is observed that male and female members of the adolescent age category use other-selection almost in equal frequency. There is no difference between the two in their choice of the strategy. However, the majority of the cases of the strategy in the adults' conversations are made by the females. This implies that females of the adult age category are better in directly selecting next speakers than the males.

Table 54 Distribution of other -selection of speakers across socioeconomic groups

Socio-economic Group	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Current Speaker Selecting Next Speaker			N	Total no of Words	Current Speaker Selecting Next Speaker		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
LSG	15	18554	382	20.59	60.43	14	14731	300	20.37	55.26
MSG	12	16245	219	13.48	39.57	13	16318	269	16.49	44.74
Total	27	34799	601	34.07	100	27	31049	569	36.86	100

In Table 54, it is shown that the LSG of the adolescents does most of the selection of next speaker when it is compared with the MSG. The same pattern exists for the adults. This implies that in both age groups the LSG leads.

Table 55 Distribution of other -selection of speakers across the two religions

Religion	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Current Speaker Selecting Next Speaker			N	Total no of Words	Current Speaker Selecting Next Speaker		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
Christian	11	16084	260	16.17	47.02	13	17934	383	21.36	60.10
Muslim	16	18715	341	18.22	52.98	14	13115	186	14.18	39.90
Total	27	34799	601	34.39	100	27	31049	569	35.54	100

In Table 55, it is presented that Muslim adolescents use the greater size of the other-selection strategy than the Christians do. The Muslims lead the Christians in the use of this discourse feature. The table also shows that it is the adult Christians who use the other-selection in higher frequency than the adult Muslims do. Thus unlike the case in the adolescent age group, Christian adults exceed the Muslims in selecting next speakers.

4.10.3. Strategies of Selecting Next Speakers

The preference of the age groups for the strategies listed in Section 4.10.1 is investigated from two perspectives. The first is identifying the top three strategies each age group prefers and comparing the groups from that respect. The second is isolating the leader in using higher number of strategies and discussing how each age group uses the strategies.

Table 56 Proportion of strategies of selecting next speakers in each age group

No	Strategies of Selecting Next Speakers	Adolescents		Adults	
		N	**%**	**N**	**%**
1	DQ	30	4.98	44	7.73
2	DC	13	2.16	12	2.11
3	DI	3	0.5	6	1.06
4	CQ	85	14.12	59	10.37
5	QR	75	12.46	118	20.74
6	CS	0	0	2	0.35
7	CUA	9	1.5	13	2.29
8	FQ	243	40.37	185	32.51
9	QPE	122	20.27	92	16.17
10	SF	20	3.32	37	6.50
11	FQ+ SF	1	0.17	1	0.18
12	QR+FQ	1	0.17	0	0
	Total	602	100	569	100

Table 56 presents that in the adolescents' conversations FQ, QPE and CQ are the first, the second and the third frequent strategies, respectively. In the adults' conversations, FQ is the first, QR the second and QPE the third. Therefore, the two age groups overlap in two of the three top strategies of their preferences and both chose FQ in the first place. These data indicate that there is insignificant difference between the adolescents and adults in the strategies of selecting next speakers they favor most. In other words, age and strategies of selecting next speakers most favored are not related to each other.

The number of strategies used by the age groups gives additional evidence about the level of emphasis they give to other-selection of next speakers. The choices of the two age groups with regard to each strategy and the evidences extracted from the recordings are discussed below in detail.

Directed question (DQ) is used by both the adolescents and the adults. In extract (139) below, it is observed that among the adolescents, Tsega calls Kelemework by the diminutive form of her name and asks her if she presented well and as a result Kelemework takes the next turn by responding to Tsega's question that she presented well.

(139) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, lines 63-64)

a. Tsega: **በደንብ አቀረብሽ ቀለምዬ? እየጻፍሽ ምናምን?**
bədəmb ak'ərrəbʃ k'ələmɨjje ɨjjəs'afʃ mɨnamɨn
well present.PFV:2SG.F Kelemye PROG:write:2SGF and_stuff
'Did you (SG, F) present well, Kelemye? By writing and stuff?'

b. Kelemework: **አልጻፍኩም ግን እንትን በደንብ አቀረብኩ።።**
als'afkum gin ɨntɨn bədəmb ak'ərrəbku
NEG:taste_good.PFV:3SG.M:2PL:NEGCOMP but INDFPRO well present.PFV:1SG
'I did not write but something I presented well.'

Adults also select next speakers using this mechanism. Extract (140) is an example.

(140) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, lines 31-33)

a. Zubeda: **መሲ እሳ ምን ታዝብሽ?**
məsi ɨssa mɨn tazzəbʃ
Mesi FOC what notice.PFV:2SG.F
'What did you (SG, F) observe, Mesi (Diminutive form of Meselech)?'

b. Habiba: **በደረጃ።።**
bədərəʤa
in:ranking
In ranking

c. Meselech: **ማለት ከባለፈው ለውጥ አላቸው።።**
maləṯ kəballəfəw ləwt' allaʧʧəw
INF:say from:former:DEF change have.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR.NPST:3PL.OBJ
'I mean they have shown a change from the earlier.'

Here Zubeda calls Meselech as **መሲ** məsi 'Mesi' and then asks what she observed. Now Meselech has no opportunity but to respond to the question directed to her by Zubeda. Habiba interferes to give a clue as shown in line (b) to her. Meselech takes a next turn as expected. That means she knows that she is selected to speak next because her name is called and then a question is asked.

The second strategy, direct calling by name and attracting attention to a talk (DC), is also used by both age cohorts. Extract (141) is an example for the use of direct calling for selecting next speaker by the adolescents.

(141) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.2, lines 85-86)

a. Hafiza: **አንተ። ብርሃኔ።**
antə birɨhane
you:SG.M Berhane
'You (SG, M). Berhane.'

b. Berhane: **አቤት**
abet
yes
'Yes.'

Here Hafiza calls Berhane by his name and then Berhane responds by saying **አቤት** *abet* 'yes'. He cannot keep quiet when his name is called unless he is rude. That means, he knows that he is selected to speak next because his name is called.

In extract (142), it is also seen that the adult Aberash calls Tewabe by her name two times and makes her say **ኧይ** *əj* 'yes'. In other words, she selects Tewabe to be the next speaker.

(142) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, lines 352-353)

a. Aberash: **ተዋቤ። ተዋቤ።**
təwabe təwabe
Tewabe Tewabe
'Tewabe. Tewabe.'

b. Tewabe: **ኧይ**
əj
yes
'Yes.'

c. Etenat: **ሚስኮል ነው ያረገው።።**
miskol nəw jadərrəgəw
missed_call be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:do:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ
'He made a false call.'

d. Aberash: **እንዴ! እንደቅናት ነው እንደመበሳጨት**?
ɨnde ɨndək'ɨnat nəw ɨndəməbbəsaʧ'ət
Aha! like:jealousy be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST like:INF:be_angry
'Ah! Are you jealous or angry?'

Directed invitation (DI) is the third used by both the adolescents and adults. Look extract (143) from the adolescent corpus.

(143) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, line 45)

a. Hayat: **ወይኔ በጣም ነው የሚያምረው ሀሎዬ።።**
wəjne bət'am nəw jəmmijamrəw halojje
alas very be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST REL:COMP:3SG.M:be_beautiful:3SG.M Halloye
'Wow! It is very beautiful, Halloye (Diminutive form of Hallima).'

b. Hallima: **በጣም ያምራል።።**
bət'am jamral
very 3SG.M:be_beautiful.IPFV:AUX

‘It is very beautiful.’

Here Hayat comments about a beauty of something and appends the diminutive form of Hallima at the end. This method is a way of inviting Hallima to show her approval to the comment. And Hallima does what she is expected of her by saying **በጣም ያምራል** *bət'am jamral* ‘it is very beautiful.’

In extract (144), the adult Shiferaw calls Samuel as “**ሳሚ**” *sami* ‘Sami’, the diminutive form, and requests him to talk. This method is a way of inviting Samuel to take the next turn.

(144) Extract (adult) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, line 238)

Sfiferaw: **ሳሚ የሆነ ወሬ አውራ እንጂ በናትህ።።**
sami jəhonə wəre awra ɨnʤi bənnatih
Sami some talk talk.2SG.M.IMP please for:mother:2SGM.GEN
‘Sami, for your (SG, M) mother’s sake, talk, please.’

Similarly, both age groups choose to use confirmation question (CQ). In extract (145) below, Hafiza reports that her friend proposed that they drink beer. Then Berhane asks her the question **ቢራ እንጠጣ አለችሽ**? *bira ɨnt'ət't'a aləʧʧiʃ* ‘did she say “let’s drink beer?” ’ in an attitude of seeking a confirmation if Hafiza really means it because he does not believe her. Hafiza knows that she is selected to speak next because it is her who had said the information on which the confirmation is sought.

(145) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.1, lines 355-357)

a. Hafiza: …**ደሞ አየኸው አስምሽዬ አስምሽ ምን እንዳለች**
dəmmo ajjəhəw asmmiʃʃje abriʃ mɨn ɨndaləʤ
again see.PFV:2SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ Asmishye Asmish what COMP:say:3SG.F
ታቃለህ ደሞ? "ነይ እባክሽ እንቀመጥ እና
tak'alləh dəmmo nəj ɨbakkiʃ ɨnɨk'k'əmət' ɨnna
2SG.M:know.IPFV:AUX:2SG.M again come.2SG.F.IMP please 1PL.SBJV:sit and
ቢራ ምናምን።።" "ኖ እኔ ቢራ አልጠጣም ጭራሽ"
bira mɨnamɨn no ɨne bira alt'ət't'am ʧ'ɨrraʃ
beer and_stuff no I beer NEG:drink.PFV:1SG:NEGCOMP completely
አልኳት።።
alk^{w}at
say.PFV:1SG:3SG.F.IO
‘And look Asmishye, Asmish, do you (SG, M) know what she said? “Come and let’s sit and drink beer and stuff.” I said, “no, I don’t drink beer at all.”’ (Asmishye and Asmish are diminutive form of Asmelash)

b. Berhane: **ቢራ እንጠጣ አለችሽ?**
bira ɨnt'ət't'a aləʧʧiʃ
beer 1PL.SBJV:drink:1PL say.PFV:3SG.F:2SG.F.IO
‘Did she say “let’s drink beer?’

c. Hafiza፡ **ቢራ እንጠጣ አለችኝ። ቆይ**
bira ɨnt'ət't'a aləʧʧɨɲ k'oj
beer 1PL.SBJV:drink:1PL say.PFV:3SG.F:1SG.IO wait.2SG.M.IMP
ባላሰብኩት መልክ
balassəbkut məlk
in:NEG:think:1SG:3SG.M.OBJ manner
'She said, "let's drink beer." I found her being different from my expectation.'

In extract (146), it is shown that the adult Samuel cannot believe Geremew saying that a certain man they are talking about is helped by his brother living in America, and then says **ተው እንጂ**? *təw ɨnʤi* 'really?' to show his surprise. The question obligates Geremew to say a word of confirmation and to show that what he says is believable. Thus he says **አዎ** *awo* 'yes'.

(146) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, lines 37-40)

a. Samuel፡ **ምን ያቺ እህቱ ናት**
mɨn jaʧʧi ɨhɨtu nat
what that:3SG.F sister:3SGM.GEN be.PFV:3SG.F.NPST
የምትረዳው አደል?
jəmɨttɨrədaw adəl
REL:COMP:2SG.F:help:3SG.F:3SG.M.OBJ be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
'That (F) sister of his helps him, isn't it?'

b. Geremew፡ **አንድ ወንድም ነበረው አሜሪካ**
and wəndɨm nəbbərəw amerika
one brother have.PFV:PST: 3SG.M. IMPR:3SG.M.OBJ America
'He had a brother living in America.'

c. Samuel፡ **ተው እንጂ**?
təw ɨnʤi
leave.2SG.M.IMP please
'Really?'

d. Geremew፡ **አዎ። ያቺ**
awo jaʧʧi
yes that:3SGF
'Yes. That (SG, F)'

The fifth method both age groups use is question for repetition (QR). In extract (147) below, Shemsedin, an adolescent, uses this strategy to select Nuredin to take the next turn. He uses the interjection **አ** *a*? 'huh?' to ask Nuredin to repeat what he already said because his speech is either not clear or inaudible; Shemsedin does not mention Nuredin's name.

(147) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 80-82)

a. Nuredin፡ **በተለይ አብሶ ፋሲል ደ ቀጮ**
bətələj abso fasil də k'əʧ'o
Especially notably Fasil de Kecho
'Especially Fasil De Kecho'

b. Shemsedin: አ?
a
huh
'Huh?'

c. Nuredin: ፋሲል ቀጮ። አማሀ
fasil k'əʧ'o ammaha
Fasil Kecho Amaha
'Fasil Kecho. Amaha.'

As it is shown in another dialogue below (extract (148)), this mechanism has a significant place in adults' conversations as well.

(148) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.9, lines 718-720)

a. Etenat: አውቃታለች።
awk'atallətʃʃ
know.PFV:3SG.F:3SG.F.OBJ:AUX
'She has recognized it.'

b. Aberash: ኧ?
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

c. Kedija: ኧ
ɨ
Uh-huh
'Uh-huh.'

Aberash uses the interjection **አ**? *a* 'huh?' to ask Etenat to repeat what she already said because her utterance is either not clear or inaudible. By this way Aberash selects Etenat to speak next. In response, Etenat repeats her sentence, **አውቃታለች** *awk'atallətʃʃ* 'she has recognized it'.

In addition, both adolescents and adults use follow up question (FQ). Among the adolescents, Salhadin selects Shemsedin to speak next using the follow up question ...**አልሰከርክም**? *alsəkkərkkɨm* 'didn't you (SG, M) get drunk?'. Shemsedin knows that he is selected to speak next because the question is based on what he said earlier; he is asked to add. This is displayed in extract (149) below.

(149) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 48-52)

a. Shemsedin: **ለመዲና። ኧ! ለመዲና የጋበዝኳ-ት።። ባዛር ማለት**
ləmədina ə ləmədina jəgabbəzk^{w}at bazaar malət
for:Medina uh uh! for:Medina REL:invite:1SG:3SG.F.OBJ bazaar INF:say
ነው ተወው ትናንትና ማታ ቅውጥ
nəw təwəw tɨnantɨnna mata k'ɨwwɨt'ɨt'
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST leave.2SGM.IMP:3SGM.OBJ yesterday evening disturb.IDEO
ቅውጥ። ኧ! ቀላል በለው ከባድ

k'ɨwwɨt't' ɨ k'əllal bələw kəbbad
disturb.IDEO wow! light say.2SGM.IMP:3SGM.OBJ heavy
በለው አምሳ ኪሎ መቶ ኪሎ ምናምን
bələw amsa kilo məto kilo mɨnamɨn
say.2SGM.IMP:3SGM.OBJ fifty kilo hundred kilo and_stuff
'For Medina. 'No!' What I invited Medina. At the bazaar. It was wonderful. Yesterday night we enlivened the occasion. 'Wow!' Whether it is light or heavy, fifty kilos or hundred kilos and stuff.'

b. Nuredin: **አንተ በጣም ደሞ**
antə bət'am dəmmo
you:SG.M very again
'And very'

c. Salhadin: **ኧረ በለው! አልሰክርክም?**
ərə bələw alsəkkərkkɨm
DM my_goodness NEG:get_drunk.PFV:2SG.M:NEGCOMP
'Eh! Didn't you (SG, M) get drunk?'

d. Shemsedin: **ተው። እኔ እማ አልጠጣሁም።**
təw ɨne ɨmma alt'ət't'ahum
leave.2SG.M.IMP I FOC NEG:drink.PFV:1SG:NEGCOMP
'Stop. I didn't drink.'

In extract (140), Habiba selects Zubeda to speak next using the follow up question in (d). It is a follow up question because it asks Zubeda for an explanation about what she said earlier about a man called Abiy.

(150) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, lines 10-14)

a. Zubeda: **አብይም ደስ ብሎት አስተያየት ሲሰጥ**
abɨjjɨm dəss bɨlot astəjajət sisət'
Abiy:FOC happy.IDEO say.3SG.M.IMPR.CVB:2SG.M.OBJ commet when:3SG.M:give
ነበር። ከሌሎቹ ጋ እያወዳደረ ራሱን።
nəbbər kələloʧʧu ga ʔjjawwədaddərə rasun
be.PFV:3SG.M.PST COM:others:DEF with PROG:compare:3SG.M himself:ACC
'Abiy was speaking with happiness. Comparing himself with the others.'

b. Habiba: **አይደል**?
ajdəl
be.NEG.PFV.3SGM.IMPR.NPST
'Isn't it?'

c. Zubeda: **አዎ።**
awo
yes
'Yes'

d. Habiba: "**በተቋሙ የሪፎርም ስራ የተሻለ ውጤት**
bətək'wamu jəriform sɨra jətəʃalə wɨt't'et
in:GEN:institution:DEF GEN:reform work REL:PASS:improve:3SG.M result
አለኝ።" **ብሎ ነው እሱ**
alləɲ bɨlo nəw ɨssu
have.PFV:3SG.M.IMPR.NPST:1SG.OBJ say:3SGM.CVB be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST he

አሁን አስተያየት የተሰጠው ወይስ በኛ ድጋፍ አሰጣጥ?
ahun astəjajət jəttəsət't'əw wəjɨs bəɲɲa dɨgaf assət'at'
now comment REL:PASS:give:3SG.M or in:GEN:we support NMLZ:give
'Is his speech on the idea that his institution is doing well on the reform work or is it on the support we offer?'

e. Zubeda: **እ የሱፐርቪዥን ቡድኑ ባወጣው ደረጃ ነው**
ɨ jəsuppərviʒɨn budnu bawət't'aw dərəʤa nəw
er GEN:supervision team:DEF in:issue:3SG.M:3SG.M.OBJ ranking be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
እንጂ
ɨnʤi
on the contrary
'Err it is according to the ranking the supervision team formed.'

The seventh method used by both age groups is QPE. Look extract (151) taken from the adolescent conversations.

(151) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, lines 93-95)

a. Betel: **የፌቨን ፌቨን እኮ በደንብ አቅርባለች።።**
jəfevən fevən ɨkko bədəmb ak'rɨballəʧʧ
GEN:Feven Feven truly well present.PFV:AUX:3SG.F
'Feven's Feven has presented well.'

b. Kelemework: **አዎ።። ሰአዳም በደንብ አቅርባለች።። እ እንትና**
awo səʔadam bədəmb ak'rɨballəʧʧ ɨ ɨntɨna
yes Seada:FOC well present.PFV:AUX:3SG.F er INDFPRO
ይችኛያይቱም ማን ናት?
jɨʧʧɨɲajɨtum mann nat
this:SGF:SGV:DEF:FOC who be.PFV:3SG.F.NPST
'Yes. Seada also has presented well. Errr what is the name? This one. What is her name?'

c. Betel: **ተምር ተምርን ተያት።።**
təmɨr təmɨrɨn təjat
Temir Temir:ACC leave:2SGF.IMP:3SGF.OBJ
'Temir. Forget Temir.'

In this extract, Kelemework's question is directed towards Betel and this is known from the fact that it is the two who were in the class where the presentations were made and the preceding exchanges were between only the two. Tsega, the third participant in the conversation, is almost an observer.

In extract (152) below, Geremew and Samuel are talking and the talk is made in a hotel where Samuel does a physical exercise. Now since the program of the exercise is approaching, Samuel is leaving the talk and going to the swimming pool. As Geremew tells him that he also wants to begin a physical exercise, Samuel invites him to begin. It is at this point that Geremew asks

Samuel **እኮ አሁን የት ነህ**? *ɨkko ahun jət nəh* ‘where are you (SG) going then?’. The meaning is that he wants Samuel to do something for him with regard to the exercise. With this question Geremew selects Samuel to speak next. The fact that Samuel is selected is known based on three things: the immediate context is that it is the two who are talking; their subject of talk is physical exercise; and it is Samuel who is engaged in physical exercise.

(152) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.14, lines 444-547)

a. Geremew፡ **እስፖርት ልጀምር ነበር እኔም፡፡**
ɨsport lɨʤəmɨr nəbbər ɨnem
sport PROS:1SG:begin be.PFV:3SG.M.PST I:FOC
‘I am to begin to do physical exercise.’

b. Samuel፡ **ና ግባ፡፡**
na gɨba
come.2SGM.IMP join.2SG.M.IMP
‘Come and join.’

c. Geremew፡ **እኮ አሁን የት ነህ**?
ɨkko ahun jət nəh
Then now where be.PFV:2SG.M.NPST
‘Where are you (SG) going now?’

d. Samuel፡ **ና እዛ ነኝ፡፡**
na ɨzza nəɲ
come.2SGM.IMP there be.PFV:1SG.NPST
‘Come. I will be there.’

The eighth, the suggestive form that encourages others to continue to speak (SF), is also practiced by both age cohorts. Extract (153) is an example for adolescents’ interest in this mechanism.

(153) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.5, lines 565-568)

a. Sultan: **ልክ ሲመጣ ማለት ነው ምን ቢያረጋት**
likk simət'a malət nəw mɨn bijarəgat
just when:3SG.M:come INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST what if:3SG.M:do:3SG.F.OBJ
ጥሩ ነው ልጅቱን ይደፍራት እና ማለት
t'ɨru nəw lɨʤɨtun jɨdəfrat ɨnna malət
good be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST girl:DEF:ACC 3SG.M:rape.IPFV:3SG.F.OBJ and INF:say
ነው እውነተኛ ታሪክ ነው፡፡ ሲሪየስ፡፡
nəw ɨwnətəɲa tarik nəw sirijəs
be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST true story be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST serious
‘Immediately he came, he raped the girl and- It is a true story. I am serious.’

b. Shemsedin ፡ **እ ከዛስ**?
ɨ kəzzas
er from:that:FOC
‘Yes? What happened next?’

c. Nuredin፡ **እ**

ɨ
aha
'Aha.'

d. Sultan: **ከዛ በኋላ እንትን ይደፍራት እና በቃ**
kəzza bəh^{w}ala ɨntɨn jɨdəfrat ɨnna bək'k'a
from:that after INDFPRO 3SG.M:rape.IPFV:3SG.F.OBJ and enough
ይገላታል።።
jɨgəllatal
3SG.M:kill.IPFV:3SG.F.OBJ:AUX
'Then he raped and killed her.'

Shemsedin encourages Sultan to continue to tell the story he began using both the question **ከዛስ**? *kəzzas* 'what happened next?' and the interjection **እ** *ɨ* 'yes?', which has the same function to the question 'why don't you continue to tell us?'.

Adults' use of the method is illustrated by extract (154).

(154) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.8, lines 80-85)

a. Awol: **አብሸሩ።። ተጫወቱ።።**
abʃiru təʧ'awətu
take_heart:2PL.IMP chat:2PL.IMP
'Be relaxed and chat.'

b. Firew: **እኛ ምን።። እንጫወታለን።።**
ɨɲɲa mɨn ɨnɨʧ'ʧ'awwətallən
we what 1PL:chat.IPFV:AUX:1PL
'We. We will chat.'

c. Awol: **ኧ**?
ə
ha
'Ha?'

d. Firew: **እኛ ምን**
ɨɲɲa mɨn
we DM
'We-.'

e. Awol: **እ**?
ɨ
huh
'Huh?'

f. Firew: **አልሀምዲሊላህ።።**
alhamdilillah
praise_be_to_GOD
'Praise be to God.'

In the dialogue, Awol encourages Firew to continue to explain in more detail what he has began as **እኛ ምን** *ɨɲɲa mɨn* 'we' using the interjection **እ**? *ɨ* whose function is equivalent to the function

of the question ‘why don’t you tell us the whole thing you want to tell?’. Then Firew said **አልሀምዲሊላህ** *alhamdilillah* ‘praise be to God’. By implication, he reveals that they are so relaxed that they can continue to talk.

Ninth, the age groups use the method of checking the listener’s understanding or attention or acceptance, or asking for their confirmation (CUA). In extract (155) below, Hayat, the adolescent, first complains that these days she is in problem because she is busy and thus says **እሺ**? *ɨffi* ‘yes?’ to check that Hallima has attended to her complaint.

(155) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.4, lines 797-799)

a. Hayat፡ **ሀሎ በናትሽ እንደው ሰራተኛ እምታቂ**
halo bənnatiʃ ɨndəw səratəɲɲa ɨmmɨtak'i
Hallo for:mother:2SG.F.GEN DM maid COMP:2SG.F:know:2SG.F
ከሆነ በአላህ ወላሂ እንድትፈልጊልኝ ሀሎዬ።።
kəhonə bəʔallah wəllahi ɨndɨttifəlligillɨn halojje
if:become:3SG.M by:Allah I_swear_to_Allah COMP:2SG.F:search:2SG.F:for:1SG Halloye
‘Hallo (Diminutive form of Hallima), for your (SG, F) mother’s sake, find a maid for me, for Allah’s sake, I swear to Allah, Halloye (Diminutive form of Hallima).’

b. Hallima፡ **እሺ**
ɨʃʃi
ok
‘Ok.’

c. Hayat፡ **ሰሞኑን ተቸግሬያለሁ ባክሽ ስራ**
səmonun təʧəggɨrrejalləhu bakkɨʃ sɨra
these_days be_in_problem.PFV:1SG:AUX:1SG truly work
በዝቶብኛል።። **እሺ?**
bəztobbɨɲɲal ɨʃʃi
be_too_much.PFV:3SG.M:on:1SG:AUX ok
‘These days, I am in problem. I have become buzy. Yes?’

Among the adults, Habiba first expresses that the sector office they visited as part of their assignment from their office has been doing well on the reform work it is undergoing. Then Zubeda expresses that she understands Habiba by saying **እሀ** *ɨhɨ* ‘Aha’. However, since Habiba is not satisfied with Zubeda’s method of acknowledgement, she says **እ**? ɨ ‘eh?’ to check if Zubeda really acknowledges the report. Extract (156) demonstrates this.

(156) Extract (Adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, line 24-27)

a. Habiba፡ **አዎ።። ኧረ በጣም ብታዪ።።** **እነሰይድ ታረቀኝ በጣም ብታዪ**
awo ərə bət'am bɨttaji ɨnnəsəjɨd tarrək'əɲ bət'am bɨttaji
yes DM very if:2SG.F:see:2SG.F DET.3PL:Seid Tarekegn very if:2SG.F:see:2SG.F
የሪፎርም ስራ በደንብ መረጃ በደንብ እያደራጁ ይዘዋል።።
jəriform sɨra bədənb mərrəʤa bədənb ɨjjaddəraʤʤu jɨzəwall

GEN:reform work well information well PROG:organize:3PL keep.PFV:3PL:AUX
'Yes. Seid Tarekegn and his friends have organized documents of the reform work very well.'

b. Zubeda: **እህ**
ɨhɨ
aha
'Aha.'

c. Habiba: **እ?**
ɨ
eh
'Eh?'

d. Zubeda: **አሪፍ ነበር ማለት ነው።።**
arif nəbbər malət nəw
fantastic be.PFV:3SG.M.PST INF:say be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'It means it was fantastic.'

The tenth method, completion statement or phrase (CS), is used only by the adults. In extract (157) below, Zubeda completes Habiba's idea and by way of this she selects Habiba to speak next (to show her approval to the completion).

(157) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.13, lines 493-495)

a. Habiba: **ነገ ቅዳሜ ግን የሆነች ልጅ አለች**
nəgə k'ɨdame gɨn jəhonəʧʧ lɨʤ alləʧʧ
tomorrow Saturday however that_happened:SG.F girl exist.PFV:3SG.F.NPST
የምትመጣ ከቤተሰብ።። ከመጣች ያው
jəmɨttɨmət'a kəbetəsəb kəmət't'aʧʧ jaw
REL:COMP:2SG.F:come:3SG.F from:family if:come:3SG.F that:itself
'There is a girl who comes from my family tomorrow, Saturday. If she comes'

b. Zubeda: **መግባትሽ አይቀርም።።**
məgɨbatɨʃ ajk'ərɨm
NMLZ:enter:2SG.F.GEN NEG:3 SG.M:remain.IPFV:NEGCOMP
'You (SG, F) most probably enter'

c. Habiba: **አዎ።። ያው በዛ አጋጣሚ እንግዲህ መገኘት የሚችል**
awo jaw bəzza aggat'ami ɨngdih məggəɲət jəmiʧɨl
yes that:itself with:that occasion thus INF:PASS:find REL:COMP:3SG.M be_able
ሰው ካለ ፕሮግራም ይዘን
səw kallə progɨram jɨzən
person if:exist:3SGM program arrange:1PL.CVB
'Yes. If anyone can come, we will make an arrangement and'

And the eleventh method, the combination of asking a follow-up question (FQ) and suggestive form that encourages others to continue to speak (SF), is again found in the adolescents' as well as in the adults' conversations. In extract (158) below, Betel says what is in line (c). Her speech contains two strategies of selecting Kelemework to speak next. The strategies are used one after

the other in the same line. The question is a follow up question and the interjection **እ** *ɨ* 'yes?' is an urge to Kelemework to speak.

(158) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.3, lines 4-6,8)

a. Betel: **ጅኦ አሳይመንቱን ሰራሽ**?
ʤɨo assajməntun sərraʃ
geo assignment:DEF:ACC do.PFV: 2SG.F
'Did you (SG, F) do Geo assignment?'

b. Kelemework: **አዎ። ቀላል እኮ ነው።።**
awo k'əlal ɨkko nəw
yes easy truly be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'Yes. It is easy.'

c. Betel: **ጨርሰሻል ሁሉንም**? **እ**
ʧ'ərrɨsəʃal hullunɨm ɨ
finish.PFV:2SG.F:AUX all:ACC:FOC huh
'Have you (SG, F) finished all? 'Eh?'

d. Kelemework: **ትንሽ ይቀረኛል።።**
tɨnnɨʃ jɨk'ərəŋŋal
little 3SG.M:remain:3SG.M:1SG.OBJ:AUX
'I am left with little.'

Etalem, the adult, uses the follow up question **ማልክ እንደ**? *malk ɨnde ə* 'did you make an oath not to drink coffee anymore?'. Extract (159) below is the evidence.

(159) Extract (adults) (Ref. Appendix 4.10, lines 239-242)

a. Etalem: **እምቢ አለኝ እኮ።።… በኋላ በግድ መጣ።።**
ɨmbbi aləŋ ɨkko bəh^{w}ala bəgɨdd mət't'a
no say.PFV:3SG.M:1SG.IO truly later by:force come.PFV.3SG.M
እንካ አህመድ።።
ɨnka ahməd
here_you_are Ahmed
'He refused. Later he came without his interest. Here you are Ahmed.'

b. Ahmed: **ምን ቡና ልጠጣ ብለሽ ነው**?
mɨn bunna lɨt'ət't'a bɨləʃ nəw
what coffee PROS:1SG:drink say:2SG.F.CVB be.PFV:3SG.M.NPST
'Do you suggest that I drink coffee?'

c. Etalem: **ማልክ እንደ**? **ሻ**?
malk ɨnde ə
make_oath.PFV:2SG.M Q eh
'Did you make an oath not to drink coffee anymore?'

d. Ahmed: **አዎ። ቡና ጡሩ አይለም…።።**
awo bunna t'uru adelləm
yes coffee good be.NEG.PFV.NPST:3SG.M:NEGCOMP
'Yes. Coffee is not good.'

Last, only the adolescents use the second combined method, a question for repetition (QR) PLUS a follow up question (FQ). In (160) below, Sulman uses **እ**? *ɨ* 'huh?' to ask for repetition and

immediately say the follow up question ምነ·? *mɨnu* 'about what?' to get clarification from Salman about the idea found in line (a).

(160) Extract (adolescents) (Ref. Appendix 4.6, lines 681-682)

a. Salman: አይደብርህም?
ajdəbbɨrɨhɨm
NEG:3SG.M:depress.IPFV:2SG.M.OBJ:NEGCOMP
'Aren't you (SG, M) thoughtful?'

b. Sulman: እ? ምነ·?
ɨ mɨnu
huh what:DEF
'Huh? About what?'

The fact that adolescents and adults each use eleven methods of selecting next speakers indicates that there is insignificant difference between them in the variety of this discourse feature they use. In other words, age and choice of variants of strategies of selecting next speakers are not related to each other.

4.10.4. Summary

In summary, there is little difference between adolescents and adults in the rate at which they select next speakers using the other-selection mechanism. There is also no difference between them in the variety of methods of selecting next speakers.

4.11. Back Channeling Utterances

4.11.1. Types of Back Channeling Utterances and Their Variants

Back channeling utterances are minimal forms that speakers use to show "supportive and engaged listenership" (Lambertz 2011, 11). "The term backchannel refers to 'main' channel being the person who is holding the floor - the speaker - and the 'back' channel being the addressed recipient of the talk - the listener - who gives information without claiming the floor" (Lambertz 2011, 12). Back channeling utterances can also be used to indicate lack of interest in the conversation (Halliday 1994, 154).

Two hundred fifty-one tokens of such utterances are identified from the recordings used for this study. Adolescents use 146 of the 251 tokens and adult use 155. This indicates that adults use the greater number of variants than adolescents do. Therefore, they are better than the adolescents in diversifying variants. The complete list of the utterances is given in Appendix 9.

Lambertz (2011, 12) classifies the utterances that different researchers designate as backchannels into three based on the level of referential meaning they carry. The researcher has made some amendment to the classification so that it can accommodate the Amharic instances involved in this study. The categories are:

1. Non-lexical backchannels – They are interjections with a minimal referential meaning or no meaning at all, and used to express emotions, to show attentiveness, to encourage the speaker to continue to speak etc. Examples found in the corpus include **ኧ** *ə* (equivalent to 'aha' in function – expressing attentiveness), **እ**? *ɨ* (equivalent to the English 'huh?' in function – requesting for repair), **እኧ** *ɨə* (equivalent to 'eh'in function – expressing surprise), **እሀ** *ɨhɨ* (equivalent to the English 'aha' in function – expressing one's understanding), and **ሀ** *hɨ*, a sound made in the throat by inhaling air quickly and forcibly through the mouth and used to express agreement.
2. Lexical and phrasal backchannels – These are expressions that listeners use to show their agreement to, acceptance of, assessments about speakers' ideas etc. The particles **አዎ** *awo* 'yes' (used to express agreement), **እሺ** *ɨffi* 'ok' (used to express acceptance), **ኧረ በጣም** *ərə bət'am* 'yes, of course?' (used to express affirmation) derived from the corpus represent this category.
3. Substantive backchannels – They are expressions that stand as turns by themselves and that carry elaborated referential meaning. They include repetitions, questions of clarification and restatement, sentence completions, and so forth (Duncan 1972, 288). The utterances **ምን**? *mɨn* 'what?', and **እንዴት**? *ɨndet* 'how?' found in the corpus fall in this category.

4.11.2. Distribution of Back Channeling Utterances

The distribution of the back channeling utterances is the first aspect that is used to determine the preference of the age groups for the feature and the groups' communicative behaviors implied by their preference. The frequency of the utterances in each social category is displayed in Tables 57-60.

Table 57 Distribution of back channeling utterances across the age groups

Age Category	N	Total no of Words	Back Channeling Utterances			P
			Raw N	Rated N	%	
Adolescent	27	34799	1233	35.43	41.20	0.026
Adult	27	31049	1570	50.57	58.80	
Total	54	65848	2803	86.00	100	

As it is shown in Table 57, adults use the majority of the back channeling utterances when compared to the adolescents. By implication, adults are the major users of back channeling utterances. In other words, adults seem to be better listeners and they give more opportunity to others to speak than adolescents do. The statistical test also indicates that there is significant relationship between the two age groups.

Table 58 Distribution of back channeling utterances across the genders

Gender	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Back Channeling Utterances			N	Total no of Words	Back Channeling Utterances		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
Male	14	15805	478	30.24	43.21	13	16172	726	45.02	44.22
Female	13	18994	755	39.75	56.79	14	14877	844	56.80	55.78
Total	27	34799	1233	69.99	100	27	31049	1570	101.82	100

Table 58 presents that the female members of each age group use the larger amount of the back channeling utterances found in the conversations of their respective age groups. This indicates that the women lead the men in both age cohorts. This data have three implications. First, the female subcategory of both age groups prefer to listen than to speak or they have little interest to talk when compared to their male counterparts. In addition, female adults are at the forefront in enabling their age cohort to surpass the adolescent age cohort in the use of back channeling utterances. Finally, the fact that the females lead in both age groups indicates that gender predicts the difference between the two age groups with regard to the use of back channeling utterances.

Table 59 Distribution of back channeling utterances across socioeconomic groups

Socio-economic Group	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Back Channeling Utterances			N	Total no of Words	Back Channeling Utterances		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
LSG	15	18554	636	34.28	48.26	14	14731	716	48.61	48.15
MSG	12	16245	597	36.75	51.74	13	16318	854	52.34	51.85
Total	27	34799	1233	71.03	100	27	31049	1570	100.95	100

As it is presented in Table 59 above, the MSG adolescents use the greater amount of the back channeling utterances picked up from the adolescent corpus. This shows that the MSG of the adolescents favors such expressions more than the LSG does. The same pattern happens to the adults. The MSG uses the majority of the discourse feature as the LSG uses the lower amount.

Two realities can be inferred from the data. First, the MSG is the key player when adults lead the adolescents in the use of back channeling utterances. Second, socioeconomic grouping does have a consistent effect across the age groups.

Table 60 Distribution of back channeling utterances across the two religions

Religion	Adolescents					Adults				
	N	Total no of Words	Back Channeling Utterances			N	Total no of Words	Back Channeling Utterances		
			Raw N	Rated N	%			Raw N	Rated N	%
Christian	11	16084	566	35.19	49.68	13	17934	872	48.62	47.74
Muslim	16	18715	667	35.64	50.32	14	13115	698	53.22	52.26
Total	27	34799	1233	70.83	100	27	31049	1570	101.84	100

As shown in Table 60 above, Christian and Muslim adolescents use almost equal amounts of back channeling utterances. The difference is not significant. Among the adults, Muslims use the greater amount when they are compared with Christians. This implies that, in the adult age group, Muslims are the dominant users of back channeling utterances. They also help the adults more than Christians do to be ahead of the adolescents. But generally, religion in general has no a consistent effect on the choice of this discourse feature by the two age groups.

4.11.3. The Most Frequent Back Channeling Utterances

The most top three back channeling utterances used by the adolescents are **አዎ** *awo* 'yes' (agreement) with 258 occurrences (21.01% of all), the continuative **እ** *i* 'mmh' with 211

occurrences (17.18% of all) and **አዎ** *awo* 'yes' (a positive response to a yes/no question) with 161 occurrences (13.11% of all). The same variants take the top position in the adult corpus but their order has some difference. The item **አዎ** *awo* 'yes' (agreement) occurs 359 times (22.87% of all), **አዎ** *awo* (a positive response to a yes/no question) 169 times (10.76% of all), and the continuative **እ** *i* 'mmh' 151 times (9.62% of all). This implies that there is no age group that specially favors a single back channeling utterance.

4.11.4. Summary

To summarize, adults lead adolescents both in using more back channeling utterances and in diversifying the variants. Females, the MSG and Muslims contribute the greater for them to be in this position. When the three social factors are considered in general, gender and socioeconomic grouping are found to have a predictive power on the relationship between the age groups in the use of back channeling utterances as religion does not have this power. However, the age groups do not have difference in the variants of back channeling utterances they favor most.

4.12. General Communicative Behaviors of Adolescents and Adults

In this section the responses to the interview are presented.

4.12.1. Time Members of the Two Age Groups Spend Together

Among twenty-seven adolescents, eighteen responded that they pass most of their time with their age-mates while only nine spend enough time with adults. Among twenty-one adults, eighteen reported that they spend most of their time with other adults; only three pass significant amount of time with adolescents. This shows that the two age groups have little shared time. This might have contributed for their differences in their preferences for the discourse features under study.

The reasons the adolescents told for this little shared time are: there are few adults around the adolescents; the adolescents pass most of their time in school with other adolescents; and they spend most of their time studying.

4.12.2. Their Interest to Spend Time Together

Five adolescents have very great interest to pass time with adults; eight great interest; seven medium interest; and seven low interest. In other words, the level of interest of almost half of the adolescents is not satisfactory. Among those with little interest some directly express the case using strong statements: they do not like talkativeness (by implication adolescents think that adults are talkative); it is not proper to stay with adults for long; and it is good to make the time with adults limited. The reasons of most of the adolescents for having medium and low interest to pass time with adults are: they fear that they may proceed into fight with the adults; they cannot talk freely with adults; they do not understand one another; adults talk about backward things and adolescents do not like that; and adults always talk about their past deeds. This implies that adolescents and adults have behavioral and interest differences that prevent them from passing time together.

The ones who have interest to pass time with adults reveal the reasons why they develop the interest. They like to listen to the adults' accounts of old happenings, tales, stories, sayings, proverbs and jokes; the adults tell them their past experiences (their ups and down in life) so that they can learn from them; it gives them a pleasure to listen to adults' old language; they like adults' advices, encouragements and words of comfort; the adults tell them good things. They also express that they like the poems the adults recite. They again said that they appreciate and learn from the expressive nature and good language use of adults. In addition, they regard adults as language and history preservation agents.

What is contradictory is that though thirteen of the adolescents have the interest to pass time with adults, only nine translate their interest into practice. This may be because their reasons for developing the interest do not require them to pass long time together: they like to be with adults only to listen to tales, narratives of past experiences, jokes, proverbs, sayings and advices as stated in the above paragraph. They take the adults more as entertainers. Therefore, in similar way as entertainers are needed occasionally, adults are needed by adolescents infrequently.

Among nineteen adults responded to the interview, five have very great interest to pass time with adolescents; four have great interest; seven have medium interest; one has low interest; and two have very low interest. Eight did not respond. The interest of nine of the adults is at a significant

level as that of the ten is not. Therefore, it is difficult to conclude that the interest of adults to pass time with adolescent is up to the required level.

What is more, though there are interested adults, most of the origins of their interest do not naturally enable them to spend more time with adolescents. Among seven origins they reported, five are mere instrumental and unilateral: caring for the adolescents; helping the adolescents in their problems; teaching life principles to the adolescents; preparing the adolescents for the next life stage; and getting new information from the adolescents. Only two are related to socializing: liking the talk of the adolescents; and believing that youngsters are open-minded. Only these two are related to adolescents' current attractive personality and communicative behaviors. The other purposes are instrumental. Instrumental purposes do not create relaxed atmosphere and intimate relationship. The unilateralism also makes the interaction dominantly one way. In cases where relaxed atmosphere and intimate relationship are lacking and the interaction is dominantly one way, adults cannot have long time together with adolescents.

4.12.3. Dislikes of the Age Groups about Each Other's Communicative Behaviors

As the adolescents report, the communicative behaviors of adults that they do not like are the following: the adults do a lot of advice and rebuke; they talk long; they repeat ideas again and again; they impose their beliefs on adolescents; they give great weight to things to which adolescents do not; they shout and get angry at adolescents; they talk about themselves; they do not listen to adolescents; when adolescents fail to comply with their orders, they count it as a disrespect; they backbite others; they are not transparent; they use words of undermining and dislike about females; they always talk about price hikes and other gloomy aspects of life, about harmful traditions and about their harmful past accomplishments; and their speech is full of expressions of hatred, satire, insult, irony, sarcasm and curse. These also contribute for the reduction of the time the adolescents pass together with adults.

The adults have also commented about the communicative behaviors of adolescents. They reported that adolescents use insulting, obscene, slang, and taboo words; they tease girls; they quarrel among themselves; they distort the structure of the language; they are not thoughtful; they mock and despise their elders; they consider what the elders suggest and think is old-fashioned; they make fun out of adults' talks; they do not listen to adults; their language is

different from that of the adults; they count themselves as knowing all; they are talkative; they lie; they usually talk about sex and going abroad; they are rigid; and they are hasty. These make the gap between the two age groups wide and the time they could pass together small. All of these comments are too powerful to repel adults away from the adolescents.

4.12.4. Understanding of Each Other's Interest

According to the interview, six adolescents think that adults have very great interest to pass time with adolescents; six think they have great interest; ten think they have a medium interest; three think they have low interest; and two did not respond. In other words, twelve believe that adults have significant level of interest as thirteen believe that the adults have no significant level of interest.

Four adults think adolescents have very great interest to pass time with adults; two think they have great interest; six think they have a medium interest; four think they have low interest; one thinks they have enough interest. But ten cannot decide. In general, seven believe that adolescents have favorable attitude towards them and ten think that adolescents do not have favorable attitude towards them.

This shows that the two age groups do have negative view about each other. This hampers their attraction to one another and limits the time they can spend together. And if they have limited common time, their language difference widens.

4.12.5. Difficulty Level the Age Groups Experience Interacting with Each Other

Seventeen adolescents interviewed find interacting with adults difficult while ten others find it easy. From the adults' side, fourteen find interacting with adolescents easy as four individuals find it to be difficult. But nine did not respond. This indicates that adolescents find the interaction more difficult than the adults do.

The reasons the adolescents forwarded for the difficulty are: they respect the adults; talking to them is to despise/dishonor them; the talks of the adults do not match the ideas the adolescents have in mind; the adults want to talk only about people of their kind; the adolescents do not get freedom to talk about everything they like while with adults; they have shortage of time; it is

difficult to understand and interpret adults' language. They also explained that they find talking with youngsters easier than talking to adults.

The reason of 'respect' has a relationship with the Ethiopian culture that discourages children from talking with adults and from relating silence with meekness. The other reasons point to the differences between the two age groups in topic choice, to the censuring and indirect talking styles of adults, and to liberal, care free, and straight forward talking styles of adolescents.

The adults also suggest that to make interaction with adolescents easy adults should not try to approach them with an adult behavior. If adults do so, adolescents do not want to relate with them. They need a relaxed atmosphere to say whatever they need in any way they like.

4.12.6. Communicative Behaviors of Adolescents and Adults

The comments people of each age give about the other imply important points about their communicative behaviors. The following table summarizes the communicative behaviors of each age group. The communicative behaviors are listed in a manner that the contrast between any two behaviors, one from each age cohort, with regard to basic features of communication can be seen clearly.

Table 61 Communicative behaviors of adolescents and adults

	Adolescents	**Adults**
Temporality	Interested to talk about the present	Interested to talk about their past experiences
Formality	Liking swear words, teasing, obscene words, slang, coined words	Liking formal language
Independence	Seeking independence, rejecting advice	Giving a lot of advice, rebuking, censuring, shouting towards adolescents
Confidence	Feeling to have enough knowledge about what to do, having low interest in guidance from adults	Counting adolescents as children, underestimating them
Topic choice	Liking topics that create fun and adventure	Liking to talk about livelihood and other tough aspects of life
Level of expressiveness	Transparent and straightforward	Being reserved, indirect and diplomatic
Care	Hasty	Thoughtful
Conventionality	Inclined to use nonstandard language	Inclined to using standard language
Allegiance to tradition	Rejecting tradition	Conservative
Topic shift	Changing topics fast	Dwelling on one issue
Communicativeness	Easily communicative	Not easily communicative

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Discussion

The interaction between the present results and the existing body of literature on discourse variation has modified the internal coherence of the field of variation research in general and discourse research in particular. For example, the fact that the classes of comment adjuncts and response tokens dominate among the most favored interpersonal discourse markers in both age groups (Section 4.1.3) contrasts with Barbieri's (2008, 67, 75) finding that the attention getter *hey* and the exclamative *wow* dominate among the interpersonal discourse markers of American younger speakers, while older speakers favor most the exclamatives *gosh* and *oops*. This difference between the present result in Ethiopia and that of Barbieri in America appears to strengthen Saez's (2003) claim that one community emphasizes some types of discourse markers and the other community other types. This confirms also the hypothesis stated in the beginning of the study that variation in a European language may not necessarily imply variation in a non-European language (Section 1.2).

The small difference between the age groups in the size of variants of discourse markers (see Section 4.1) also stands in contrast to Barbieri's (2008, 67) report that the youth use a wide variety of such discourse feature as stated in Section 2.5. This difference may be caused by the fact that the upper age limit of the younger group of participants of Barbieri's study goes beyond eighteen, the maximum age limit for the adolescent category, and her finding does not precisely represent the adolescent age group. Barbieri follows the etic approach in which people are classified into broad age ranges without any criteria but the present study uses the emic approach in which the psychosocial characteristics of people are used as basis for the classification. This makes the present finding more meaningful than Barbieri's.

The fact that the difference between the two age groups in the usage frequency of the quotative **አለ** *ələ* 'said' is bigger than the difference in the quotative **ነው** *nəw* 'it is' and the null quotative (Section 4.2) is consistent with Cameron's finding (1998, 70) that with increasing age the use of

verbs of direct reporting becomes more frequent, while the use of the speaker-centered reporting and free-standing variants decreases (Section 2.5).

However, one of the present findings (Section 4.2.2), in which the socioeconomic status only has a weak predicting power for the two quotatives (**ኣለ** *alə* 'said' and the null quotative) do not conform with Cameron's claim that reporting verbs are more preferred by members of the lower class than by the upper class, which dominantly uses freestanding construction. There are two possible reasons for the disagreement. First, the research designs are different from each other. Cameron's (1998, 74) data stem from sociolinguistic interviews with questions that are designed to elicit only data on quotatives, but the present study derives its data from casual conversations that are not predetermined. Second, there are differences in the statistical procedures. Cameron (1998, 74) first puts the raw frequencies of all the quotatives used by each age group in rank and then compares the ranks. But the present study makes a comparison between rated frequencies each quotative has in different age groups. As a result, the current study is based on data from natural situations because rated frequency considers the length of talk on the probability of the occurrence of a discourse feature, but raw frequency does not.

In addition, as discussed in Section 4.2 about quotatives, gender has a weak predictive power on the relationship between the two age groups in their choice of **ኣለ** *alə* 'said' and the null quotative. In spite of its methodological differences from this study, Cameron's (1998, 74) research reaches the same conclusion. His study proves that there is no coherent generalizable relationship between males and females in their use of quotative constructions across age groups (see Section 2.6).

Former research also shows similar results to the present with regard to slang. As described in Section 4.3, adolescents lead adults in the frequency and variety of slang expressions they use. Former findings reviewed in Section 2.5 demonstrate that slang is typical to adolescents, while adults prefer standard forms to slang (Holmes 1992, 183; Eckert 2003, 114; Barbieri 2008, 64). This shows that the adolescents' obsession with slang is a universal phenomenon. Slang is so common among adolescents because they count it as a sign of group solidarity and a mark of distinctiveness from the adult community (Holmes 1992, 183; Eckert 2003, 114; Reyes 2005). But it does not mean that all adolescents are equally interested in slang. The present study shows that the lower socioeconomic group contributes the greater share for the adolescents to be in the

leading position (Section 4.3.2). This agrees with Eckert's (2003, 114) finding that adolescents of the lower social status play the higher role in creating and propagating slang.

The middle socioeconomic group's use of lower amount of slang in both age groups when compared to the lower socioeconomic group, its lower preference for vulgar expressions and its avoidance of the vocatives **አንተ** *anttə* 'you' (SG,M) and **አንቺ** *anʧi* 'you' (SG,F) is compatible with Mallinson's (2007, 156-160) argument that the speech of people with high social status is usually careful, regulated and formal. This also shows that socioeconomic status has strong predictive power on formality and carefulness in selecting utterances.

In contrary to socioeconomic grouping, the impact of gender on the selection of slang lacks consistency across the age groups. Among the adolescents, men use more slang than women, but among the adults the reverse is true. This does not agree with the claims of former research (e.g. Watt and Milroy 1999, 30, 41; Cheshire, Kerswill, and Williams 2005, 146; Milroy and Milroy 1998, 38; Schilling-Estes and Wolfram 1994, 298; Sundgren 2009, 118-124; and Chambers 2003a, 267-268) that the English and Swedish speaking men of both adolescent and adult age groups tend to use non-standard and local phonological and syntactic forms, while women prefer standard and prestigious variants (See section 2.6). Since, in the present study, gender is not a factor that conditions the preference to slang, Chambers' (2003a, 267) statement that the relationship between gender and linguistic variability is generally predictable is challenged; at least slang use makes the relationship unpredictable. Rather, the explanation of Eckert and McConnel-Ginet's (2003) that only women of the western societies tend to use standard forms because as a custom women in those societies are engaged in the types of jobs that demand the use of standard language seem to be plausible.

Two additional implications are drawn from the above comparison. First results on syntax and phonology may not predict results on discourse. Second, research results on English and Swedish cannot be generalized for Amharic because the Amharic speaking community has its own characteristics not shared by speakers of English and Swedish. For instance, unlike empowered women in the highly civilized societies through the feminist movement, Ethiopian women are not well aware at least of the fact that they can exploit the potential of language "to assert their authority and position" (Holmes 1999, 167) in the society.

Another source of challenge to former findings is the finding about question tags. Lack of consistency in the differences between the socioeconomic groupings across the age groups in the use of tags in general (see Section 4.5) is incompatible with Bernstein's (1971) claim that circularity of speech in tags is typical for the working class. The difference may be caused by the nature of social divisions in Ethiopia vis-à-vis the societies Bernstein (1971) used as a source of data. As discussed in Section 2.3, socioeconomic groups in Ethiopia are not as segregated from one another as in the countries that have a long capitalist background so that their discourses are not highly specialized.

The findings on other discourse features do not totally reject former findings. Adolescents' lead in second person pronouns as addressing terms (Section 4.6) and vulgar language (Section 4.8) has a universal nature. As presented in Section 2.5, Barbieri (2008, 68) has found out that American young speakers use the English *you* as an addressing term more frequently than the older speakers do. She relates adolescents' higher use of the addressing term with their higher desire to involve others in the discourse when compared to adults. Besides, Section 4.8 demonstrates that more adolescents than adults use vulgar language. The similarity of this result with Holmes' (1992, 183) review shows that adolescents' pervasive use of vulgar language and less interest of adults in it is not dependent on any other social factor but on age. Adolescents' lead in diversifying variants is again in line with Eckert's (2003, 115) claim that they are fond of creating new forms and new meanings because they are engaged in repeated activities of identity formation and adjustment. However, the narrowing down of the differences in their use of vulgar language between men and women as they grow older (Section 4.8) is new. Though it is difficult to account for this controversy, it points out that additional research should be conducted in different settings to verify the case.

5.2. Conclusions

The study was concerned with the differences that exist between the discourses of adolescents and adults. In particular, first, it identifies the features in which adolescent and adult discourses differ. Next, it considers the influence of gender, socioeconomic status, and religion on the differences. Furthermore, it examines the implication of the differences in the discourses for the

communicative behavior of adolescents and adults. Finally, it discusses the probable reasons for the differences in discourse between the age groups.

It was based on recordings of conversations of twenty-seven adolescents and twenty-seven adults of Kombolcha town in the South Wollo Zone of the Amhara Regional State. Then twenty-five discourse features that are grouped into eleven types, namely discourse markers, quotatives, slang, repair strategies, tag questions, addressing terms, vowing expressions, vulgar language, speech overlap, speaker selection, and back channeling responses were selected and compared. In addition, interviews were conducted with all participants to supplement the conversational data. The conclusions drawn from the results found from the data colleceted through these instruments are explained in subsections 5.2.1 to 5.2.4 below.

5.2.1. The Discourse Features in which the Adolescents and Adults Differ

Generally, adolescents surpass adults in the frequency of eighteen discourse features, namely textual discourse markers, interpersonal discourse markers, slang, other-initiation self-repair, other initiation other-repair, epistemic modal tags, affective tags, proper names (addressing terms), second person pronouns (addressing terms), terms of intimacy (addressing terms), descriptive phrases (addressing terms), pseudonyms, mixed addressing terms, bad wishes (vowing), declaration of seriousness or truthfulness (vowing), religious terms (vowing), vulgar language, and speech overlap. Adults, however, surpass adolescents only in six discourse features. They are: the quotative **አለ** /alə/ 'said', the quotative **ነው** /nəw/ 'it is', the null quotative, self-initiation self-repair, zero addressing terms, and back channeling utterances. The two age groups only have a similar frequency with regard to a single discourse feature, namely other selection of next speakers. This distribution clearly indicates that there are age-caused differences in the discourses of adolescents and adults.

The discourse features involved in the study of use (function) are the null quotative, the quotative **ነው** *nəw* 'it is', tags, vowing expressions, and vulgar language (Sections 4.2.3, 4.53, 4.7.3 and 4.8.3). The null quotative, vowing expressions, and vulgar language are more frequent in the discourses of adolescents whereas only tag has a higher frequency in adult conversations. There is no difference between the age groups regarding one discourse feature, the quotative **ነው** *nəw* 'it is'. In general, adolescents lead adults in diversifying the uses of discourse features.

The discourse features involved in the study of the diversity of variants are discourse markers, slang, initiating others for repair, tags, terms of intimacy for addressing, descriptive phrases for addressing, vulgar language, methods of selecting next speakers, and back channeling utterances (Sections 4.1.1, 4.3.1, 4.4.3, 4.5.1, 4.6.3, 4.8.1, 4.10.3 and 4.11.1). The adolescents surpass the adults in six of these discourse features, namely slang, the number of strategies of initiating others to repair their speech they apply, tags, terms of intimacy (addressing terms), descriptive phrases (addressing terms), and vulgar expressions. Adults are ahead of the adolescents only in the discourse feature back channeling utterances. There is no difference between the age groups regarding discourse markers and methods of selecting next speakers. Thus the differences in variants between the two age groups are greater than their similarities. Adolescents lead in diversifying variants.

The age groups were also compared for their motivations behind the occurrence of certain discourse features. Adolescents use other-repair for six reasons, namely speaker's forgetting of information, lack of knowledge of the correct information, refusal to self-correct, maintaining tone, sluggishness to self-repair, and holding the troublesome utterances as the integral part of one's communication behavior (Section 4.4.4). Adults, however, have only one reason that led them into other-repair, viz, sluggishness to self-repair. Thus adolescents lead adults in the varieties of reasons that forced them to repair others.

The two groups, in contrast, do not differ in their causes for overlapping their speech and the relationship between the frequency of overlaps and the time the talk takes (Sections 4.9.1 and 4.9.3). The main three causes of overlap for both groups are lack of tolerance to wait for the first speaker to finish his speech, coincidence, and the need to give additional information. The length of talk and the number of overlaps are also strongly directly related to each other in both groups, but even stronger among adolescents.

The discourse features involved in the study of the most favored variants are textual discourse markers, interpersonal discourse markers, slang, vowing expressions, and back channeling utterances (Sections 4.1.3, 4.3.3, 4.7.5 and 4.11.3). The comparison shows a difference between the age groups regarding two features (textual discourse markers and the slang) but no contrasts in three (interpersonal discourse markers, vowing expressions, and back channeling utterances).

Adolescents are different from adults in certain applications of different discourse features. First, they use two types of addressing terms and two vowing expressions together (Sections 4.6.3 and 4.7.4). Next, they use long and emphatic forms of vowing expressions like **ወላሂ ለአዚም** *wəllahi ləazim* 'I swear to Allah and His Name", **ወላሂ ላል** *wəllahi lal* 'I swear to Allah", **ወላሂ ቢላሂ** *wəllahi billahi* 'I swear to Allah, the Creator' and **ወላሂ ቢላሂ ክምር** *wəllahi billahi kəmmɨr* 'I swear to Allah, the Creator. I am serious'. And then, male adolescents address each other in intimate contexts using **አንቺ** *anʧi*, the feminine and singular form of the pronoun 'you' (Section 4.6.3). None of the adults do these.

The study on the use of repair strategies has given forth additional interesting results (Section 4.4). Adolescents' repetitive and unreasonable ignoring to requests for repair and yet not causing resentment on the part of the ignored participant makes one to think seriously about the differences in psychological makeup of the two age groups. What is more, adults' greater reliance on other-initiation to repair their troublesome utterances, and adolescents' better position in identifying their own problems instantly is remarkable since it is generally the adults who are thought to have learned from experience to be more cautious about their speech. Finally, the fact that other-repair is more rampant among adolescents than among adults indicates that adolescents reveal their criticalness more directly than adults do.

5.2.2. The Impact of Gender, Socioeconomic Status and Religion on the Differences

The impact of gender, socioeconomic status and religion on the differences in the distribution of the discourse features was investigated from two perspectives: the contribution of these social factors to any of the age groups to surpass the other, and their power to predict the differences.

Regarding gender, males are observed to play the greater role when the two age groups differ from one another in eleven discourse features, namely the quotative **አለ** *alə* 'said', the null quotative, slang, other-initiation self-repair, affective tags, second person pronouns (addressing terms), descriptive phrases (addressing terms), mixed addressing terms, bad wishes (vowing), religious terms (vowing), and vulgar language while females do so in nine features, namely textual discourse markers, the quotative **ነው** *nəw* 'it is', other-initiation other-repair, proper

names (addressing terms), terms of intimacy (addressing terms), zero addressing terms, declaration of seriousness or truthfulness (vowing), speech overlap, and back channeling utterances; gender has no special role in four discourse features, namely interpersonal discourse markers, epistemic modal tags, self-initiation self-repair and pseudonyms (addressing terms). This implies that males appear to be the major instigators of discourse differences between the age groups.

Among the two socioeconomic groups, the lower one contributes the greater proportion for differences in seventeen discourse features, namely interpersonal discourse markers, the quotative **አለ** *alə* 'said', the null quotative, the quotative **ነው** *nəw* 'it is', slang, other-initiation other-repair, affective tags, proper names (addressing terms), terms of intimacy (addressing terms), second person pronouns (addressing terms), descriptive phrases (addressing terms), zero addressing terms, mixed addressing terms, bad wishes (vowing), religious terms (vowing), vulgar language, and speech overlap. The middle socioeconomic group plays the greater role only in two features, namely declaration of seriousness or truthfulness (vowing) and back channeling utterances. None of the two groups has a special role in the following five discourse features: interpersonal discourse markers, self-initiation self-repair, other-initiation self-repair, epistemic modal tags, and pseudonyms (addressing terms). This indicates that the lower socioeconomic group is in the forefront in inciting differences between adolescents and adults.

The role of the two religions is similar to that of gender. Christians play the greater role for differences in eleven discourse features, namely the quotative **ነው** *nəw* 'it is', other-initiation self-repair, other-initiation other-repair, epistemic modal tags, descriptive phrases (addressing terms), zero addressing terms, pseudonyms, mixed addressing terms, bad wishes (vowing), declaration of seriousness or truthfulness (vowing), and speech overlap. Muslims play the greater role for differences in the following ten features: interpersonal discourse markers, the quotative **አለ** *alə* 'said', the null quotative, slang, affective tags, proper names (addressing terms), terms of intimacy (addressing terms), second person pronouns (addressing terms), religious terms (vowing), and back channeling utterances. None of the two religions has a special effect on three discourse features, i.e., textual discourse markers, self-initiation self-repair, and vulgar language.

In general, males, the lower socioeconomic group and Christians are more involved in causing discourse differences but their level of influence varies. Being a member of the lower socioeconomic group is more decisive in creating discourse differences than being a male or a Christian.

The three social factors also fall into different levels according to their power to predict the differences between the adolescents and the adults in their use of the discourse features. Gender plays a significant role in affecting the difference in eleven discourse features, namely the quotative ነው *nəw* 'it is', other-initiation other-repair, affective tags, addressing with proper names, addressing with terms of intimacy, addressing with second person pronouns, addressing with descriptive phrases, vowing with declaration of seriousness or truthfulness, vulgar language, speech overlap, and back channeling utterances; socioeconomic grouping in eleven, namely interpersonal discourse markers, the quotative ነው *nəw* 'it is', proper names, addressing with terms of intimacy, addressing with second person pronouns, addressing with descriptive phrases, vowing by making bad wishes, vowing with declaration of seriousness or truthfulness, vowing by using religious terms, vulgar language, and back channeling utterances; and religion in five, namely textual discourse markers, interpersonal discourse markers, other-initiation other-repair, vowing by making bad wishes, and vowing by using religious terms. In general, gender and socioeconomic grouping are at the top but religion is in a second place.

5.2.3. The Implications of the Discourse Differences about Communicative Behaviors of the Two Age Groups

The discourse features in which the age groups differ imply differences in their communicative behaviors. The first difference lies with recognition and singularization to interlocutors. Adolescents choose the types of addressing terms that give people recognition more than the adults do and by doing so they honor individuality. On the contrary, adults are ahead of adolescents in using the types of addressing terms that blur the identity of people. In other words, they promote anonymity (Section 4.6.2).

The second point of difference is the level of intimacy the interlocutors create among themselves. Adolescents' addressing of the males in the feminine form of 'you' አንቺ *antʃi,* and their lead in the use of the terms of intimacy and the endearment forms for addressing one

another indicate the increased informality and the sense of closeness that exists among them when compared to the adults (Section 4.6.3).

The third is related to people's attitude towards their interlocutors. Adults' use of less slang, vowing expressions and vulgar language than adolescents do indicates that they lead in politeness, formality and reliance on validity of information and logic (Sections 4.3.2, 4.7.2 and 4.8.2). What amplifies adolescents' greater impoliteness when compared to the adults is their use of most of their vulgar expressions against people with whom they talk; the adults refrain from doing so (Section 4.8.2). In addition, adolescents' lead in ignoring requests for repair indicates their negligence to their co-participants (Section 4.4.5).

Fourth, the two age groups differ in their skill in handling language as instrument of communication. The varieties of ways adolescents use to bring forth new slang expressions, and their formation of new terms of intimacy by affixation and mixing of addressing terms show that they are experts in using language creatively, flexibly and innovatively (Section 4.3.1). Adults do not have this behavior.

Fifth, adolescents being leaders in tags in general shows that they like to develop discourse more cooperatively with their addressees than adults do (Section 4.5.2).

The sixth difference is on the way people maintain their credibility. Adolescents vow more frequently possibly because there is a general adult belief that youngsters do not tell a truth nor are serious about their promises (Section 4.7.2). The adolescents vow in order that they can increase their acceptability. The other possible reason is that since adolescent communication is full of fierce antagonisms, jeering and direct rejections, the adolescents accompany their statements with vowing to prevent these unnecessary responses from friends. On the contrary, the reason for adults to vow less is that adult listeners normally express their opposition and disapprovals to what they listen to so tactfully that the speakers are not preoccupied with fears of abrupt disqualification of their ideas; therefore, they do not need to add vowing to their speeches.

Seventh, as it is inferred from the interview data, the age groups show differences in topic choice and topic shift (Section 4.12.6). Adolescents prefer topics that create fun and adventure while adults mostly talk on serious and tough issues of life. Adolescents also shift topics quickly as adults dwell on one topic for longer time.

Eighth, there are differences in communicative styles between the age groups. The interview contains a lot of evidences that adults have censuring, indirect, formal and careful talking styles and adolescents prefer liberal, carefree, straightforward and informal talking styles (Section 4.12.6).

5.2.4. The Reasons for the Differences in Discourse Between the Two Age Groups

The major reason for the differences between adolescents and adults in their preferences of discourse features is lack of shared time (Section 4.12.1). The types of daily engagements of each age group are different from that of the other and this automatically makes them create relationship exclusively with their age-mates. Their awareness to their age-driven differences also makes them to repel one another to avoid the clash that would be created due to the differences. In addition, the lack of knowledge of developmental features of different age group makes each of the groups develop negative attitude towards the other. Finally, a culture that imposes silence on adolescents when being together with adults makes them to create their own independent groups where they can freely talk (Section 4.12.5).

The purposes of members of each group for which they want to pass time with the members of the other age group do not also naturally require them to pass significant time together (Section 4.12.2). Those of the adults are instrumental and unilateral: they want to pass time with adolescents because they want to care for the adolescents; help the adolescents in their problems; teach life principles to the adolescents; prepare the adolescents for the next life stage; and get new information from the adolescents. For this reason the adults cannot build an intimate relationship with adolescents and create relaxed atmosphere in mixed age companionships. Their communication also becomes one-way. The purpose of the adolescents is limited to entertainment; they like to be with the adults to listen to the stories the adults tell, the poems they recite, and the sayings, jokes, and proverbs they use in their speeches. As entertainment is naturally done occasionally, this purpose of the adolescents does not enable them to pass long time with adults.

5.3. Recommendations

Reading into the present findings indirectly shows that there are three directions of research to be further pursued so that it is possible to view what the greater picture of Amharic discourse looks like. First, the discourse features like narrative structure, techniques of opening and closing conversations, coherence, cohesion, rules of turn taking, gap, interruption, topic management, and nomenclature, which this study could not cover due to scope and methodological restrictions need be studied to make the comparison between the age groups more comprehensive. Second, the discourses of children and old people must be studied to prove whether the age-driven differences between adolescents and adults presented in this study indicate language change in progress or not. Third, the influences of the other social factors such as ethnicity and social networks, which are also not addressed in this research due to lack of baseline information, should be explored if more comprehensive understanding of the social players in the making of the Amharic discourse is sought.

REFERENCES

Adler, Ronald and George Rodman. 2003. *Understanding Human Communication*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Aitchison, Jean. 2001. Language Change. In *The Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, edited by Paul Cobley, 95–104. London: Routledge.

Aliakbari, Mohammed and Arman Toni. 2008. The Realization of Address Terms in Modern Persian in Iran: A Sociolinguistic Study. *Linguistik Online* 35, 3/08

Ash, Sharon. 2003. Social Class. In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, edited by J.K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schlling-Estes, 305-319. Oxford: Blackwell.

Barbieri, Federica. 2008. Patterns of Age-Based Linguistic Variation in American English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(1): 58–88.

Bedisti, Elena. 2004. The Influence of Social Class on the Language of School Children in Greece. PhD Thesis, University of Reading.

Bernstein, Basil. 1971. *Class, Codes and Control. London*. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Berry, Margaret. 1977. *An Introduction to Systemic Linguistics 2: Levels and Links.* London: Batsford.

Bolden, Galina. 2011. On the Organization of Repair in Multiperson Conversation: The Case of "Other"-Selection in Other-Initiated Repair Sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 44 (3): 237–262.

Bolden, Galina. 2012. Across Languages and Cultures: Brokering Problems of Understanding in Conversational Repair. *Language in Society* 41: 97–121.

Britain, David. 1992. Linguistic Change in Intonation: The Use of High-Rising Terminals in New Zealand English. *Language Variation and Change* 4 (1): 77-104.

Buchstaller, Isabelle, John R. Rickford, Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Thomas Wasow and Arnold Zwicky. 2010. The Sociolinguistics of a Short-lived Innovation: Tracing the Development of Quotative 'all' across Spoken and Internet Newsgroup Data. *Language Variation and Change* 22: 191–219.

Burridge, Kate and Margaret Florey. 2002. 'Yeah-no He's a Good Kid': A Discourse Analysis of Yeah-no in Australian English. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 22 (2): 149-171

Butler, Christopher. 2006. Functionalist Theories of Language. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* 4: 696-704.

Cameron, Richard. 1998. A Variable Syntax of Speech, Gesture, and Sound Effect: Direct Quotations in Spanish. *Language Variation and Change* 10(1): 43–83.

Central Statistical Agency. 2010. *The 2007 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia: Results for Amhara Region, Part I – Statistical Report on Population Size and Characteristics.* Addis Ababa: Central Statistical Agency.

Chambers, Jack. 1995. *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and Its Social Significance*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chambers, Jack. 2003a. Patterns of Variation Including Change. In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change,* edited by Jack Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schlling-Estes, 265-283. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chambers, Jack. 2003b. Studying Language Variation: An Informal Epistemology. In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change,* edited by Jack Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schlling-Estes, 6 – 15. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cheshire, Jenny. 2005. Syntactic Variation and Beyond: Gender and Social Class Variation in the Use of Discourse – New Markers. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9(4): 479–508.

Cheshire, Jenny. 2007. Discourse Variation, Grammaticalisation and Stuff Like That. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11 (2):155–193.

Cheshire, Jenny and Ann Williams. 2002. Information Structure in Male and Female Adolescent Talk. *Journal of English Linguistics* 30: 217-238.

Cheshire, Jenny, Paul Kerswill, and Ann Williams. 2005. On the Non-Convergence of Phonology, Grammar and Discourse. In *Dialect Change: Convergence and Divergence in European Languages*, edited by Peter Auer, Frans Hinskens and Paul Kerswill, 135–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheshire, Jenny, Paul Kerswill, Sue Fox and Eivind Torgersen. 2011. Contact, the Feature Pool and the Speech Community: The Emergence of Multicultural London English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15 (2): 151–196.

Coates, Jennifer. 2007. Gender. In *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics,* edited by Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell, 62-68. London and New York: Routledge.

Collins, W. Andrew, Tracy Gleason, and Arturo Sesma, JR. 1997. Internalization, Autonomy and Relationships: Development during Adolescence. In *Parenting and Children's*

Internalization of Values: A Handbook of Contemporary Theory, edited by Joan Grusec and Leon Kuczynski, 78-99. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Coulmas, Florian. 1998. Introduction to *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, edited by Florian Coulmas, 5-11. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer. 2000. The Sociolinguistic Distribution of and Attitudes towards Focuser 'like' and Quotative 'like'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics.*4 (1): 60-80.

Du Bois, John, Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Sussana Cumming and Danae Paolino. 1993. Outline of Discourse Transcription. In *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research,* edited by Jane Edwards and Martin Lampert, 45–90. New Jersey: Hillsdale Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eckert, Penelope. 1989. The Whole Woman: Sex and Gender Differences in Variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1(3): 245 – 267.

Eckert, Penelope. 1998. Age as a Sociolinguistic Variable. In *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, edited by Florian Coulmas, 105-115. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eckert, Penelope. 2003. Language and Adolescent Peer Groups. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 22(1):112 – 118.

Eckert, Penelope and Sally McConnel-Ginet. 2003. Language and Gender. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erman, Britt. 2001. Pragmatic Markers Revisited with a Focus on 'You Know' in Adult and Adolescent Talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(9): 1337 – 1359.

Felton, Mark. 2004. The Development of Discourse Strategies in Adolescent Argumentation. *Cognitive Development* 19(1):5. – 52.

Felton, Mark and Deanna Kuhn. 2001. The Development of Argumentative Discourse Skill. *Discourse Processes* 32(2):135-153.

Fortman, Jennifer. 2003. Adolescent Language and Communication from an Intergroup Perspective. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 22(1): 104-111.

Fox, Sue and Jenny Cheshire. 2009. A 'Youth' Variety or Long-Term Language Change? An Investigation of a Multiracial Vernacular. *NWAV 38*.

Friðriksson, Finnur. 2008. Language Change vs. Stability in Conservative Language Communities: A case Study of Icelandic. PhD Thesis, University of Gothenburg.

Garrett, Peter. 2007. Language Attitudes. In *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, edited by Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell, 116 – 121. London and New York: Routledge.

Georgakopoulou, Alexandra and Dionysis Goutsos. 1997. *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gordon, Matthew. 2007. Techniques of Analysis I: Phonological Variation. In *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, edited by Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell, 19 – 27. London and New York: Routledge.

Halliday, Michael. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Halliday, Michael and Christian Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Arnold.

Holmes, Janet. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Long man

Holmes, Janet. 1999. Setting New Standards: Sound Changes and Gender in New Zealand English. *Cuadernos de Filologia Inglesa* 8(1):147-175.

Horvath, Barbara. 1985. *Variation in Australian English: The Sociolects of Sydney*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kalat, James. 2005. *Introduction to Psychology.* Belmont: Thompson Wadsworth.

Kerswill, Paul. 2007. Social Class. In *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, edited by Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell, 51 – 61. London and New York: Routledge.

Kerswill, Paul and Ann Williams. 1999. Mobility versus Social Class in Dialect Levelling: Evidence from New and Old Towns in England. *Cuadernos de Filologia Inglesa* 8(1): 47 – 57.

Kerswill, Paul and Ann Williams. 2000. Mobility and Social Class in Dialect Levelling: Evidence from New and Old Towns in England. In *Dialect and Migration in a Changing Europe*, edited by K. Mattheier, 1–13.Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Kokeb Aberra. 1981. The Phonological Acquisition of Two Three-Year old Amharic Speaking Children Who Are from Different Socio-Economic Backgrounds. Senior Essay, Addis Ababa University.

Lambertz, Kathrin. 2011. Back-channeling: The Use of 'yeah' and 'mmm' to Portray Engaged Listenership. *Griffith Working Papers in Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication* 4 (1/2): 11-18

Lauwereyns, Shizuka. 2002. Hedges in Japanese Conversation: The Influence of Age, Sex, and Formality. *Language Variation and Change* 14: 239–259

Lennig, Matthew. 1978. Acoustic Measurement of Linguistic Change: The Modern Paris Vowel System. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Lesko, Nancy. 2002. Making Adolescence at the Turn of the Century: Discourse and the Exclusion of Girls. *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 2(2):182-191.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1989. Social Network Integration and Language Change in Progress in a Rural Alpine Village. *Language in Society* 18(2):213 – 34.

Llamas, Carmen. 2007. Age. In *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*, edited by Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell, 69 – 76. London and New York: Routledge.

Macaulay, Ronald. 2002. 'Extremely Interesting', 'Very Interesting', or Only 'Quite Interesting'? Adverbs and Social Class. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6 (3): 398–417.

Macaulay, Ronald. 2006. Pure Grammaticalization: The Development of a Teenage Intensifier. *Language Variation and Change* 18:267–283.

Mallinson, Christine. 2007. Social Class, Social Status and Stratification: Revisiting Familiar Concepts in Sociolinguistics. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 13/2: 149 – 163.

Mathisen, Ann. 1999. Sandwell, West Midlands: Ambiguous Perspectives on Gender and Models of Change. In *Urban Voices: Accent Studies in the British Isles*, edited by Paul Foulkes and Gerard Docherty, 107– 123. London: Arnold.

McCarthy, Michael. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mees, Inger and Beverley Collins. 1999. Cardiff: A Real-Time Study of Glottalization. In *Urban Voices: Accent Studies in the British Isles*, edited by Paul Foulkes and Gerard Docherty, 185 – 202. London: Arnold.

Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2006. *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. 1998. Variation and Varieties. In *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, edited by Florian Coulmas, 33 – 45. Oxford: Blackwell.

Milroy, James, Lesley Milroy, Sue Hartley and David Walshaw. 1994. Glottal Stops and Tyneside Glottalization: Competing Patterns of Variation and Change in British English. *Language Variation and Change* 3(3): 327- 357.

Milroy, Lesley and James Milroy. 1992. Social Network and Social Class: Toward an Integrated Sociolinguistic Model. *Language in Society* 21(1): 1-26.

Milroy, Lesley and Matthew Gordon. 2003. *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Norrby, Catrin and Joanne Winter. 2001. Affiliation in Adolescents' Use of Discourse Extenders. *Proceedings of the 2001 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*.

Ramos, Jennifer Tan-de. 2010. A Comparative Study of the Discourse Marker Types in the Body Section of the Research Papers of DLSU Students. *TESOL Journal* 2:62-73

Reyes, Angela. 2005. Appropriation of African American Slang by Asian American Youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9 (4): 509-532.

Richards, Jack and Richard Schmidt. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. 3rd Ed. London: Longman.

Roberts, S. J. 2000. Nativization and the Genesis of Hawaiian Creole. In *Language Change and Language Contact in Pidgins and Creoles*, edited by John McWhorter . Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sacks, Harvey, Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A Simplest Systemics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language* 50 (4): 696-735.

Saez, Fernando Trujillo. 2003. Culture in Writing: Discourse Markers in English and Spanish Student Writing. In *Tadea seu liber de Amicitia*, edited by Departamento de Didáctica de la Lengua y la Literatura, 345-364.

Sankoff, Gillian. 2005. Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Studies in Sociolinguistics. In *An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Vol. 2. edited by von Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus Mattheier and Peter Trudgill, 1003-1012. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Schilling-Estes, Natalie and Walt Wolfram. 1994. Convergent Explanation and Alternative Regularization Patterns: 'Were/Weren't' Levelling in a Vernacular English Variety. *Language Variation and Change* 6(3):273–302.

Sundgren, Eva. 2009. The Varying Influence of Social and Linguistic Factors on Language Stability and Change: The Case of Eskilstuna. *Language Variation and Change* 21(1): 97–133.

Tagliamonte, Sali. 2005. So who? Like how? Just what? Discourse Markers in the Conversations of Young Canadians. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 1896–1915.

Tagliamonte, Sali and Alexandra D'Arcy. 2004. 'He's Like, She's Like': The Quotative System in Canadian Youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8 (4): 493–514.

Tagliamonte, Sali and Alexandra D'Arcy. 2009. Peaks beyond Phonology: Adolescence, Incrementation, and Language Change. *Language* 85(1): 58-108.

Tagliamonte, Sali and Rachel Hudson . 1999. 'Be Like' et al. Beyond America: The Quotative System in Canadian and UK Youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (2): 147-172.

Tottie, Gunnel. 2006. Tag Questions in British and American English. *Journal of English Linguistics* 34 (4): 283-311.

Trappes-Lomax, Hugh. 2004. Discourse Analysis. In *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics,* edited by Alan Davies and Catherine Elder, 133-164. Oxford: Blackwell.

Trask, Robert and Peter Stockwell. 2007. *Language and Linguistics: The Key Concepts*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Trillo, Romero. 2006. Discourse Markers. *Encyclopedia of Languages and Linguistics*. 1: 639-642.

Trudgill, Peter. 1972. Sex, Covert Prestige and Linguistic Change in the Urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society* 1 (2):179 – 195.

Watt, Dominic. 2007. Variation and the Variable. In *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics,* edited by Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell, 3 – 11. London and New York: Routledge.

Watt, Dominic and Lesley Milroy. 1999. Patterns of Variaitoon and Change in Three Newcastle Vowels: Is This Dialect Levelling? In *Urban Voices: Accent Studies in the British Isles*, edited by Paul Foulkes and Gerard Docherty, 25 - 46. London: Arnold.

Williams, Ann and Paul Kerswill. 1999. Dialect Levelling: Change and Continuity in Milton Keynes, Reading and Hull. In *Urban Voices: Accent Studies in the British Isles*, edited by Paul Foulkes and Gerard Docherty, 141– 162. London: Arnold.

Winter, Joanne. 2002. Discourse Quotatives in Australian English: Adolescents Performing Voices. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 22 (1): 5-21.

Wodak, Ruth.1996. *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman.

Wodak, Ruth and Gertraud Benke. 1998. Gender as a Sociolinguistic Variable: New Perspectives on Variation Studies. In *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, edited by Florian Coulmas, 88 – 104. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wolfram, Walt. 2006. Variation and Language Use: Overview. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 13: 333-341.

Yui, Megumi. 2012. The Function of Address Terms in English and Japanese: Analysis Using Scenarios. *IAPL Journal* 1: 59-73

ጌታቸው እንዳላማው። 1987 ዓ.ም.። በኮተቤ መምህራን ትምህርት ኮሌጅ የኢትዮጵያ ቋንቋዎችና ስነጽሁፍ ተማሪዎች በተጻፉ ተራኪ ውሁድ-አሃዶች ውስጥ የዲስኩር አመልካቾች ስርጭትና ተግባር ትንተና። የማስተርስ ዲግሪ ማሟያ ጽሁፍ፣አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ። [getaʧʧəw ɨndalamaw bəkotəbe məmɨhɨran tɨmɨhɨrt koleʤ jəʔitjop'ja k'^{w}ank'^{w}awoʧʧɨnna sɨnəs'ɨhuf təmariwoʧʧ bətəs'afu tərraki wɨhud ahadoʧʧ wɨst' jədiskur aməlkaʧʧoʧʧ sɨrɨʧ'ʧ'ɨtnna təgbar tɨntəna jəmastərs digri mam^{w}aja s'ɨhuf addis abəba junivərsiti] [Getachew Endalamaw. 1995. The Analysis of the distribution and use of Discourse Markers in the Narrative Texts Written by Students of Ethiopian Languages and Literature at Kotebe College of Teacher Education. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.]

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Profile of Participants

Adolescents

	Name	Age	Family Breadwinner's Education	Family Breadwinner's Occupation
1	Muktar	15	Primary	Driver
2	Kirubel	15	Diploma	Supervisory job at an NGO
3	Dawit	15	Bachelor's degree	Teacher
4	Hailu	15	Secondary	Retail trade
5	Abdulfetah	15	Primary	Driver
6	Minas	16	Primary	Pensioner
7	Salman	15	Primary	Small scale Trader
8	Sultan	16	Illiterate	Farmer
9	Asmelash	15	Bachelor's degree	Teacher
10	Berhane	16	Primary	Guard
11	Leylla	15	Diploma	Librarian
12	Hafiza	14	Diploma	Small business owner
13	Betel	15	Diploma	Trader
14	Kelemework	15	Secondary	Mechanic
15	Tsega	17	Primary	Lower rank government employee
16	Hayat	15	Primary	Driver
17	Hallima	16	Primary	Retail Trader
18	Lydia	15	Primary	Trader
19	Shemsedin	16	Primary	Stock trading
20	Nuredin	17	Illiterate	Garage Owner
21	Salhadin	17	Primary	Building Contractor
22	Sulman	17	Primary	Trader (mobile phone)
23	Yeshihareg	16	Bachelor's degree	Merchant
24	Kerrima	15	Primary	Daily laborer
25	Rabiya	14	Primary	Retail trade
26	Lily	15	Diploma	Record officer
27	Kemeriya	15	Primary	Retail trade

Adults

	Name	Age	Education	Occupation
1	Geremew	32	Secondary complete	Painting
2	Samuel	40	Secondary	Broker
3	Shiferaw	40	Bachelor's degree	Religious leader
4	Tesfaw	40	Secondary	Woodwork workshop employee
5	Etsub	30	Secondary	Library attendant
6	Mahmud	48	Primary	Guard
7	Awol	30	Bachelor's degree	Supervisor, Agriculture office
8	Kedo	45	Basic literacy	House wife
9	Hassen	40	Primary	Carpenter
10	Firew	56	Basic literacy	Masonry
11	Nuri	60	Basic literacy	Retired guard
12	Farris	30	Bachelor's degree	Teacher
13	Kemal	38	Bachelor's degree	Teacher
14	Woinareg	32	Diploma	Purchaser and cashier
15	Aberash	61	Secondary complete	Unemployed
16	Kedija	40	Primary	Small scale trader
17	Etalem	42	Secondary complete	House wife
18	Ubah	35	Primary	House wife
19	Simeneh	27	Bachelor's degree	Teacher
20	Illham	20	Diploma	Teacher
21	Mestawot	32	Bachelor's degree	Teacher
22	Zubeda	34	Bachelor's degree	Vice head of town level sector office
23	Habiba	38	Diploma	Expert at a sector office
24	Meselech	37	Diploma	Expert at a sector office
25	Sinishaw	39	Bachelor's degree	Project coordinator at an NGO
26	Guday	28	Diploma	Teacher
27	Etenat	56	Basic literacy	Unemployed

Appendix 2: Transcription Conventions

1. X is used for unidentified speaker where many speakers are speaking at a time.
2. [ ] (square brackets) indicate overlapping speeches. The brackets are put at the beginning and end of the speeches of all the speakers involved in the overlap. The left brackets beginning the speeches of all the speakers involved in the overlap must be vertically parallel to one another to show the temporal parallelism of the utterances. When many overlaps occur at the same time, single, double and triple brackets are used to show which speech overlapped with which. If the overlaps occur after the first speaker begins to speak a word, the bracket is put inside the word where the overlap starts.
3. ( ) (single parentheses) are used to enclose verbal descriptions of non-verbal noises like coughing, yawning, throat clearing, gulping, sniffing, breathing, laughing, etc., inaudible speech, transcriber's comments on transcribed utterances, back channeling continuatives, and meanings or functions of interjections and other selected discourse features.
4. <u>Underlining</u> Transcriber's comments on a long exchange are underlined and put at the head of the exchange.
5. *Italics* Transcriber's comments on the exchange that is not transcribed or on any activity that does not involve speaking are italicised and put in a new line independently.
6. <x x> This pair of signs with transcription of an utterance in between shows that the transcriber is not sure to hear the utterance accurately.
7. Ø represents null or zero quotative.
8. " " (double quotation marks) are used to mark a quotation.
9. ' ' (single quotation marks) are used to mark quotations within quotations
10. … (three dots) represent speech not transcribed because it is not necessary for analysis as it is spoken by a person not selected to participate in the research

Appendix 3: Symbols and Signs Used for Coding the Data

ACTO	Abrupt change of topic overlap
AO	Addition overlap
ATSPP	Second Person Pronoun as an addressing term
ATPN	Proper name as an addressing Term
ATTI	Term of intimacy as an addressing term
ATDP	Descriptive phrase as an addressing term
ATZ	Zero addressing term
ATM	Mixed addressing term
BCU	Back channeling utterance
CBO	Call back overlap
CIO	Coincidental overlap
CO	Completion overlap
CQ	Confirmation question
CS	Completion statement or phrase
CUA	Checking the listener's understanding, attention or acceptance, or asking for their confirmation
DC	Direct calling by name and attracting attention to a talk
DI	Directed invitation
DQ	Directed question
FQ	Follow up question
ITO	Interfering topic overlap
LTO	Lack of tolerance overlap
OINR	Other-initiated No repair
OIOR	Other-initiated Other-repair
OISR	Other-initiated self-repair
PTRO	Predicting turn relevance Overlap
QS	Quotative 'say'
QI	Quoative 'It is'
Ø	Null or zero quotative
QPE	Question to who it is addressed is known from the preceding exchanges, the physical context and history
QR	Question for repetition
ROO	Right override overlap
SF	Suggestive form that encourages others to continue to speak
SISR	Self-initiated self-repair
Sl	Slang
VBW	Bad wish as vowing expression
VDST	Declaration of seriousness or truthfulness as vowing Expression
VRT	Religious term as vowing Expression
VL	Vulgar language

Appendix 4: Transcripts

The transcripts are recorded in the CD-ROM attached at the back of this report.

Appendix 4.1. Adolescents: Abdulfetah, Dawit, Hailu, Muktar, Samuel

Appendix 4.2. Adolescents: Asmelash, Berhane, Hafiza, Leyla

Appendix 4.3. Adolescents: Betel, Kelemework and Tsega

Appendix 4.4. Adolescents: Halima, Hayat and Lydia

Appendix 4.5. Adolescents: Nuredin , Salahadin, Shemsedin and Sultan

Appendix 4.6. Adolescents: Minas, Salman, and Sulman

Appendix 4.7. Adolescents: Kemeriya, Kerima, Lily, Rabiya and Yeshihareg

Appendix 4.8. Adults: Awel, Firew, Hassen, Kedo, Nuri and Mahmud

Appendix 4.9. Adults: Aberash, Etalem, Kedija, Tewabe and Ubah

Appendix 4.10. Adults: Ahmed, Ansha, Etenat, Maritu, Muhdin, Sara, Sitina and Umer

Appendix 4.11. Adults: Moges, Farris, Kemal and Woinareg

Appendix 4.12. Adults: Moges, Simeneh, Mestawot and Illham

Appendix 4.13. Adults: Habiba, Meselech and Zubeda

Appendix 4.14. Adults: Shiferaw, Geremew and Samuel

Appendix 4.15. Adults: Shiferaw, Sinishaw and Taddesse

Appendix 4.16.Adults: Shiferaw, Tesfaw and Etsub

Appendix 4.17. Adults: Tsedey, Guday, Bizuayehu and Selam

Appendix 5: Interview Questions

For Adolescents

1. What is your father's job?
2. How much is his monthly income? Tell in 500 Birr interval.
3. What is your mother's job?
4. How much is her monthly income? Tell in 500 Birr interval.
5. What is the educational level of your father? Your mother? Yours?
6. How old are you?
7. What is your religion?
8. With whom, different from your family members, do you pass most of your time?
9. How old are they? What is their religion? Which sex are they? What is their educational level? What is their job?
10. If they are youngsters like you and do not have a job, what is the job of their fathers and mothers or the family heads?
11. How often do you meet with them?
12. What do you do when you meet with them?
13. What are the common places where you meet with them?
14. Whom do you prefer to talk to in your family? Why?
15. What is the thing you like about the communication behavior of adults like your father, mother, teachers, neighbors, relatives, etc?
16. What is the thing you dislike about the communication behavior of adults like your father, mother, teachers, neighbors, relatives etc?
17. How interested are you to pass time with adults? Why?
18. How do adults around you respond to your requests, actions and behaviors?
19. How do you evaluate the interest of adults to interact with you?
20. In what areas do you usually not agree with adults around you?
21. How easy do you find interacting with adults?

Amharic Translation

1. የአባትህ ስራ ምንድነው?
2. የአባትህ ወርሀዊ ገቢ ምን ያህል ነው? በ500 ብር ምድብ ብትገልጸው፡፡
3. የእናትህ ስራ ምንድነው?
4. የእናትህ ወርሀዊ ገቢ ምንያህል? በ500 ብር ምድብ ብትገልጸው፡፡
5. የእባትህ የትምህርት ደረጃ እንዴት ነው? የእናትህስ? የአንተስ?
6. እድሜህ ምን ያህል ነው?
7. ሀይማኖትህ ምንድነው?
8. ከቤተሰብህ ውጭ ብዙ ጊዜህን አብረሀቸው የምታሳልፋቸው ሰዎች እነማናቸው?
9. እድሜያቸው ምን ያህል ነው? ሀይማኖታቸውስ? ጾታቸውስ? የትምህርት ደረጃቸውስ ? ስራቸውስ?
10. እንዳንተ ወጣቶች ሆነው ስራ ከሌላቸው የአባቶቻቸው ወይም የእናቶቻቸው ወይም የቤተሰባቸው ሀላፊዎች ስራ ምንድነው?
11. ከነሱ ጋር የምትገናኝበት የጊዜ ድግግሞሽ እንዴት ነው?
12. አብራችሁ ስትሆኑ በጋራ የምትሰሩት ስራ ምንድነው?
13. ብዙ ጊዜ የምትገኙት ምን አይነት ቦታ ነው?
14. በቤተሰብህ ውስጥ ብዙ ጊዜ ማውራት የምትወደው ከማን ጋር ነው? ለምን?
15. አባትህን፣ እናትህን፣ መምህራንህን፣ ጎረቤቶችህንና ዘመዶችህን ከመሳሰሉ ትላልቅ ሰዎች የተግባቦት ባህሪያት የምትወዳቸው ምንድናቸው?
16. አባትህን፣ እናትህን፣ መህራንህን፣ ጎረቤቶችህንና ዘመዶችህን ከመሳሰሉ ትላልቅ ሰዎች የተግባቦት ባህሪያት የምትጠላቸው ምንድናቸው?
17. ከትላልቅ ሰዎች ጋር ጊዜ ለማሳለፍ ያለህ ፍላጎት ምንያህል ነው? ለምን?
18. በዙሪያህ ያሉ ትላልቅ ሰዎች ለንግግርህ፣ ለምትሰራቸው ስራዎችና ለባህሪህ የሚሰጡት ምላሽ ምን ይመስላል?
19. ትላልቅ ሰዎች ከአንተ ጋር ለማውራት ያላቸውን ፍላጎት እንዴት ትመዝነዋለህ?
20. ብዙ ጊዜ ከትላልቅ ሰዎች ጋር የማትስማሙባቸው ነጥቦች ምን ምን ናቸው?
21. ለአንተ ከትላልቅ ሰዎች ጋር ማውራት ከባድ ነው ወይስ ቀላል?

For Adults

1. What is your job?
2. How much is your monthly income? Tell in 500 Birr interval.
3. What is your wife's/husband's job?
4. How much is her/his monthly income? Tell in 500 Birr interval.
5. What is your education level?
6. How old are you?
7. What is your religion?
8. With whom, different from your family members, do you pass most of your time?
9. How old are they? What is their religion? Which sex are they? What is their educational level?
10. What is their job? If they are youngsters, what is the job of their fathers and mothers or the family heads?
11. How often do you meet with them?
12. What do you do when you meet with them?
13. What are the common places you meet with them?
14. Whom do you prefer to talk to in your family? Why?
15. What is the thing you like about the communication behavior of adolescents?
16. What is the thing you dislike about the communication behavior of adolescents?
17. How interested are you to pass time with adolescents? Why?
18. How do adolescents around you respond to your requests and actions towards them?
19. How do you evaluate the interest of adolescents to interact with you?
20. In what topics do you usually not agree with adolescents around you?
21. How easy do you find interacting with adolescents? Why?

Amharic Translation

1. ስራዎ ምንድነው?
2. ወርሀዊ ገቢዎ ምን ያህል ነው? በ500 ብር ምድብ ቢገልጹት።
3. የባለቤትዎ ስራ ምንድነው?
4. የባለቤትዎ ወርሀዊ ገቢ ምን ያህል ነው? በ500 ብር ምድብ ቢገልጹት።
5. የትምህርት ደረጃዎ እንዴት ነው?
6. እድሜዎ ምን ያህል ነው?
7. ሀይማኖትዎ ምንድነው?
8. ከቤተሰብዎ ውጭ ብዙ ጊዜዎን አብረዋቸው የሚያሳልፏቸው ሰዎች እነማናቸው?
9. እድሜያቸው ምን ያህል ነው? ሀይማኖታቸውስ? ጾታቸውስ? የትምህርት ደረጃቸውስ ? ስራቸውስ?
10. ወጣቶች ሆነው ስራ ከሌላቸው የአባቶቻቸው ወይም የእናቶቻቸው ወይም የቤተሰባቸው ሀላፊዎች ስራ ምንድነው?
11. ከነሱ ጋር የሚገናኙበት የጊዜ ድግግሞሽ እንዴት ነው?
12. አብራችሁ ስትሆኑ በጋራ የምትሰሩት ስራ ምንድነው?
13. ብዙ ጊዜ የምትገኙት ምን አይነት ቦታ ነው?
14. በቤተሰብዎ ውስጥ ብዙ ጊዜ ማውራት የሚወዱው ከማን ጋር ነው? ለምን?
15. ከ13-18 አመት እድሜ ውስጥ ካሉ ወጣቶች የተግባቦት ባህሪያት የሚወዷቸው ምንድናቸው?
16. ከ13-18 አመት እድሜ ውስጥ ካሉ ወጣቶች የተግባቦት ባህሪያት የሚጠሏቸው ምንድናቸው?
17. ከ13-18 አመት እድሜ ውስጥ ካሉ ወጣቶች ጋር ጊዜ ለማሳለፍ ያለዎት ፍላጎት ምን ያህል ነው? ለምን?
18. በዙሪያዎ ያሉ በተጠቀሰው እድሜ ውስጥ ያሉ ወጣቶች ለንግግርዎ፣ ለሚሯቸው ስራዎችና ለባህሪዎ የሚሰጡት ምላሽ ምን ይመስላል?
19. በተጠቀሰው እድሜ ውስጥ ያሉ ወጣቶች ከእርስዎ ጋር ለማውራት ያላቸውን ፍላጎት እንዴት ይመዝኑታል?
20. ብዙ ጊዜ በተጠቀሰው እድሜ ውስጥ ካሉ ወጣቶች ጋር የማትስማሙባቸው ነጥቦች ምን ምን ናቸው?
21. ለእርስዎ በተጠቀሰው እድሜ ውስጥ ካሉ ወጣቶች ጋር ማውራት ከባድ ነው ወይስ ቀላል? ለምን?

Appendix 6: List of Discourse Markers Used in the Study

Textual Discourse Markers

		Phonetic Transcription	Literal Meaning	Contextual Meaning	Discourse Function
Conjunctions and Conjunctive Adjuncts (96)					
1	**ሁለተኛ**	hulәttәɲɲa	Second	Second	To mark enumeration
2	**ሁለት·**	hulәtt	Two	Second	To mark enumeration
3	**ለምሳሌ**	lәmɨssale	For example	For example	To mark example
4	**ለምሳሌ ብንወስድ**	lәmɨssale bɨnnɨwәsd	If we take for example	If we take an example	To mark example
5	**ለምሳሌ አሁን/አሁን ለምሳሌ**	lәmɨssale ahun/ ahun lәmɨssale	For example now/ now for example	For example	To mark example
6	**ለምን**	lәmɨn	Why	The reason is this	To mark a reason
7	**ለምንድን ነው·**	lәmɨndɨnn nәw	Why is it	The reason is this	To mark a reason
8	**መሰለሽ?/መሰለህ?/መሰላች ሁ·?**	mәssәlәʃ mәssәlәh mәssәlaʧʧɨhu	It seems to you		To show addition
9	**መጀመሪያ**	mәʤәmmәrija	In the beginning	In the beginning	
10	**መጀመሪያ ላይ**	mәʤәmmәrija laj	Upon the beginning	In the beginning	
11	**መጨረሻ**	mәʧ'әrrәʃa	At last/in the end	At last/in the end	
12	**መጨረሻ ላይ**	mәʧ'әrrәʃa laj	Upon the end	At last/in the end	
13	**ማለት·**	malәt	Saying		To mark an implication
14	**ማለት·**	malәt	Saying		To mark an idea that specifies the preceding idea
15	**ማለት·**	malәt	Saying		To mark a correction to one's own idea
16	**ማለት·/ ማለቱ/ ማለት·ም**	malәt/ malәte/ malәtɨm	Saying/ i saying/		To mark further explanation or

			saying		additional information
17	**ማለት· ነው**	malət nəw	It is saying		To mark an implication
18	**ማለት· ነው/ማለቱ ነው**	malət nəw/ maləte nəw	It is saying / i saying		To mark a further explanation or restatement
19	**ማለት·/ማለት·ም**	malət/ malətɨm	Saying/ saying		To mark a change in topic
20	**ምን ልልህ ፈልጌ መሰለህ**	mɨn lɨlɨh fəllɨgge məssələh	What i want to say to you is		To mark further explanation
21	**ምን መሰለህ/ምን መሰለሽ**	mɨn məssələh mɨn məssələʃ	It seems to you what		To mark further explanation
22	**ምክንያቱም**	mɨknɨjatum	Because	Because	
23	**ስለዚህ**	sɨləzzih	Therefore	Therefore	
24	**ስልህ/ስልሽ**	sɨlɨh/ sɨlɨʃ	Saying to you		To mark further explanation
25	**ሶስተኛ**	sosttəɲɲa	Third	Third	
26	**ቆይ ግን/ግን ቆይ**	k'oj gɨn/ gɨn k'oj	Wait but/ but wait		To mark an interfering idea
27	**በ…የተነሳ**	bə…jəttənəssa	By… beginning	Because	
28	**በመጀመሪያ**	bəməʤəmmərija	Upon the beginning	In the beginning	
29	**በመጨረሻ**	bəməʧ'ərrəʃa	Upon the end	At last/in the end	
30	**በቅድሚያ**	bək'ɨdmija	Upon priorly	First of all	
31	**በዛ ላይ/በዚያ ላይ**	bəzza laj/bəzzija laj	Upon that	In addition	
32	**በዛ የተነሳ**	bəzza jəttənəssa	By that beginning	Because of that	
33	**ቢሆንም**	bihonɨm	Though	Though	
34	**ብ… ኖሮ**	bɨ … noro	If …existed		To mark impossible condition
35	**ብቻ** (**ያም ሆነ ይህ**)	bɨʧʧa	Only	Anyhow	
36	**ታዲያ/ታዳ/ታያ**	tadija/tada/taja	If that is so	If that is so	
37	**ታዲያ/ታዳ/ታያ**	tadija/tada/taja	Then	Then	
38	**ነገሩ**	nəgəru	The thing	Actually	
39	**አለበለዚያ**	aləbələzzija	Unless otherwise	Unless otherwise	
40	**አለዛ**	aləzza	Unless otherwise	Unless otherwise	

41	**አንደኛ**	andəɲɲa	First	First	
42	**አንደኛው**	andəɲɲaw	The first	The first	
43	**አንድ**	and	One	First	
44	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark a disclaimer
45	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark a compensational idea
46	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark an alternative idea
47	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark an opposite idea
48	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark a disproving idea
49	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark an idea that goes in line with the preceding idea
50	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark an idea that is not compatible with the preceding idea
51	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark an idea unexpected by the former speaker or to weaken his/her idea
52	**አይ**	aj	No	In fact	To mark an idea that reinforces or supports the idea of the former speaker
53	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark an idea that shows an acceptance to the preceding idea
54	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark a disproving idea
55	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark an unexpected idea
56	**አይ**	aj	No		To mark a new idea
57	**አደለም/አይደለም**	adllm ajdllm	No		To mark an idea that helps to defend one’s position against opposing idea and reinforces one’s idea
58	**እ**	ɨ	Again	Again	To mark an addition
59	**እ!**	ɨ	Er		To mark a change in topic
60	**እምልህ ነገር**	ɨmmɨlɨh nəgər	The thing i say to you		To mark further explanation

61	**እምልሽ/እምልህ**	ɨmmɨlɨʃ/ ɨmmɨlɨh	What i say to you		To mark further explanation
62	**እስከ… ድረስ**	ɨskə dɨrəs	Upto … until	Until	
63	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok	If that is so	
64	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Now that	
65	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok		To mark transition to the next idea
66	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok	To mark a change in topic
67	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok	To mark a return to the former topic
68	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok)	To mark a resumption to the interrupted topic
69	**እሺ/እሺ?**	ɨʃʃi ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok	To mark an alternative idea
70	**እና**	ɨnna	And	And	
71	**እና ታዲያ**	ɨnna	An if that is so	And if that is so	
72	**እንደገና**	ɨndəgəna	Again	Again	
73	**እንደገና ደሞ/እንደገና ደግሞ**	ɨndəgəna dəmmo/ ɨndəgəna dəgmo	Again also/ also again	Again	
74	**እንዲሁ**	ɨndihu	Like this	Similarly	
75	**እንዳውም/እንዲያውም/እንደውም**	ɨndawɨm/ ɨndijawɨm/ ɨndəwɨm	In any case/for that matter/as a matter of fact	In any case/for that matter/as a matter of fact	
76	**እንጂ/ ይ**	ɨndʒi/j	On the contrary/but	On the contrary/but	
77	**እንጂ/ ይ**	ɨndʒi/j	Unless otherwise	Unless otherwise	
78	**እንግዲህ**	ɨngdih/ ɨngdiʧ	Therefore	Therefore/thus	
79	**እንግዲያው/እንግዲያውስ/እንግዲያስ/እንግዳስ**	ɨngɨdijaw/ ɨngɨdijawɨs/ ɨngɨdijas/ ɨngɨdas	If that is so	If that is so	
80	**እኮ**	ɨkko	Then	Then/so	
81	**ከ… በፊት**	kə..bəfit	From … before	Before	
82	**ከ…በኋላ**	kə…bəh^{w}ala	From…after	After	
83	**ከ…በስተቀር**	kə…bəstək'ər	From… except	If	

84	**ከ…ጀምሮ**	kə…ʤəmmɨro	From…beginning	Beginning from	
85	**ከእንደገና**	kəɨndəgəna	Again	Again	
86	**ከዚህ የተነሳ/ከዚ በኋላ**	kəzzih jəttənəssa/kəzzi bəh^{w}la	Beginning from this	Because of this	
87	**ከዛ በኋላ ላይ**	kəzza bəh^{w}la laj	Upon from that after	After that	
88	**ከዛ በኋላ/ከዚያ በኋላ/ተዛ በኋላ**	kəzza bəh^{w}la kəzzijaa bəh^{w}la təzza bəh^{w}la	From that after	Then after	
89	**ከዛ በፊት**	kəzza bəfit	From that before	Before that	
90	**ከዛ ወዲህ**	kəzza wədih	From that onwards	Beginning from that	
91	**ከዛ/ ከዛን/ከዚያ**	kəzza/ kəzzan/ kəzzijaa	From that	Then after	
92	**ወይም/ ወይ/ወይንም**	wəjɨm/wəj/wəjnɨm	Or	Or	To mark an alternative
93	**ወይስ**	wəjɨs	Or else	Or else	
94	**የመጀመሪያ**	jəməʤəmmərija	The beginning	First	
95	**ያለበለዛ**	jaləbələzzija	Unless otherwise	Unless otherwise	
95	**ደግሞ/ደሞ**	dəgmo/dəmmo	Also	Also	
96	**ግን/ግን ግን**	gɨn	But	But	
Continuatives (15)					
1	**ሀ** *	hɨ		Ahh/aha/hm/hmm /mmh/mm	A listener uses it to show that he/she is listening
2	**ሀ**	hɨ		Ahh/aha/hm/hmm /mmh/mm	A listener uses it to show that he/she is listening
3	**ሀ** *	hɨ		Yes?	To encourage aspeaker to continue to speak
4	**አሀ**	aha	Aha	Yes?	To encourage aspeaker to continue to speak
5	**አዎ**	awo	Yes	Yes?	
6	**አዎ**	awo	Yes	Yes	A listener uses it to show that he/she is listening

7	እ	ɨ		Ahh/aha/hm/hmm /mmh/mm	A listener uses it to show that he/she is listening
8	እ/እ እ	ɨ/ ɨ/ ɨ ɨ		Yes?	To encourage aspeaker to continue to speak
9	እህ	ɨhɨ		ahh/ aha/hm/hmm/mm h/mm	A listener uses it to show that he/she is listening
10	እህ/እህ እህ	ɨhɨ		Yes?	To encourage aspeaker to continue to speak
11	እሺ	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Yes	To encourage aspeaker to continue to speak
12	እሺ	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok	A listener uses it to show that he/she is listening
13	እኧ	ɨə		Yes?	To encourage a speaker to continue to speak
14	ኧ	ə		Yes?	To encourage a speaker to continue to speak
15	ኧ	ə		Ahh/aha/hm/hmm /mmh/mm	A listener uses it to show that he/she is listening
Discourse Extenders (15)					
1	ማን	mann	Who		To represent a name of a person in a list not said
2	ምኑ	mɨnu	What	This, that and the other	To represent names of things in a list not said
3	ምኑን ምኑን	mɨnun mɨnun	What what	This and that	To represent a name of a thing in a list not said
4	ምናምን ነገር	mɨnamɨn nəgər	And stuff thing	And stuff	
5	ምናምን	mɨnamiɨn	And stuff	And stuff	
6	ምን	mɨn	What	This, that and the other	To represent a name of a thing in a list not said
7	ምን አሚል	mɨn ɨmil	It says what		To represent a name of a thing in a list not said

8	**ምን እንደማት·ይ/ምን ብለን/ምን ስት·ል/ምን አት·ልም/ምን ብለናል/ ምን አላለች/ምን ልበልህ/**	mɨn ɨndəmmatɨj/mɨn bɨlən/ mɨn sɨtɨl/mɨn attɨlɨm/mɨn bɨlənal/mɨn alaləʧ/mɨn lɨbəlɨh	That you do not say what		To represent a name of an action in a list not said
9	**ምን የለ**	mɨn jəllə	What does not exist		To represent an idea in a clause form in a list not said
10	**ምንም ሲለኝ**	mɨnɨm siləɲ	When he says what		To represent a name of a action in a list not said
11	**ምንም ብለን**	mɨnɨm bɨlən	After we say what		To represent a name of an action in a list not said
12	**ባየህ**	bajjəh	If you see	You see	
13	**ነገር**	nəgər	Thing	Something like that	
14	**እምኑም**	ɨmɨnum	Into what again		To represent a name of a thing in a list not said
15	**እንደዚህ/እንደዝህ/እንደዚህ እንደዚህ / እንደዚሁ**	ɨndəzzih/ ɨndəzzɨh/ ɨndəzzihu	Like this		To represent a name of an idea in a list not said
Focus or highlight adverbial particles (6)					
1	**ሁሉ**	hullu	All	Even	Additive focuser
2	**ለራሱ/ራሱ/እራሱ**	lərasu/rasu/ɨrasu	For itself	Even	Specifying focuser
3	**እማ**	ɨmma	Even	Even	Emphatic focuser
4	**እሳ/እስ/ስ**	ɨssa/ɨss/ss	Even	Even	Contrastive focuser
5	**እንኳን/እንኳ**	ɨnk^{w}a/ɨnk^{w}an	Even	Even	Emphatic focuser
6	**ያውም**	jawɨm	Even	Even	Intensifying focuser
Speech framing markers (13)					
1	**ልንገርሽ/ልንገርህ**	lɨngərɨʃ lɨngərɨh	Let me tell you	Listen	
2	**ቆይ ቆይ እማ**	k'oj k'oj ɨmma	Wait wait	Listen	
3	**ቆይ**	k'oj	Wait wait	Listen	

4	**ቆይ እስቲ**	k'oj ɨsti	Wait please	Listen	
5	**ቆያ**	k'oj/ k'oja	Wait	Listen	
6	**በነገራችን ላይ**	bənəgəraʧʧɨn laj	By our thing	By the way	
7	**እምነግራችሁ**	ɨmmɨnəgraʧʧɨhu	What i tell you	Let me tell you	
8	**እኔ ልንገርህ**	ɨne lingərɨh	Let me tell you	Let me tell you	
9	**እኔ እምለው**	ɨne ɨmmɨləw	What i say	I have an idea	
10	**እኔ እምላችሁ ነገር**	ɨne ɨmmɨlaʧʧɨhu nəgər	The thing i tell you	I have an idea	
11	**እኔ እምላችሁ/እኔ እምልህ**	ɨne ɨmmɨlaʧʧɨhu/ ɨne ɨmmɨlɨh	What i say to you	I have an idea	
12	**እየውልህ/እይውልሽ**	ɨjəwɨllɨh ɨjɨwɨllɨʃ	See	Look	
13	**እይው/እየው**	ɨjɨw ɨjəw	See	Look	
Pause markers (46)					
1	**ማለት**	maləṭ	Saying	I mean	To mark a pause to think what to say next
2	**ማለት**	maləṭ	Saying	Uhm	To mark a beginning of a speech
3	**ማለት ነው**	maləṭ nəw	It is saying	I mean	To mark a pause to think what to say next
4	**ማነው?/ማናት**	mannəw	Who is he/who is she		To mark a pause when a name of a person is not remembered
5	**ምን**	mɨn	What		To mark a pause when a name of a thing is not remembered
6	**ምን**	mɨn	What		To mark a beginning of a speech
7	**ምን መሰለህ/ምን መሰለሽ**	mɨn məssələh/ mɨn məssələʃ	It seems to you what	You know	
8	**ምንድነው**	mɨnɨdɨnnəw	What is it		To mark a pause when a name of a thing is not remembered
9	**ስንት**	sɨnt	How much	A lot of	
10	**በቃ**	bək'k'a	Enough		To mark a pause to think what to say next
11	**ትንሽ**	tɨnnɨʃ	Some	Some	To mark a pause to think what to say

					next
12	**አሁን**	ahun	Now	Now	
13	**አለ አደለ**?/**አለ አይደል**?/**አለ አደል**?//**አለ አደለም**?	allə adəllə allə ajdəl allə adəl allə adəlləm	Isn't it?	Did you get me?	
14	**አም**	M	Ahm	Er, um, umm, hmm/ahm	To mark a hesitation what to say next
15	**አ**	a		Er, um, umm, hmm, ahm	To mark a hesitation what to say next
16	**አእ**	aɨ		Er, um, umm, hmm/ahm	To mark a hesitation what to say next
17	**አኧ**	aə		Er/ um/umm/hmm/ahm	To mark a hesitation what to say next
18	**አዎ**	awo	Yes	Yes	To mark a pause to think what to say next
19	**አዎ**	awo	Yes	Ok	To mark a beginning of a speech
20	**አዎ**	awo	Yes	Ok	To mark a beginning of a speech
21	**እ**	ɨ	Uhm	Uhm	To mark a beginning of a speech
22	**እ/ እ እ**	ɨ / ɨ ɨ		Er, um, umm, hmm, ahm	To mark a hesitation what to say next
23	**እ**?	ɨ		Ah/ huh	To mark lack of answer to a question
24	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok	To mark a beginning of a speech
25	**እንት·ና/እንት·ናዬ**	ɨntɨna/ ɨntɨnajje	Somebody	What is the name	To replace a name of a person not remembered now
26	**እንት·ን/እንት·ኑ/ እንት·ኗን/እንት·ኖች**	ɨntɨn ɨntɨnu ɨntɨn^{w}an ɨntɨnoʧ	Something	What is the name	To replace a name of a thing not remembered now
27	**እንደው/እንዳው/እንዲያው**	ɨndəw/ ɨndaw/ ɨndijaw			To mark a pause to think what to say next
28	**እንደዛ**	ɨndəzza	Like that	Something like that	

29	**እንዲሀለ እንዲሀለ**	ɨndihallə ɨndihallə	Something like this something like this	Something that looks…	
30	**እንዲህ**	ɨndih	Like this	Like	
31	**እንዴት· ነው·**	ɨndet nəw	How is it		To mark a pause to think what to say next
32	**እንግዲህ/እንግዲች·**	ɨngdih/ ɨngdiʧ	Now	Now	
33	**እአ**	ɨa		Er, um, umm, hmm, ahm	To mark a hesitation what to say next
34	**እኧ**	ɨ		Er, um, umm, hmm, ahm	To mark a hesitation what to say next
35	**እኧእ**	ɨɨ		Er, um, umm, hmm, ahm	To mark a hesitation what to say next
36	**እከሌ**	ɨkəle	Mr ‘x’		To replace a name of a person when no need to mention the name
37	**እኽ (ይሄ)**	ɨhə	This	This	
38	**እዝህ**	ɨzzɨh	Here	Now	To mark a pause to think what to say next
39	**ኧ**	ə	Er	Er, um, umm, hmm, ahm	To mark a hesitation what to say next
40	**የሆነ ነገሮች/የሆነ ነገር**	jəhonə nəgəroʧʧ/jəhonə nəgər	The thing that happened	Something	
41	**የሆነ የሆነ**	jəhonə jəhonə	That happened	Something	
42	**የሆነ/ የሆነይ/ የሆነች/የሆኑ·/በሆነ**	jəhonə/ jəhonəj/ jəhonəʧʧ/jəhonu/bəhonə	That happened	Something	
43	**የዚ**	jəzzi	That of	This	
44	**ያው·**	jaw	That itself	Like	To mark a pause to think what to say next
45	**ይሄ**	jɨhe	This	This	To mark a pause to think what to say next
46	**ይኸው·**	jɨhəw	This itself	As it is seen now	

Interpersonal Discourse Markers

		Phonetic transcription	Literal meaning	Contextual meaning	Discourse function
Alarms (3)					
1	ተመልከት	təməlkət	Look	Look	
2	እሺ	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok	
3	እይ	ɨj	See	Look	
Comment Adjuncts (80)					
1	ሀ (e.g. አዎ ሀ)			Truly/actually	To express emphasis (add strength)
2	ሀያ	hajja	Let us		To express suggestion
3	ለነገሩ	lənəgəru	For the thing	Actually	
4	ለካ	ləkka		Oh	
5	ልነግርሽ አልችልም	lɨnəgrɨʃ alʧɨlɨm	I cannot tell you	You cannot believe	
6	መቼም	məʧem	Whenever	After all	
7	መቼስ	məʧes	Whenever	As a matter of fact	
8	መች	məʧ	When		To express a feeling of disapproval
9	ምን	mɨn	What		To express a feeling of disapproval
10	ሲገርም	sigərm	When it is surprising	What a wonder	
11	ቀድሞ	k'ədmo	Priorly	As a matter of fact	
12	ቁም ነገር	k'um nəgər	Serious issue	To be serious	
13	ቆይ ግዴለም	k'oj gɨddelləm	Wait no obligation		To express a gdudge
14	ቆይ/ቆይ ቆይ/ ቆያ	k'oj/ k'oja	Wait/ wait wait/ wait please		To express that a speaker should stop his/her idea
15	ቆይማ	k'ojɨmma	Wait		To express a plan to a counter action

16	**በሉ/በይ/በል**	bəlu/bəj/bəl	Say	Bye	To express parting
17	**በሉ/በይ/በል**	bəlu/bəj/bəl	Say	Go ahead	To express urging
18	**በሚገርማችሁ ነገር**	bəmmigərmaʧʧihu nəgər	The thing with which surprises you	For your wonder	
19	**በሚገርምሽ**	bəmmigərmɨʃ	With what surprises you	For your wonder	
20	**በናትህ/ በናትሽ/ በናታችሁ**	bənnatɨh/ bənnatɨʃ/ bənnataʧʧihu	By your mother	For your mother's sake	
21	**በጣም /በጣም በጣም/በጣም በጣም በጣም**	bət'am	Very/very very/very very very	Of course	To acknowledge somebody's idea
22	**በጣም ነው እሚገርመው**	bət'am nəw ɨmmigərməw	It is very surprising	Amazing	
23	**በጣም እንጂ**	bət'am ɨnʤi	Very …	Of course	To acknowledge somebody's idea
24	**ቢገርማችሁ/ቢገርምሽ**	bigərmaʧʧihu bigərmɨʃ	If it surprises you	For your wonder	
25	**ባይገርምሽ**	bajgərmɨʃ	If it does not surprise you	For your wonder	
26	**ብልሽ አታምኝም**	bɨlɨʃ attamɲɨm	You do not believe I if I say to you	For your wonder	
27	**ብታቂ**	bɨttak'i	If you know	You know	
28	**ተው**	təw	Leave	Stop	To express objection
29	**ተው ተው**	təw təw	Leave leave	Stop	To express prevention
30	**ተው እንጂ**	təw ɨnʤi	Leave please	Stop	To express objection
31	**ትቀልዳለህ**?	tɨk'əllɨdalləh	Are you kidding?	Are you kidding?	
32	**ነገሩ**	nəgəru	The thing	Actually	
33	**አ** (e.g. **አዎ አ**)			Truly/actually	To express emphasis(add strength)
34	**አልኩሽ/አልኩህ**	alkuʃ/alkuh	I said to you		To express admiration
35	**አበቃ**	abək'k'a	Finished		To express surprise
36	**አቦ**	abbo	Please	Please	

37	**አቦ**	Abbo	Truly	Truly	To mark emphasis (add strength)
38	**አይገርምህም?/አይገርምሽም?**	ajgərmmɨhɨm/ajgərmmɨʃɨm	Isn't it surprising to you?	What a wonder	
39	**አይገርምም?**	ajgərmɨm	Isn't it surprising?	What a wonder	
40	**እልሻለሁ**	ɨlɨʃalləhu	I will say to you	You know?	To express importance of the action described
41	**እሚደንቅህ ነገር**	ɨmmidənk'ɨh nəgər	The thing that amazes you	For your wonder	
42	**እሚገርመኝ ነገር**	ɨmmigərməɲ nəgər	The thing that surprises me	For your wonder	
43	**እሚገርመው ነገር**	ɨmmigərməw nəgər	The thing that surprises	For your wonder	
44	**እሚገርም**	ɨmmigərm	Surprising	For your wonder	
45	**እሚገርም ነው**	ɨmmigərm nəw	It is surprising		
46	**እሚገርምህ ነገር**	ɨmmigərmɨh nəgər	The thing that surprises you	For your wonder	
47	**እሚገርምህ/እሚገርምሽ/የሚገርምሽ/የሚገርምህ**	ɨmmigərmɨh ɨmmigərmɨʃ/jəmmigərmɨʃ/jəmmigərmɨh	What surprises you	For your wonder	
48	**እስቲ/እስኪ/እሲ**	ɨsti/ɨski/ɨssi	Please	Please	
49	**እስቲ/እስኪ/እሲ**	ɨsti/ɨski/ɨssi	Please	Please	To mark an act of proposing
50	**(እ)ባክሽ/እባክሽን/ እባክሀ/እባካችሁ/እባክህ**	bakkɨʃ/bakkɨʃɨn/bakkɨhu bakkaʧʧɨhu/bakkɨh	Please		To express disappointment
51	**(እ)ባክሽ/እባክሽን/ እባክሀ/እባካችሁ/እባክህ**	bakkɨʃ/bakkɨʃɨn/bakkɨhu bakkaʧʧɨhu/bakkɨh	Please	You know	
52	**(እ)ባክሽ/እባክሽን/ እባክሀ/እባካችሁ/እባክህ**	bakkɨʃ/bakkɨʃɨn/bakkɨhu bakkaʧʧɨhu/bakkɨh	Please	Please	To express a request
53	**(እ)ባክሽ/እባክሽን/ እባክሀ/እባካችሁ/እባክህ**	bakkɨʃ/bakkɨʃɨn/bakkɨhu bakkaʧʧɨhu/bakkɨh	Please	Truly/actually	To express emphasis (add strength)
54	**እርግጠኛ ነኝ**	ɨrgɨt'əɲɲa nəɲ	I am sure	I am sure	
55	**እናቴዋየ**	ɨnnatewwajjə	My mother	My dear	

56	እንዴ	ɨnde			To mark a yes/no question
57	እንጂ	ɨndʒi	Please	Please	To express urging
58	እውነት?	ɨwnət	True?	Is that correct?	
59	እኮ	ɨkko		Actually/ In fact/Truly	To express emphais
60	ሸረ ቆይ እማ	ərə k'oj ɨmma	Wait		To express a plan to a counter action
61	ሸረ በናታችሁ/ ሸረ በናትሽ	ərə bənnataʧʃɨhu/ ərə bənnatɨʃ	Please by your mother	Please For your mother's sake	
62	ሸረ በጣም	ərə bət'am		Yes, of course	To express affirmation/acknowledgement
63	ሸረ ተው/ ሸረ ተይ ሸረ ተይ	ərə təw/ ərə təj ərə təj	Please leave	Please, please	To express a pleading
63	ሸረ ተይ	ərə təj	Please leave	Stop	To express objection
64	ሸረ ተይ?	ərə təj	Please leave	Really?/ How come?	To express surprise because what is heard is unexpected
65	ሸረ እንደው/ሸረ እንዲያው	ərə ɨndəw/ərə ɨndijaw			To mark emphasis (add strength)
66	ሸረ/ኦሮ	ərə/oro			To mark emphasis (add strength)
67	ሸረ?	ərə		Hmph	To express displeasure
68	ሸረኔ	ərəne			To mark emphasis (add strength)
69	ከሚገርማችሁ ነገር/ከሚገርምሽ ነገር	kəmmigərmaʧʃɨhu nəgər/ kəmmigərmɨʃ nəgər	The thing that surprises you	For your wonder	
70	ከሚገርምሽ/ከሚገርምህ	kəmmigərmɨʃ/ kəmmigərmɨh	What surprises you	For your wonder	
71	ከምሬ ነው	kəmɨrre nəw	I am serious	I am serious	
72	ከምር	kəmɨrr	Serious	Serious	
73	ወይ	wəj			To mark a yes/no question
74	የሚገርምህ ነገር	jəmmigərmɨh	The thing that surprises you	For your wonder	
75	ይታይህ/ይታይሽ	jɨttajɨh/jttajɨʃ	Let it be seen to you	Imagine	To express admiration

76	**ይገርመኛል**	jɨgərməɲɲal	I am surprised	What a wonder	
77	**ይገርማል**	jɨgərmal	It is surprising	What a wonder	
78	**ይገርምሀል/ይገርማችኋል**	jɨgərmɨhal/jɨgərmaʧʧɨh^{w}al	It is surprising to you	For your wonder	
79	**ጭራሽ**	ɨrraʃ	Completely		To express extremity
80	**ጭራሽ**?	ɨrraʃ		Really?/ How come?	To express surprise because what is heard is unexpected
Exclamations (170)					
1	**ሂድ**!	hid	Go away	Really?/ How come?/No	To express surprise because what is heard is unexpected
2	**ሂጅ በይው**	hiʤ bəjɨw	Say go	My goodness	To express surprize
3	**ሀ** *	hɨ		Oh/blimey	To express a shock
4	**ሀ**	hɨ		Wow	To express admiration
5	**ሀ**	hɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
6	**ሀኢ**	hɨɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
7	**ሀኢ** *	hɨɨ		Yes	To express affirmation
8	**ሀኢ**	hɨɨ		Wow	To express admiration
9	**ሀኢ**	hɨɨ		Yes	To express affirmation
10	**ሆ**	ho		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
11	**ምናለ/ምናላ/ምናል**	mɨnallə/ mɨnalla/ mɨnall	What is there	What a wonder	To express admiration
12	**ሲላ**	sila		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
13	**ሲላ**	sila		Wow	To express admiration
14	**በለው**	bələw	Kick it	My goodness	To express a surprise
15	**በለው**	bələw	Kick it/kick it	My goodness	To express admiration
16	**በስማም**	bəsmam	In the name of the Father	Jesus	To express surprise

17	**በስማም ጌታዬ**	bəsmam getaje	In the name of the Father My God	Jesus	To express frustration
18	**በአላህ**	bəallah	By allah	For the sake of allah	To express a feeling of pity
19	**በእየሱስ ስም**	bəɨjjəsus sɨm	In Jesus name	In Jesus name	To express surprise
20	**ተወው ኧረ**	təwəw ərə	Leave it please	Wow	To express exaggeration and admiration
21	**ተወው/ተይው**	təwəw/təjɨw	Leave it	Wow	To express exaggeration and admiration
22	**ተይ እንጂ/ተው እንጂ**	təj ɨnʤi/təw ɨnʤi	Leave please	Really?/ How come?	To express surprise because what is heard is unexpected
23	**ተይኝ**	təjɨɲɲ	Leave me		To express displeasure
24	**ተይኝ አልኩሽ**	təjɨɲɲ alkuʃ	I said to you to leave me	Wow	To express admiration
25	**አ**	a		Ha/hah/aha	To express the emotion created when discovering or understanding or remembering something interesting
26	**አ**	a		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
27	**አ**	a		Yes	To express affirmation
28	**አ**	a		Ha/hah/aha	To express the emotion created when discovering or understanding or remembering something interesting
29	**አ አ**	a a		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaning
30	**አ**?!	a		Oh/blimey	To express a shock
31	**አሀ**	aha	Aha	Aha/ Ha/hah	To express the emotion created when discovering or understanding or remembering something interesting
32	**አሀ**	aha	Aha	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/ha	To express a surprise

				h/huh/oh/phew/uh	
33	**አሀ**	aha	Aha	Aha/ Ha/hah	To express the emotion created when discovering or understanding or remembering something interesting
34	**አሀ**	aha	Aha	No/ uh uh	To express objection
35	**አሀ**	aha	Aha		To mark a disclaimer
36	**አሀ**	aha	Aha	Aha/ah/ahh /hhh	To express understanding
37	**አሄ**	ahe		Alas	To express a feeling of pity
38	**አሄሄ**	ahehe		Oh	To express exaggeration
39	**አሪፍ**	arif	Fantastic	Very good	To express admiration
40	**አቤት·**	abet		Wow	To express admiration
41	**አዎ**	awo	Yes	Yes, Of course	To express afirmation
42	**ኤየኤ**	aje		Alas	To express a feeling of pity
43	**አዬ.**	aje		Alas	To express a feeling of pity
44	**አዬ**	aje		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
45	**አዬ**	aje		Ah	To express disappointment
46	**አይ**	aj	No	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
47	**አይ**	aj	No	Blimey	To express anger
48	**አይ**	aj	No	Blimey	To express pleasure in what one hears
49	**አይ**	aj	No	Boo/uh oh/huh	To express a negative attitude
50	**አይ**	aj	No	Alas	To express a feeling of pity
51	**አይ**	aj	No	Wow	To express admiration
52	**አጀባ/አጀብ**	adʒəba/ adʒəb		What a wonder	To express admiration
53	**ኡኡኡ·**	uuu		Oh/blimey	To express a shock
54	**ኡፍ**	uf		Alas	To express a feeling of pity
55	**ኤ**	e		Alas	To express a feeling of pity

56	ኤ	E		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaning
57	ኤ	E		Blimey	To express anger
58	ኤሀ	eh		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaning
59	ኤሀ	eh		Blimey	To express anger
60	ኤሀ	eh		No/ uh uh	To express objection
61	ኤይ	ej		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaning
62	ኤይ	ej		Blimey	To express anger
63	ኤጅ!/ኤድ	edʒ/ed	Go away	No	To express surprise
64	ኧ	ɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
65	ኧ	ɨ		Eww/phew	To express a feeling of digust
66	ኧ	ɨ		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaning
67	ኧ	ɨ		Yes	To express affirmation
68	ኧ	ɨ		Huh	To express sarcasm
69	ኧ	ɨ		Ah	To express disappointment
70	ኧ	ɨ		Yes	To express affirmation
71	ኧ	ɨ		Eww/phew	To express a feeling of digust
73	ኧ	ɨ		Bla/gee	To express anxiety and fear
74	ኧ	ɨ		Blimey	To express anger
75	ኧ	ɨ		Wow	To express admiration
76	ኧ	ɨhɨ		Huh	To express unbelief
77	ኧ	ɨ		Alas	To express a feeling of pity
78	ኧ	ɨ		Wow	To express admiration
79	ኧ	ɨ		No/ uh uh	To express objection
80	ኧ?	ɨ		Oh/blimey	To express surprise and shock
81	ኧ?	ɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise

82	እ?	ɨ		Huh	To express afirmation
83	እ?	ɨ		Ah/ huh	To express a feeling of confusion
84	እሀ	ɨhɨ		No/ uh uh	To express surprise and objection
85	እሀ	ɨhɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
86	እሀ	ɨhɨ	Oh		To mark an annoyed remark
87	እሀ	ɨhɨ		Blimey	To express anger
88	እሀ	ɨhɨ		Uh-huh	To express admiration and agreement
89	እሀ	ɨhɨ		Yes	To express affirmation
90	እሀ	ɨhɨ		No/ uh uh	To express objection
91	እሀ	ɨhɨ		Eww/phew	To express a feeling of digust
92	እሀ	ɨhɨ		Ha	To express success or truimph
93	እሀ	ɨhɨ		Oh/ blimey	To express a shock
94	እሰይ	ɨssəj		Blimey	To express pleasure
95	እስ	ɨs		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaning
96	እስ	ɨs		Eww/phew	To express surprise
97	እሪ	ɨrri		Oh/blimey	To express a shock
98	እርፍ!	ɨrɨf		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
99	እሺ	ɨʃʃi	Ok		To express a plan to revenge
100	እንዳው ወይኔ	ɨndaw wəjne	Alas	Ah	To express regret
101	እንደው ወይኔ	ɨndəw wəjne	Alas	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express surprise
102	እንዲህ	ɨndih	Like this	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
103	እንዲህ	ɨndih	Like this	Of course	To express affirmation/acknowledgement
104	እንዴ	ɨnde		Eww/phew	To express a feeling of digust

105	እንዴ	ɨnde		Blimey	To express anger
106	እንዴ	ɨnde		No/ uh uh	To express objection
107	እንዴ	ɨnde		Of course	To express afirmation
108	እንዴ	ɨnde		Oh/blimey	To express a shock
109	እንዴ	ɨnde		Oh/pooh	To express surprise and shock
110	እንዴ	ɨnde		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
111	እንግዲያ	ɨngɨdija		Of course	To express afirmation
112	እኝክ!	ɨɲɲɨk	Chewing	Wow	To express admiration
113	እኧ	ɨə		Alas/dear/hum	To express a feeling of pity
114	እኧ	ɨə		Eww/phew	To express a feeling of digust
115	እኧ	ɨə		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
116	እኧ	ɨə		Yes	To express affirmation
117	እኧ	ɨə		Ya	To express good attitude
118	እኧ	ɨə		No/ uh uh	To express objection
119	ኦ ኦ	o o		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
120	ኧ	ə		No/ uh uh	To express objection
121	ኧ	ə		Blimey	To express anger
122	ኧ	ə		Blimey/oh	To express a shock
123	ኧ!	ə		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaning
124	ኧ/ኧ?	ə/ə		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
125	ኧ/ኧ?	ə/ə		Huh	To express afirmation
126	ኧሀ	əh		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
127	ኧሀ	əh		Eww/phew	To express a feeling of digust
128	ኧረ	ərə		Aha/ah/ahh /hhh	To express understanding
129	ኧረ	ərə		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/ha	To express a surprise

				h/huh/oh/phew/uh	
130	ኧረ	ərə		Wow	To express admiration
131	ኧረ	ərə		Sure?/Really?	To express unbelief and a need for a confirmation
132	ኧረ	ərə	Please	No/ uh uh	To express objection
133	ኧረ በለው	ərə bələw	Kick it	My goodness	To express surprise
134	ኧረ በለው እና	ərə bələw ɨnna	Kick it and	My goodness	To express surprise
135	ኧረ በአላህ	ərə	By alah	For allah's sake, please	To express surprise
136	ኧረ ባክሽ/ኧረ ባክህ	ərə bakkɨʃ/ərə bakkɨh	Please	Huh	To express sarcasm
137	ኧረ ባክሽ/ኧረ ባክህ	ərə bakkɨʃ/ərə bakkɨh	Please	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/ha h/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
138	ኧረ ባክሽ/ኧረ ባክህ	ərə bakkɨʃ/ərə bakkɨh	Please	No	To express objection
139	ኧረ ባክሽ/ኧረ ባክህ	ərə bakkɨʃ/ərə bakkɨh	Please	Blimey/oh	To express a shock
140	ኧረ ተይኝ/ ኧረ ተወኝ	ərə təjiɲ/ərə təwəɲ	Please leave me		To express displeasure
141	ኧረ ወየው	ərə wəjjəw	Alas in deed/woe to me in deed	Alas/woe to me	
142	ኧረ ወይኔ	ərə wəjne	Alas in deed/woe to me in deed	Alas/woe to me	
143	ኧረዲያ	ərədija		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaning
144	ኧረገኝ	ərəgəɲ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/ha h/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
145	ኧረግ	ərəg		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/ha h/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express surprise
146	ኧኸ			Uh uh	To express objection and surprise
147	ኧይ	əj		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/ha h/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
148	ኧይ	əj		Oh/blimey	To express a shock
149	ኧዲያ	ədija		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaning

150	**ወየው**	wəjjəw	Alas/Woe to me	Alas/Woe to me	
151	**ወይ ጉድ**	wəj gud		What a wonder	To express a surprise
152	**ወይኔ ጉዴ**	wəjne gude	Alas my scandal	Woe to me	
153	**ወይኔ**	wəjne	Alas for me/Woe to me	Alas/Woe to me	
154	**ወይኔ**	wəjne	Alas for me/Woe to me	Wow	To express a admiration
155	**ወግድ**	wəgɨd	Go away	Go away	To express anger at another person
156	**ዋ**	wa		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh	To express a surprise
157	**ዋ እኔ**	wa ɨne	Alas for me	Bla/gee /alas	To express anxiety and fear
158	**ዋይ**	waj		Blimey	To express anger
159	**ውይ**	wɨj		Wow	To express a admiration
160	**ውይ**	wɨj		Boo/uh oh	To express derision/demeaing
161	**ውይ**	wɨj		Eww/Phew	To express displeasure or disgust
162	**ውይ**	wɨj		Blimey	To express a pleasure
163	**ውይ**!	wɨj		Blimey	To express anger
164	**ውይ**!	wɨj		Huh	To express sarcasm
165	**ውይ**	wɨj		Alas/dear	To express a feeling of pity
166	**ያ አላህ**!	ja allah	Alah	Alah	
167	**ጉድ ነው**	gud nəw	It is shocking	It is shocking	To express a shock
168	**ጉድ**	gud	Shocking	Oh/It is shocking	To express a shock
169	**ፐ**	pə		Wow	To express admiration
170	**ፐ**	pə		Blimey	To express pleasure
Hedging Expressions (4)					
1	**ለምን መሰለህ?/ለምን መሰላችሁ?**	ləmɨn məssələh/ ləmɨn məssəlaʧʧɨhu	It seems to you why	I think the reason is …	
2	**መሰለሽ/መሰለህ/መሰላችሁ**	məssələʃ məssələh məssəlaʧʧɨhu	It seems to you	I think…	
3	**ምናልባት**	mɨnalbat	Perhaps	Perhaps	

4	**ብለሽ ነው**	bɨləʃ nəw	You said	You think…	
Markers of invitation to speak and instigation to continue to speak (5)					
1	**እ/አ**?	ɨ/ ɨ		Yes?	To encourage others to continue to speak
2	**እ**	ɨ		Please go on	To initiate others to speak
3	**እህ**	ɨhɨ		Yes?	To encourage others to continue to speak
4	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi		Please go on	To initiate others to speak
5	**ኧ**?	ə		Yes?	To encourage others to continue to speak
Involvement (hearer-appeal) markers (19)					
1	**ብታዪ/ብታይ**	bɨttaji/bɨttaj	If you see	You see	
2	**ብታያት/ብታያቸው**	bɨttajat bɨttajʧʃ ə w	If you see them	You see	
3	**ተረድተኸኛል**?	tərədtəhəɲɲal	Did you understand me?	Did you get me?	
4	**ታቂያለሽ/ታቃላችሁ/ታቃለህ**?	tak'ijalləʃ/ta k'alla ʧʧhu/tak'alləh	Do you know?	You know?	
5	**አ**?	A		Eh?	To check the listener is following
6	**አስብ/አስቢ**	assɨb/assbi	Think	Imagine	
7	**አየህ/አየሽ**?	ajjəh/ajjəʃ	Did you see?	You see?	
8	**አየ ኸው**?	ajjəhəw	Did you see it?	You see?	
9	**እ**?	ɨ		Eh?	To check the listener is following
10	**እ**?	ɨ		Huh?	To see the listener's agreement
11	**እሺ**?	ɨʃʃi	Ok?	Eh?	To check the listener is following
12	**እሺ**?/**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi/ɨʃʃi	Ok?/ok	Huh?/yes?	To see the listener's agreement

13	ኧ?	ə		Eh?	To check the listener is following
14	ኧ?	ə		Huh?/Yes?	To see the listener's agreement
15	ይኸውልሽ	jɨhəwɨllɨʃ	This for you	Look	
16	ይገባሃል?	jɨgəbahal	Do you understand?	Did you get my idea?	
17	ገባህ አደለም?	gəbah adəlləm	You understood, isn't it?	Did you get my idea?	
18	ገባሽ?/ገባህ?	gəbbaʃ/gəbbah	Did you understand?	Did you get my idea?	
19	ገብቶሀል?/ገብቶሻል	gəbtohal/gəbtoʃal	Did you understand?	Did you get my idea?	
Requests for Repair (3)					
1	አ?	a		Eh?/huh?/hm?	To request a former speaker to repeat his speech
2	እ?/እ?እ?	ɨ/ ɨ ɨ		Eh?/huh?/hm?	To request a former speaker to repeat his speech
3	ኧ?	ə		Eh?/huh?/hm?	To request a former speaker to repeat his speech
Response Tokens (63)					
1	ሃ *	ha		Uh-huh	To express agreement
2	ህ	hɨ		Uh-huh	To express agreement
3	ህ *	hɨ		Uh-huh	To express agreement
4	ህ *	hɨ		Uh-huh	To express a positive response to a question
5	ህ *	hɨ		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh	To express understanding
6	ህ *	hɨ		Ok	To express acceptance
7	ህ *	hɨ		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh	To express understanding
8	ህእ	hɨɨ		Uh-huh	To express agreement
9	ለበይክ	ləbbəjk	Yes	Yes	A response to a calling
10	መርሀባ/መህራባ	mərhaba/ məhraba	Ok	Ok	To express acceptance

11	በጣም	bət'am	Very	Of course	To express a positive response to a question
12	በጣም	bət'am	Very	Of course	To express agreement
13	አ	a		Uh-huh	To express a positive response to a question
14	አ	a		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh	To express understanding
15	አ	a			To express a disclaimer
16	አ!	a		Uh-huh	To express agreement
17	አቤት·	abet	Yes	Yes	A response to a calling
18	አዎ	awo	Yes	Aha/ah/ahh	To express understanding
19	አዎ	awo	Yes	Yes	To express agreement
20	አዎ/ኣወ/ኣዎ	awo/ awo/ awo	Yes	Yes	To express a positive response to a question
21	አይ	aj	No	No no/Sorry	To express a lack of intereset to involve in the exchange
22	አይ	aj	No	No	To express objection
23	አይ	aj	No	No	To express rejection
24	አይ	aj	No	No	To express a negative response to a yes/no question
25	አይደል?/አደል?	ajdəl/adəl	Isn’t it?	I understand	To express understanding
26	አይደል?/አደል?	ajdəl/adəl	Isn’t it?	Yes	To express agreement
27	አደለም	adəlləm	No	No	To express a disclaimer
28	አደለም	adəlləm	No	No	To express objection
29	እ	ɨ		Uh-huh	To express a positive response to a question
30	እ	ɨ		Ok	To express acceptance
31	እ እ እ	ɨ ɨ ɨ		Huh-uh/uh-uh/No	To express refusal
32	እ/እ እ	ɨ/ ɨ ɨ		Uh-huh	To express agreement
33	እ/እ?	ɨ/ ɨ		Yes	A reply to a calling

34	**እ**	ɨ		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh	To express understanding
35	**እ**	ɨ		Huh-uh/uh-uh/No	To express a negative response to a question
36	**እህ**	ɨhɨ		Yes	A reply to a calling
37	**እህ**	ɨhɨ		Uh-huh	To express a positive response to a question
38	**እህ**	ɨhɨ		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh	To express understanding
39	**እህ/እህ እህ**	ɨhɨ/ ɨhɨ ɨhɨ		Uh-huh	To express agreement
40	**እም**	ɨm		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh	To express understanding
41	**እምቢ**	ɨmbi	I refuse	No	To express refusal
42	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok	To express lack of interest to continue to involve in an argument
43	**እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Yes	To express understanding
44	**እሺ እሺ**	ɨʃʃi	Ok ok	Ok ok	To express agreement
45	**እሺ/ኧሺ**	ɨʃʃi/ əʃʃi	Ok	Ok	To express acceptance
46	**እኔ እምቢኝ**	ɨne ɨmbiɲ	I refuse	No	To express refusal
47	**እኔ እንጃ**	ɨne ɨndʒa	I don’t know	I don’t know	To express ignorance
48	**እኔ እንጃለቱ**	ɨne ɨndʒalltu	I don’t know	I don’t know	To express ignorance
49	**እንደ**	ɨnde		Uh-huh	To express agreement
50	**እንጃ**	ɨndʒa	I don’t know	I don’t know	To express ignorance
51	**እንግዲያ**	ɨngɨdija		Of course	To express agreement
52	**እኧ**	ɨə		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh	To express understanding
53	**እኧ**	ɨə		Uh-huh	To express agreement
54	**እኧ**	ɨə		Uh-huh	To express a positive response to a question
55	**እኮ**	ɨkko		Of course	To express agreement
56	**ኧ**	ə		Yes	A reply to a calling
57	**ኧ**	ə		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh	To express understanding
58	**ኧእ**	əɨ		Uh-huh	To express agreement

59	ኧይ	əj	Yes	Yes	A reply to a calling
60	ኸይ	həj	Yes	Yes	A reply to a calling
61	ወዬ	wəjje	Yes, my dear	Yes, my dear	A reply to a calling
62	ጥሩ	t'ɨru		Ok	To express agreement
63	ጽ/ጽጽ	s'/s's'	No	No	To express a disclaimer
Vocatives and attention getters (6)					
1	ስሚ/ስማ/ስማ ስማ	sɨmi/sɨma	Hear/Hear/Hear hear	Listen	To call attention of people
2	እ/አ?	ɨ/ɨ		Hey/oh	To call attention of people
3	እ	ɨ		Hey/oh	To address people
4	እሺ	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok/oh	To call attention of people
5	እኧ	ɨə		Hey/oh	To address people
6	ኧ	ə		Hey/oh	To call attention of people

Notes: Discourse functions are not given for tokens whose contextual transalation is transparent.

The asterix indicates (∗) a sound made in the throat by inhaling air quickly and forcibly through the mouth

Appendix 7: List of Slang Expressions Used in the Study

Loan Words

Token	Phonetic Transcription	Meaning in English /Discourse Function	Source Language
ዶ‌ች	deʃʃ	Ten	Italian
ጀዝባ	ʤəzbba	Stupid	Arabic
መ·ድ	Mud	Attractiveness	English
አሪፍ	Arif	Fantastic	Arabic
ቺክ	ʧik	Girl	Spanish or English
ሼም ያዘው	ʃem jazəw	He is ashamed	English
ስታይል	stajl	*Expression for approval, agreement, acknowledgement etc.*	English
ፒስ	Pis	Good	English
ፒር	Pir	*Expression that shows approval*	English

Note: explanations of discourse functions are italicized.

New Derivatives

Token	Phonetic Transcription	Meaning in English	Root
መለፋለፍ	məlləfaləf	*To speak bad words that annoys others*	**ለፈለፈ** *ləfəlləfə* ‘talked too much pointlessly’
አካበደ	akkabbədə	Exaggerated	**ከበደ** *kəbbədə* ‘became difficult’
ተበተ	təbbətə	Became proud	**ትእቢት** *tɨʔɨbit* ‘pride’
ቀወጠ	k'əwwət'ə	Disturbed	**ቀውጢ** *k'əwt'ɨ* ‘messy’

Existing forms with meaning extensions and new qualities

Token	Phonetic Transcription	Meaning in English / Discourse Function
ደረቀ	dərrək'ə	Became stubborn
ያምራል	jamral	Is pleasing
የመጨረሻ	jəməʧʼərrəʃa	Very e.g. **የመጨረሻ እኮ ነው እሚያምረው** *jəməʧʼərrəʃa ɨkko nəw ɨmijamrəw* 'is very good'
እንደጸባዩ ነው መግባት ያለብሽ	ɨndə s'əbaju nəw məgbat jalləbbɨʃ	You (SG, F) should take his behavior into account when you (SG, F) approach him
ግድ ይላል	gɨdd jilall	Is necessary
አጃጃለ	adʒdʒadʒalə	Fooled
ፎረፉ	forrəfə	Cut class
ዘና በል	zəna	Relax
አስጠላ	ast'əlla	Behaved badly
ወራጅ አለ	wəradʒ allə	*Used to express that one declines to do or to be something*
ጣጣ የለውም	t'at'a jəlləwɨm	No big deal
አልሰማህም	alsəmahɨm	I do not accept your (SG, M) idea
ኮበለለ	kobəllələ	Go abroad illegally
ጣመ	t'amə	Liked something very much
ተማማተ	təm^{w}am^{w}atə	Made the maximum effort
ለከፉ	ləkkəfə	Teased
-ልህም (suffix)	-lɨhɨm	Not…for you e.g **አልሰራልህም** *alsərallɨhɨm* 'I do not do it'
ተበላ	təbəlla	It was eaten
ማጨናነቅ	məʧʧʼənanək'	To make oneself worried

ምርጥ	mɨrt'	Very good
አይሻልህም?	ajɨʃʃalɨhɨm	*An expression for sarcastic criticism*
ቀላል	k'əllal	Not serious

Note: explanations of discourse functions are italicized.

Existing forms with new meanings

Token	**Phonetic Transcription**	**Meaning in English / Discourse Function**
ሂደት አላት፡	hidət allat	She is very good
አፈጋ	afəgga	Made one fail exam
ተጫረ	təʧ'arə	Was expelled
እንዴት አባቱ	ɨnddet abbatu	*An expression used to exaggerate*
ትርምስምሴ ወጣ	tɨrmɨsmɨse wət'ta	I became confused
አመቻመች	ammətʧʧammətʧʧə	Arranged
ክው አረገው	kɨw arəgəw	Got or took much of something
እኽክ	ɨɲɲɨk	*A form used for expressing approval, agreement, acknowledgement etc*
ጠበሰ	t'əbbəsə	Began to date
ሞባይል	Mobajl	Hip flesh
ክላስ ዘጋ	kɨlas zəgga	Cut class
ሰቀለ	sək'k'ələ	Scored the highest
ጽድት ያለ	s'ɨddɨt jalə	Very good
ጠባ	t'əbba	Beat
ወጋ	wəgga	Beat
ፈካ ብሎ	fəka bɨlo	Is beautiful
ቀረቀረ	k'ərək'k'ərə	Is mean

ዘፈነ	zəffənə	Pestered
ቀየሰ (ርእስ)	k'əjjəsə	Changed topic
ተመቸ	təməʧʧə	Is suitable
አይገልጸውም	ajgəls'əwm	Very
ወጣ	wət't'a	Had sexual intercourse
አህመድ ጨብ ጨብ	ahməd ʧ'əbb ʧ'əbb	A sandal locally made of tire

Note: explanations of discourse functions are italicized.

Newly created forms

Token	**Phonetic Transcription**	**Meaning in English / Discourse Function**
ተሳፈጠ	təsaffət'ə	Mocked
ገገመ	gəggəmə	Became stubborn
ጠሸ	t'əʃ	Crazy
ጠበረ	t'əbbərə	Boasted
አሽቃበጠ	aʃk'abbət'ə	Acted as though one is in service of another to get favor or be loved by that person
ቡሌ	Bulle	Leftover food
አረፈ	arrəfə	Knew
ሸወደ	ʃəwwədə	Cheated, made a trick
ጨጨሞ	ʧ'uʧ'e	Little child
ፋራ	Fara	Uncultured
ፎገረ	foggərə	Jeered
ነፍ	nəff	Much
ጠበሰ	t'əbbɨsʷal	Looked at somebody in hatred
ደበረ	dəbbərə	Is detestable
አይደብርህም?	ajdebbɨrɨhɨm	Aren’t you (SG, M) considerate?

ፎገፈ	foggərə	Became a sign of bad luck
-ዋ	-wa	*A definite marker added to proper names* (e.g **ህሊናዋ** *hɨllinawa* the Hilina’)
ፍቅር አላት·	fɨk'ɨr allat	She is lovable

Note: explanations of discourse functions are italicized.

Appendix 8: List of Vulgar Expressions Used in the Study

	Token	**Phonetic Transcription**	**Meaning in English / Discourse Function**
1	**ሂድ**	hid	Ha
2	**ሂድ በል ተህ ግዲም ‘**	hid bəl təh gɨdim	Go away from here
3	**ሂጂ ወደዛ**	hiʤi wədəzza	Go away with it
4	**ህዱ እምከዱበት**	hɨdu ɨmmɨkkədubbət	Go away
5	**ሆዳም**	hodam	Ravenous
6	**መቀርጠጫ ራስ**	mək'ərt'əʧ'a ras	A head as flat and wide as a griddle
7	**መፋቂያ ‘**	məfak'ija	Scraper
8	**መልከስከስ/ከሚልከስከሱ**	məlkəskəs/ kəmilkəsəkkəsu	Going around unwanted places
9	**ምናባቱ/ምናባቷ/ ምናባክ**	mɨnabbatu/ mɨnabbat^{w}a/ mɨnabbak	What a rubbish person he is/ what a rubbish person she is/ you (SG, M) rubbish
10	**ሲቅለበለብ**	sik'ləbəlləb	As he is talking garrulously
11	**ሹጣም**	ʃut'am	One who has tapeworm
12	**ቀጥ ብላችሁ ውጡ**	k'ət't'bɨlaʧʧɨhu wɨt'u	Go out of the compound directly
13	**ቂንጥራም**	k'int'ɨram	Uncircumcised
14	**በመጋጎ እጅህ**	bəməgaʒa ɨʤʤɨh	With your (SG, M) big hand
15	**ባላገር**	balagar	Savage
16	**ቶፋ**	Tofa	Ugly’
17	**አታስብም**?	attassɨbɨm	Aren’t you (SG, M) thoughtful?
18	**አታስጠላ**	atast'əlla	Do not behave badly
19	**አትጨማለቅ**	attɨʧ'əmalək'	Do not behave badly
20	**አፈር ብላ አባክ**	afər bt'la abbakk	I wish you (SG, M) die
21	**አፉን መክፈቱ**	afun məkfətu	He becoming mouthy
22	**እናትህን**	ɨnatɨhɨn	Fuck your (SG, M) mother
23	**እንዳልወጋህ**	ɨndalwəgah	I will kick you(SG, M)
24	**ኤጅ!**	eʤ	Ha
25	**እስ (ማጣጣል)**	ɨs	Boo
26	**እንደኅት አባቱ**	ɨndet abbatu	*Expression showing apprehension*

27	እስ (ጥላቻን መግለጫ) ‘	ɨs	Eww
28	ከመነቋቆር	kəmənnək'^{w}ak'or	Tit for tat; exchange of offensive language
29	ወሬ አታብዛ	wəre attabza	Do not talk a lot
30	ወደዛ ሂድ	wədəzza hid	Go away
31	ወግዲ /ወይድ	wəgɨdi/ wəjɨd	Go away
32	ዘልዛላ ባለጌ	zəlzalla baləge	Rude, uncultivated, disrespectful
33	ዝም በል	zɨmm bəl	Shut your (SG, M) mouth
34	የታባክ	jətabbak	You (SG, M) rubbish
35	የተኮፈሰ/ከመኮፈስ	jəttəkoffəsə/ kəməkoffəs	Proud
36	ይበለኝ	jɨbələɲ	I am paying the price
37	የራስህ ጉዳይ	jərasɨh guddaj	I don’t care about you (SG, M)
38	የሸርሙጣ ልጅ	jəʃərmut'a lɨdʒ	Son of a prostitute
39	የዲቃላ ልጅ	jdikala lɨdʒ	Son of a bastard woman/man
40	ይቀርቅርህ	jɨk'ərk'ɨrɨh	Let God hammer you (SG, M) in
41	ይፋቅህ	jɨfak'ɨh	Let God scrape you (SG, M)
42	ደደብ	dəddəb	Idiot
43	ጀዝባ	ʤəzba	Stupid
44	ጅል	ʤɨl	Foolish
45	ገበሬ	gəbəre	Savage
46	ገበሬ አቱንብኝ/ ገበሬ እንዳቶንብኝ	gəbəre attunɨbbɨɲ/ gəbəre ɨndattonɨbbɨɲ	Do not act like a savage person before me
47	ግም	gɨm	Worthless
48	ጎደሎ	godəlo	Crippled
49	ጥፍራም	t'ɨfram	Rude
50	ፋራ አትሁንብኝ	fara attɨhunɨbbɨɲ	Do not act like a rough person before me
51	ፋራ ነው	fara nəw	He is rough
52	ኧረ አልሰማህም	ərə alsəmahɨm	I do not accept your (SG, M) idea

Appendix 9: List of Back Channeling Utterances Used in the Study

Function		**Token**	**Phonetic Transcription**	**Literal Meaning**	**Contextual Meaning**
Acceptance (4)	1	**ህ ∗**	hɨ		Ok
	2	**አዎ**	awo	Yes	Ok
	3	**እ**	ɨ		Ok
	4	**እሺ/ኧሺ**	ɨʃʃi/ əʃʃi	Ok	Ok
Acknowledgement (3)	1	**አሚን**	amin	Amen	Amen
	2	**አዎ አይ**	awo aj	Yes No	Yes in fact
	3	**እንዲህ**	ɨndih	Like this	Of course
Agreement (23)	1	**ሃ∗**	ha		Uh-huh
	2	**ህ**	hɨ		Uh-huh
	3	**ህ∗**	hɨ		Uh-huh
	4	**ህ ∗፡፡ አዎ፡፡**	hɨ awo		Uh-huh
	5	**ህእ**	hɨɨ		Uh-huh
	6	**በቃ**	bək'k'a	Enough	
	7	**በጣም**	bət'am	Very	Of course
	8	**ታዲያ**	tadija		Of course
	9	**ታዲያሳ/ ታዲያስ**	tadijassa/tadijas		Of course
	10	**አ**	a		Uh-huh
	11	**አዎ**	awo	Yes	Yes
	12	**አዎ**	awo	Yes	Yes, Of course
	13	**እ**	ɨ		Uh-huh
	14	**እ፡፡ በጣም፡፡**	ɨ bət'am		Uh-huh፣ of course
	15	**እህ**	ɨhɨ		Uh-huh

	16	እሺ	ɨʃʃi	Ok ok	Ok ok
	17	እንዴ	ɨnde		Uh-huh
	18	እኧ	ɨə		Uh-huh
	19	እኮ	ɨkko		Of course
	20	እውነት ነው	ɨwnət nəw	It is true	It is true
	21	ኧረ በጣም	ərə bət'am		Yes, of course
	22	ወላሂ	wəllahi	Wallahi	I swear to Allah
	23	ጥሩ	t'ɨru	Good	Good
Agreement/ Acceptance (2)	1	እ፡፡ እሺ	ɨ ɨʃʃi	Ok	Uh-huh ok
	2	እ፡፡ እ?	ɨ ɨ		Uh-huh. Huh?
Assessment (15)	1	በናትሽ	bənnatɨʃ	By your mother	For your mother's sake
	2	አበቃ፡፡	abək'k'a	Finished	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	3	አየሽ?	ajjəʃ	Did you see?	You see?
	4	አሚገርም ነው፡፡	ɨmmigərm nəw	It is surprising	It is surprising
	5	አርፍ	ɨrrɨf		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	6	አንደው ወይኔ፡፡	ɨndəw wəjne	Alas	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	7	እውነት?	ɨwnət	True?	Is that correct?
	8	ወላሂ?	wəllahi	Wallahi?	Sure?
	9	ጉድ	gud	Shocking	Oh/It is shocking
	10	ኧረ	ərə		I see
	11	ኧረ በናትሽ?	ərə bənnatɨʃ	Please by your mother	Please For your mother's sake
	12	ኧረ ባክሽ/ኧረ ባክህ	ərə bakkɨʃ/ərə bakkɨh	Please	Huh
	13	ኧረ! ተይ እንጂ!	ərə təj ɨndʒi	Leave please	Really?/ How come?
	14	ኧረ ጉድ	ərə gud	Oh	
	15	ኧረግ	ərəg		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh

Completion (4)	1	ላንቺ	lanʧʃi	For you	For you
	2	በርበር	bərbər		
	3	የለበትም አዎ	jəlləbbətɨm awo	You don’t have, yes	Yes, you don’t have
	4	የዚያ ግዜ	jzzija gɨzze	That time	
Comprehension (13)	1	ህ*	hɨ		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh
	2	አ	a		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh
	3	አሀ	aha	Aha	Aha/ Ha/hah
	4	አሀ	aha	Aha	Aha
	5	አዎ	awo	Yes	Aha/ah/ahh
	6	አይደል?/አደል?/አደለ	ajdəl/adəl/adəllə	Isn’t it?	I understand
	7	እ	ɨ		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh
	8	እህ	ɨhɨ		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh
	9	እም	ɨm		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh
	10	እሺ	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Yes
	11	እኧ	ɨə		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh
	12	ኧ	ə		Aha/ah/ahh/hhh
	13	ኧረ	ərə		Aha/ah/ahh /hhh
Comprehension/Continuative (1)	1	እህ	ɨhɨ		
Continuatives and instigators (18)	1	ህ *	hɨ		Yes?
	2	ህ	hɨ		Ahh/aha/hm/hmm/mmh/mm
	3	ህ	hɨ		Yes?
	4	አሀ	aha	Aha	Yes?
	5	አዎ	awo	Yes	Yes?
	6	አዎ	awo	Yes	Yes
	7	እ	ɨ		Ahh/aha/hm/hmm/mmh/mm
	8	እ/እ እ	ɨ/ ɨ ɨ		Yes?
	9	እ?	ɨ		Yes?
	10	እ?	ɨ/ ɨ		Please go on

	11	እህ	ɨhɨ		Ahh/ aha/hm/hmm/mmh/mm
	12	እህ	ɨhɨ/ ɨhɨ ɨhɨ		Yes?
	13	እሺ	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Yes
	14	እሺ	ɨʃʃi	Ok	Ok
	15	እኧ	ɨə		Yes?
	16	እኧ	ɨə		Please go on
	17	ኧ	ə		Yes?
	18	ኧ	ə		Ahh/aha/hm/hmm/mmh/mm
Continuative/ Agreement (1)	1	እ? እ	ɨ ɨ		Huh? uh-huh
Emotion (52)	1	ሂድ!	hid	Go away	Really?/ How come?/No
	2	ህ!	hɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	3	ህእ	hɨɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	4	ሆ!	ho		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	5	በለው	bələw	Kick it	My goodness
	6	በስማም	bəsmam	In the name of the Father	Jesus
	7	በአላህ	bəallah	By allah	For the sake of allah
	8	ተይ እንጂ?/ ተው እንጂ?	təj ɨndʒi/təw ɨndʒi	Leave please	Really?/ How come?
	9	አ	a		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	10	አ?!	a		Oh/blimey
	11	አሀ	aha	Aha	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	12	አሄ	ahe		Alas
	13	አህ	ah		Blimey
	14	አየኤ!	ajəe		Alas
	15	አዪ	aji		Alas
	16	ኡኡኡ!	uuu		Oh/blimey

	17	**ኡፍ!**	uf		Alas
	18	**እ**	ɨ		Ah
	19	**እ**	ɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	20	**እ**	ɨ		Bla/gee
	21	**እ**	ɨ		Blimey
	22	**እ**	ɨ		Alas
	23	**እ**?	ɨ		Oh/blimey
	24	**እ**?/**እ**!?	ɨ/ ɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	25	**እህ**!	ɨhɨ		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	26	**እናቴ**	ɨnnate	My mother	My dear
	27	**እናቴዋየ**	ɨnnatewwajjə	My mother	My dear
	28	**እናትዋ**	ɨnnatɨwwa	My mother	My dear
	29	**እንዲህ**	ɨndih	Like this	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	30	**እንዳው ጉድ**	ɨndaw gud	Oh/It is shocking	Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	31	**እንደ**	ɨnde		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	32	**እኧ**	ɨə		Alas/dear/hum
	33	**እኧ**	ɨə		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	34	**ኦ ኦ**	o o		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	35	**ኧ**	ə/ə		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	36	**ኧ**	ə		Blimey/oh
	37	**ኧ**?	ə		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	39	**ኧህ**	əh		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/p

					hew/uh
	40	ኧረ	ərə		Ah/blimey/eh/ha/hah/huh/oh/phew/uh
	41	ኧረ በለው	ərə bələw	Kick it	My goodness
	42	ኧረ በአላህ	ərə bəallah	By Allah	For Allah’s sake, please
	43	ኧረ ተይ?	ərə təj	Please leave	Really?/ How come?
	44	(ከንፈር መምጠጥ)። እናት·ዋ	ɨnnatɨwwa	Dear mother	My dear
	45	(ከንፈር መምጠጥ) ስ	s	Alas	Alas
	46	ወይ ጉድ	wəj gud		What a wonder
	47	ወይኔ	wəjne	Alas for me/Woe to me	Alas/Woe to me
	48	ወይኔ ጉዴ	wəjne gude	Alas my scandal	Woe to me
	49	ዋ እኔ።	wa ɨnne		Bla/gee
	50	ውይ	wɨj		Alas/dear
	51	ኧይ	əj		Oh/blimey
	52	ፐ	pə		Wow
Emotion/ Request for confirmation (1)	1	እ። “ወላሂ” በል።	ɨ wəllahi bəl	Say wallahi	Ah, sure?
Emotion/Agreement (1)	1	እህ	ɨhɨ		Uh-huh
Minimal responses (18)	1	ህ*	hɨ		Uh-huh
	2	ህ*። እ	hɨ		Uh-huh
	3	ህ*። አዎ	hɨ awo		Uh-huh
	4	በጣም	bət'am	Very	Of course
	5	ተው እንጂ	təw ɨnʤi	Leave please	Stop
	6	አዎ/አወ/አዎ	awo/ ɨwə/ ɨwo	Yes	Yes
	7	አዎ እንዴ	awo ɨnde	Yes	Yes
	8	እ	ɨ		Uh-huh

	10	እ	ɨ		Huh-uh/uh-uh/No (Rejection)
	11	እ	ɨ		No/ uh uh (Negative response to a yes/no question)
	12	እህ	ɨhɨ		Uh-huh
	13	እህ ኧረ!	ɨhɨ ərə		No/ uh uh
	14	እንዴ	ɨnde awo		Of course
	15	እኧ	ɨə		Uh-huh
	16	ኧረ ባክሽ።	ərə bakkɨʃ	Please	No
	17	ኧረ ተይ	ərə təj	Please leave	Stop
	18	ኧረ	ərə	Please	No/ uh uh
Repetition (9)	1	ለባዛሩ አዎ	ləbazaru awo	Yes for the bazaar	For the bazaar, yes
	2	ማለት ነው	maləṯ nəw	It means	It means
	3	ስለምን?	sɨləmɨn	About what?	About what?
	4	ሸህ ውሴን አሊ	ʃəh wɨssen ali	Sheh Hussien Ali	Sheh Hussien Ali
	5	ሸገር	ʃəggər	Sheger	Sheger
	6	አማርኛ እና እንግሊዝ።	amarɨɲɲa ɨnna ɨngɨliz	Amharic and English	Amharic and English
	7	አዲስ ነው አዎ።	adis nəw awo	It is new yes	Yes, it is new
	8	ወረዳ	wərəda	District	District
	9	ይኽ አለዎት	jɨhə alləwot	Do you have this?	Do you have this?
Request for clarification (8)	1	ምን?	mɨn	What?	What?
	2	ምን በላች?	mɨn bəllaʧʧ	What did she eat?	
	3	ምን? እ?	mɨn ɨ	What? huh?	What? huh?
	4	ምን? እንዴት?	mɨn ɨndet	What? How?	What? How?
	5	ምንድነው ግምብ ጥብስ?	mɨndɨnnəw gɨmb t'ɨbs	What is ‘block roast?	What is block roast?
	6	ምንድን?	mɨndɨnnəw	What?	What?
	7	እ? ምን?	ɨ mɨn		Eh? What? /Huh? What?/Hm? What?
	8	እንዴት?	ɨndet	How?/ How? How?	What do you mean?
Request for	1	መላጨት?	məllaʧəṯ	Shaving?	Shaving?

confirmation (75)	2	**መስተካከል አለብሽ?**	məstəkakəl alləbbɨʃ	You should be correctly positioned?	You should be correctly positioned?
	3	**መቶ ሃያ ብር?**	məto haja bɨrr	One hundred twenty Birr	One hundred twenty Birr
	4	**መቶ አለቃ?**	məto aləkˈa	Sergeant?	Sergeant?
	5	**መከለስ?**	məkəlləs	Revising?	Revising?
	6	**መጣ?**	məˈtˈa	He came?	He came?
	7	**መጣድ ነው?**	məˈtad nəw	It is putting on the fire?	It is putting on the fire?
	8	**ማርያምን?**	marijamɨn	Do you swear to Mary?	Sure?/ Really?
	9	**ማትሪክ?**	matrik	Matriculation	Matriculation
	10	**ሞተች?**	motəʧʧ	She died?	She died?
	11	**ሱሪ?**	surri	Trousers?	Trousers?
	12	**ሲቪክም አይወድቅም?**	sivikɨm ajwədkˈɨm	Doesn’t civics drop?	Isn’t civics excluded?
	13	**ሲቪክ?**	sivik	Civics?	Civics?
	14	**ሸገር?**	ʃəggər	Sheger?	Sheger?
	15	**ቀበሌ አምስት?**	kˈəbəle ammɨst	Kebele Amist?	Kebele Amist?
	16	**በሁለት እጅሽ?**	bəhulətt ɨʤʤɨʃ	In your two hands?	In your two hands?
	17	**ቢራ እንጠጣ አለችሽ?**	bira ɨntˈətˈtˈa aləʧʧɨʃ	Did she say “let’s drink beer?	Did she say “let’s drink beer?
	18	**ቢራ እንጠጣ?**	bira ɨntˈətˈ tˈa	Let’s drink beer?	Let’s drink beer?
	19	**ባለፈው?**	balləfəw	Formerly	Formerly
	20	**ባዛር?**	bazar	Bazaar?	Bazaar?
	21	**ባጃጅ ነበረችው?**	baʤaʤ nəbbərəʧʧɨw	Did he have a bajaj?	Did he have a tricycle?
	22	**ተሙ?**	təmu	Temu?	You said ‘Temu’?
	23	**ተገናኛችሁ?**	təgənaɲaʧʧɨhu	Did you meet?	Did you meet?
	24	**ታስሮ?**	tasro	Arrested?	Arrested?
	25	**ትተውታል?**	tɨtəwɨtal	You said ‘they have stopped it’?	You said ‘they have stopped it’?
	26	**ነው እምትሆነው አ?**	nəw ɨmmɨttɨhonəw a	You become so, isn’t it?	You become so, isn’t it?
	27	**ነው እንዴ?**	nəm ɨnde	Is it?	Sure?
	28	**ነው?**	nəw	Is it?	Sure?

	29	ነጫፊ?	nəʧ'afi		
	30	ናት? እሷ ናት?	nat ɨsʷa nat	Is it she? Is it she?	Is it she? Is it she?
	31	ናችሁ?	naʃʧʧɨhu	You are?	You are?
	32	አሀ አክስት ናቸው እንዴ?	aha akɨst naʧʧəw ɨnde	Aha	Aha, is it an aunt?
	33	አለው?	alləw	Has it?	Has it?
	34	አሉ?	alu	Did he say?	They said so?
	35	አማቱ ናት?	amatu nat	Is she his mother-in-law?	Is she his mother-in-law?
	36	አምስቱንም ቀን?	ammɨstunɨm k'ən	All the five days?	All the five days?
	37	አባቴ ይሙት?	abbate jɨmut	Shall my father die?	Sure?
	38	አትበይም?	attbəjɨm	Don't you eat?	You don't eat?
	39	አወከው?	awwəkkəw	Do you know him?	Did you recognize him?
	40	አይቲ?	ajti	IT?	You said 'IT'?
	41	አይደርስም?	ajdərsɨm	It doesn't reach?	It doesn't reach?
	42	አደል?	adəl	Isn't it?	Isn't it?
	43	እራታችንን ነው?	ɨrataʧʧɨnɨn nəw	Is it our supper?	You say it is our suppor?
	44	እኔ?	ɨne	Me?	Me?
	45	እንዳታብጂ?	ɨndattabʤi	He said 'take care not to lose your mind'?	He said 'take care not to lose your mind'?
	46	እንግሊዝኛ?	ɨngliziɲɲa	English?	In English?
	47	ክረምት?	kɨrəmt	Summer?	Summer?
	48	ክባዱ?	kɨbadu	Kibadu?	You said 'Kibadu'?
	49	ወላሂ በል/ወላሂ በይ	wəllahi bəl/ wəllahi bəj	Say Wallahi.	Sure?
	50	"ወላሂ" በል እስቲ	wəllahi bəl ɨsti	Please say wallahi.	Sure?
	51	ወላጅ?	wəlaʤ	Parent?	You said 'parent'?
	52	ዘጠንኛ ክፍል ነህ? የዘጠንኛ አመት ክፍል አመት ተማሪ ነህ አ?	zət'nɨɲɲa kɨfɨl nəh jəzət'ənɨɲɲa amət kɨfɨl amət təmari nəh a	Are you ninth grader? Are a student of grade year nine?	Are you grade nine?
	53	ዘፋኝ?	zəfaɲ	Singer?	You said 'singer'?
	54	የለህም?	jəlləhɨm	You don't have?	You don't have?

	55	የመጣሁት?	jəmət't'ahut	I came from?	The place I came from?
	56	የስሙኒ	jəsɨmuni	Of twenty-five cents	Bought for twenty-five cents
	57	የኔ?	jəne	Mine?	Mine?
	58	የአምስተኛ አመት ተማሪ ነህ?	jəammɨstəŋŋa amət təmari nəh	Are you a student of year V?	Are you a fifth year student?
	59	ያቁኛል?	jak'uŋŋal	They know me?	They know me?
	60	ያደንቅሀል?	jadənk'ɨhal	They admire you?	They admire you?
	61	ይመጣል?	jɨmət'al	Will he come?	Will he come?
	62	ይሞላል እንዴ? ይሞላል?	jɨmolal ɨnde jɨmolal	Does he give a mark?/ Does he give a mark?	Does he give a mark?
	63	ይቆሽበኛል?	jɨk'oʃʃɨbəŋŋal	It inflates my stomach?	It inflates my stomach?
	64	“ይዞህ ይሂድ” አለ?	jɨzoh jɨhid alə	Did he say ‘let it take you away’	Damn you
	65	ደሴ ልትሄጂ?	dəse lɨttɨhedʒi	You are going to Dessie?	You are going to Dessie?
	67	ዱርዬ?	hurɨjje	Hooligan?	
	68	ጅኦ ይቀራል?	dʒɨo jɨk'əral	Geo is left?	Geo is left?
	69	ጅኦ?	dʒɨo	Geo?	You said ‘geo’?
	70	ገዝተህ ነው?	gəztəh nəw	You buy?	You said ‘you buy’?
	71	ጎጆ ለማውጣት ማለት ነው	goʤʤo ləmawt'at mələt nəw	It means to make economically independent	Er to make economically independent
	72	ፍላጎቱ አለህ?	fɨllagotu allәh	You have the interest?	You have the interest?
	73	ፓይለት?	pajlət	Pilot?	You said ‘pilot’?
	74	ኧረ	ərə		Sure?/Really?
	75	ኧረ?	ərə	Really?/ How come?	Really?/ How come?
Request for repetition (3)	1	አ?	a		Eh?/huh?/hm?
	2	እ?	ɨ		Eh?/huh?/hm?
	3	ኧ?	ə		Eh?/huh?/hm?

Note: The asterix indicates (*) a sound made in the throat by inhaling air quickly and forcibly through the mouth.