



**Addis Ababa University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**College of Social Science and Humanities**  
**Faculty of Humanities**  
**Department of Linguistics and Philology**

**LANGUAGE USE AND CONTACT PHENOMENA IN THE AFAR  
REGIONAL STATE: THE CASE OF AB'ALA TOWN**

**BY**  
**MOHAMMED EBRAHIM**



**September, 2010**

**Addis Ababa**

**LANGUAGE USE AND CONTACT PHENOMENA IN THE AFAR  
REGIONAL STATE: THE CASE OF AB'ALA TOWN**

**BY  
MOHAMMED EBRAHIM**



**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of Master of Arts in Linguistics  
Department of Linguistics and Philology  
Addis Ababa University**

**September, 2010**

**Addis Ababa**

**Addis Ababa University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**College of Social Science and Humanities**  
**Faculty of Humanities**  
**DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND PHILOLOGY**

**LANGUAGE USE AND CONTACT PHENOMENA IN AFAR REGIONAL  
STATE: THE CASE OF AB'ALA TOWN**

**BY**  
**MOHAMMED EBRAHIM**

**BOARDS OF EXAMINERS:**

*Graziano Savà*

**Advisor**

*for [unclear]*

**Signature**

*Bekale Seyum*

**Examiner**

*[unclear]*

**Signature**

**Examiner**



**Signature**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this study would have been impossible without the assistance, encouragement, and cooperation of many people to whom I owe marvelous debt of thankfulness. I would like to thank all the individuals who have contributed towards the fruition of this study. Firstly, I would like to express my deepest heartfelt gratitude and sincere thanks to Dr. Graziano Savá, my thesis advisor, for his unreserved and constructive comments. I would like to give him special thanks since he helped me in every way possible by devoting his valuable time. Dr. Graziano's contribution to the successful completion of my study could not have been certainly summarized merely by saying within a paragraph.

Secondly, I would like to acknowledge Mohammed Idris Mussa, for his enthusiasm and sympathy to my forefront problem and granting me his computer at critical time to accomplish all my works successfully. Without his generous support, it was impossible to become successful.

*least*  
Last but not the list I wish to express my gratitude to my spouse Fatuma Osman Ibrahim for her affectionate support encouragement, and patience throughout my study to pursue my education.

# Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgement .....	i
Table of Contents .....	ii
List of Tables .....	v
Acronyms.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Background of the Study .....	1
1.2. The Study Area .....	2
1.3. Statement of the Problem .....	4
1.4. Objectives of the Study.....	5
1.5. Scope of the Study .....	6
1.6. Significance of the Study.....	6
1.7. Methodology and Procedure of the Study .....	7
1.7.1. Data Gathering Technique .....	7
1.7.2. Sampling Technique.....	7
1.7.3. Data Analysis Techniques .....	8
1.7.4. Procedure of the Research .....	8
CHAPTER TWO	
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, RELATED WORKS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS .....	9
2.1. Review of Related Literature.....	9
2.1.1. Language Contact .....	9
2.1.2. Language Use/Choice.....	11
2.1.3. Language Attitude.....	12
2.1.4. Bilingualism.....	13
2.1.4.1. Why Do Bilinguals Code-switch .....	14
2.1.5. Accommodation.....	15

2.1.6. Language Maintenance and Shift .....	17
2.1.6.1. Factors Influencing Language Maintenance and Shift .....	18
2.1.7. Code switching .....	18
2.1.8. Code mixing.....	19
2.1.9. Matrix Language.....	20
2.1.10. Borrowing.....	20
2.2. Review of Related Works .....	22
2.3. Conceptual Frameworks .....	24
CHAPTER THREE	
3. SOCIOLINGUISTIC INQUIRY .....	25
3.1. Data Description, Analysis, and Interpretation.....	25
3.2. Analysis and Discussion of the Demographic Characteristics .....	25
3.2.1. Respondents Language Proficiency.....	30
3.3. Domain of Language Use .....	33
3.3.1 Less powerful Domains .....	34
3.3.1.1. Language Use in the Family Domain with Different Interlocutors .....	34
3.3.1.2. Language Use in the Home Domain and Intermarriage .....	36
3.3.1.3. Language Use in the Friendship Domain .....	37
3.3.1.4. Language Use in the Neighborhood .....	39
3.3.1.5. Language Use in the Market Domains .....	40
3.3.2. Powerful Domains .....	41
3.3.2.1. Language Use in the Public Service Domains.....	41
3.3.2.1.1. Health Center .....	41
3.3.2.1.2. School .....	41
3.3.2.1.3. Office .....	42
3.3.2.1.4. Mosques/churches.....	43
3.3.2.2. Language Use in the Authority Domains.....	44
3.3.2.2.1. Courtroom.....	44
3.3.2.2.2. Police station.....	45
3.3.3. Respondents' Mother Tongue Use in Different Topics (Contexts).....	45
3.4. Attitude .....	47

CHAPTER FOUR

4. INTERFERENCE.....53

4.1. Code mixing and Borrowing .....53

4.1.1. Code Switching.....53

4.1.1.1. Inter-sentential .....54

4.1.1.2. Intra-sentential CS.....56

4.1.1.3. Borrowing .....66

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....76

5.1. SUMMARY .....76

5.2. CONCLUSION.....76

References.....79

Appendices .....82



## List of Tables

	Page
<b>Table 1:</b> Population size in kebele, and woreda level .....	2
<b>Table 2:</b> Demographic Characteristics of respondents by their mother tongue, ethnic group, occupation, religion, residence, and intermarriage .....	29
<b>Table 3:</b> Respondents' self-rated proficiency in each language.....	30
<b>Table 4:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in family domain with percentage representation.....	34
<b>Table 5:</b> Respondents' intermarriage vs. language use at home .....	36
<b>Table 6:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in friendship with percentage representation.....	38
<b>Table 7:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in Neighborhood with percentage representation.....	39
<b>Table 8:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in market/transaction with percentage representation .....	40
<b>Table 9:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in health center with percentage representation.....	41
<b>Table 10:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in education with percentage representation.....	42
<b>Table 11:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in workplace/employment with percentage representation .....	43
<b>Table 12:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in religion with percentage representation.....	43
<b>Table 13:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in court with percentage representation .....	44
<b>Table 14:</b> Respondents' language use behavior with authorities in percentage representation.....	45
<b>Table 15:</b> Respondents' use of MTs in different topics/situations .....	46
<b>Table 16:</b> Respondents' opinion about use of languages .....	48
<b>Table 17:</b> Chart of Afar-af phonemes .....	60

### List of Acronyms

1PL	-1 <sup>st</sup> person plural (we)
1S	-1 <sup>st</sup> person singular (I)
2 MS/F	-2 <sup>nd</sup> person masculine/feminine (you)
3FS	-3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular feminine (she)
3MS	-3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular masculine (he)
ADJ	-Adjective
ART	-Article
CM	-Code mixing
CS	-Code switching
Eth.n	-Ethiopian
DEMO	-Demonstrative
IMPER	-Imperfective
LM	-Language maintenance
LS	-Language shift
ML	-Matrix language
N	-Noun
NEG	-Negative
PERF	-Perfective
PL	-Plural marker
POSS	-Possessive
PREP	-Preposition

## Abstract

In the linguistically heterogeneous Ab'ala town, the dwellers use diversified languages in different domains. In Ab'ala town, over four distinct Ethiopian languages are in use. These are Afar-af, Tigrinya, Amharic, Afan Oromo, and Saho. Of these languages, Afar-af and Tigrinya are the two indigenous local languages in the research area. On the other hand, Amharic, Afan Oromo, and Saho are non-indigenous languages. Amharic which is used as the main official language, both in the town and the region, functions in the powerful domains as language of public services ( in office, school, health center). and authorities (in police station and courtroom). However, Afar-af functions only in certain domains. It is used as the de-jure regional language and restricted only to the domains under grass root level (less powerful). It functions in the family domain, among couples of the same ethnic group (intra-marriage), and in religious domain (along with Arabic). In other words, Afar-af developed in the less-affluent domains. This shows the language seizes so many important domains at the expense of Amharic. Besides, Tigrinya to a greater degree and Afar-af to lesser degree are the two most commonly used languages in the domains of market. On the other hand, in the case of less powerful domains language use does not seem to be consistent in all the domains. This is evident in the family domain in which three languages are predominantly used by respondents while interacting with various participants in this domain. Respondents use Amharic extensively while communicating with children, spouses/husbands and siblings. Tigrinya and Afar-af are also the two commonly used languages between parents and respondents. Language use in neighborhood seems to have two features. These are while Tigrinya is predominantly used in Wuhdet kebele, Afar-af is used in Wakrigubi kebele. In addition, the friendship domain is one of the less powerful domain in which Amharic is predominantly used. In general, in the powerful domains, Amharic to a greater degree and Afar-af to a lesser degree are used as languages of wider communication.

Similar to many other urban settings where ethno-linguistic groups live together, Ab'ala is a place where different languages are in contact. Therefore, in Ab'ala town ethnic-groups such as Afar, Tegar, Amhara, Oromo, and Irob are in contact in a sophisticated and unstable manner. In turn, this gives rise to the legacy of the different language contact phenomena such as switching, mixing, borrowing, and shift. The dwellers exhibited code switching or mixing, and borrowing extensively in their day-to-day communication.

## CHAPTER ONE

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Background of the Study

The day after the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) come to power, Ab'ala<sup>1</sup> town is the administrative center of zone two, which is one of the five administrative zones in the Afar regional state. Ab'ala town is situated in the transitional zone between the eastern Tigray escarpments and the northern Afar lowlands. It is located in the north-east of Ethiopia, especially, in the northern part of the capital of the regional state at 638 kms, adjacent to Mekelle-the administrative center of Tigray region at about 55 kms, and 835 kms, north of Addis Ababa. It is encircled by several woredas' of Afar, such as Kunaba, Barhle and Dallol in the north, Irebti and Afdera, in the southeast, Magale in the southwest as well as Quiha and Mekelle in the northwest from the neighboring region (Tigray).

Ab'ala town being a multi-ethnic and multi-lingual area, it is made up of three major linguistic groups. These are Afar: the indigenous people of the region with their respective language Afar-af, Tegar: indigenous people of neighboring region with their language Tigrinya (the official language in Tigray), and Amhara: people who are indigenous in Amhara region with their respective language Amharic, which is an official language particularly in the town and in the federal government of Ethiopian. As a result, people in Ab'ala town are always characterized by contact between members of these different language groups living together and with people in the border areas for various economic and social reasons. For instance, every Thursday (market day) people from the rural settlements and from the neighboring areas, such as the towns of Mekelle and Quiha, including their rural settlements, flow to the market place. On the other hand, the people of Ab'ala town also stream to these places for the same purpose. Consequently, mainly Tigrinya, Afar-af, and Amharic come into contact in Ab'ala. Of these languages, Afar-af belongs to the Lowland East Cushitic sub-family of Afro-Asiatic, which is also named Saho-Afar (<http://www.wikipedia>). Besides, Bender (1976:5) classifies the language under Lowland East Cushitic. He also puts Amharic and Tigrinya under Ethio-Semitic (Bender 1976:5-13).

According to Loren, Bliese (1967:133) Afar<sup>2</sup> is the name of the people inhabiting the

---

<sup>1</sup> According to municipality of the town, which is established in 1991, "Shiket" was the former name for Ab'ala town.

<sup>2</sup> Bliese (1970:1) the Arabic and European name "Danakil", the Ethiopian Amharic name "Adal" the Afar name themselves both the people and the their language Afar.

desert regions of the Red Sea Coast from Djibouti north to Mitsiwwa and extending west to the foothills of the Ethiopian plateau, and of the language they speak. However, to the best of my knowledge, the term “Afar” only refers to the people and the compound or hyphenated word (Afar-af) refers to the languages. Bender (1976:5) also calls the language Afar-af (Afar mouth). In the course of this study (hereafter) the researcher will use the term Afar to refer to the Afar people and the term Afar-af to their language. In a similar fashion, the term Tegar<sup>3</sup> will consequently be used to refer to the Tigray people and the term Tigrinya to their language, the term Amhara will be used to refer to the people and Amharic to their language. In researches, so far languages in this area have received too little attention. This makes the research area an interesting location in which to study language contact. The major consideration is linguistic heterogeneity. This study makes its focus only on the urban center, as it would be very difficult to observe linguistic diversity in the rural settlements as in most cases societies in the rural settlements are monolinguals.

### 1.2. The Study Area

In the census (1996) the total population of Ab'ala Woreda is 24, 291 (Kelemework, 2006). According to him the total population in the town comes to 3,300. of which 2,765 (Tigray), 405 (Afar), 55 (Amhara) and the rest belongs to other ethno-linguistic groups. In the more recent census of the 2007 Population Housing Census of Ethiopia, the total population of the Woreda is 37,943. Among these the two kebeles (Wuhdet and Wakrigubi) in Ab'ala town constitutes a total population of 10,288. The population at the level of the settlements is 6,963 and 3, 325, respectively. Of these Wuhdet has 3,475 (male) and 3,488 (female) whereas Wakrigubi has 1,705 (male) and 1,620 (female). In the following table, I have summarized the total population size of Ab'ala woreda on the bases of urban and rural, and male and female.

No	Woreda/Kebele	Urban +Rural			Urban		
		Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female
1	Ab'ala Woreda	37,943	20,469	17,474	10,288	5,180	5,108
2	Wuhdet Kebele	-----	-----	-----	6,963	3,475	3,488
3	Wakrigubi Kebele	-----	-----	-----	3,325	1,705	1,620

Table (1) Population size in kebele, and woreda level

*Source: Summary and Statistical Report of the 2007 Population and Housing Census and the 2007 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia Results for Afar Region at Kebele Level.*

<sup>3</sup>The people speaking Tigrinya call themselves as “Tegar<sup>3</sup>” and their language “Tigrinya” Roza Hailu (2009).

According to some elderly people who belong to Afar, “Ab'ala town” got its name from the term ‘abqa’, which literally means ‘spring’ in Afar-af. The name corresponds with the spring water find between two big mountains in the area.

Ab'ala town is established on a big flat plain lowland, which is intermittently interrupted by few rising and falling hills surrounded by another elongated ridges, and high broken hills with very few outlets joined to other areas. The area is covered with sandy and salty soil. In general, the area has a semi-arid type of climate, when compared to other woredas’ in the zones and the region. It has a moderate weather condition. It is situated approximately in between 13<sup>o</sup> 15' and 13<sup>o</sup>30'N latitude and 39'and 39<sup>o</sup>55' longitude (Diress et al.1999). Ab'ala woreda's land area is approximately 1,182.30 Km<sup>2</sup> with a population density of 32 (2.7 %, 2007 census).

Different ethno-linguistic and religious groups reside in the town. The principal ones are Afar, Tegarü and Amhara. Regarding their religious compositions, the Afar are wholly followers of Islam religion and mostly reside in one of the neighborhood (i.e., Wakrigubi) whereas the Tegarü and Amhara reside predominantly in Wuhdet with a composition of three religions. Here it is worth mentioning that this does not mean that the ethnic groups do not live together in the same Kebele. As to their religion Tegarü are composed of Orthodox Christians and Muslim, the Amhara incorporate followers of Islam, Orthodox Christianity and the Protestant beliefs.

In the town, there is one Orthodox Christian church and three mosques. Besides, there are one kindergarten (KG), two first cycles or lower level elementary schools (grades 1-4), one-second cycle or upper primary school (grades 5-8) one general and preparatory school (grades 9-12). The medium of instruction in both the kindergarten (KG) and the two lower elementary schools is Amharic, while Afar-af is given as a school subject. In the case of the upper primary schools, the medium of instruction which has been Amharic is changed into English in grade 7 and 8, yet still Afar-af has remained only as a school subject. To put it another way, the region in general and the area in particular are one of the regions that apply English as medium of instruction at the level of primary second cycle school (grades 7 and 8). In both high school and preparatory school, English functions as the medium of instruction along with

Amharic as supplementary language (school subject). Hence, from the above it can be noted that Tigrinya has no role in all the educational levels.

The Ab'ala population livelihood is mostly based on tending livestock. However, currently, the people of Ab'ala town are primarily engaged in agro-pastoral economy whereby both livestock and crop production are practiced. In addition some of the people are engaged in small business, and others work as daily laborers and as government employees and earn extra income.

### **1.3. Statement of the Problem**

Even though there is no clear-cut information about when languages of the globe came into contact, it is believed that languages have been in contact ever since the time human beings started dispersing out into independent sub-groups (Smelser, 2000: 8325). According to him, there are two principal ways in which languages come into contact:

[One of which] at an earlier time in human history, some language contacts must have been established when groups met after moving into previously unoccupied territory; now that the world has no unoccupied habitable territory, this mode of contact onset is no longer available.

Another way is in most recent human history, probably the most common way in which language comes into contact, is the movement of groups of individuals into other people territory (Ibid: 8325).

Ab'ala town is a place where groups of people from different ethno-linguistic groups flock for different purposes. As a result, the great majority of the urban dwellers who are the chief concern of this study are bilinguals who are proficient in at least two languages, their ethnic language and one other language. In such urban settings where many ethno-linguistic groups co-exist with their respective languages, there is a need to give serious attention. This makes Ab'ala town a convenient location to study language use and contact.

From the ranges of interesting outcomes of language contact phenomena, code-switching and code-mixing, maintenance, shift, and borrowing are few of language contact outcomes which are the concerns of the present study. These phenomena are likely to occur in multilingual settings. Moreover, these phenomena have drawn a considerable attention and have certainly aroused the curiosity of many researchers in

recent years. So, the people in Ab'ala town display these phenomena in their speech while speaking their indigenous languages. Besides, attitude towards languages is another appropriate issue to study in such multilingual society. So, the researcher believes that such facts have great input to the field of study, wants to investigate the forgoing issues in the said area.

Furthermore, the fact that there is no research conducted in the area regarding the sociolinguistic study in general and language use and language contact phenomena in particular, this study can lend support for the necessity of such an investigation.

### **Research Questions**

Based on the objectives, the study intends to answer the following questions:

- How are the language proficiency of speakers' in each language described in Ab'ala town?
- What are the domains and/or circumstances in which the community utilizes a particular language?
- How do the dwellers of Ab'ala town employ language (s) in both intra-and inter-group communications?
- To what extent is Afar-af being in use in the research area?
- What language (s) is/are appropriate to what purpose in the town?
- How do the Ab'ala town dwellers express their motive behind the use of the different languages, the alteration of codes, and borrowing?
- What language is the donor or source language (s) for borrowing?

### **1.4. Objectives of the Study**

The study sets out to meet the following general and specific objectives:

#### **General Objectives:**

- 1) To describe the present language use situations such as language proficiency, language use in different domains/contexts/, and language attitudes in the Ab'ala town:
- 2) To examine language contact phenomena such as code switching, code-mixing, language maintenance and shift, and borrowing in Ab'ala town, more specifically in Wakrigubi and Wuhdet kebeles.

### **Specific Objectives:**

- 1) To understand the language proficiency of Ab'ala town dwellers in each language;
- 2) To determine language (s) most suitable for situations such as daily communications, sociopolitical, cultural, academic etc. contacts in the locality;
- 3) To investigate the role of language (s) in the community in both intra-group and inter group communications;
- 4) To investigate whether the Afar community is maintaining their ethnic language in the town;
- 5) To identify attitudes of the community towards each language;
- 6) To investigate and analyze the motives behind the use of different languages, the alteration of codes, and borrowing;
- 7) To describe the nature of borrowing, code switching, code mixing, and borrowing and to identify the source language in the research area.

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

This study relies on Ab'ala town dwellers. It focuses on the populations of two urban kebeles (Wuhdet and Wakrigubi) where diversified ethno-linguistic groups and substantial population size are living together. The coverage and depth of analysis is determined by the availability of some data gathered through questionnaire, participant observation, and recording from the total population of 190 town dwellers. The study cannot claim the selected samples are representative as regards to population size in the two kebeles. However, it is believed that the samples present good sample of the diverse nature of language use in the town.

### **1.6. Significance of the Study**

First of all, the significance of this study lies on the absence of any previous sociolinguistic works in the area in general and on the lack of any study about language use and contact phenomena in particular. The study will have the following significances:

- 1) It may be used by governmental and non-governmental organizations that are making interventions in the various development activities of the society as the linguistic behaviors of the members of the society are points of entry to various social activities;

- 2) Policy makers, curriculum designers, and teaching and learning material producers will benefit from the findings of the study;
- 3) The study will have significant value and could help other researchers who are interested in studying related topics;
- 4) The study could also help as a reference to the students of sociolinguistics at higher educational institutions.

## **1.7. Methodology and Procedure of the Study**

This section consists of discussion on three major techniques used in the study. These are data gathering technique, sampling technique, and data analysis technique.

### **1.7.1. Data Gathering Technique**

The data for this study was gathered through three techniques. Among them self-reported questionnaire was the principal means of data gathering used for sociolinguistic inquiries in chapter three. It allows inclusion of large number of participants and enables the involvement of relatively high degree of variation within the sample in terms of the variables. It was suitable to secure information from a large number of people. The questionnaires were prepared in English and translated into Amharic. However, participant observation and sound recording are used to gather linguistic data for interference in chapter four. During data gathering for interference through the two methods, nobody was aware that the conversation being recorded for sociolinguistic study. Moreover, data gathered through sound recording and participant observations were used to supplement the data obtained through questionnaire. Fraenkel and Wallen (2000), states that participant observation is a key ingredient in ethnographic research. In line with this, participant observation employed to verify the actual linguistic behavior in the social domains.

### **1.7.2. Sampling Technique**

In general, the sample chosen for this study is limited to the Ab'ala town dwellers. Due to language contact, Ab'ala town is a multilingual setting where different languages are at play. Dawn (1984:49) states that there are no universal set of domains applicable to all speech communities. Examples of possible domains are the school, the family, the employment, the playground, the street, government administrations and so on. As a result, to study the present language use situation, 200 respondents were taken randomly from the most important domains—the public

serves (schools, health centers, workplace and religious institutions); the authority (Police station and the court); the family; the market; home; neighborhood, and friendship domains . One of the most frequently used methods in sociolinguistics is random sampling (Šabec, N. 1997:139). According to her, this is the appropriate type of sampling to accommodate the different variables prevailing in the whole population in a city. Two Kebeles have been selected through purposive sampling technique from the 11 Kebeles in the woreda (see table 1). These were Wuhdet and Wakrigubi

### **1.7.3. Data Analysis Techniques**

The obtained data is analyzed both in quantitative and qualitative methods. In order to meet the purpose of this study the researcher gathered the intended information through the three methods—the questionnaire, participant observation and tape recording. In the first step, the data gathered through questionnaire was analyzed using simple statistics—tallying, and then putting them into percentage, mean, and tables. In the second step of data, gathered through participant observation and recording, that is, the data, which are expected to constitute words, sentences, utterances and dialogues from different subjects in different social contexts, were described and analyzed by using qualitative technique. Percentage is used to explain the demographic factors of the respondents. The weighted mean is calculated to identify the significant differences of language proficiency and language attitude of respondents. This in turn has helped to determine the significant mean differences between the research respondents attitude for each language.

### **1.7.4. Procedure of the Research**

The following steps were viable to achieve the intended outcomes. First, different literatures on the topic were reviewed. The objectives and research questions were organized in such a way that they were given clarity to the investigation and enable the researcher to speculate about the findings. Based on the nature, the objective and the problem statement of the study the appropriate data collecting instruments such as questionnaire, participant observation and recording were developed and employed on the samples. Finally, the data so obtained are described, analyzed and interpreted. The findings are described in the summary and conclusion.

## CHAPTER TWO

### 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, RELATED WORKS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS

#### 2.1. Review of Related Literature

##### 2.1.1. Language Contact

The following are some of the available literature on language contact and its resultant phenomena. Different scholars define language contact differently. However, many scholars in the field of language contact, prefer to cite Weinreich's (1953:1) language contact definition, that is, when two or more languages get into contact they have to be used alternatively by the same person. Fasold (1984) points out that language contact refers to a situation when different people with diversified linguistic behaviors come into contact, not only the people interact but also their languages interact. Appel and Muysken (1987:1), state that language contact inevitably leads to bilingualism. Hence, language contact is a prerequisite for bilingualism.

According to Haugen cited in Kamwangamalu, Nkonko M. (2000:88) when two or more languages come into contact, as is the case in multilingual communities in Africa and elsewhere in the world, they color one another. He termed this coloring inter-lingual contagion, manifesting itself in language contact phenomena such as borrowing, code switching, code mixing, language change, pidginization, creolization and diglossia.

As Coulmas (1997) states language contact focuses on the traces that can be detected in linguistic system of the contact and interact of neighboring speech communities through bilingual members. Coulmas (1997:282) defines that language contact is "a prerequisite for language shifts". Language contact is "any situations in which speakers of two or more languages communicate with each other usually in person, but sometimes in writing (including e-mail)" (Smelser, 2000: 8325). Appel and Muysken (1987:5-6) have listed down situations that lead to language contact-linguistic border, colonial expansion, ethno-linguistic enclaves, and post colonial migration. The main means of language contact however, in the present research area seems to be border and trade.

The present study focuses on some of the result of language contact phenomena, which rise controversy in defining them, and draws separating lines that distinguish them from each other. These involve code switching, code mixing, and borrowing. Other linguistic consequences such as bilingualism and language maintenance and shift are also the concern of this study. Prior to discussing code switching, it gives importance to mention some of the descriptions made by scholars. As can be read in the vast literature, code switching has become one of the most intensively investigated topics in the studies of contact phenomena (Kamwangamalu, 200: 94). Code switching (or code mixing) has been the objective of considerable attention in recent years; the topic has certainly aroused the curiosity of many researchers and a host of different aspects of it has been studied (Hoffman, 1994. Appelle and Muysken, 1987, Šabec, 1997:129, Kamwangamalu, 2000: 93-94). In line with this Zelalem Leyew (1998:199) states, "Code switching has flourished in recent years as part of a growing emphasis on sociolinguistic code switching". First, among the language contact phenomena code switching is regarded as an infant phenomenon. According to Appelle and Muysken (1987:117) code switching has been studied in considerable detail since 1970, from a sociolinguistic code switching point of view--why do people switch between languages; from a psycholinguistic point of view--what aspect of their linguistic capacity enables them to switch and to have not simply introduced an element from another language into their linguistic system? However, the present study is concerned with the first viewpoint to identify social factors that lead to code switching.

### **2.1.2. Language Use/Choice**

Language choice is the next notion discussed in the present study, as it is one of the outcomes of language contact in a multilingual setting. Sociolinguistic code switching, social psychologists and anthropologists have studied the sociolinguistic aspect of language choice. Generally, a number of variables such as location, community structure, situation, topic and participants determine language choice.

As cited in Fasold (1984:183) one way of examining language choice from the sociologist's point of view is introduced by Joshua Fishman (1964, 1965, and 1968). Fishman proposes that there were certain institutional contexts, called domain, in which language varieties are more likely to be appropriate than another. According to him, "domains are taken to be constellations of factors such as location, topic, and participants". Coulmas, F. (1997: 308-309), states those multi-linguals' choices of

languages are determined according to: interlocutors', relationship, topic, domain venue, channel and phatic functions.

When talking about language use or choice in a multilingual setting or nation, it is of interest to discuss the concept of domain. Different scholars defined this concept differently. Domain is medium of communications in different situations. For example, Fishman (1971) cited in Downs (1984: 49) "a major figure in the sociology of language" has developed the notion of domain of language use. Downs (ibid: 49) defines domain as:

A domain is a grouping together of recurring situation types in such a way that one of the languages or varieties in a repertoire, as opposed to the others, normally occurs in that class of situations. Moreover, members of the speech community judge that the use of that variety, and not the others, is appropriate to that domain.

He further notices that there is no universal set applicable to all speech communities. Examples of possible domains are the school, the family, employment, the playground and street, government administrations and so on. Regarding this Fishman (2001) cited in Gebre Hishe language use domains classified into two main categories: powerful domains and less powerful domains. Powerful domains include employment, higher education, mass media, and government institutions. In contrast, less powerful domains include family, friendship, neighborhood, community institutions and in some cases pre-school or elementary schools.

On the other hand, Wolff (2000: 307) defines domains of language use as the use of the same linguistic variety, by the same set of participants and in a particular setting or socio-cultural context on a topic, which is also typical for that occasion. According to Assebe (1981: 24) domain is an institutionalized sphere of activity in which language behavior occurs, such as family, education, religion, and so on. Appel and Muysken (1987:41) states that domain intrusion is a clear representative of language shift. Similarly, Fasold (1984:213) states, "when a speech community begins to choose a new language in domains formerly reserved for the old one, it may be a sign that language shift is in progress". Regarding language use behavior in bi-or-multilingual speech community, Downs (1998:62) points out that the more a minority language is limited in its use the more it is subject to shift. The situation gets worse when the

intrusion of the dominant language extends to the home domain (Ibid: 63). Similarly, Dittmar (1976: 178) states “usually a language (variety) that is not used in the family has less chance of being retained than one which is”. Thus language use in family domain has a determinant role in language maintenance (LM). In line with this Appel and Muysken (1987: 24) and Holmes (1992: 262) state functional reduction of certain language could inevitably result in poor proficiency of the speaker.

### **2.1.3. Language Attitude**

Attitude is one of the determinant factors that cause variation in language choice. People draw attitude towards languages (i.e., both to their own and to other languages). According to Dworetzky (1988: 581), attitude is a social psychological concern: a social attitude is a relatively enduring system of feelings, beliefs, and behaviors with respect to social objects. The attitudes that a person has about other people can be powerful influence in social situations. According to Fasold (1984:148), language attitudes are at variance from other attitudes in that they are precisely about language:

- (a) Some language attitude studies are strictly limited to attitudes towards language itself;
- (b) Most often, the definition of language attitude is broadening to include attitudes towards speakers of a particular language or dialect;
- (c) Further broadening of the definition allows all sort of behavior concerning language treated, including attitudes towards language maintenance and language planning.

Fasold (1984: 148) states that attitudes towards languages are often the reflection of attitudes towards members of various ethnic groups. Appel and Muysken (1987: 12), states that if a language has social meaning, people will evaluate it, in relation to the social status of its users. Their language attitude will be social attitude. Here the underlining assumption is that in a society social (or ethnic) groups have certain attitudes towards each other, relating to their differing social positions. These attitudes affect attitudes towards cultural institutions or patterns characterizing these groups such as language, and carry over to and reflected in attitudes towards individual members of the group. Dworetzky (1988: 582) states that investigators depending on the approach they follow, often measure attitudes by means of questionnaires or scales. If the questionnaires or scale is worded carefully, and is used properly, it can

provide much valuable information about attitude.

Generally, there are two theoretical approaches to the study of language attitude: the behaviorist and the mentalist. According to the former view, attitudes should be studied by observing the responses to certain language, i. e., to their use in actual interaction. Attitudes found simply the responses people make to social situations. This view makes research easier to undertake, since it requires no-self report or indirect inference. The latter view, considers attitude as internal, mental, state, which may give rise to certain forms of behavior. It described as “an intervening variable between a stimulus affecting a person and that person’s response” (Fasold, 1984: 147). He further states that nearly all researchers in the field of language attitude adhere to this latter view. Although it poses serious research problems because internal, mental states cannot be directly observed, but have to be inferred from behavior or from self-reported data, which are often of questionable validity and inferences from behavior take the researcher one-step away from what he has actually observed.

#### **2.1.4. Bilingualism**

One of the most common outcomes of language contact is bilingualism. In defining bilingualism, there are two extreme and well-known definitions of bilingualism given by scholars. These are Bloomfield’s 1935 and Macnamara’s 1969 definitions (cited in Appel and Muysken (1987:2). Bloomfield defines “a bilingual should possess “native-like” competence of two or more languages”. Quite opposite to Bloomfield’s definition, Macnamara proposes that somebody should be called bilingual if he has some second language skill in one of the four modalities (listening, speaking, reading and writing) other than in his mother tongue. As opposed to Bloomfield’s and Macnamara’s definition, Weinreich’s (1968: 1) defines bilingualism as “The practice of alternatively using two languages” and, the person involved, bilingual. However, there are many intermediated definitions between the definitions above. For instance, Smelser (2001: 117) defines “Bilingualism” is the regular use of two languages, and bilinguals are those people who use two languages. More specifically, he notes bilingualism refers to the individual competence of comprehension and production of two (natural) languages (language variants like dialects).

Harmers and Michel (1989: 8) have distinguished two dimensions of bilingualism based on relative competence and age of acquisition, among other dimension. The first dimension includes:

- **Balanced Bilingual:** refers to a person who has equivalent competence in both languages.
- **Dominant Bilingual:** refers to a person's competence is one of the languages, more often in the mother tongue which is superior to his competence in the other.

The second dimension involves:

- I) **Compound:** implies two sets of linguistic signs come to be associated with the same set of meaning.
- II) **Coordinate:** refers to translation equivalents in the two languages correspond to two different sets of representations.

On the other hand, Spolsky (1998: 48) distinguishes three natures of bilingual competence: compound, co-ordinate and mixed. According to him the former has a single meaning system with two sets of words, while the latter is assumed to have two meaning system each with its own set of words. The third is mixed nature of bilinguals in this situations bilinguals often develop a mixed code.

Rubin (1968: 353) provides three categories of bilingualism:

- **Co-ordinate Bilingual:** is one who speaks and understands both languages well.
- **Subordinate Bilinguals:** are those who lack fluency and good understanding, but able to speak.
- **Incipient Bilinguals:** are those only good at understanding, but they do not speak.

Similarly, Smelser (p. 1170) states that there are three types of bilingualism: balanced bilingualism--having balanced full competence in both languages; imbalanced bilingualism--having dominance of one language; and semi-balanced bilingualism--having imperfect competence in both languages.

#### 2.1.4.1. Why Do Bilinguals Code switch (CS)

Prior to considering the reasons for bilinguals code switch (hereafter CS), it would be appropriate to deal with the two scholarly views. The first (purist) view of scholars considers (CS) as bad. The second (non-purist) view sees (CS) as linguistic ability. Regarding the former view, traditionally, CS was viewed as a strategy to compensate

code switching as bad mannered and shows disrespect to the routine culture of uttering and using language. The switch mainly made due to the mood of speakers or he/she might feel that a particular part of the conversation can best be conveyed by switching to. However, the second view asserts CS as natural bilinguals' ability; almost everyone is engaged in CS every day. This is because we all deal with different kinds of people, with whom we have different levels of relationships in contexts of all sorts all the time. In this respect, Baker (2001) mentioned bilinguals are accessed to job opportunities, and can have different cultural experience.

With regard to reasons why bilinguals code-switch in the present study I will rely on using the functional framework model of Jakobson (1960) and Halliday et al. (1964) both cited in Appel and Muysken (1987:118). According to this model, switching can have the following functions:

- a) **Referential Function:** refers to speakers' lack of knowledge in one language or lack of facility in that language on a certain subject. Certain subjects more appropriately discussed in one language, and the introduction of such a subject may lead to a switch. This is the type of switch that bilingual speakers are most conscious of.
- b) **Directive Function:** this type of CS involves the hearer and have two roles: to include certain person by using her/his language (i. e. accommodation) or to exclude certain person by using other language.
- c) **Phatic function:** the typical example is comedian who tells joke in a standard variety, but brings the punch line in a vernacular type of speech.
- d) **Meta-linguistic Function:** this type of CS comes into effect when used in one way or another way on the language involved. Many examples of this kind of switches are found in the public domains: performers, circus directors, market salespeople.
- e) **Poetic function:** it serves the poetic function of language.

#### 2.1.5. Accommodation

In the course of interaction between individuals and groups in a multilingual setting, speech accommodation is likely to occur. Giles et al., 1973 and his colleagues (Appel and Muysken, 1987: 28) first developed the notion of accommodation. In respect to this phenomena Šabec, N (1997: 168) states that accommodation can be explained within the theoretical framework of the audience design (Bell, 1984) and the interpersonal accommodation theory (Giles and Johnson 1981, 1987; Giles et al. 1986). According to the former, the speaker designs his or her speech in such a way as

to accommodate his or her addressee. This is done by style shifting, which a bilingual situation translates into a choice between two codes/languages. According to the latter theory, something very similar happens. The interlocutors generally adopt their speech style to each other's, when there is an affinity between them; when they want to bridge the social or personal gap between them. As they expect some potential benefit from the interaction (which may be anything from possible future cooperation to simply enjoying each other's company), they attempted to move closer to each other by resorting to their shared ethnic language. In line with this, Fasold (1984: 188) mentions that there are two forms of accommodation--convergence and divergence. Convergence refers to a situation when a speaker uses a language or language variety that seems to suit the need of the person addressed. While divergence refers to a situation, in which a person makes no effort at all to adjust his speech maximally unlike the other person. This will happen when the speaker wants to emphasize his loyalty to his own group and dissociate himself from his interlocutors' group. Spolsky (1998: 42) states that accommodation occurs in conversation between people with differing pronunciation; it is noted that there is a common tendency for the pronunciation of the two to move slightly closer together. He also stated that accommodation involves the use of some features often converge-speech choice of vocabulary, grammatical forms, and even pronunciation-moves towards that of one's interlocutor. The opposite effect occurs, when a speaker chooses not to converge but diverge, by moving his or her speech away from the other party. Wolff (2000: 303-304) sees accommodation as a linguistic behavior that is equally applicable for accents within the same language because the various lects (i.e. dialects) are not homogeneous.

On the other hand, Giles (1973) and Giles and Powesland (1975) all cited in Hamers and Michel (1986: 136) mention that accommodation focuses on the underlying social cognitive process mediating the individual's perception of the communication and his communicative behavior. Holmes (1992: 255) in his part defines accommodation theory as a process that refers the similarity of individuals in their speech. Similarly, Downs (1984: 229) defines accommodation theory as the process of modifying their speech in interactions with respect to listeners, by becoming more like the listener or less like the listener. He further states that the two principal factors behind accommodation involve identifying its maintenance as distinct from that of the recipient, or a wish to be seen as similar to the recipient and hence with social approval.

### 2.1.6. Language Maintenance and Shift (LM and LS)

Another very common effect of language contact in many bilingual countries or settings is language maintenance (hereafter LM) and language shift (hereafter LS). Language shift refers to the decision of a linguistic community to replace its own language by another language. To put it into other words, LS refers to the process in which a community gives up a language completely in favor of another. Moreover, Coulmas (1997: 321) dichotomize LS into two forms. First, some languages have form of disappearing with the extinction of the entire monolingual community. Second, some languages survive the LS in certain domains. On the other hand, Webb and Kembo-Sure (2000: 13) state that LS refers to a process in which the speakers of one language begins to use a second language for more and more function, until they eventually use only the second language. Similarly, Holmes (1992: 64) defines LS as a process by which one language displaces another in the linguistic repertoires of a community. Fishman (1991:1) cited in Kamwangamalu (2003:72) states that LS refers to speech communities whose native languages are threatened because their international continuity is preceding negatively, with fewer and fewer users (speakers, readers, writers, and even under-standers) or uses every generation.

Regarding LS Appel and Muysken (1987: 32) notes that 'shift' can be equated with 'shift towards the majority or prestigious language', but in fact 'shift' is a natural concept, and also shift towards the extended use of the minority language can be observed. Hoffman (1994: 186) defined LS as when a community does not maintain its language but gradually adopts another one. Hoffman (1991:186) mentions that "when a community does not maintain its language, but steadily adopts another one, we speak about LS while "LM refers to circumstances where members of a community try to keep the language (s) they have always used". Furthermore, he stated that under some conditions such as cultural, political, and social situation a community might decide on to transform a linguistic element at the expense of another. On the other hand, Edward (1996) suggests that when cultures come into contact and competition over resource developed, LS is inevitable. According to him, LS will also move to favor the language that provides the most power, prestige, and economic gain. This is true to all indigenous languages of the world.

### **2.1.6.1. Factors Influencing Language Maintenance and Shift**

According to Edward (1996) factors such as power, prestige, and economic gain causes LS. Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor (1977) all cited in Appel and Muysken (1987: 33) have mentioned status, demographic, and institutional supports are three main factors influencing LM. They are known as 'ethno-linguistic vitality'. Linking up with ethno-linguistic vitality, that minority groups that have little or no group vitality would eventually cease to exist as distinctive group. On the contrary, the more vitality a linguistic group has, the more likely it will survive and thrive as a collective entity in an inter group context.

Similarly, Yagmur, Kutlay and Mehmet-Aliakinci (2003: 108) state LM is influenced by the ethno linguistic vitality (EV) of a linguistic minority group. According to Giles et al. (1977:108) "...low vitality groups are most likely to go through linguistic assimilation may not be considered a distinctive collective group (Brouhi et al.1981) whereas high vitality groups are likely to maintain their language and distinctive cultural traits in multilingual settings".

As opposed to LM, there are various factors that lead to LS. Among them, the principal one is intermarriage. To this end, Kloss (1966) states exogamy as a clear factor that lead to LS.

### **2.1.7. Code switching (CS)**

Different scholars define code switching (hereafter CS) differently. Hudson (1980: 56) defines CS as the use of different varieties at different times by the same speaker. Myers-Scotton (1997: 150) defines CS as "the selection by bilinguals or multi-lingual's of forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation". According to Gumperz cited in Solé, M. (2003: 1) CS is "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical system or subsystem". Weinreich, 1953 cited in Šabec (1997: 130) states CS as switching "from one language to another according to appropriate change in the speech situation (interlocutor, topic etc.), but not in an unchanged speech situation, and certainly not within a single sentence".

In different literature, scholars use different names for various types of CS. For instance, Appel and Muysken (1987:119) distinguish three types of CS:

- a) **Intra-sentential Switches:** occurs within a sentence.
- b) **Inter-sentential Switches:** occurs among sentences.
- c) **Tag-switches:** involve a tag, exclamation, or a parenthetical in another language than the rest of the sentences.

On the other hand, Gumperz and Blom cited in Hudson (1980:56) states three types of code switching:

- a) **Metaphorical CS:** a speaker switches his/her language to a variety or varieties of language, which best suits for particular purpose.
- b) **Conversational CS:** every instances of switch closely related to a change in the situations.
- c) **Situational CS:** refers to the relative appropriateness of different varieties of language in different situations.

### 2.1.8. Code mixing (CM)

Code mixing (hereafter CM) is another result of language contact phenomenon. Fasold (1984) defines code mixing as the use of at least two languages together to the extent that interlocutors change from one language to another in the course of a single utterance. Wolff (2000: 317) defines CM as a particular phenomenon, which is intimately linked to individual multilingualism and has attracted much attentions referred to by terms such as code-choice, code-change, and code mixing. For his purpose, he used the term code mixing to refer to any instances of interchanging usage of two or more languages within the same conversation or discourse by the same bilingual speaker.

Among the scholars, little consensus has been reached regarding the usage and functions of the terms CS and CM. Some scholars have attempted to make distinction between the two language contact outcomes (CS and CM). For instance, Kamwangamalu (2000: 92) attempts to put distinction between CS and CM. While CS refers to language alteration across sentence boundaries, CM is language alteration within sentence boundaries. In the contrary, some scholars admit similarity between the two terms. In other words, some scholars use either term to denote the same practice. For example, Wolff (2000:317) sees the two phenomena as the same and used CM as a cover term for terms such as code-change, code choice and code mix.

### 2.1.8.1. Matrix Language

Grosjean 1988 and Myers-Scotton 1993b cited in Finlayson and Slabbert (1997:74) stated ML as a process by bilinguals indicates, "While a bilingual's two languages are both turned 'on' during language processing; one language is a 'base' language. ... There is some evidence that both bilinguals have direct access to a common conceptual store. This "base" language then defined as the ML during code switching. Besides, Myers-Scotton 1993b cited in Finlayson and Slabbert(1997: ibid) stated "The ML is the language of more morphemes in interaction types including intra-sentential CS".

Regarding ML and EL, Eastman (1992) cited in Zelealem (1989:202) that ML is a language in which the majority of morphemes in a given conversation occur. Besides, Gumperz and Bokombo (cited in Zelealem (1998:198)) dichotomize CS and CM into inter-sentential and intra-sentential.

### 2.1.9. Borrowing

Borrowing is not a new phenomenon. Speakers of one language take words and any linguistic elements or properties such as sound, phonological rules, grammatical morphemes, syntactic patterns and semantic associations from another language. This process is called borrowing (Campbell, 1989). Gumperz (1982) cited in Kamwangamalu (2000: 89), defines borrowing as the introduction of single words or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases from one language into another. Spolsky (1998: 49) also states that the switching of word is the beginning of borrowing, which occurs when the new word is more or less integrated into the second language. According to Wardhough (1977: 237), borrowing is adding new items to a language or dialect by taking them from another language or dialect. From this definition we can infer that borrowing can occur both at dialect and at language level.

Kamwangamalu (p. 91) by citing Spolsky (1978) defines nonce borrowing as the use of linguistic items from one language in discourse in another language that shows no sign of adoption in the borrowing language. This kind of borrowing is said to be nonce borrowing. According to Haugen (cited in Appel and Muysken (1987:164)) there are three types of borrowing:

- a) **Loanwords:** morphemic in-portion without substitution.
- b) **Loan blends:** both morphemic substitution and in-portion,

- c) **Loan shift:** morphemic in-portion without substitution and only meaning, single or composite is imported.

According to Campbell (1998: 69-70) there are criteria that addresses the question about how we identify and determine loanwords? These are:

- A) **Phonological Clues:** this is the strongest evidence for loanword identification and the directions of borrowing. It is concerned with phonological patterns of the language. Words containing sounds which are not normally expected in native words are candidates for loans
- B) **Morphological Complexity:** deals with the cases of borrowing, when the form in one language is morphologically complex (composed of two or more morphemes), but the form in the other languages has no morphological analysis. Then usually the donor language is the one with the morphologically complex form and the borrower is the one with the monophonic form.
- C) **Geographical and Ecological Clues:** refers to associations of the words suspected of being loans whether they are borrowed and what the identity of the donor language is.

There is a hot debate with in bilingual studies in differentiating CS from borrowing. In making distinction between the two language contact results Winford (2003:107) supplies two major criteria in which CS and borrowing are distinguished. These are "degree of use by monolingual speakers" and "morphophonemic integration". Kamwangamalu (2000: 92) states that one of the criteria that sets CS apart from the language contact phenomena is non-integration or nonce borrowing. Sirdhar and Sirdhar (1980) (cited in Kamwangamalu (2000: 93)) states that CS is different from borrowing in the following important respects. First, in CS, the switched elements do not fill 'lexical gap' in the host language. Second, they are not restricted to a more or less limited set of lexically assimilated items accepted by the speech community of the host language; and thirdly, they are not adopted necessarily into the host language by regular phonological and morphological process. Besides, Šabec (1997:131) states that the only valid criterion that distinguishes CM from borrowing is the one that regards borrowing as phenomena that may take place in both bilingual and monolingual contexts, whereas CS is a category that is available only to bilinguals. Similar, but not identical criteria was offered by Myers-Scotton and Gumperz (cited in Meckacha (1993)).

A) Borrowing is the one that takes place by both monolinguals and bilinguals while CS takes place only by bilinguals.

B) Borrowing occurs by the need to bridge lexical gap, but the need in CS occurred by such a need subtle;

c) Borrowing is phonologically and morphologically adapted to the borrowing language while CS structures are not.

He further forwards CS should be distinguished from borrowing, where morphological assimilation of lexical items from the donor language into the recipient language is of essence and there we are basically dealing with one not with two linguistic systems. Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987:172) suggest that in the classical views CS and borrowing can easily be kept apart: with CM the non-native items are not adopted morphologically and phonologically, with borrowing they are. According to Fasold (1984:181). orthographic and pronunciation are conventions used as criteria for separating borrowing from switching.

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

To ensure the relevance of the present study the researcher has reviewed some of the previously worked research. Among them, two researches are on Ethiopian languages and one on a foreign language. Hence, the most related work to this study is the work of Samuel (2009), which studied language use pattern in Shone town. The chief objective of his study was:

To describe the pattern of language use among different ethno-linguistic groups in Shone town; to examine the patterns of language use in the town; to describe the nature of borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing in the linguistic behaviors of the town dwellers; to examine the attitude of different language speakers in Shone town.

He took representative samples from the dwellers of Shone randomly and assessed their language use pattern in different domains. The data were collected through questionnaire, interview and observation and were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative methods. The researcher has put the following findings:

a) First, Shone town is a multilingual setting where seven languages are in use. Second, among these languages Amharic is the most commonly learned language as second language by different ethno-linguistic groups. Third, fathers are more bilinguals than mothers are due to the fact that, fathers have more exposure to

participate in outdoor activities. Fourth, children are primarily bilinguals in both Amharic and Haddiyyisa. Fifth, all MTs are used between the respondents; parent; and spouses. On the other hand, the shift to Amharic is evidenced during the respondents language use with their children and siblings. Furthermore, Haddiyyisa is the main language for urban-rural family communication while Amharic is widely use in different domains.

b) While Haddiyyisa is the most predominantly used language in the indoor domain such as schools, health centers, street, bus stations, cafés and market places. Amharic and Haddiyyisa are alternatively used in governmental offices with Amharic to a greater degree and Haddiyyisa to a lesser degree. Haddiyyisa dominantly occupies the domains of neighborhood and public meeting settings. In religious domain, the sole use of Amharic and alternate use of Amharic with Haddiyyisa are apparent in the town. In general he concluded that Amharic to greater extent and Haddiyyisa to a lesser extent are the widely used languages in different domains. Finally, he stated that Amharic is found to be a lingua franca among various linguistic groups. However, the present study is different from Samuel's work in that it assesses the present language use situations--language proficiency, language use in different domains and language attitude in the Ab'ala town. Besides, the main departure is rely on examining language contact phenomena—code switching, borrowing, language maintenance and/or shift in Ab'ala town, more specifically in Wakrigubi and Wuhdet.

Assebe Bule (1981) conducted a research on “Bilingualism in Kistane Nationality”. The main purpose of this study was to assess what language (s) the Kistane uses in different situations and what are the attitudes of the Kistane towards their own language and towards other languages in both Soddo and Addis Ababa. His findings showed that KistaniNNa is the language of the home while Amharic is the preferred language for education, officialdom, work; religion etc. in both Soddo and Addis Ababa. The similarity between Assebe's work and the current study lies on the investigation of language use in different situations. Yet, the work of Assebe is interested on the study of one linguistic community (Kistane) in both Soddo and Addis Ababa. While this study is at variance from Assebe's work, in that it will takes into account different linguistic communities in Ab'ala town (Afar-af, Tegar, Amhara and others) and investigates the language use patterns in different situations.

One of the works related to the present study is Greenfield's research (1972) cited in Fasold (1984:183) on the study of language choice that utilize domain analysis on the choice between Spanish and at least three congruent components: person, place and topic. In this study, the researcher tried to test whether a combination of the three factors were actually associated in the minds of members of the community. To do this the researcher distributed a questionnaire in which subjects were given two congruent factors and asked to select the third, along with the language that would be best suited in that combination of circumstance. For example subjects were let to assume topics of discussion with parents regarding family issues and were asked to opt the best place out of the given alternatives 'home', 'beach', 'church', 'school' and 'workplace'. From this particular case, his finding shows that 100 percent of their subjects selected the expected 'home' location, with one exception (selection of 'beach' as the appropriate location for friendship domain). Besides, the expected congruent third component was selected by at least 81percent of the subjects. According to this study, the obtained result tends to confirm the validity of the five domains as real in the minds of the subjects. Furthermore, subjects were asked to indicate which language went with that domain on a five-point scale very similar to the semantic-differentials scale used in language-attitude research.

### **2.3. Conceptual Frameworks**

As conceptual framework, this study relies on Fishman's (1971) domain of language use and Wolff's (2000) patterns of language use.

Downs (1984: 49) defines a domain is a grouping together of recurring situation types in such a way that one of the languages or varieties in a repertoire, as opposed to the others, normally occurs in that class of situations. Moreover, members of the speech community judge that the use of that variety, and not the others, is appropriate to that domain. Fishman (1971: 19) states that there is no unified domain applicable to all multilingual settings as language behavior reflecting socio-cultural patterns. The most common domains are: family, school, worship places, literature, press, military, court, and government administration. According to him "who speaks to whom" refers to participants, "what" refers to the topic, "where and when" refers to the setting and socio-cultural context, "why and what" refers to the pragmatic function of particular variety 'lect' 'code' register which is being used.

The Wolff's (2000) language use pattern includes the five "WII" questions (what, who or whom, when, where, and why).

## CHAPTER THREE

### 3. SOCIOLINGUISTIC INQUIRY

#### 3.1. Data Description, Analysis and Interpretation

In this study, attempts are made to evaluate the language use patterns in Ab'ala town. The data are collected through such methods as questionnaires, participant observations and recordings. During data gathering, 200 questionnaires were administered to participants to gather and analyze the patterns of language use in Ab'ala town. The questionnaire has three main parts. The first part is concerned with self-reported questions about respondents' language proficiency and demography; the second part is concerned with respondents' language use in different domains and respondents' mother tongue use in different domains; the third is concerned with attitude statements. The questionnaires are translated into Amharic. This was made because the researcher has observed from the preliminary study that the dwellers have difficulty in (reading and writing) all the languages other than Amharic including their own languages (mother tongue). Therefore, participants could pick either of the two languages (i.e. English and Amharic) in providing answers to the questions outlined in the questionnaires.

It is of interest to note that the language selected for responding the questionnaire was entirely a choice that respondents were free to make. Hence, out of 200 questionnaires, 110 and 90 were distributed in Amharic and English respectively. Of the total number of questionnaire administered, 190 were returned successfully. However, out of the total questionnaires administered, 10 questionnaires came back with unsatisfactory responses. These 10 questionnaires were discarded for lack of complete information. Therefore, the data analysis of this study relies on the responses of the 190 respondents.

#### 3.2. Analysis and Discussion of the Demographic Characteristics

Part one of the questionnaire aims at eliciting personal information to make the task of categorizing possible. Besides, it portrays language proficiency of the subjects to examine the degree of bi-or-multilingualism, patterns of the language maintenance and shift.

The major characteristics of respondents in the study sample are summarized in table (1), below. Respondents in this research claimed the use of mother tongues: Afar-af, Amharic, Tigrinya, Afan Oromo and Saho. In response to the research question number (4), "What is your first language?" respondents claimed having one of the five languages (see table, 1). As the respondents' mother tongue (hereafter MT) were several in number and difficult to comprehend, for the sake of convenience-in terms of categorization, respondents MT were categorized as indigenous and non indigenous languages. The former includes Afar-af and Tigrinya whereas, the latter includes Amharic, Afan Oromo, and Saho. The former category involves over 139 (73.1%) of respondents in the research area. On the other hand, the latter category covers 51(26.7%) of total respondents.

A close assessment to the data obtained from respondents of indigenous MT demonstrates that Tigrinya MT and Afar-af MT speakers were greater in number. To put these in figure, 82 (43.1%) and 57 (30%) of respondents were Tigrinya and Afar-af MT speakers, respectively. From this data, one can understand that Tigrinya and Afar-af are the two languages having many first language speakers in the town. This could imply the dominance of Tegararu demographically in the town. It also indicates demographically Tigrinya speakers have high ethno-linguistic vitality (EV) in the locality.

Concerning the data on ethnic group distribution of respondents the data in table (1) shows that, different language speakers were residing in Ab'ala town. Of the various ethno-linguistic groups living together the striking feature reveals the dominance of Tegararu, Afar and Amhara respectively in the research area (Ab'ala town). In contrast, Oromo and Saho live to a lesser extent in the town. Therefore, these two ethno-linguistic groups have less ethno-linguistic vitality.

Occupation is one of the important factors that determine language use behaviors in a multilingual setting. It accelerates contact among ethno-linguistic groups. Participants of this research are characterized by different occupations. In turn, this inevitably led individuals to operate in different languages in their daily interactions. Subsequently, by occupation participants of this research were farmers, government employees, traders, students, teachers, public workers, and shopkeepers (see table 1). One unique

occupation probably that is uncommon in other urban areas is farming. Respondents occupation in this study area were dichotomized into governmental (employee, public workers, teachers, and students) and non-governmental (farmers, merchants, and shopkeepers) for convenience. Of these immense numbers of occupations, respondents were selected randomly from the above stated domains and most of them were students followed by employees.

Religion assumed to play significant role in influencing language use behavior among different religion followers while carrying their religious activities. Hence, the number of people adhering to different religions is displayed in (table 2). As designated numerically in the table below there were significant differences between the uses of language patters across different religions. Most of the respondents, which is, nearly half of the total population of respondents, *i.e.*, 94 (49.4%) were Muslims. This implies that Muslims exceed followers of other religion in the research area. This is due mainly to the fact that the Afar are exclusively Muslims, while other ethnic groups were significantly composed of Muslims, despite the fact that they also have members that follow other religions.

Generally, the respondents of this research were dwellers of Ab'ala town. According to administration of the woreda the two kebeles were mixed up to form one. As a result, the two kebeles were unevenly distributed in terms of ethnic composition. However, as mentioned in the background section, the Afar is predominantly resided in (Wakrigubi) kebele. Consequently, Afar-af is the presumably the language to be used extensively in this kebele. Likewise, in Wuhdet, the dwellers are principally Tegarü and tend to speak Tigrinya.

Intermarriage or cross marriage is one of the variables resulting in internal stratification of the community that can extremely affect their language use pattern. Concerning intermarriage elderly people asserted that intermarriage with Afar is less frequent as compared to intermarriage among other ethnic groups. Intermarriage has only one direction (*i.e.*, Afar men can marry outside their ethnic groups whereas women are not). This is because of two reasons, one being cultural influence and the other being religious influence. In relation to the former factor men are culturally permissible to marry from other ethnic groups (outside their ethnic group), whereas females are not. The second factor manifests that inter-ethnic marriages among Afar

men and Muslim women of other ethnic groups are occasional occurrences. This shows the case that men inter-marriage is conditioned by the sameness in religion. Therefore, in the present study, language use of only Afar men with partners from other ethnic groups will be the object of this research. The data show there is no intermarriage between Afar and Irob. This may have to do with the two ethnic groups (Afar and Saho) are overpoweringly followers of two distinct religions Muslim and Orthodox Christian. According to the respondents, intermarriages occurred between ethnic groups of the same religion. See the characters of participants presented thus far in the following table.

Items		No	%	Total	No %
Mother-tongue: <sup>4</sup>					
Indigenous local language (s)					
• Afar-af		57	30		
• Tigrinya		82	43.1		
Non-indigenous language (s)				190	100%
• Amharic		33	17.4		
• Afan Oromo		10	5.3		
• Saho		8	4.2		
Ethnic group:					
• Afar		57	30		
• Tegar		82	43.1		
• Amhara		33	17.4		
• Oromo		10	5.3	190	100%
• Irob		8	4.8		
Occupation:					
• Farmers		13	6.8		
• Merchant		32	16.8		
• Student		59	31.1	190	100%
• Teacher		18	9.5		
• Shopkeeper		12	6.3		
• Public worker		16	8.5		
• Employee		40	21		
Religion:					
• Muslim		94	49.5		
• O. Christian		73	38.4	190	100%
• Protestant		17	8.9		
• Catholic		6	3.2		
Residence:					
• Wuhdet		105	55.3	190	100%
• Wakrigubi		85	44.7		
Marital status:	Unmarried	120	63.2	190	100%
	Married	70	36.8		
-Afar with Tegar -Afar with Amhara -Afar with Oromo	• Intra-ethnic marriage	52	74.3		
	• Inter-ethnic marriage	5	7.1	70	100%
		11	15.7		
	2	2.9			

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of respondents by their mother tongue, ethnic group, occupation, religion, residence, and intermarriage

<sup>4</sup> Afar-af and Saho are claimed as dialects Beliese (1981:133) and Bender (1976:5)

### 3.2.1. Respondents Language Proficiency

Under this section items were included that asked the respondents to rate their language proficiency. Respondents' language proficiency are categorized into the four integrated language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) by using three point scales. Table (3) presents data on language proficiency of respondents.

According to David, et al. (2003: 10) language proficiency self-assessment could best predict the levels of LM and LS.

	Language (s)	Proficiency						Total	
		G		F		P			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Listening	Afar-af	67	45.3	41	27.7	40	27.0	148	100%
	Tigrinya	70	37.8	84	45.4	31	16.8	185	100%
	Amharic	86	45.7	90	47.9	12	6.4	188	100%
	Afan Oromo	9	8.5	12	11.3	85	80.2	106	100%
	Saho	42	30	44	31.4	54	38.6	140	100%
Speaking	Afar-af	63	34.1	72	38.9	50	27.0	185	100%
	Tigrinya	57	30.8	81	43.8	47	25.4	185	100%
	Amharic	79	41.5	91	47.9	20	10.5	190	100%
	Afan Oromo	3	4.9	8	13.1	50	82	61	100%
	Saho	30	21.4	50	35.7	60	42.9	140	100%
Reading	Afar-af	44	29.5	65	43.6	40	26.9	149	100%
	Tigrinya	10	8.6	46	39.3	61	52.1	117	100%
	Amharic	80	42.1	99	52.1	11	5.8	190	100%
	Afan Oromo	2	2.0	17	17.2	80	80.8	99	100%
	Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%
Writing	Afar-af	22	16.6	60	45.1	51	38.3	133	100%
	Tigrinya	8	6.3	34	27	84	66.7	126	100%
	Amharic	111	58.4	76	40	3	1.6	190	100%
	Afan Oromo	1	1.3	20	27.4	52	71.2	73	100%
	Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Table 3. Respondents' self-rated proficiency in each language<sup>5</sup>

NB. No. = Number

Scale: 3= Good (G)

2= Fair (F)

1= Poor (P)

$\mu$ =Expected Mean Score= 1.5

Respondents' mean scores of four-language proficiency in each language:

Afar-af: listening (2.3) speaking (2.1) reading (2.1) writing (1.7)

Tigrinya: listening (2.2) speaking (2.1) reading (1.6) writing (1.4)

Amharic: listening (2.5) speaking (2.3) reading (2.4) writing (2.6)

Afan Oromo: listening (1.2) speaking (1.2) reading (1.2) writing (1.3)

Saho: listening (1.4) speaking (1.1) reading (-) writing (-)

<sup>5</sup> Afar-af and Saho are claimed as dialects Beliese (1981:133 ) and Bender (1976:5)

Respondents provide their proficiency in each language as presented in the above table (3). The respondents' language proficiency for each language presented in the above table (3) thus far are described below.

-Regarding their speaking proficiency in each language respondents rate themselves as follows:

#### **☞ Respondents' Listening Proficiency in Each Language**

The obtained mean score calculated for the respondents' listening proficiency in Afar-af and Tigriny, 2.3, 2.2, are nearly equal to one another, and significantly exceed the expected mean score, 1.5. The respondents do have relatively equal proficiency in listening skill in the two languages (Afar-af and Tigrinya). Besides, the mean score calculated for the respondents listening proficiency in Amharic, 2.5 greatly exceeds the expected mean score, 1.5. On the other hand, the mean score that is calculated for the respondents' proficiency in the same skill in Afan Oromo, 1.2 is lesser than the expected mean score. Besides, respondents' calculated proficiency in listening Saho 1.4 is, less than expected mean score. This indicates respondents' have good proficiency in listening the above stated languages in varying levels except in Afan Oromo and Saho.

#### **☞ Respondents' Speaking Proficiency in Each Language**

Regarding the respondents speaking proficiency, the obtained calculated mean score in Afar-af and Tigrinya is exactly the same, that is, 2.1. This shows that the respondents proficiency significantly exceed the expected mean score (i.e., 1.5) in the two languages. Respondents' proficiency in Amharic is much greater than Afar-af, that is, 2.3. In Afan Oromo and Saho the respondents' proficiency (1.2 and 1.1, respectively) is less than the expected mean. This shows that respondents from Afan Oromo and Saho are not proficient in the speaking skills. From the above discussion, it is possible to infer that regardless of the respondents' proficiency in Afar-af and Tigrinya; respondents are more proficient in Amharic than the two languages

#### **☞ Respondents' Reading Proficiency in Each Language**

Concerning respondents proficiency in reading skill the mean score for Amharic and Afar-af, is (2.4 and 2.1) respectively. This denotes that the respondents' proficiency in reading significantly exceeds the expected mean score in the two languages. On the other hand, the mean score of respondents' proficiency in Tigrinya and Afan Oromo is

(1.6 and 1.2) respectively. While respondents' reading proficiency in Tigrinya is relatively equal with the expected mean score (i.e. 1.5), the proficiency of Afan Oromo by the language speakers is less than the expected mean. However, respondents do not show their reading proficiency of Saho language. This indicates that respondents have a good reading skill in both Afar-af and Amharic; however, they are more proficient in reading Amharic than Afar-af. This has to do with the fact that a language used as a means of instruction in education, where respondents are more proficient and are less proficient in cases where, the languages are not used in education.

#### ☞ Respondents' Writing Proficiency in Each Language

With respect to respondents' writing proficiency in Amharic, the mean score (2.6) significantly exceeds the expected mean score (1.5). However, the obtained mean score for respondents' writing proficiency in Afar-af, (1.7) is relatively equal to the expected mean score whereas respondents' proficiency in Tigrinya and Afan Oromo (1.3 and 1.4) are relatively equal and less than the expected mean score. In Saho respondents do not show their reading proficiency. Generally, this finding reveals that respondents have good ability in Afar-af even though not as good as Amharic. In other words, the degree of bilingualism is varying.

To summarize, the above discussions it is evident that respondents have better proficiency in the first two skills (the oral skills) in the majority of languages in question, whereas they have lesser proficiency in the two latter language skills (in reading and writing or the literacy skills). This is due to the reason that the languages (Amharic and Afar-af) have significant roles in the education system. While Afar-af is only given as school subject in elementary school, Tigrinya, Afan Oromo and Saho have no role to play in the education system of the region in general and the research area in particular. However, respondents are proficient in Tigrinya language due to its ethno linguistic vitality in the research area. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the first two skills (listening and speaking) are skills in which respondents are proficient. Besides, the figure in table (3) shows knowledge of Amharic is much more common in the town: there is also substantial bilingualism between the three main languages (Amharic, Afar-af and Tigrinya). The consistent good proficiency of respondents' shown for the majority of participants both in Amharic and Afar-af have mainly emanated from the educational role the two languages play in the research area.

Generally, this finding may be concluded by the idea of Macnamara cited in Appel and Muysken (1987: 2), that someone should be called a bilingual if he/she has some second language skill in one of the four modalities (listening, speaking, reading and writing). Therefore, in this regard Ab'ala town dwellers are bilinguals in the three languages.

### **3.3. Domain of Language Use**

Under part two of the questionnaire an attempt is made to elicits the language use patterns and mother-tongue use of respondents in different domains.

As indicated in the preceding section, domain is a sociolinguistic factor. which determines the language choice of multilingual people. In this section, respondents have been asked to indicate the language (s) they use most often in different domains in the course of interaction with different people. Thus, the respondents' language use shows variation in language use of respondents' among different participants. Fishman 1964, 1965, 1968 all cited in Fasold (1984:183) states that domains are comprised of factors such as location, topic and participants. To this end, in collecting data on the language use behavior of Ab'ala people three things have been taken into consideration. These are setting, topic and participant. Responses on language use pattern in domains such as family, friendship, neighborhood, market; authority domain (judge and police); public serves (health center and governmental office, school, and mosques/churches) are the concern of the study. The results of the responses for each variables are presented in tables (4-17). Parasher (1980) cited in Fasold (1984: 185) categorizes family, friendship, neighborhood as low domains whereas education, government, employment are grouped under high domain. Furthermore, he states that transaction domain might be rather low or high. For the purpose of this study, the responses give with respect to language use pattern of respondents in several domains, that is, in questions ranging from (11-24) were grouped into two categories as powerful and less powerful domains. Furthermore, the powerful domains are subdivided into public services and authorities. The data about the respondents' language use pattern in less powerful domains are summarized in items percentage in tables 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 whereas language use pattern in powerful domains are summarized in table, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. Each question/item will be presented and analyzed in the following section.

### 3.3.1. Less powerful Domains

#### 3.3.1.1. Language Use in the Family Domain with Different Interlocutors

Home is the most important domain of language use reserved for the minority languages. In line with this Dittmar (1976: 17) states that often a language (variety) that is not used in family domain has less chance to be retained than the one, which is used. According to Fishman (2001:69) family domain is one of the less powerful domains. In line with this, respondents were asked “Which language (s) they use in each of the less powerful domains during their interaction with different interlocutors. The following table presents data on language use pattern of respondents’ with different interlocutors in the home domain.

Language(S)	Language spoken with different interlocutors							
	Spouse/husband		Children		Parents		Brother/ sister	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Afar-af	9	12.9	3	7.5	8	26.7	5	10
Tigrinya	28	40	10	25	10	33.3	17	34
Amharic	21	30	15	37.5	7	23.3	23	46
Afan Oromo	3	4.3	2	5	1	3.3	2	4
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Afar-af/Amharic	5	7.1	5	12.5	2	6.7	1	2
Tigrinya/Amharic	3	4.3	4	10	2	6.7	2	4
Afan Oromo/Amharic	1	1.4	1	2.5	-	-	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	70	100%	40	100%	30	100%	50	100%

Table 4. Respondents language use behavior in family<sup>6</sup> domain

Of the 70 (100%) respondents who have responded to have spouses, that is, the number of respondents who have responded to use Tigrinya and Amharic in the family domain with their spouses’ 40 % and 30 % respectively and husbands’ were significantly higher than those who have responded to use other languages with their spouses in this domain. Thus, it is evident from the table (4), that Tigrinya is a relatively dominantly used language among respondents and their spouses. However, the number of respondents claimed to use other language alternatively are insignificant in number. Therefore, in this case shifting to non-indigenous languages has not been exhibited.

<sup>6</sup> Fishman (2001) cited in Gebre Hishie (2008:16) domains of language use are divided into two: powerful and less powerful. The former includes employment, higher education, mass media and government institutions whereas the later include family, friends, neighborhood, community institutions and in some cases pre-school or elementary education

Again, one can see a very marked difference between the language uses of respondents in this domain with their children. Of the respondents who have responded to have children 40 (100%), Amharic and Tigrinya respectively are the two more often used languages when parents wish to speak with their children. 37.5% and 25% of the respondents claimed to use Amharic and Tigrinya respectively with their children at home. On the other hand, it is evident that Afar-af and Afan Oromo are seldom used when parents speak with their children. This shows that the indigenous language (s) of the research area is seldom used and the use of non-indigenous language (s) is more prevalent when compared to the language use of respondents with their spouses. In other words, when we compare language uses of respondents with their cohorts and with their children shift towards Amharic is exhibited.

In response to question 12, asking what language they speak with their parents the majority of respondents indicated that they use Tigrinya 33.3% and Afar-af 26.7 %. Besides, respondents considerably use Amharic (i.e. 23.3) when they speak with their parents. In this regard the use of the indigenous languages of the research area shows some dominance. This shows that indigenous languages of the vicinity (Tigrinya and Afar-af) are used more as languages of interaction in the family domain among respondents and their parents. Therefore, MT is used between respondents and their parents in the family domain.

Concerning respondents language use with their siblings, 23 (46%) of respondents claimed that they use Amharic, whereas 17 (34%) of the respondents claimed that they use Tigrinya with their siblings. The third largest number of respondents, that is, 5 (10%) respondents claimed that they use Afar-af with their siblings. This shows that the non-indigenous language (Amharic) has the sole of a means of wider communication among siblings. In other words, shift towards Amharic is apparently observed from respondents while communicating with their siblings.

In general, in the family domain respondents claimed that they predominantly use three languages with all interlocutors. Of these languages, Amharic gets the highest position while respondents communicating with their children and their siblings. Tigrinya dominantly used language with spouses and parents followed by Afar-af.

### 3.3.1.2. Language Use in the Home Domain and Intermarriage

As has been mentioned in the preceding section (part one) of this study under the characteristics of respondents, participants of the study were dichotomized as married and unmarried. Again, those ones married have been categorized into intra-ethnic group marriage and inter-ethnic group marriages. Among the respondents 120 (63.1%) were unmarried while 70 (36.8%) were married. Furthermore, 52 (74.2%) were married to their ethnic group cohorts while 18 (25.7%) were married outside their ethnic group. The following table presents data on language use of both marriage patterns of respondents.

Ethnic groups	Language (s)	Interethnic marriage		Total		Language (s)	Intra-ethnic marriages		Total	
		No	%	No	%		No	%	No	%
Afar and Amhara	Amharic	7	38.9	18	100	Tigrinya	18	34.7	52	100
Afar and Tegar	Tigrinya	5	27.8			Afar-af	25	48		
Afar and Oromo	Afar-af	2	11.1			Amharic	9	17.3		
Afar and Irob	Afar-af/Oromo	1	5.6			Amharic/Afar-af	-	-		
	Afar-af/Amharic	2	11.1			Tigrinya/Amharic	-	-		
	Afar-af/Tigrin	1	5.5			Afan Oromo/Saho	-	-		

Table 5. Respondents' intermarriage vs. language use at home

The above table depicts that two types of marriage are practiced. In the case of intra-ethnic marriage, the majority 18 (34.7) of respondents who are inter-ethnically married couples have stated that they dominantly use Tigrinya at home. On the other hand, considerable number of respondents 25 (48%) have responded that they frequently use Afar-af at home. Besides, relatively small numbers of respondents 9 (17.3%) have stated that they use Amharic at home. This indicates that since the cohorts are from the same ethnic background, each of the couple have reported to use their ethnic languages alone. Here, language maintenance is observable at home by couples of the same ethnic groups.

As has been mentioned in the previous section only Afar men can be married with other ethnic groups. Thus, a language use of Afar men having other wives was investigated. Of the Afar men married with other ethnic group wives the majority 7 (38.9%), have claimed to use Amharic at home. 5 (27.8%) have reported to use Tigrinya at home. Only insignificant number of respondents 2 (11.1%) have reported to use Afar-af at home. However, the same number of respondents, 2 (11.1%) have reported to use Afar-af and Amharic alternatively at home. Regarding alternate use of languages Afan Oromo and Tigrinya along with Afar-af is very rare, that is, only 1 (5.5) respondents claim they use the languages. This implies that Amharic is the most commonly used language between couples of varying ethnic groups.

It is also possible to infer in the first type of intermarriage (inter-ethnic marriage) it is likely that language maintenance is prevalently observed. However, in the second type of marriage (intra-ethnic marriage) language shift is revealed with mainly the shift towards Amharic being most frequent. Generally, it is revealed that intra-ethnic marriage contributes a lot for language maintenance whereas inter-ethnic marriage causes language shift. Hence, Afar-af is not being maintained by couples of mixed marriage. This can be generalized the following by the idea of Kloss (1966) that exogamy is factor for language shift. This is also the case in Afar community in Ab'ala town. Therefore, intermarriage is one of the principal factors for language shift from Afar-af to Amharic and Tigrinya.

### **3.3.1.3. Language Use in the Friendship Domain**

Friend ship is one of the domains in which complicated nature of language use is exhibited. This domain is build up with various ethnic group members in a

multilingual setting. In the table below data on respondents' language use is presented.

Language (s)	Language spoken with	
	Friends	
	No	%
Afar-af	26	13.7
Tigrinya	66	34.7
Amharic	94	49.5
Afan Oromo	4	2.1
Saho	-	-
Afar-af/Amharic	-	-
Tigrinya/Amharic	-	-
Afan Oromo/ Amharic	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-
Total	190	100%

Table 6. Respondents' language use behavior in friendship with percentage representation

According to responses of participants displayed in the above table, the majority of respondents, 94 (49.4%) claimed that they use Amharic in the course of interaction with their friends. 66 (34.7%) of the respondents stated that they use Tigrinya during their interaction with friends. A significant number of respondents 26 (13.6%) claimed to use Afar-af with their friends. But only a small number of respondents, 4 (2.1%) respond that they use Afan Oromo with their friends. The data also reveals that no respondent has reported to use Saho in friendship domain. This implies respondents use Amharic extensively and Amharic is a widely used language between friends.

One interesting condition that can be inferred from the above table (4) is that in the friendship domain respondents never use languages alternatively. In other words, all of the respondents have responded they use one of the said languages solely. According to Appel and Muysken (1987:41) the intrusion of one language into the domain of another language is a clear representative of language shift. Therefore, the dominance of Amharic is prevailing in the domain of friendship which has been supposed to be dominated by the indigenous local language (s) (Afar-af and Tigrinya) as they have vitality demographically. This implies that respondents shift <sup>to</sup> towards Amharic while interacting within the friend ship domain. This could be attributed that again shift towards Amharic is observed. This implies that respondents shift towards Amharic while interacting with peers in the friend ship domain.

### 3.3.1.4. Language Use in the Neighborhood

In the two kebeles (Wuhdet and Wakrigubi) two ethno-linguistic groups apparently reside. These are Afar and Tegarú respectively. Due to the fact that ethno-linguistic groups are distributed unevenly in the kebeles, the Tegarú are predominant in the former kebele while the Afar are predominant in the latter one. The table below shows language use of speakers in the two kebeles. As indicated in the previous section (part one) respondents of this study were people residing in the kebeles. Consider the data in the following table.

Language (s)	Language spoken with							
	Neighbors							
	Wuhdet			Wakrigubi				
	Total			Total				
No	%	No		%				
Afar-af	28	26.6	105	100%	38	44.7	85	100%
Tigrinya	60	57.1			10	11.8		
Amharic	8	7.6			5	5.9		
Afan Oromo	1	1			2	2.4		
Saho	-	-			-	-		
Afar-af/Amharic	-	-			15	17.6		
					8	9.4		
Tigrinya/Amharic	5	4.8			-	-		
Afar-af/Tigrinya	3	2.9			7	8.2		
Afan Oromo	-	-			-	-		

Table 7. Respondents' language use behavior in Neighborhood<sup>7</sup>

As depicted in table (5), in Wuhdet kebele Tigrinya and Afar-af more often used in the neighborhood domain. In this domain, 60 (57.1%) and 28 (26.6%) of respondents use the two languages respectively in the course of interaction with their neighbors. The use of languages such as Afan Orom, Saho and the alternate use of these languages seldom found. Amharic is used in this domain in both kebeles when the neighborhoods do not share the MT. Thus, it is possible to generalize that an important factor MT governs the subjects language use in the domain. In the other kebele, the respondents overwhelmingly use (Wakrigubi) Kbele Afar-af. Another 38 (44.7%). respondents use Afar-af solely followed by 10 (11.8%) respondents who use Tigrinya. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that residence and MT conditions the language use patterns of respondents.

<sup>7</sup> Fishman (1971:248) stated neighborhood as an informal domain of language use.

### 3.3.1.5. Language Use in the Market Domains

Generally, the Ab'ala market is a setting where people of different ethnic backgrounds flock into, from different directions, once a week. As the town is situated at the border area of the Tigray region, people come from the surrounding localities of this bordering region. Respondents were asked to report language use in market domain. The following table represents data on respondents' language use pattern in this particular domain.

Language(s)	Language spoken with								Total
	Buyers or sellers								
	Afar-af	Tigrinya	Amharic	Afan Oromo	Saho /Amharic	Afar-af/ Amharic	Afar-af/Tigrinya	Afan Oromo/ Amharic	
No	10	34	5	1	-	2	5	-	57
%	17.5	59.6	8.8	1.8	-	3.5	8.8	-	100%

Table 8. Respondents' language use behavior in market

As can be seen in table (8), respondents show different language use pattern in this domain. Out of 57, 34 (59.6%) respondents use Tigrinya in this domain with buyers and sellers; whereas 10 (17.5%) respondents use Afar-af for market purposes. The sole use of Amharic and the alternate use of Afar-af along with Tigrinya however is said to be used by 5 (8.8%) respondents. Of the respondents 1 (1.8%) use Afan Oromo and 2 (3.5%) respondent claimed to uses Afar-af alternatively with Amharic. No one responded the use of Saho with buyers and sellers in this domain.

From this diverse language use pattern of respondents, it is evident that Tigrinya is the most commonly used language in this domain. In this domain Tigrinya functions as a language, which is used among interlocutors (buyers and sellers) to facilitate their communication or to carry out marketing activities. This is due to the reason that especially in the market day Tigrinya speaking people bring what they have to the market not only from Ab'ala, but also from the neighboring Tigray region. Because of this in the market place, Tigrinya is more likely used language when the ethno-linguistic background of an individual not known. However, the alternate use of language seems to indicate the sellers use the buyers' language (i.e., seller's accommodate). In the case of market in Ab'ala town Tigrinya speakers (Tegaru)

accommodate towards Afar-af since Tegarū are predominantly sellers and Afar are buyers. The finding of the present study supports the view that sellers utilize the buyers' language.

### 3.3.2. Powerful Domains

#### 3.3.2.1. Language Use in the Public Service Domains

##### 3.3.2.1.1. Health Center

Public service domains are domains where diversified ethnic group member go to in order to gain services they want. During this process, they interact with different interlocutors. In the case of this particular domain, respondents were asked, "which language (s) they used with health professionals in the health center?" The respondents' language use pattern in the health center is presented as follows:

Language (s)	Language spoken with Physicians									
	Afar-af	Tigrinya	Amharic	Afan Oromo	Saho	Afar-af/ Amharic	Tigrinya/ Amharic	Afan Oromo/ Amharic	Saho/Afa-af	Total
No	5	17	92	-	-	10	2	-	-	126
%	4	13.5	73	-	-	7.9	1.6	-	-	100%

Table 9. Respondents' language use behavior in health center

In this domain, Amharic is the most commonly used language. Of the 126 respondents, 92 (73%) reported that they use Amharic often when they visit a doctor. Those who responded using Tigrinya were 17 (13.5%). 5 (4%) respondents reported to have used Afar-af in this domain. Some of the respondents replied that they use different languages alternatively with health professionals' when they interact.

Therefore, from this we can conclude that Amharic is the most widely used language in this domain by the respondents.

##### 3.3.2.1.2. School

School is one of the powerful domains in which speakers used a particular language. As mentioned above, this is a domain in which all the members of societies are served. As a result, most students coming from different ethnic background are obliged to learn languages other than their MTs. As has been mentioned in the chapter

on the background, Amharic and English are the sole mediums of instruction in elementary and in high schools respectively. However, Afar-af remains the school subject (see chapter 1). In the subsequent table, language use of respondents' in the school is presented.

Language (s)	Language spoken with			
	Student		Teacher	
	No	%	No	%
Afar-af	15	25.4	3	16.7
Tigrinya	10	16.9	5	27.8
Amharic	25	42.4	7	38.9
Afan Oromo	-	-	-	-
Saho	-	-	-	-
Afar-af/Amharic	7	11.9	1	5.5
Tigrinya/Amharic	2	3.4	2	11.1
Afan Oromo/ Amharic	-	-	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-	-	-
Total	59	100%	18	100%

Table 10. Respondents' language use behavior in education

Large numbers of student respondents, 25 (42.4%) indicated that they use Amharic with their peers. Among the total student respondents, out of the total sample size 15 (25.4%) replied that they use Afar-af with their fellow students. While 10 (16.9%) use Tigrinya with students. Again, other respondents indicate that they use Afar-af/Amharic and Tigrinya/Amharic 7 (11.9%) and 2 (3.4%) respectively. Regarding teachers language use behavior in this domain, 7 (38.9%) use Amharic with students. The second dominantly used language by teachers in this domain is Tigrinya, 5 (27.8%) followed by Afar-af, 3 (16.6%).

Generally, Amharic is the most extensively used language with both students and teachers. However, with students Afar-af is used relatively to greater extent. This attributes to the reason that Amharic has greater role in the medium of instruction in the whole of the education system.

### 3.3.2.1.3. Office

This is one of the settings where people of different languages interact. The table below presents data on language use of respondents.

language(s)	Language spoken with									
	Boss or colleague									
	Afar-af	Tigrinya	Amharic	Afan Oromo	Saho Saho	Afar-af/ Amharic	Tigrinya/ Amharic	Afan Oromo/ Amharic	Saho/Afar-af	Total
No	10	5	21	-	-	3	1	-	-	40
%	25	12.5	52.5	-	-	7.5	2.5	-	-	100

Table 11. Respondent language use behavior in workplace

As the data in table (11) indicates, 21 (52.5%) respondents use Amharic with their boss. Many respondents 10 (25%) replied that they use Afar-af and 5 (12.5%) respondents use Tigrinya with their boss. Again, others 3 (7.5%) claimed to use Afar-af along with Amharic. Of the respondents, an insignificant number of respondents, 1 (2.5) use Tigrinya along with Amharic while interacting with their boss.

Generally, in this domain overwhelmingly respondents' use Amharic. The reason for this is mainly that Amharic is the working language in the research area.

#### 3.3.2.1.4. Mosques/churches

Religion is one of the areas of language use where people show different languages interactions. The table below shows the report of language use of respondents in the Mosques and the churches.

Language (s)	Language spoken with			
	Sheiks or		priests	
	No	%	No	%
Afar-af	32	36.8	-	-
Tigrinya	13	15	30	46.2
Amharic	9	10.3	13	20
Afan Oromo	-	-	-	-
Saho	-	-	-	-
Arabic	5	5.7	-	-
Ge'ez	-	-	-	-
Afar-af/ Arabic	22	25.3	-	-
Ge'ez/ Tigrinya	-	-	21	32.3
Afar-af/Amharic	4	4.6	-	-
Tigrinya/Amharic	2	2.3	1	1.5
Afan Oromo/ Amharic	-	-	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-	-	-
Total	87	100%	65	100

Table 12. Respondents' language use behavior in religion domains

In this domain, 32 (36.8%) respondents replied that they use Afar-af with the sheiks. Of the respondents 13 (15%) answered that they use Tigrinya with sheiks whereas 9 (10.3%) replied that they use Amharic. 5 (5.7%) replied that they use Arabic with sheiks with Sheikhs. However, among the respondents no one claimed that he/she uses Afan Oromo or Saho in the domain in question while interacting with Sheikhs and priests. Another considerable number of respondents 22 (25.3%) asserted that they use Afar-af along Arabic with sheiks whereas no respondent responded to use Arabic with priest. Conversely, while there are 4(4.6%) and 2 (2.3%) respondents who responded the use of Afar-af and Tigrinya respectively alternatively with Amharic.

On the other hand, 30(46.2%) respondents reported that they use Tigrinya with priests. Other respondents 13(20%), reported that they use Amharic. Considerable number of respondents, 21 (32.3%) claimed that they use Ge'ez alternatively with Tigrinya they use Ge'ez alone with priests. Only 1 (1.5%) responded the use of Tigrinya alternatively with Amharic. Therefore, the two indigenous languages have dominant functions in the religion domain along with Arabic and Ge'e and with Sheikhs and Priests respectively.

### 3.3.2.2. Language Use in the Authority Domains

#### 3.3.2.2.1. Courtroom

As law is the supreme power, whenever people face problems it is customary to go to courtrooms and made charge of people against law. In such circumstances. In Ab'ala town members of several ethnic groups are likely to interact with judges. The following table presents data on respondents language use.

	Language spoken with									Total
	Judges									
	Afar-af	Tigrinya	Amharic	Afan Oromo	Saho Saho	Afar-af/ Amharic	Tigrinya/ Amharic	Afan Oromo/	Saho/Afar -af	
No	4	1	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	13
%	30.8	7.7	53.8	-	-	7.7	-	-	-	100%

Table 13. Respondents' language use behavior in court

As indicated in the above table a greater number of respondents use Amharic in the court domain. Among the 13 respondents, 7 (53.8%) claimed to use Amharic, whereas 4 (30.8%) claimed to use Afar-af with judges. Besides, 1 (7.7%) respondent reported

use of solely Tigrinya and Afar-af along with Amharic in this domain.

Generally, it is possible to conclude that Amharic is the most commonly used language in this domain. Here, the alternative use of languages shows the respondents are bilinguals in Afar-af and Amharic. This enables interlocutors to use more appropriate language while interacting.

### 3.3.2.2. Police station

Another setting where people contact with authorities is the police station.

Respondents' language use with the police is presented in the table below.

Language (s)	Language spoken with	
	Police	
	No	%
Afar-af	5	25
Tigrinya	3	15
Amharic	10	50
Afan Oromo	-	-
Saho	-	-
Afar-af/Amharic	2	10
Tigrinya/Amharic	-	-
Afan Oromo/ Amharic	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-
Total	20	100%

Table 14. Respondents' language use behavior with police authorities

As the data in table 14 indicates, 10 (50%) respondents reply they use Amharic with police officers in this domain. Next, the use of Afar-af in this domain covers a relatively larger proportion, that is, 5 (25%). On the other hand, the number of respondents that indicated they use other languages in this domain shows insignificant number, for example, Tigrinya 3 (15%). Besides, some respondents, 2 (10%) indicated that they use both Afar-af and Amharic alternatively. From this, it is possible to generalize that Amharic is the most dominantly used language in this domain since Amharic is both the working language and language of wider communication.

### 3.3.3. Respondents' Mother Tongue Use in Different Topics (Contexts)

In this section, we endeavor to discuss some topics and contexts in which respondents prefer the use of their MT. Under this section, the language use behavior of each language group is investigated.

Answers for the questions No. 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 respondents give the following figures.

Language use in different situations (contexts)		Often		Sometimes		Never		No response		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
24	<b>In oaths</b>										
	Afar-af	11	19.3	13	22.8	27	47.4	6	10.5	190	100
	Tigrinya	13	15.9	39	47.6	23	28.0	7	8.5		
	Amharic	20	60.6	8	24.2	-	-	5	15.2		
	Afan Oromo	3	30	1	10	4	40	2	20		
Saho	1	12.5	2	25	3	37.5	2	25			
25	<b>In dream</b>										
	Afar-af	5	8.8	16	28.0	12	21.1	24	42.1	190	100
	Tigrinya	8	9.7	35	42.7	20	24.4	19	23.2		
	Amharic	5	15.2	2	6.0	17	51.5	9	27.3		
	Afan Oromo	2	20	3	30	5	50	-	-		
Saho	-	-	3	37.5	4	50	1	12.5			
26	<b>In the extents of viewing TV program</b>										
	Afar-af	35	61.4	18	31.6	-	-	4	7.0	190	100
	Tigrinya	46	56.1	9	11	27	32.9	-	-		
	Amharic	25	75.8	4	12.1	3	9.1	1	3.0		
	Afan Oromo	2	20	3	30	5	50	-	-		
Saho	-	-	-	-	7	87.5	1	12.5			
27	<b>For letter writing</b>										
	Afar-af	14	24.6	15	26.3	27	47.4	1	1.7	190	100
	Tigrinya	6	7.3	19	23.2	32	39.0	25	30.5		
	Amharic	31	94	1	3.0	-	-	1	3.0		
	Afan Oromo	-	-	1	10	4	40	5	50		
Saho	-	-	-	-	6	75	2	25			
28	<b>For counting</b>										
	Afar-af	8	14.0	20	35.1	13	22.8	16	28.1	190	100
	Tigrinya	4	4.9	41	50	37	45.1	-	-		
	Amharic	30	91	3	9	-	-	-	-		
	Afan Oromo	-	-	2	20	3	30	5	50		
Saho	-	-	1	12.5	3	37.5	3	37.5			

Table 15. Respondents' use of MT in different topics/situations

As can be seen from the above table respondents provide the following responses regarding their MTs use. Five ethnic groups given in table (3) above showed that the patterns of their MT uses are different among the groups. The Amhara ethnic group uses their MT (Amharic) in oaths, for letter writing and for counting more often than the rest of the ethnic groups. Tegarü on the other hand, uses their MT (Tigrinya) more often than the rest of ethnic groups in dream. The Afar use their MT more often than other ethnic languages in TV viewing. This reflects in most cases that languages such as Afar-af, Tigrinya etc. reduces their function in favor of Amharic. This seems there is a shift of Afar-af to Amharic. The findings of the present study shows respondents use new language in domains which were reserved by the old one and limitation of languages in function. Downs (1998:62) claims that the more a minority language is limited in its function the more it is subject to shift; when speech community begins to choose a new language in domains formerly reserved for the old one, it may be a sign that language shift is in progress.

### **3.4. Attitude**

Under part three of the questionnaire, the data collected is presented and analyzed using tables and percentages.

In a situation, where several languages are spoken in the same area speakers will inevitably develop attitudes towards language(s), that is, one may like or dislike a language (Haugen 1956:95 cited in Tsehaye Tefera (1977:1) In other words, one may have positive or negative attitudes to a certain language. People assign various attributes to language forms. According to Apple and Muysken (1987:17), most research on language attitudes follows the mentalist perspective. Respondents' language attitude towards different languages can be assessed by administering close-ended questionnaire for all languages in the town. Backer (2006:210) argues that language revitalization, decay or death is conditioned by speakers' attitudes towards them. In other words, there is a correspondence relation between language maintenance and attitudes of MT speakers towards their language. If speakers have positive attitude towards their MTs it is plausible that a language will be maintained and the vice versa. Downs (1998:65) and Holmes (1992:69) state a positive attitude towards a language encourages its maintenance and Backer (2006:213) on the other hand, claims that, "negative attitude to a minority language may be a prime cause of parents' not passing on the heritage language to a child".

Topics or contexts	Responses										Total
	5		4		3		2		1		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
<b>Daily topics</b>											
Afar-af	36	21.9	40	24.4	14	8.5	48	29.3	26	15.9	164
Tigrinya	34	19.6	41	23.6	18	10.3	43	24.7	38	21.8	174
Amharic	86	45.2	64	33.7	-	-	18	9.5	22	11.6	190
Afan Oromo	-	-	-	-	-	-	83	44.8	102	55.1	185
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	90	47.3	100	52.6	190
<b>Academic topic</b>											
Afar-af	38	22.1	41	23.8	8	4.7	43	25	42	24.4	172
Tigrinya	57	39.3	60	41.4	3	2.1	15	10.3	10	6.9	145
Amharic	8	4.2	10	5.3	2	1	95	50	75	39.5	190
Afan Oromo	76	44.4	93	54.4	2	1.2	-	-	-	-	171
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sexuality</b>											
Afar-af	38	20.3	44	23.6	20	10.7	47	25.1	38	20.3	187
Tigrinya	30	17	39	22	14	7.9	49	27.7	45	25.4	177
Amharic	9	5	10	5.6	4	2.2	89	49.4	68	37.8	180
Afan Oromo	42	22.1	148	77.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	190
Saho	20	11.1	160	88.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	180
<b>Sociopolitical issues</b>											
Afar-af	17	9	24	12.7	-	-	86	45.5	62	32.8	189
Tigrinya	34	24.8	40	29.2	6	4.4	29	21.2	28	20.4	137
Amharic	3	1.6	7	3.7	-	-	100	53.2	78	41.5	188
Afan Oromo	87	45.8	100	52.6	3	1.6	-	-	-	-	190
Saho	90	48.4	96	51.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	186
<b>Cultural issues</b>											
Afar-af	13	7.1	17	9.3	4	2.2	85	46.7	63	34.7	182
Tigrinya	21	12	22	12.6	2	1.1	78	44.6	52	29.7	175
Amharic	56	29.5	80	42.1	-	-	31	16.3	23	12.1	190
Afan Oromo	72	44.2	91	55.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	163
Saho	77	45.3	91	53.5	2	1.2	-	-	-	-	170
<b>As vehicular</b>											
Afar-af	90	47.4	72	37.9	2	1	11	5.8	15	7.9	190
Tigrinya	66	39.5	50	29.9	-	-	26	15.6	25	15	167
Amharic	118	64.8	60	33	-	-	-	-	4	2.2	182
Afan Oromo	-	-	-	-	2	1	85	44.7	103	54.2	190
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	80	88.9	10	11.1	90
<b>Most prestigious</b>											
Afar-af	29	15.8	37	20.2	2	1.1	62	33.9	53	29	183
Tigrinya	33	17.6	58	30.9	4	2.1	48	25.5	45	23.9	188
Amharic	5	2.6	10	5.3	-	-	81	42.6	94	49.5	190
Afan Oromo	168s	90.8	17	9.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	185
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	187	100	187

Table 16. Respondents' attitude about the different languages

1. Scale: Strongly disagree (SD) = 5, Disagree (D) = 4, Undecided (UN) =3, Agree (A) =2, and strongly agree (SA) = 1,
2. N=190
3. M= Mean
4.  $\mu$ = Expected Mean Score

We will discuss each of the above statement one by one.

- I do not support using Afar-af in daily topics  
I do not support using Tigrinya in daily topics  
I do not support using Amharic in daily topics  
I do not support using Afan Oromo in daily topics  
I do not support using Saho in daily topics
- I feel good when I use Afar-af in academic topics  
I feel good when I use Tigrinya in academic topics  
I feel good when I use Amharic in academic topics  
I feel good when I use Afan Oromo in academic topics  
I feel good when I use Saho in academic topics
- It gives me pleasure when I use Afar-af in sexuality  
It gives me pleasure when I use Tigrinya in sexuality  
It gives me pleasure when I use Amharic in sexuality  
It gives me pleasure when I use Afan Oromo in sexuality  
It gives me pleasure when I use Saho in sexuality
- I think Afar-af is appropriate to use in socio-political issues  
I think Tigrinya is appropriate to use in socio-political issues  
I think Amharic is appropriate to use in socio-political issues  
I think Afan Oromo is appropriate to use in socio-political issues  
I think Saho is appropriate to use in socio-political issues
- I prefer to use Afar-af in cultural issues  
I prefer to use Tigrinya in cultural issues  
I prefer to use Amharic in cultural issues  
I prefer to use Afan Oromo in cultural issues  
I prefer to use Saho in cultural issues
- I do not prefer using Afar-af as vehicular language  
I do not prefer using Tigrinya as vehicular language  
I do not prefer using Amharic as vehicular language  
I do not prefer using Afan Oromo as vehicular language  
I do not prefer using Saho as vehicular language
- I believe Afar-af is the most prestigious  
  
I believe Tigrinya is the most prestigious

I believe Amharic is the most prestigious

I believe Afan Oromo is the most prestigious

I believe Saho is the most prestigious

For the entire questions respondents showed negative attitude in the two languages (Afan Oromo and Saho). However, in the three languages (Afar-af, Tigrinya and Amharic) they showed variation of attitudes.

Items 1 and 6 were stated negatively, while the remaining (2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8) were presented positively. For analysis purpose, the responses of the negatively stated items are reversely scored. Thus, in the responses, frequencies of agree and strongly agree categories for negatively stated items show the negative opinion (perception) of the respondents. Similarly, response frequencies of disagree and strongly disagree categories indicated the positive opinion while the undecided category indicates neutral perception.

Of the questions presented positively respondents assert their agreements in Afar-af only for questions 4, 5, and 7. These questions were agreed by more than 50 % of respondents (agree and strongly agree) with the calculated mean score of 3.4, 3.6, and 3.8 respectively. However, for the negatively presented questions respondents report their (disagreement and strongly disagreement), (i.e., they give positive attitudes) in the same language for question 6. This question was disagreed by more than 50 % of respondents (disagree and strongly disagree) with the calculated mean score of 4.

Similarly, from questions presented positively respondents assert their agreements in Tigrinya only for question 5. This question was agreed by more than 50 % of respondents (agree and strongly agree) with the calculated mean score of 3.3. However, for the negatively presented questions respondents showed that their (disagreement and strong disagreement), (i.e., they give positive attitudes) in this language for question 6. These questions were disagreed by more than 50 % of respondents (disagree and strongly disagree) with the calculated mean score of 3.2.

Finally, out of the questions presented positively respondents assert their agreements In Amharic in questions such as 2, 3, 4, and 7. All these questions agreed by more than 50 % of respondents (agree and strongly agree) with the calculated mean score of 4, 4, 4, and 4.2 respectively. Even though respondents have stated positive attitude in

Afar-af for questions (2 and 7), they favor Amharic much more than Afar-af. However, for the negatively presented questions respondents report their (disagreement and strongly disagreement), (i.e., give positive attitude) in Amharic language for questions 1 and 6. These question were disagreed by more than 50 % of respondents (disagree and strongly disagree) with the calculated mean scores of 4.5 and 3.6 respectively.

The mean rating value of these questions in each language is substantially more than the expected mean score, which is 3. This shows that the respondents have a positive attitude with the issue under question. Even if the respondents assert positive attitudes in questions presents negatively (1 and 6) in the above three languages the calculated mean score is prevalent in Amharic than other languages.

In response to the questions why respondents assert positive or negative attitudes towards languages, some of the respondents reported the follows reasons:

- Regarding Afar-af, a summary of participants' reasons for supporting (i.e., agree) with the above statement is offered as follows:
  - Afar-af is most preferable language to communicate with monolingual Afar people that inhabit the surrounding districts.
  - One means of keeping Afar-af alive is using it in day-to-day activity and we have to make an effort to use it in Ab'ala.
- Some of the responses of participants' who showed negative attitude towards Afar-af for the above statement give the following reason:
  - Because there are no words that can represent scientific terms,
  - This is one of the languages which is least developed
- Here are some of the responses of participants asserting negative attitude towards Afar-af. They give the following main reasons:
  - Because it is not a working language
  - It is not a language of education
- Among the reasons provided by respondents asserting positive attitude towards Amharic the salient reason are:
  - Majority of respondents adopt the majority language (Amharic) as their regular vehicle of communication, often mainly because they expect that speaking that language gives better chances for upward social mobility and economic success.

-Only Amharic can commonly satisfy the common interest of interlocutors in day- to-day interaction.

Generally, from the above data we can conclude that Amharic is the most commonly used language in contexts (situations) such as daily interactions, academic issues, sociopolitical issues, sexualities, and preferred for a vehicular and prestigious language. This implies that Amharic gains more positive attitude by respondents. From the above analyses, it is possible to infer that the majority of the research participants have negative attitudes towards Afar-af. Therefore, findings of the present study can support Backer's (2006:210-13) and Down's (1998:65) statement and Holme's (1992:69) "... positive attitude towards a language encourages its maintenance" view that "...if speakers have positive attitude towards their MTs it is plausible that a language will be maintained and the vice versa".

## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4. INTERFERENCE<sup>8</sup>

This chapter touches upon a few language contact resultants such as CS and borrowing. It also assesses whether Afar-af is being maintained or not in the locality. The data for this chapter are mainly obtained from recording and participant observation.

#### 4.1. Code Switching and Borrowing

As mentioned in the preceding section (i.e., review of related literature), there are several outcomes of language contact. Among them, the most prevalent outcomes that draw considerable attention of scholars are CS and borrowing. Therefore, this section is devoted to these language contact phenomena. Due to rapid social mobility, human beings exist in different corners of the world together and it is likely that linguistic, cultural, and social contacts, among others are exhibited. Because of this, language contact results of the ethno-linguistic groups that are coexisting in Ab'ala town are assessed. Of the ethno-linguistic groups that are in contact, Afar, Tegarū and Amhara are the dominant ones. A set of quantitative data, reported in this section, are obtained through participant observation and by taking notes. The following CS and borrowing data have been collected from Ab'ala community members in the course of their interaction with each other. The data from the community have been generated from naturally occurring conversations. The researcher also recorded several exchanges from the community members in various circumstances. In the occasion of data gathering nobody was aware that the conversations were being recorded for sociolinguistic study.

##### 4.1.1. Code Switching

Code switching refers to switching back and forth between two or more languages in the course of conversation depending on the situation or conversation pattern. Myers-Scotton (1997: 150) defines CS as “the selection by bilinguals or multi-linguals of forms from embedded variety (s) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation”. Besides, she states, (ibid: 150) that CS can be either intra-sentential or inter-sentential.

---

<sup>8</sup> Interference is traditional name for one of the language contact phenomena that involve phonetic, lexical, morph-syntactic or semantic materials transferred from one language to another (Sole, M 2003).



On the other hand, we were informed by the vast literature, relating to the issue of switching or mixing languages, that there are a number of levels. These are CS between conversational turns, CS between sentences, CS between clauses, CS between phrases and intra-word CS. However, as realized in the present study, the overwhelming number of speakers took part in intra-sentential CS to Afar-af. In this particular study, there were slight or rare occurrences of the levels of inter-sentential CS. This is ascribed to the respondents' lack of proficiency in the coexisting languages. Concerning this, Myers-Scottt (1993), cited in Finlayson and Slabbert (1997:70) state that intra-sentential CS is "simple" insertion of allowable embedded-language islands according to unconsciously "known" constraints. In line with this in the following section, inter-sentential and intra-sentential switching will be assessed.

In the present research area, the most visible switching is among Afar-af and Amharic the majority of data deals with intra-sentential CS. Hence, this study devotes a great deal of attention to analyze the Afar-af speaking bilinguals' speech both in intra-sentential and inter-sentential CS. According to Myers-Scotton (1997: 150), the concept of ML is relevant in all CS. Both in intra-sentential CS or in CM there are a matrix language and an embedded language.

#### 4.1.1.1. Inter-sentential

Inter-sentential CS manifests switch/mix between languages at sentence level. Finlayson and Slabbert (1997: 70) remarked that inter-sentential CS is the more "skilled" code switching. In other words, this level of CS would seem to involve the more skilled production, the speaker must produce entire, well-formed sentence. Similarly, Myers-Scotton (1993: 147) mentioned that in this type of switching, to switch proficiently one needs to have a familiarity with both languages in the CS interaction. The examples listed down below have been collected through participant observation from telephone conversation in Ab`ala town.

a) be:ra                    saku                    burah                    yol                    ama:y, *kāza*                    *bī:ro*  
*abrān*  
tomorrow                    morning                    home.PREP me.PREP                    come,                    then                    office  
together  
*in ihādālān*  
IMPERF.go.IPL

come to my home tomorrow and then we will go together to the office

b) awak ta:ma liyoh, *bähu<sup>w</sup>ala inn igänaññ*

now work have.IS. latter meet.IMPERF.IPL

Now I am at work, we shall meet later

c) sora bahtem ka takku akkewaytu, *käz ih bähu<sup>w</sup>ala yihdirgit  
inday iddäggäm*

mistake commits 3MS or not, hereafter DEMO.action should.NEG. happen  
again

Whether he commits the mistake or not, this action should not happen again

Thus, the above examples are indicative of the idea of Myers-Scotton (p. 147) and Slabbert (1997: 70) that is inter-sentential CS requires good proficiency of the languages under question. Concerning reasons behind the switch of respondents' in the above examples seems to do with one of the functional modalities (met linguistic code switching) suggested by Apple and Muysken (1987:20), that is, speakers switching takes place to show their linguistic abilities.

Other CS levels that apparently occurred in the research area are language alteration across clauses and phrases. Consider the following data. In distinguishing CS from borrowing, throughout this study, it is important to know the words underlined without bolding refers to CS instance whereas the bold words, which underlined referred to borrowing instance.

d) wo ba:teh innte saga **milikkitih** mañalukten  
DEMO missed say.2M/F cow **sign**.any what.have.PERF  
Does the miss.PERF cow have any signs?

This extract is from unstructured conversation during the "Afar Daagu" 'traditional way of exchanging information among ethnic members' of two old men. They were discussing about their cattle which are in the country side. One of them tells to the other that one of his cattle is missing and asks his friend whether or not he saw or heard anything about his cow. The other person asks whether the cow has a unique sign to identify it with.

#### 4.1.1.3. Intra-sentential CS

Intra-sentential CS refers to switching of languages in the middle of sentences. It occurs when CS takes place between different languages at the sentence level. It refers to mixing or switching of languages in the middle of a sentence. Myers-Scotton, 1993b cited in Finlayson and Slabbort (1997:75) stated that in intra-sentential CS, “all sentences have a ML”. The examples below (1-24) indicate intra-sentential switches between languages. Remember once again in the following data the underlined ones are instances of CS elements and the bold underlined ones are borrowed form.

In this section, examples extracted from Afar-af conversation collected from the target population at different times and in different techniques, mainly through participant observation are presented. The languages involved are English, Tigrinya and Amharic switched into Afar-af.

##### Data taken from bureau head and unemployed young boy<sup>9</sup>

- 1) atu naharak sira limd litomantu  
2MS/F first work-experience have.2MS/FS.or.NEG  
First, do you have work experience or not
- 2) toke:k k'it'ir dabdabe koh aktubäno  
then appoint **letter** 2MS/FS.PREP write.IMPERF.1PL  
Then, we can issue you a letter of appoint
- 3) a bi:ro dumak kabital-badet dago  
DEMO **office** from the very beginning **capital-budget** lacks  
This office from the very beginning lacks capital budget
- 4) digri ke: dibloma yalle:nimih, ta tama mageyan  
**degree** and **diploma** even if.they.have DEMO job find.IMPERF.NEG.they  
Even though they are degree and diploma holders, they will not get this job
- 5) sirfat dabbahay bi:ro<sup>1</sup>k yokaweŋ  
**law** obey.and **office**.PREP get out.PREP.my  
Obey the law and get out of my office
  - Data gathered from farmer community members in the town
- 6) kimal rade rob mahares nek bayse

---

Note that items that are offered in bold and underlining were found to be identified by monolingual Afar-af speakers

yesterday rained rain plowing us.PREP stop

The rain that rained yesterday, stopped us from plowing

7) biri rob bikkultih mameŕe

yesterday night's rain new shoots.PREP good.NEG

The rain that rained yesterday-night is not good for new shoots

- Data taken from conversation of head of woreda municipal with one community member

8) atu naharak mamälkäčča nelba:ha:y koh bihsenno

2MS/F first application letter bring.1PL.and 2MS/FS.PREP process.IS.IMPERF.  
it

- Data collected from Wakrigubi youth association

9) akkel tammullem ŕunda:neytah moral hato abtam anewaytama

here what observed.is youth.PREP **moral** help work present.NEG

Here there is no one who helps for morality of the youth

- Data collected from collective members of the community in outdoor domains

10) num ŕalama yellek fareikke gufam du:dah

man objective has wherever reach.3MS can.3MS

A man with an objective can reach any where he sets his mind on

Note that this transcription is made according to central dialect (Bender (1076), and Mahaffy (1952) cited in Belies (1976).

As clearly depicted in the above examples, it is noted that speakers make intra-sentential CS in Afar-af and Amharic. In the majority of examples, massive numbers of Amharic lexical items have infiltrated into Afar-af. For example, in (1) speakers mix N; (2) N; (3) N; (4) N; (5) N; (7) N; (8) N; (9) N; (10) ADJ; (11) ADJ.

From the above examples, it is possible to understand nouns have more susceptibility to CS into Afar-af. For instance in example (1), the speaker begins in Afar-af, then switches in the same sentence to Amharic noun 'siralimd' which is completely inserted into the host Afar-af structure. In example (2) the speaker begins with Afar-af and switches into the Amharic phrase 'k'it'ir däbdabä'.

According to Apple and Muysken (1987:172) cited in chapter two of this study with

CM, non-native items are not adopted morphologically and phonologically while with borrowing they are. This view confirms completely with the above examples. For instance, (2) is persistent with this. In other words, the non-native phonemes *k'* and *t'* (ejective sounds) were not adopted phonologically. Based on the above examples CS into Tigrinya is not observed apparently. This might be because Tigrinya has less prestige in the research area as compared to Amharic.

As can be observed from the above data there are examples involving borrowed elements from different languages. Of these languages the dominant and prominent donor language is Amharic. Amharic borrowed elements are massively used in the host Afar-af to facilitate communication and as to fill lexical gap. From the above data, words which are underlined and are bold are striking examples of borrowed words in the host language Afar. These involve words like *capital budget*, *degree diploma*, and *moral*, which are borrowed from English, and words like *däbdabä'*, *sirpat*, and *ḥalama* are loan words in Afar-af from Amharic. Besides, the term *bureau* is a loan word from French in via Amharic.

Monolingual Afar-af speakers identify all the borrowed lexicons from the said languages into Afar-af. This is consistent with the idea of Winford (2003:107), which states that CS and borrowing can be distinguished from one another by the degree of use by monolinguals and by their morphophonemic integration. šabac (1997:131), borrowing takes place both in monolinguals and bilinguals. However, bilinguals also know the rest of the borrowed lexical items.

Furthermore, in (5) the Amharic noun is borrowed with Afar-af suffix (-*k*) and in the (12) Amharic noun is borrowed with Afar-af suffix (-*i*) which has an equivalent meaning with the English definite article “the”. These suffixes are incorporated into the Amharic words.

In the example, only a few CS elements of Tigrinya into Afar-af were seen. These indicated examples in (7) and (8), *maḥräs* and *buk'ult*. In Afar-af the first borrowed element “*maḥras*” is adopted with the change of /ä/ →/a/ and the latter lexical element is *buk'ult* →*bukult* ‘New shoots’ is not adopted to Afar-af.

In order to analyze the phonetic treatment of the loanwords first we have to examine the phonetic system of Afar-af. As has been clearly depicted in the above examples

Amharic loan words have extensively infiltrated into Afar-af and for all practical purposes they have become Afar-af words.

Hence, it is useful to compare and contrast Amharic phonemes with Afar-af phonemes. For the purpose of this study most important phonemes that are susceptible to change will be discussed below. We shall now investigate the treatment of the Amharic phonemes in the Afar-af loanwords. The correspondences deal only with the consonant phonemes.<sup>10</sup>

**Affricate:** Amharic *ñ, š, ž, č* = Af. *n, s, d, and s*

**Ejectives:** Amharic *k', t', p'* = Af. *k, t, b*

All the above stated Amharic phonemes are replaced by the nearest sound in the recipient language Afar-af (see table 17). The following reasons can be drawn. First, this modification process primarily means to give the borrowed words new shapes different from the donor languages and to make the form compatible with the host language. Second, the need to change the phoneme has to do with the absence of the phoneme in the phoneme system of Afar-af. The third reason seems to fill the lexical gap. Similarly, there is another modification of borrowed word. For instance, in example (11), the word “chat” changed into “gat”. In this /č/ sound is substituted by /g/ and this reason is similar to the second reason in the above demonstration.

The following chart consists of the consonant inventory of Afar-af phones.

---

<sup>10</sup> The names of languages are abbreviated as follows: Af. = Afar-af, Tnya. = Tigrinya, Eng. = English, and Ar. = Arabic

Consonants	Bilabial	Labiodentals	Dental	Alveolar	Retroflex	Palatal	Velar	Pharyngeal	Glottal
stop: voiceless			t				K		
voiced	b		d		d (ḍ)		G		
Nasal	m		n						
fricative: voiceless		f		s				x (ħ)	h
voiced								c (ʕ)	
Lateral			l						
flapped/rolled				r					
Glides	w					y			

table 17: chart of Afar-af phonemes

(Adopted from Bliese 1981)

Concerning the vowel quantity it should be kept in mind that Afar-af preserves the short and long vowel system at variance from Amharic. In other words, Afar-af like many Cushitic languages has a five vowel systems. These are:

<u>vowels:</u>	short	long
	i	ii (i:)
	ee	ee (e:)
	a	aa (a:)
	u	uu (u:)
	o	oo (o:)

Note that the above chart (17) is adopted from Bliese (1981:1-2) with the exception of a handful phonemes shown in parentheses. In the case of consonant phonemes, phoneme /d/ with bar inside the circle is no more in use in the current orthography of Afar-af and substituted by /x/=d/. Besides, despite the fact that phonemes /c/ and /ʕ/ exist in the present orthography they represent different sounds. In other words, as can

be seen from the above formerly /x/ used to be equivalent with /h/ and /c/ used equally with /ʕ/. However, now this is not the case and while /c/ is equivalent with /h/, /x/ is equivalent with /d/. For example, the term ‘Afar’ used to be written as (cafar), but now it is written as Afar (self-name Qafar).

Another data for CS found from the press conference is held on 12 March, ETV Afar Program by Ali Ibrahim head of Afar Pastoral, Agriculture and Rural Development Office in Ab'ala woreda. In the data CS Afar-into-Amharic has been observed. The following two sentences illustrate this.

25) dolat            neh            tehehtan            männoh            arahal  
 government 1PL.PREP give.PERF animal nutrition.PREP place.PREP  
atkilttite ke: firafire    aysabakuk    geytimna  
 fruit.PL and up.IMPER fruit.PL    grow.PROG    find.1PL

We are planting trees and nursing fruits in the place where the government gave us land for animal nutrition

26) barri kebelelah            mango silt'ānani amhawuk    geytimta  
 rural kebeles.PL.PREP    many training.PL undertaking find.IMPERF  
 For rural kebeles much trainings are being undertaken

The above two examples illustrate the existence of CS between two languages. For instance, in (25) the ML is Afar whereas the switched element /fire/ 'fruit' with its reduplicated form 'fira-fire/ 'fruits' that encode plurality, that is, commonly used both in Amharic and Tigrinya is a CS element.

In the case of example (26), in similar fashion the switched code is Amharic and the suffix /-ni/ which Afar-af plural marker is added. The evidence for the switched term from Amharic is the presence of the ejective /t'/. In the same sentence, there is an instance of borrowing, which is /kebele/ 'small village' taken by the ML Afar-af.

#### 4.1.2. Borrowing

Borrowing is a universal phenomena and very common for all languages of the world. Campbell Lyle (1998:62) states borrowing, "... is not restricted to just lexical items taken from one language to another; any linguistic material--sounds, phonological rules, grammatical morphemes, syntactic patterns, semantic associations, discourse strategies or whatever-can be borrowed, that is, can be taken over from a foreign language so that it becomes part of the borrowing language". Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987: 164) states, "it is hard to imagine a language that has not borrowed words from some other language, just as there is no culture that has developed entirely without acquiring some structural property from another language that is contemporary to it. The acquired language will be called "borrowing language," the language from which the property is acquired will be called "source language". Winford, (2003) cited in Mesfin Wodajo (2009:18) identifies the type of borrowing between languages, as structural or lexica, and indicates that they are determined by the degree of contact. Intense contact may enhance structural borrowing while casual contact is limited to lexical borrowing. Biliese (1970:7) states that lexical evidence of borrowing has a special place in pointing out sources of cultural innovations. The evidence of borrowing can often be found in unusual phonological pattern, or whether the language has a long recorded history, in the introduction of a term pre-existent only in a contact language. Different languages vary in the degree of their willingness to accept lexical borrowings from other languages. But unless some nationalistic pride, culturalist language borrowing, hardly any language will remain "pure" where cultures are in contact.

Apple and Muysken (1987:165-166) mentions the following reasons why borrowing takes place in many different social and cultural contexts:

- a) Cultural influence result because of the dominance of minority languages by the majority culture. An existence of cultural loans in a recipient language to represent new concept can be taken as evidence;
- b) In existence of two native words sounding so much alike, there is a need to replace one by a foreign word so as to resolve potential ambiguity;
- c) A word could be introduced unconsciously into recipient language by intensive bilingualism.

In line with this, Haugen, 1969, cited in Grosjean, (1982:312) dichotomize lexical borrowing as necessary and unnecessary. According to him, the former fills lexical gap in the borrowing language and the latter shows the borrowing language speakers' ignorance of their language. Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987:174) state that "...ignorance may lead to low esteem to the recipient language which on the other hand causes language loss".

The present study will deal with loan words from different languages into Afar-af. However, the study only concerned with lexical borrowing since the contact among the ethnic groups seems to be casual. As Amharic lexicon is pervasively observed in Afar-af, the prime focus of this study deals with borrowing elements in Afar-af from different languages and mainly from Amharic.

When a certain element of a language is borrowed from another language, it can be either with modification or without. In the following examples borrowing of elements both modified and unmodified were pointed out by taking some loan words from Amharic, Tigrinya and Arabic into Afar-af. For the purpose of this study the types of borrowing we are going to deal with has dichotomized into two categories as superfluous elements and loans elements. Superfluous borrowing is kind of borrowing in which certain lexical element is borrowed by the speaker of other language speakers in the presence of genuine equivalent term.

Amharic loan words in Afar-af pass through some phonological and morphological processes of modification.

<u>Phonological Process</u>				
27)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
a)	higg	higgi	'law'	i → i and suffix (-i)
b)	timhirt	timhrti	'education'	i → i and suffix (-i)
c)	wānjäl	wendeli	'crime'	i → e and suffix (-i)
d)	māngist	mingisti	'government'	i → i and suffix (-i)
e)	silk	silki	'phone'	i → i and suffix (-i)

As evident from the above examples (27), Afar-af takes some sort of modification, which is, adding suffix /-i/ into the Amharic loan word. All the above examples have

undergone a phonological process in the language. It is a phonological process since it merely added at the end of the word with no meaning. In examples (a-e), the roots have undergone this process. For example, *higg* 'law' is borrowed from Amharic into Afar-af with no variation in meaning and only by adding suffix /-i/. We observe from the above examples that Afar-af consists of many loan elements from Amharic with certain modification.

Another kind of phonological process which is carried out when certain loan words from Amharic are taken into Afar-af has to do with another kind of phonological modification, which passes through some adaptation of foreign elements into the host language--Afar-af.

28)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
f)	kätäma	katama:	'town'	ä → a
g)	däbtär	dabtar	'book'	ä → a
h)	läslassa	laslassa	'beverage' (soft drink)	ä → a
i)	däbdabbe	dabdabe	'letter'	ä → a
j)	si bsäba	sabsaba	'meeting'	i & ä → a
k)	bärbärre	barbare	'pepper'	ä → a

The above data shows that in the course of borrowing Amharic loan words into Afar-af the vowel forms changes are visible. Due to the reason that Afar-af does have mid central vowels /ä/ and (i) in its vowel system, these vowels change the into low front vowel /a/, the front vowel (-i) as shown in the examples.(see the vowel system of Afar-af in the preceding section).

### Morphological Process

The greatest numbers of loan words coming from other languages into Afar-af in the case of nouns take some kind of modification. The most common morphological structure in Afar-af is affixation of roots that are drawn from Amharic and other donor languages. The striking examples are:

29)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
	mämhi ranočč	mamhirwa	'teachers'	očč→wa
	mäs rabetočč	misrabetwa	'offices'	očč→wa
	hakimočč	hakimwa	'doctors'	očč→wa

exist in the present orthography they represent different sounds. In other words, as can be seen from the above formerly /x/ used to be equivalent with /h/ and /c/ used equally with /ʕ/. However, now this is not the case and while /c/ is equivalent with /h/, /x/ is equivalent with /d/. For example, the term ‘Afar’ used to be written as (cafar), but now it is written as Afar (self-name Qafar).

Another data for CS found from the press conference is held on 12 March, ETV Afar Program by Ali Ibrahim head of Afar Pastoral, Agriculture and Rural Development Office in Ab'ala woreda. In the data CS Afar-into-Amharic has been observed. The following two sentences illustrate this.

25) dolat        neh        tehehtan    männoh        arahal  
 government 1PL.PREP give.PERF animal nutrition.PREP place.PREP  
atkilttite ke: firafire    aysabakuk    geytimna  
 fruit.PL and up.IMPER fruit.PL    grow.PROG    find.1PL

We are planting trees and nursing fruits in the place where the government gave us land for animal nutrition

26) barri kebelelah        mango silt'änani    amhawuk    geytimta  
 rural kebeles.PL.PREP    many training.PL undertaking find.IMPERF  
 For rural kebeles much trainings are being undertaken

The above two examples illustrate the existence of CS between two languages. For instance, in (25) the ML is Afar whereas the switched element /fire/ 'fruit' with its reduplicated form 'fira-fire/ 'fruits' that encode plurality, that is, commonly used both in Amharic and Tigrinya is a CS element.

In the case of example (26), in similar fashion the switched code is Amharic and the suffix /-ni/ which Afar-af plural marker is added. The evidence for the switched term from Amharic is the presence of the ejective /t'/. In the same sentence, there is an instance of borrowing, which is /kebele/ 'small village' taken by the ML Afar-af.

#### 4.1.2. Borrowing

Borrowing is a universal phenomena and very common for all languages of the world. Campbell Lyle (1998:62) states borrowing, "... is not restricted to just lexical items taken from one language to another; any linguistic material--sounds, phonological rules, grammatical morphemes, syntactic patterns, semantic associations, discourse strategies or whatever-can be borrowed, that is, can be taken over from a foreign language so that it becomes part of the borrowing language". Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987: 164) states, "it is hard to imagine a language that has not borrowed words from some other language, just as there is no culture that has developed entirely without acquiring some structural property from another language that is contemporary to it. The acquired language will be called "borrowing language," the language from which the property is acquired will be called "source language". Winford, (2003) cited in Mesfin Wodajo (2009:18) identifies the type of borrowing between languages, as structural or lexica, and indicates that they are determined by the degree of contact. Intense contact may enhance structural borrowing while casual contact is limited to lexical borrowing. Bilièse (1970:7) states that lexical evidence of borrowing has a special place in pointing out sources of cultural innovations. The evidence of borrowing can often be found in unusual phonological pattern, or whether the language has a long recorded history, in the introduction of a term pre-existent only in a contact language. Different languages vary in the degree of their willingness to accept lexical borrowings from other languages. But unless some nationalistic pride, culturalist language borrowing, hardly any language will remain "pure" where cultures are in contact.

Appel and Muysken (1987:165-166) mentions the following reasons why borrowing takes place in many different social and cultural contexts:

- a) Cultural influence result because of the dominance of minority languages by the majority culture. An existence of cultural loans in a recipient language to represent new concept can be taken as evidence;
- b) In existence of two native words sounding so much alike, there is a need to replace one by a foreign word so as to resolve potential ambiguity;
- c) A word could be introduced unconsciously into recipient language by intensive bilingualism.

In line with this, Haugen, 1969, cited in Grosjean, (1982:312) dichotomize lexical borrowing as necessary and unnecessary. According to him, the former fills lexical gap in the borrowing language and the latter shows the borrowing language speakers' ignorance of their language. Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987:174) state that "...ignorance may lead to low esteem to the recipient language which on the other hand causes language loss".

The present study will deal with loan words from different languages into Afar-af. However, the study only concerned with lexical borrowing since the contact among the ethnic groups seems to be casual. As Amharic lexicon is pervasively observed in Afar-af, the prime focus of this study deals with borrowing elements in Afar-af from different languages and mainly from Amharic.

When a certain element of a language is borrowed from another language, it can be either with modification or without. In the following examples borrowing of elements both modified and unmodified were pointed out by taking some loan words from Amharic, Tigrinya and Arabic into Afar-af. For the purpose of this study the types of borrowing we are going to deal with has dichotomized into two categories as superfluous elements and loans elements. Superfluous borrowing is kind of borrowing in which certain lexical element is borrowed by the speaker of other language speakers in the presence of genuine equivalent term.

Amharic loan words in Afar-af pass through some phonological and morphological processes of modification.

<u>Phonological Process</u>				
27)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
a)	higg	higgi	'law'	i → i and suffix (-i)
b)	timhirt	timhrti	'education'	i → i and suffix (-i)
c)	wänjäl	wendeli	'crime'	i → e and suffix (-i)
d)	mängist	mingisti	'government'	i → i and suffix (-i)
e)	silki	silki	'phone'	i → i and suffix (-i)

As evident from the above examples (27), Afar-af takes some sort of modification,

which is, adding suffix /-i/ into the Amharic loan word. All the above examples have undergone a phonological process in the language. It is a phonological process since it merely added at the end of the word with no meaning. In examples (a-e), the roots have undergone this process. For example, *higg* 'law' is borrowed from Amharic into Afar-af with no variation in meaning and only by adding suffix /-i/. We observe from the above examples that Afar-af consists of many loan elements from Amharic with certain modification.

Another kind of phonological process which is carried out when certain loan words from Amharic are taken into Afar-af has to do with another kind of phonological modification, which passes through some adaptation of foreign elements into the host language--Afar-af.

28)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
f)	kätäma	katama:	'town'	ä → a
g)	däbtär	dabtar	'book'	ä → a
h)	läslassa	laslassa	'beverage' (soft drink)	ä → a
i)	däbdabbe	dabdabe	'letter'	ä → a
j)	sibsäba	sabsaba	'meeting'	i & ä → a
k)	bärbärre	barbare	'pepper'	ä → a

The above data shows that in the course of borrowing Amharic loan words into Afar-af the vowel forms changes are visible. Due to the reason that Afar-af does have mid central vowels /ä/ and (i) in its vowel system, these vowels change the into low front vowel /a/, the front vowel (-i) as shown in the examples.(see the vowel system of Afar-af in the preceding section).

### Morphological Process

The greatest numbers of loan words coming from other languages into Afar-af in the case of nouns take some kind of modification. The most common morphological structure in Afar-af is affixation of roots that are drawn from Amharic and other donor languages. The striking examples are:

29)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
	mämhiranočč	mamhirwa	'teachers'	očč→wa
	mäsrbetočč	misrabetwa	'offices'	očč→wa

hakimočč                      hakimwa                      ‘doctors’                      očč→wa

As can be seen from the above the examples, suffix /-očč/ ‘PL’ marker in Amharic is changed into Afar-af /-wa/ which has equivalent meaning in Afar-af.

Languages can make the contacts with one another in numerous situations. These will be presented present sequentially. For the purpose of this study, of the numerous ways in which lexical borrowing can be viewed the researcher looks for loan words in the areas of political, transactional, commodities, furniture, educational, and religious instances. Doing so the main purpose of this study is to show whether Afar-af is making language shifting or not in the research area.

**Data gathered from political terminologies**

30) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u> <sup>11</sup>
l) girazmačč	giradmat	‘commander of the left (title of distinction)
m) k’āññazmačč	kennadmat	“                      right                      ”
n) dāḍḍazmačč	deddadmat	“
o) fitawrari	fitawra:ri	“
p) balabbat	balabbat	‘land lord’
q) nigus	nagus	‘king’ <sup>12</sup>
r) māk <sup>w</sup> anint	makabantu	‘noble’
s) mängist	mingist	‘government’

This list shows there is borrowing of lexicon (vocabulary) from Amharic. An interesting examples from in the above examples is change of (ḍḍ→dd; z→d; j→d; čč→t). These loan words indicate that there was casual contact between the two ethno-linguistic groups (see Winford, 2003). Besides, the words mentioned above give traces of the Amhara had prestige over the Afar in terms of their political interaction. The implication of this lexical borrowing seems to have function of filling the lexical gaps through borrowing the newly imported terms by making little

<sup>11</sup> For instance, in the research area the researcher found Afar individuals many of them were sons and grandsons of *Kennadmat* Abdalla and one of them was the grandson of *Gradmat* Haydera. (government).

<sup>12</sup> Blicse, Loren (1970:15-16) stated that the lack of cohesion and national unity of the Afar through history most likely means they had no national political structure and thereby had no use for terms such as *nugus*, *makabantu*, *misili* (local governor), *bolus* (police), *askartu* (servant or national guardsman), *bosta* (letter), *mingist* (government).

phonological modifications.

### Data gathered from names for commodities

In line with this, additional sources came via Amharic loan words from commodities purchased. We find the following Amharic loans in Afar-af:

31) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
birtukan	burtukana	'orange'
lomi	lomunu	'lemon'
karot	karutu	'carrot'
timatim	timatimi	'tomato'
šinkurt	sungurti	'onion'
samuna	sabuna	'soap'
bärbäre	barbare	'pepper'
k'ibat	kibata	'ointment'
širo	siro	'shiro' (an Eth.n stew)
zäyit	deyti	'oil'

Some of these words have borrowed regardless of Afar terms in use. In relation to the first four loan words, they are already loan words in Amharic, which have now gone from Amharic to Afar-af. The rest of the loan words are directly from Amharic. For instance, the genuine Afar term for the term "onion" is *basal*. Therefore, the purpose of the above Amharic loan words in Afar-af seems to have filling lexical gap, since most of these terms are produced and coined names by the producers and traders. In other words, this borrowing seems to have emanated from lack of concepts and linguistic forms.

### Data collected from market place during interaction

Another very important set of borrowing lexicons emanated from trade (transactions). This is particularly evident in the contact through trade between the Afar and Tegar. Because these two groups have lived together for a long time in the town, it is likely that these people have had extensive contacts. As was noted in the preceding section, in particular concerning language use pattern of respondents in the market domain, it has been proved that Tigrinya is extensively used in this domain. The following is a case in point.

In the situation in which several languages are spoken in the same area and mostly by

the same people for a long time, it is likely that language to influence each other. The coexistence of Tegarü with Afar inhabitants have led to considerable lexical influence:

32) <u>Tnya.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u> <sup>13</sup>
dunku <sup>w</sup> an	dukkan	'shop'
šärf	serfi	'change'
mänzo	mendo	'25 cent'
?alad	alad	'75 cent'

As the data clearly signify these words are borrowed from Tigrinya. In Afar the equivalent term for “shop” is *bada š-araḥa*; for the term exchange of money is *ma:li-barsa* ; for 25 cents is *laba:tana ke: kona šastiya*; for “shilling”, *konttom šastiya*; and for “Alad” *malhina taban ke: ko:na šastiya*. In this particular situation, all of the lexical items that are borrowed from Tigrinya to Afar-af imply the use of Tigrinya loans though genuine lexical elements exist.

#### Superfluous words

Some words are borrowed from the donor language (Amharic in this case) in the existence of genuine words in the recipient language (Afar-af). This kind of borrowing is usually termed as superfluous borrowing. Consider the examples below in (33, 34, and 35).

#### Data gathered from names of furniture

Furniture is another source for loanwords from Amharic. The three loan words below come from furniture.

33) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
wänbär	wanberi	'chair'
alga	alga	'bed'

Some of these words have been borrowed in spite of the fact that Afar its own terms in used. For example, *korsi* is the most commonly use Afar term for chair, and *šarkayto or ka šada* is the word for bed. In addition, some phonological modifications, are also made.

#### Data gathered from educational terminologies

Modern education is another determinant factor (source) of loan word in Afar-af.

34) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
-----------------	------------	--------------

---

Amharic loan words borrowed into Afar are: *gebaya* “market”, *midan* “scale”, *safari* “to weight”, *siling* “shilling” (Bliese, 1981:16).

timhirt	timhirti	'education'
mämhir	mamhiri	'teacher'
timhirt-bet	timhirtibeti	'school'

The equivalent terms in Afar to the above stated loan words are read as *baritto* for education; *barse:na* for teacher; and *baritto bura (ʕari)* for school.

35) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
killil	killil (raka:ay)	'region'
zone (originally English)	donu (rasu)	'zone'
wäräda	warada (daʕa:ra)	'woreda/district'
k'äbäle	kabale (awda)	'kebele' <sup>14</sup>

In the above-cited examples, the words inside parenthesis are the native lexicons of Afar-af for the borrowed words, which are under question. These superfluous words show the existence of Amharic loan words in Afar-af. In these particular cases, the Amharic loan words used without any modification. Most of the terms recently introduced into the Afar, have had indigenous names. However, the data reveals that Amharic loan words are used instead of the equivalent Afar terms.

#### Data gathered from religious based terminologies<sup>15</sup>

Another main source of borrowing in Afar-af is due to religious contact with Arabic. In other words, the religious influence has led to numerous loan words via the religion. According to Leslau (1990: 27) there are various reasons for the existence of Arabic loanwords in Ethiopic. Besides, he stated that Arab speakers found commercial opportunities in Ethiopia and became the merchants of the country. They also found political entities there, and converted certain segments of the Ethiopian population to Islam. Consequently, the Arabs<sup>16</sup> overall live dispersed within their Ethiopian neighbors. This may be the case for contact between Afar and Arab speakers. For all the reasons mentioned by Bliese (1970), it is likely to find certain number of Arabic loan words in Afar-af. Consider the following examples:

36) <u>Ar.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
----------------	------------	--------------

<sup>14</sup> Kebele smallest administrative unit

<sup>15</sup> Edward Ullendorff cited in Bliese (1970:17) states the entrance of Islam into the coastal areas of Ethiopia from the 10 th to 12 th c.

<sup>16</sup> It is often difficult to know whether an Arabic loan word in Amharic comes directly from an Arabic or through intermediary of another Semitic Ethiopic or Cushitic language Leslau (1990 )

šäk	se:ki	'an individual who know holy Quran'
ʕalim	ʕalim	'religious knowledgeable person'
ramadan	ramadan	'month fasting'
ʕulama	ʕoloma	'religious knowledgeable persons'
zuhur	dohri	'7 o' lock prayer'
ʕasir	ʕasri	'10 o' lock prayer'
maXrib	magrib	'1 o' lock prayer'
ʕiša	ʕisa	'2 o' lock prayer'
adduniya	addoniya	'possession of this world'
ḥayat	ḥayat	'being alive'
duʕa	duʕa	'benediction'

These loan words fully adopted in the Afar-af as religious are principal indicators of the existence of Arabic loan words in Afar-af. Besides, to adopt the loan words Afar change (z→d and š→s). Furthermore, religion is the main means of language contact.

Another source of borrowing is observed in terminologies related with crown.

37)	<u>Ar.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
	rais	amoyta	'emperor'
	sult'an	sultan	'king'

In the case of the first example, that is, *amoyta* 'emperor' the borrowing type is quite different from the rest of the examples. It is loan shift borrowing. The meaning adopted as it is while is the form substituted into the native Afar-af (see Appel and Muysken). However, in the case of second example the borrowing type is loan borrowing since this example exhibits both the meaning and the form (see also Appel and Muysken).

In line with this, the majority of proper nouns (personal names) are highly borrowed from Arabic including my full-name Mohammed Ibrahim Usman.

38)	<u>Ar.</u>	<u>Af.</u>
	hawa	hawa
	ʕabdu	ʕabdu
	ʕaiša	ʕeysa
	ʕali	ʕali

As seen in the above examples, some of proper nouns that are mentioned and a myriad number of names, not mentioned, are loan words from Arabic into Afar-af.

On the other hand, because of language contact, an immense number of very interesting phenomena are experienced. The present vivid social mobility brings forth extensive contact between cultures and languages, this leading to leveling differences and mixing of languages, and bringing instability and variation. Eventually, people try to reduce these variations through mixing codes and through assimilations (borrowing) in their course of interaction. According to Weinrich, Uriel (1968: 90), 'the relationship of the culture to one another in a particular geographic habit determines what one group learns from the other and defines such gaps in the vocabulary of each group as may need filling by borrowing'. In line with this issue, Bilese (1970:1) states that the close relation between a culture and its vocabulary is obvious enough for it to be generally assumed that an acquaintance with the other. He further states that the relation between a lexicon and culture is obvious when one recalls the list of Eskimo words and Arabic words for camel, which ethnographers have used to show cultural interest. In all the above examples, we have seen Afar-af is the borrowing language. However, in example (38) a few examples of words borrowed by Amharic from Afar-af are presented. The following examples are striking ones.

39) <u>Af.</u>	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Gloss</u> <sup>17</sup>
gile	gile	'big knife'
bakal	bäkäl	'goat-kid'

As has been mentioned in chapter two, Campbel (2000: 73) geographical and ecological clue is one of the clues in which borrowed item or element of a language can be identified. In line with this that, the word /gile/ refers to one of the cultural assets (value) of Afar the people. Others particularly Tigray and Amhara people, in the research area also commonly use this term. The motive behind the borrowing seems to be to fill the cultural gap between ethnic groups. In other words, because these two

---

<sup>17</sup> Joseph Greenberg cited in Bliese (1970:4) in many ways a lexicon "mirror" to culture.

ethno-linguistic groups do not possess /gile/ as a cultural value or it is only confined to (a core) value for Afar, it is possible to say this word is borrowed from Afar. This type of borrowing is loanwords (Haugen cited in Appel and Muysken, (1987: 164)).

In a similar fashion, the word /bakal/ 'small goat' refers to male and believed to be Afar because of the reason that this people are predominantly pastoral whose way of life is engaged in animal rearing. Afar is known by the practice of eating the meat of /bakel/. They also provide the meat of /bakel/ for honorable guests. In spite of this, other linguistic groups, in particular, Amhara borrows the word, but in this case, the mode is adoption with slight modification that is the change of /ä/ into /a/. However, the meaning remains unchanged.

To sum up from the whole lot of examples above it is remarkable that many Amharic, few Tigrinya and considerable Arabic elements have been borrowed into Afar-af. In light of the above stated scholars (Alitchison, 1981; Grosjeena, 1982; and Appel and Muysken, 1987) views all cited in Mesfin (2009: 19-20), the adoption of elements from these languages signify language shift. This is also evident in the preceding section (i. e., language use). In general, the linguistic data offered in this section demonstrate a linguistic sign of shift of Afar-af in favor of the above stated languages in Ab'ala town.

In the examples above the functions of borrowing being diverse is concerned mainly with the functional value that the respondents allocate to borrowing between English and Amharic. English has different roles from the borrowing of Amharic. While English has the highest status, as an international language of education and in the higher institutions of the education system in the country borrowings are marked indications of this. Amharic is used the official language of both sthe country and the region and widely used in interactions among various ethnic groups.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### 5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

#### 5.1. SUMMARY

The main objective of this study was to assess the language use pattern in Ab'ala town with respect to the town dwellers. In order to achieve the stated objective, basic questions were raised regarding proficiency, choice of language in different domains, use of MTs, and perception of respondents towards each language. In attempting to address the questions, data were collected through self-reported questionnaires, participant observations, and recordings from the targeted population.

Chapter two concerned the review of related literature and related works so as to make a basis for the discussions of the findings. The review of related literature involves language contact results such as CS, borrowing, LM and language shift. Besides, some related works are reviewed in order to ensure the importance of this study.

The third chapter was devoted to data analysis on language use patterns. The study employed mixed (qualitative and quantitative) survey method to analyze the data based on the basic research questions. The obtained data were calculated using percentage, tables, and mean scores. The remaining data are analyzed qualitatively. After analysis and interpretations of data are made both quantitatively and qualitatively, the findings were drawn.

The fourth chapter emphasizes on a few language contact results. These are CS, CM and borrowing. The fifth relies on conclusions and recommendations.

#### 5.2. CONCLUSION

Based on the major findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

The patterns of language use are analyzed in Ab'ala town. Despite the considerable differences in the language use behavior of the population in the town as the current data indicates the difference of respondents' proficiency in each language in the four language skills reveals that there is varying standards of proficiency among respondents. Majority of respondents have better skills (in listening and speaking)

languages such as Amharic, Tigrinya, and Afar-af. This reveals that respondents' proficiency in Amharic is much more than their proficiency in the rest of languages. They are slightly less proficient in reading and writing skill in the same languages. The good proficiency in these languages is emanated from difference in role of the two languages (Amharic and Afar-af) in education and ethno-linguistic vitality (in demography) of Tigrinya speaking community in the area. However, they are not proficient in all the skills in Afan Oromo and Saho. Therefore, listening and speaking are the two first learned skills.

The Amharic MT speakers use their MT more often in contexts of Oaths, letter writing, and counting. Similarly, Tigrinya MT speakers use their MT more often than the rest MT speakers in dream. Besides, Afar-af MT speakers used their MT more often in the context of TV viewing. This shows Afar-af and Tigrinya speakers reduce the use of their MT in favor of Amharic. Therefore, this seems a clear shift of languages in the area including Afar-af to Amharic.

In the less powerful domains, that is, market Tigrinya is used predominantly followed by Afar-af. This is because of the simple reason that the number of Tigrinya speakers is greater than that of the rest of the languages spoken in the town. Afar-af is used exclusively in Wakrigubi Kebele while use of solely Tigrinya has been exhibited in Wuhdet Kebele. Despite the use of Afar-af and Tigrinya in the family domain, Amharic is the dominantly used language in the family domain. In intermarriage respondents use mostly Amharic at home. On the other hand, Amharic has shown dominance even in less powerful domains (i.e. friendship) domain.

On the other hand, in the powerful domains such as school, office, health center, police station, and courtroom Amharic is used as dominant language. Hence, Amharic is the de-facto official language in Ab'ala town. Besides, in a religion domain respondents predominantly use Afar-af alternatively with Arabic to communicate with Sheikhs and Tigrinya alternatively with Ge'ez used to communicate with Priests. Generally, Amharic dominates in the domains that are in question. In other words, Amharic is likely to have dominant function in all the powerful domains. This implies that Amharic is the major means of communication in Ab'ala town.

All of the respondents showed negative attitude towards Afan Oromo and Saho in all the raised issues. However, among positive statements, in statements such as academic issues, sexual issues, sociopolitical issues, and most prestigious language in

the town, the majority of respondents express favorable attitude with the use of Amharic. On the contrary, in one of the positive statements, that is, in cultural issues, majority of respondents revealed negative attitude. On the other hand, regarding negative statements, respondents showed their positive attitude of using Amharic in daily topic and using as vehicular language. Concerning Tigrinya language in for positive statements, only in one statement (i.e. in cultural) majority of respondents replied their positive attitude towards Tigrinya whereas from the negatively stated statements in statement (i.e. Tigrinya as vehicular) respondents replied positive attitude. Finally, as the study indicates the majority of respondents reflected positive attitude towards Afar-af in sociopolitical, cultural, as the most prestigious language in Ab'ala, and equally the most vehicular. Generally, respondents have positive attitudes in both Amharic and Afar-af in the majority of attitudinal statements.

As resultant from language contact, CS between Amharic and the host language Afar-af was exhibited. Even though the speaker first language was Afar-af the more active (dominant) languages such as Amharic, English, Tigrinya and Arabic determine the speech behavior of speakers in the town. The overwhelming majority of lexicons are borrowed into Afar-af either directly or indirectly taken from Amharic. However, Arabic through religious contact; English through education are dominant languages as sources of loan words in Afar-af. Tigrinya is a less contributing language in terms of borrowing into Afar-af. This may reasonably be accounted for by bilingualism of the population in Ab'ala town, whose first languages are Afar-af, Tigrinya, Afan Oromo, Saho who obtain their formal education in Amharic. Although many of their every day interactions involve their MT language, words and concepts of Amharic become more accessible than Afar-af (MT) language.

The motives for borrowing lexical items from the said languages have to do with the lack of concepts and linguistic form in the MTs. Concerning the reason behind code C S and two main reasons can be drawn: One and the most common reason for the occurrences of CS has to do with speakers having no competence for using the target language properly for a particular lexical item. This process correlated with the lack of proficiency in the target language (Afar-af). In such occasions speakers employ CS in which lexical elements from other languages bridge the gaps resulting from language incompetence. This mechanism functions as defensive mechanism for speakers as it gives opportunity to continue communication or in order to avoid gaps. The second need for CS has to do with speakers' lack of concept in the target language and speakers have no term, which is well expressive, equivalent for using the target language explanation for a particular lexical item.

## REFERENCES

- Afshar, Iraj. 1989. *The Farsi Language in Azerbaijan (in Farsi)*. Tehran: Baniade Moghoofate Dr. M. Afshar Yazdi. An introduction to Language and Linguistics of Africa. Oxford: University press. *An introduction*. Cambridge: University press.
- Appel, René and Peter, Muysken. 1987. *Language contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Assebe Buli. 1981. "*Multilingualism in Kistanne Nationality*". MA Thesis (unpublished). AAU.
- Backer, C. 2006. "Psycho-Social Analysis in Language Policy". In: Ricento, T. (Ed.). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Black-well publishing, 210-228.
- Baker, C. 1992. *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Beliese, L. 1976. Introduction. Bender, et al.(eds.). *Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. London: Oxford university press.
- Bender, Lionel. 1976. Introduction. *Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopian*. In Bender, M.L. et al. (eds.). , London: Oxford university press.
- Bliese, Loren F.1976. Afar. Bender et al. *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. USA, Michingan State University.
- Bloomfield, L. 1935. *Language*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Campbell, Lyle. 2004. *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh University.
- Cooper, L, R. and Carpenter, S. 1976. Language in the Market. In Bender, et al. (eds.). *Language in Ethiopia*. London: Oxford University press, 244-255.
- Cooper, L.R. 1970. The Description of Language Use in Ethiopia. In Tom Gorma (ed.). *Journal of the Language Association of Eastern Africa*. Nirobi.
- Coulmas, Florian. 1997. *The Hand Book of Sociolinguistics*. Berlin: Blackwell publisher.
- CSA. (2007). *Statistics Abstract*. Addis Ababa.
- Dworetzky, Jhon P. 1988. *Psychology (third edition)*. St. Paul; West Publishing Company.(ed.).
- Edwards, J., Ed. 1996. "Symbolic ethnicity and language". J. Hutchinson and A. Smith (eds). *Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fasold, Ralph. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Fishman, J.A. 1971. The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Social Science. In Fishman, J. A. (ed.). *Advances in Sociology of Language*. (pp.217-404). Paris: Mouton-The Hague.
- Fishman, J.A. 2001. "Why it is so hard to save a threatened language?" J.A. Fishman(ed.). *Can Threaten Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, revisited: A 21<sup>st</sup> centenary perspective (pp.1-22)*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Fraenk, Jack R. and Norman, E. Wallen. (200). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). USA: The McGraw-Hill companies, Inc.
- Gada Melba. 1988. *Oromia: An Introduction*. Kartoum, Sudan.
- Gebre Hishe. 2008. *Language use and Identity of Children Born to the Tigrinya Speaking Community Living in Addis Ababa*. Un Published MA Thesis. Addis Ababa.
- Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life with Two Languages. An Introduction to Bilingualism*. England: Harvard University Press Hague.
- Hoffmann, Charlette. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. New York: London Group UK Limited.
- Holmes, Janet. 1992. *An introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman publisher.
- <http://www.wikipedia>, the free encyclopedia
- Hudson, R.A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*: Cambridge. Cambridge: University press.
- Kamwangamalu, Nkonko. 2000. Language in contact. Webb and Kcmbo-sure (eds.). *African Voices: An Introduction to the language and linguistics of Africa*: Oxford University Press.
- Kelemework Tafere. 2006. "*Indigenous institutions of conflict resolution among the Ab'ala Afar of*". Un published MA Thesis. Addis ababa.
- Keshavard, M. 2001. The Role of Social Context, Intimacy, and Distance in the Choice of Formsof Address. *International Journal of the Sociology of language*. Rudolf F. and Damir, K. (eds.). PP 5-18. New York: Mouton De Gureyter.
- Leslau, W. 1990. *Arabic Loan words in Ethiopian Semitic*. Germany: Ottoharrassowitz. Wiesbaden.
- Macnamara, J. 1967a. *The Bilingual Linguistic Performance*. Journal of Social Issues, 23, 58-77.
- Mesfin Wodajo. 2009. *Language maintenance Among Afan Oromo Speakers in Addis Ababa*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Addis ababa.
- Myers-Scottn. 1997. "We just mix: CSin a South Africa township". *International Journal of the Society of Languages, Moha, Ennaj and Joshua A. Fishman*

- (eds.), 65-69 New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Myers-Scott. 1997. "We just mix: CSin a South Africa township". *International Journal of the Society of Languages*, Moha, Ennaj and Joshua A. Fishman (eds.), 65-69 New York: Mouton de Gruyter. *north-eastern Ethiopia" people*. MA Thesis (unpublished). AAU. Perspective (pp.1-22). Toronto: Multilingual matters.
- Rubin, J. 1968. "Acquisition and Proficiency". In: Pride, J. B. and Holmes, J (1972) 'Sociolinguistics',. Penjuin Book New York: Oxford University Press, 350-366.
- Šabec, Nada. 1997. Slovene-English language contact in the USA. Moha, Ennaji and Joshua A. Fishman (eds.), *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, pp 129-181. New York: Mouton De Gruyter. Science, vol.12, p 8325.
- Smelser, Neil and Baltes, Paul(eds.). 2001. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral*
- Sole, Mireia Galindo. 2003. *Selected Proceedings of the First Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, Lotffi Sayah, 19-29. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceeding Project. #1004
- Stilwell, Jean. 1999. Language and Age. Linda Thomas and Shan Wareing (eds.). *Language, Society, and Power: An introduction*. London and New York. Routledge: *threatened language be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21<sup>st</sup> century*
- Warduogh, Ronald. 1986. *An introduction to Sociolinguistics*: Blackwell publisher.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Language in Contact: findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1968. *Language in contact*. Mouton: The Hague.
- Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. India: Blackwell publisher.
- Wolff, Ekkehard H. 200. "Language and Society". Heine, B and Nurse, D. (eds.). *African Languages: An Introduction* (pp303-304) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zealelem Leyew. 1998. Code-switching: Amharic-English. *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, vol.11,(199), pp 197-213.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX-A

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND PHILOLOGY

#### QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire focuses on language use situation and the role of each language in Afar regional state Ab'ala town. The questionnaire is helpful to describe the Ab'ala people use which language, where, with whom and at what circumstance etc. Hence, the main objective of this research is to study language use situations of the area. To make this research successful, your engagement in filling this questionnaire will have great contribution. Therefore, I request you to suggest information that you assume as correct. Since, any information that you suggest will only used for this research, I guarantee you no information from this questionnaire will used for any other purpose or pass to anybody. No need of writing your names.

**Thank you in advance for your cooperation!!!**

#### PART ONE:

##### A) Self-reported questionnaire

For the questions from 1-7, please put “√” mark in the box preceding each information that is compatible with your personal information, whereas for questions 7-8 write an answer that you assume correct

1. Ethnic group: (    ) Afar (    ) Tegar (    ) Amhara  
(    ) other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
2. Marital status (    ) Single (    ) Married
3. Mother tongue: (    ) Afar-af (    ) Tigrinya (    ) Amharic  
(    ) other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Your husband's/spouse's? \_\_\_\_\_
5. What is the dominant language at your home? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Residence : (    ) Wakrigubi (    ) Wuhdet
7. Religion: (    ) Muslim (    ) Orthodox Christian (    )  
Catholic (    ) Protestant (    ) other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

##### B) Self-evaluation of respondents' proficiency in each language

Read the questions below thoroughly and answer the following questions based on the instruction.

**Instruction:** Regarding your ability or skill in each language below are questions along with alternatives. Put “√” mark in your right alternative in the space provided

- 8 a) when I listen to people speaking in Afar-af my skill or proficiency is
- b) When listen to people speaking in Tigrinya my skill or proficiency is
- c) When listen in people speaking in Amharic my skill or proficiency is
- d) Please specify your listening ability/skill if any other than the language that are stated above by writing the name of the language

Poor	Fair	Good

- 9 a) When I speak to people in Afar-af my skill or proficiency is
- b) When I speak to people in Tigrinya my skill or proficiency is
- c) When I speak to people in Amharic my skill or proficiency is
- d) Please specify your speaking ability/skill, if any other than the languages that are stated above by writing the name of the language

Poor	Fair	Good

10. a) When I speak to people in Afar-af my skill or proficiency is
- b) When I speak to people in Tigrinya my skill or proficiency is
- c) When I speak to people in Amharic my skill or proficiency is
- d) Please specify your reading ability/skill, if any other than the languages that are stated above by writing the name of the language

Poor	Fair	Good

- 10 a) When I write in Afar-af, my skill or proficiency is
- b) When I write in Tigrinya, my skill or proficiency is
- c) When I write in Amharic, my skill or proficiency is
- d) Please specify your writing ability/skill, if any other than the languages that are stated above by writing the name of the language-

Poor	Fair	Good

**PART TWO: Questions related to language use situations or preferences**

In the following questions alternatives are given, put “x” mark against your right choice and if your answer is “other” please specify the name of the language

<b>I. Questionnaire regarding language use in different domains</b>					
<b>Which language (s) do you use</b>		<b>Afar-af</b>	<b>Tigrinya</b>	<b>Amharic</b>	<b>Other</b>
11	<b>Family domain</b>				
	Which language do you use with your spouse/husband at home				
	Which language do you use with your parents at home				
	Which language do you use with your children at home				
	Which language do you use with siblings				
12	Which language do you use with your neighbors				
13	Which language do you use with your friends				
14	<b>Education</b>				
	Which language do you use with your fellow students at school				
	Which language do you use with your teachers in school				
15	<b>Market</b>				
	Which language do you use with buyer in the market				
	Which language do you use with sellers in the market				
16	<b>Religion</b>				
	Which language do you use with Sheiks in the mosques				
	Which language do you use with Priests in the Church				
17	<b>Health center</b>				
	Which language do you use with Physicians in health center				
18	<b>Employment</b>				
	Which language do you use with your colleagues in office				
	With your boss in office				
19	<b>Authorities</b>				
	Which language (s) do you use with police man in police station				
	Which language (s) do you use with judge in court room				
<b>II. Questionnaire regarding domains of mother-tongue use</b>					
	<b>Situations (contexts)</b>	<b>Often</b>	<b>Some times</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>No response</b>
20	<b>In oaths</b>				

	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				
21	<b>In dream</b>				
	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				
22	<b>In the extent of viewing TV programs</b>				
	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				
23	<b>For letter writing</b>				
	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				
24	<b>For counting</b>				
	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				

### III. Questions referring to the perceptions of respondents for each languages

Each of the statements below expresses an attitude towards each language spoken in Ab'ala. Please tick ( ) your attitude/opinion with respect to each statements for each language in only one of the five alternatives (i.e., 5= SA, 4 = A, UD=3, 2= D, and 1= SD)

	Topics (contexts)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
25	<b>Daily topics</b>					
	I do not support using Afar-af in daily topics					
	Why?					
	I do not support using Tigrinya in daily topics					
	Why?					
	I do not support using Amharic in daily topics					

	Why?					
	I do not support using Afan Oromo in daily topics					
	Why?					
	I do not support using Saho in daily topics					
	Why?					
26	<b>Academic topics</b>					
	I feel good when I use Afar-af in academic topics.					
	Why?					
	I feel good when I use Tigrinya in academic topics.					
	Why?					
	I feel good when I use Amharic in academic topics.					
	Why?					
	I feel good when I use Afan Oromo in academic topics.					
	Why?					
	I feel good when I use Saho in academic topics.					
	Why?					
27	<b>Sexuality</b>					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Afar-af in sexuality					
	Why?					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Tigrinya in sexuality					
	Why?					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Amharic in sexuality					
	Why?					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Afan Oromo in sexuality					
	Why?					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Saho in sexuality					
	Why?					
28	<b>Sociopolitical issues</b>					
	I think Afar-af is appropriate to use in socio-political issues.					
	Why?					
	I think Tigrinya is appropriate to use in socio-political issues.					
	Why?					
	I think Amharic is appropriate to use in socio-political issues.					
	Why?					
	I think Afan Oromo is appropriate to use in					

	socio-political issues.						
	Why?						
	I think Saho is appropriate to use in socio-political issues.						
	Why?						
29	<b>Cultural issues</b>						
	I prefer to use Afar-af in cultural issues						
	Why?						
	I prefer to use Tigrinya in cultural issues						
	Why?						
	I prefer to use Amharic in cultural issues						
	Why?						
	I prefer to use Afar Oromo in cultural issues						
	Why?						
	I prefer to use Saho in cultural issues						
	Why?						
30	<b>As vehicular</b>						
	I do not prefer using Afar-af as vehicular language						
	Why?						
	I do not prefer using Tigrinya as vehicular language						
	Why?						
	I do not prefer using Amharic as vehicular language						
	Why?						
	I do not prefer using Afan Oromo as vehicular language						
	Why?						
	I do not prefer using Saho as vehicular language						
	Why?						
31	<b>Most prestigious</b>						
	I believe Afar-af is the most prestigious						
	Why?						
	I believe Tigrinya is the most prestigious						
	Why?						
	I believe Amharic is the most prestigious in						
	Why?						
	I believe Afan Oromo is the most prestigious						
	Why?						
	I believe Saho is the most prestigious in						
	Why?						

**አባሪ - B**  
**የሰነ ልሳንና ፊሎሎጂ ትምህርት ክፍል**  
**የቋንቋዎች ጥናት ተቋም**  
**ኣዲስ አበባ**

የጥናት መረጃ አሰባሰብ መጠይቅ

ይህ መጠይቅ በዋናነት የሚያተኩረው በአፋር ክልል በአብካላ ከተማ ያለውን የቋንቋ አጠቃቀም ሁኔታንም በመርመር እያንዳንዱ ቋንቋ ያለውን ሚና ለማወቅ የሚያስችል መረጃ የሚሰጥ ነው። ይህ ማለት ሕብረተሰቡ የትኛው ቋንቋ በየትኛው ቦታ፣ በምን ሁኔታ፣ በምን ርዕሰ ጉዳይ፣ ከማን ጋር፣ ወዘተ እንደሚጠቀም ለመግለጽ የሚረዳን ነው። የጥናቱ ዋነኛ አላማ የአካባቢው ቋንቋዎች ነባራዊ ሁኔታን በማጥናት የአፋርኛ ቋንቋ (አፋር-አፍ) በተጠቀሰው ቦታ (በአብካላ ከተማ) ውስጥ በምን አይነት ሁኔታ እንደሚገኝና በሕብረተሰቡ ምን አይነት አገልግሎት እንዳለው በተለይም የቋንቋው ባለቤት የሆኑት አፋር ቋንቋቸውን እየተጠቀሙበት መሆኑንና አለመሆኑን ለማወቅ የሚያስችል ነው። ጥናቱ ተገቢውን ውጤት ያስገኝ ዘንድ እርስዎ ይህንን መጠይቅ በመሙላት የሚያበረክቱት አስጸዋጽኦ ክፍ ያለ ነው። ስለዚህ ያመነ-በትና ትክክለኛ ያሉትን መረጃ እንዲሰጡ በታላቅ አክብሮት ይጠየቃሉ። የሚሰጡት ማንኛውም መረጃ ለዚህ ጥናት ብቻ የሚውል ስለሆነ ለማንኛውም ሁለተኛ ወገን ተላልፎ የማይሰጥ መሆኑን ከወዲሁ ላረጋግጥልዎ እወዳለሁ። ስምዎን መጻፍ አይኖርብዎትም።

**መጠይቁን በመሙላት ስለተባበሩን ክልብ አመሰግናለሁ**

**ክፍል አንድ:**

**ሀ. ግላዊ መረጃ**

ከዚህ በታች ከ 1-6 ለቀረቡት ጥያቄዎች ከተሰጡት አማራጮች የእርስዎን ግላዊ መረጃ በያዘው ፊት ለፊት ባለው ክፈት ቦታ ላይ “√” ምልክት በማድረግ ይግለጹ። መልስዎ “ሌላ” ከሆነ የቋንቋውን ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

1. ብሔረሰብ፡ አፋር-አፍ (     ) ተጋሩ (     ) አማራ (     ) ሌላ \_\_\_\_\_
2. የጋብቻ ሁኔታ፡ ያገባ/ች/ (     ) ያላገባ \_\_\_\_\_
3. አፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ፡ አፋር (     ) ትግርኛ (     ) አማርኛ (     ) ሌላ \_\_\_\_\_
4. ቤት ውስጥ በዋናነት የምትጠቀሙት/ሚው? \_\_\_\_\_
5. የባልሽ /የሚሰትህ አፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ? \_\_\_\_\_
6. መኖሪያ፡ ዋክሪጉቤ (     ) ውህደት (     ) \_\_\_\_\_
7. ሃይማኖት፡ እስላም (     ) ኦርቶዶክስ (     ) ካቶሊክ (     ) \_\_\_\_\_  
 ኘሮቴስታንት (     ) ሌላ \_\_\_\_\_

**ለ. የቋንቋ ክህሎትን በተመለከተ የቀረቡ ጥያቄዎች።**

ከዚህ በታች ያሉትን ጥያቄዎች በጥንቃቄ በማንበብ በሚከተለው መመሪያ መሰረት መልስዎን ያስቀምጡ።

**መመሪያ:** በእያንዳንዱ የቋንቋ ችሎታዎን በተመለከተ ከዚህ በታች ለቀረቡት ጥያቄዎች አማራጮች ተቀምጠዋል፡ ከተሰጡት አማራጮች ስር ባሉ ክፍት ቦታዎች ይህንን “√” ምልክት በማኖር ምርጫዎን አሳዩ።

8. ሀ) በአፋርኛ የሚናገሩ ሰዎች ሣዳምጥ ያለኝ ችሎታ
  - ለ) በትግርኛ የሚናገሩ ሰዎች ሣዳምጥ ያለኝ ችሎታ
  - ሐ) በአማርኛ የሚናገሩ ሰዎች ሣዳምጥ ያለኝ ችሎታ
- መ) እባክዎ ከተሰጡት ቋንቋዎች ውጪ በሌላ ቋንቋ ያልዎት የመስማት ክህሎትዎን የቋንቋውን

ጥሩ	መካከለኛ	ዝቅተኛ

ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

9. ሀ) በአፋርኛ ያለኝ የመናገር ችሎታ  
 ለ) በትግርኛ ያለኝ የመናገር ችሎታ  
 ሐ) በአማርኛ ያለኝ የመናገር ችሎታ  
 መ) እባክዎ ከተሰጡት ቋንቋዎች ውጪ በሌላ ቋንቋ ያልዎት የመናገር ክህሎትዎን የቋንቋውን ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

ጥሩ	መካከለኛ	ዝቅተኛ

10. ሀ) በአፋርኛ ያለኝ የማንበብ ችሎታ  
 ለ) በትግርኛ ያለኝ የማንበብ ችሎታ  
 ሐ) በአማርኛ ያለኝ የማንበብ ችሎታ  
 መ) እባክዎ ከተሰጡት ቋንቋዎች ውጪ በሌላ ቋንቋ ያልዎት የማንበብ ክህሎትዎን የቋንቋውን ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

ጥሩ	መካከለኛ	ዝቅተኛ

11. ሀ) በአፋርኛ ስጽፍ ያለኝ ችሎታ  
 ለ) በትግርኛ ስጽፍ ያለኝ ችሎታ  
 ሐ) በአማርኛ ስጽፍ ያለኝ ችሎታ  
 መ) እባክዎ ከተሰጡት ቋንቋዎች ውጪ በሌላ ቋንቋ ያልዎት የመጻፍ ክህሎትዎን የቋንቋውን ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

ጥሩ	መካከለኛ	ዝቅተኛ

**ክፍል ሁለት፡**

የቋንቋ አጠቃቀም ሁኔታን በተመለከተ የቀረቡ ጥያቄዎች

ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች እባክዎ ከቀረቡት አማራጭ ቋንቋዎች ስር "X" ምልክት በማኖር ትክክለኛውን መልስ ይግለጹ። መልሶ "ሌላ" ከሆነ የቅንቋውን ስም ይግለጹ።

IV. ስለቋንቋ አጠቃቀም የሚመለከቱ ጥያቄዎች				
የትኛውን ቋንቋ /ዎች/ ይጠቀማሉ	አፋር-አፍ	ትግርኛ	አማርኛ	ሌላ
12	ቤት			
	ከቤት ውስጥ ከባለቤትዎ ጋር			
	ከቤት ውስጥ ከወላጅ ጋር			
	ከቤት ውስጥ ከልጆችዎ ጋር			
	ከቤት ውስጥ ከወንድምዎ/እህቶችዎ/ ጋር			
13	ጎረቤት			
	ከጎረቤትዎ ጋር			
14	ጓደኛ			
	ከጓደኛዎ ጋር			
15	ትምህርት ቤት			
	ትምህርት ቤት ውስጥ ከተማሪዎች ጋር			
	ትምህርት ቤት ውስጥ ከመምህራን ጋር			
16	ገበያ			
	ከገዥዎ ጋር			
	ከሻጭዎ ጋር			
17	ቤተክርስቲያን /መስጊድ/			

	ከቆሶች ጋር				
	ከሸክ ጋር				
18	ጤና ጣቢያ				
	የጤና ባለሙያዎች ጋር				
19	ቢሮ				
	ቢሮ ውስጥ ከስራ ባልደረቦች ጋር				
	ቢሮ ውስጥ ከአለቃዎ ጋር				
20	ሕግ ማስከበሪያ ቦታዎች				
	ፖሊስ ጣቢያ ውስጥ ከፖሊሶች ጋር				
	ከፍ/ቤት ውስጥ ከዳኞች ጋር				
II	የአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ የሚጠቀሙባቸው ሁኔታዎች	የአጠቃቀም ሁኔታዎች			
	ሁኔታዎች	ሁልጊዜ	አልፎአልፎ	ፍጹም አልጠቀምም	መልስ የለም
21	በመሃላ ጊዜ				
	አፋር-አፍ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				
22	በሕልም ጊዜ				
	አፋር-አፍ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				
23	ቴሌብዥን በሚመለከትበት ጊዜ				
	አፋር-አፍ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				
24	ደብዳቤ ስንጽፍ				
	አፋር-አፋ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				
25	ቁጥር ስንቆጥር				
	አፋር-አፍ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				

III ለቋንቋዎች ያላቸው አመለካከት የተመለከቱ ጥያቄዎች ከዚህ በታች በአብራሃ ከተማ ውስጥ ስለሚነገሩ ቋንቋዎች ማህበረሰቡ ለእያንዳንዱ ቋንቋ ያለው አመለካከት በተመለከተ ሃሳቦች ተዘርዘረዋል። እባክዎ ለእያንዳንዱ ቋንቋ ያልዎት አመለካከት የ“√” ምልክት በማድረግ አመልክቱ።


	ርዕሰ ጉዳይ	በጣም አልሰማም	አልሰማምም	አልወሰንኩም	እስማማለሁ	በጣም እስማማለሁ
26	በዕለት ተዕለት ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋር					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					
27	ትምህርታዊ ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋር					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					
28	በጾታዊ ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋር					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					
29	በማህበራዊና ፖለቲካዊ ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋር					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					

	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					
30	በባሕላዊ ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋ					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					
31	እንደ ዋነኛ ቋንቋ					
	አፋር-አፋ					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					
32	የበላይ ቋንቋ					
	አፋር-አፋ					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					

## DECLARATION

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

Name: Mohammed Ebrahim

Sig 

Date 18/10/2010

Place: Department of Linguistics and Philology Addis Ababa University.

Date of submission \_\_\_\_\_

### Approval

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

Name: Graziano Savá (Ph. D)

Sig \_\_\_\_\_

Date 18/10/2010



**Addis Ababa University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**College of Social Science and Humanities**  
**Faculty of Humanities**  
**Department of Linguistics and Philology**

**LANGUAGE USE AND CONTACT PHENOMENA IN THE AFAR  
REGIONAL STATE: THE CASE OF AB'ALA TOWN**

**BY**  
**MOHAMMED EBRAHIM**



**September, 2010**

**Addis Ababa**

**LANGUAGE USE AND CONTACT PHENOMENA IN THE AFAR  
REGIONAL STATE: THE CASE OF AB'ALA TOWN**

**BY  
MOHAMMED EBRAHIM**



**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of Master of Arts in Linguistics  
Department of Linguistics and Philology  
Addis Ababa University**

**September, 2010**

**Addis Ababa**

**Addis Ababa University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**College of Social Science and Humanities**  
**Faculty of Humanities**  
**DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND PHILOLOGY**

**LANGUAGE USE AND CONTACT PHENOMENA IN AFAR REGIONAL  
STATE: THE CASE OF AB'ALA TOWN**

**BY**  
**MOHAMMED EBRAHIM**

**BOARDS OF EXAMINERS:**

*Graziano Savà*

**Advisor**

*for [unclear]*

**Signature**

*Bekale Seyum*

**Examiner**

*[unclear]*

**Signature**

**Examiner**



**Signature**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this study would have been impossible without the assistance, encouragement, and cooperation of many people to whom I owe marvelous debt of thankfulness. I would like to thank all the individuals who have contributed towards the fruition of this study. Firstly, I would like to express my deepest heartfelt gratitude and sincere thanks to Dr. Graziano Savá, my thesis advisor, for his unreserved and constructive comments. I would like to give him special thanks since he helped me in every way possible by devoting his valuable time. Dr. Graziano's contribution to the successful completion of my study could not have been certainly summarized merely by saying within a paragraph.

Secondly, I would like to acknowledge Mohammed Idris Mussa, for his enthusiasm and sympathy to my forefront problem and granting me his computer at critical time to accomplish all my works successfully. Without his generous support, it was impossible to become successful.

*least*  
Last but not the list I wish to express my gratitude to my spouse Fatuma Osman Ibrahim for her affectionate support encouragement, and patience throughout my study to pursue my education.

# Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgement .....	i
Table of Contents .....	ii
List of Tables .....	v
Acronyms.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Background of the Study .....	1
1.2. The Study Area .....	2
1.3. Statement of the Problem .....	4
1.4. Objectives of the Study.....	5
1.5. Scope of the Study .....	6
1.6. Significance of the Study.....	6
1.7. Methodology and Procedure of the Study .....	7
1.7.1. Data Gathering Technique .....	7
1.7.2. Sampling Technique.....	7
1.7.3. Data Analysis Techniques .....	8
1.7.4. Procedure of the Research .....	8
CHAPTER TWO	
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, RELATED WORKS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS .....	9
2.1. Review of Related Literature.....	9
2.1.1. Language Contact .....	9
2.1.2. Language Use/Choice.....	11
2.1.3. Language Attitude.....	12
2.1.4. Bilingualism.....	13
2.1.4.1. Why Do Bilinguals Code-switch .....	14
2.1.5. Accommodation.....	15

2.1.6. Language Maintenance and Shift .....	17
2.1.6.1. Factors Influencing Language Maintenance and Shift .....	18
2.1.7. Code switching .....	18
2.1.8. Code mixing.....	19
2.1.9. Matrix Language.....	20
2.1.10. Borrowing.....	20
2.2. Review of Related Works .....	22
2.3. Conceptual Frameworks .....	24
CHAPTER THREE	
3. SOCIOLINGUISTIC INQUIRY .....	25
3.1. Data Description, Analysis, and Interpretation.....	25
3.2. Analysis and Discussion of the Demographic Characteristics .....	25
3.2.1. Respondents Language Proficiency.....	30
3.3. Domain of Language Use .....	33
3.3.1 Less powerful Domains .....	34
3.3.1.1. Language Use in the Family Domain with Different Interlocutors .....	34
3.3.1.2. Language Use in the Home Domain and Intermarriage .....	36
3.3.1.3. Language Use in the Friendship Domain .....	37
3.3.1.4. Language Use in the Neighborhood .....	39
3.3.1.5. Language Use in the Market Domains .....	40
3.3.2. Powerful Domains .....	41
3.3.2.1. Language Use in the Public Service Domains.....	41
3.3.2.1.1. Health Center .....	41
3.3.2.1.2. School .....	41
3.3.2.1.3. Office .....	42
3.3.2.1.4. Mosques/churches.....	43
3.3.2.2. Language Use in the Authority Domains.....	44
3.3.2.2.1. Courtroom.....	44
3.3.2.2.2. Police station.....	45
3.3.3. Respondents' Mother Tongue Use in Different Topics (Contexts).....	45
3.4. Attitude .....	47

CHAPTER FOUR

4. INTERFERENCE.....53

4.1. Code mixing and Borrowing .....53

4.1.1. Code Switching.....53

4.1.1.1. Inter-sentential .....54

4.1.1.2. Intra-sentential CS.....56

4.1.1.3. Borrowing .....66

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....76

5.1. SUMMARY .....76

5.2. CONCLUSION.....76

References.....79

Appendices .....82



## List of Tables

	Page
<b>Table 1:</b> Population size in kebele, and woreda level .....	2
<b>Table 2:</b> Demographic Characteristics of respondents by their mother tongue, ethnic group, occupation, religion, residence, and intermarriage .....	29
<b>Table 3:</b> Respondents' self-rated proficiency in each language.....	30
<b>Table 4:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in family domain with percentage representation.....	34
<b>Table 5:</b> Respondents' intermarriage vs. language use at home .....	36
<b>Table 6:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in friendship with percentage representation.....	38
<b>Table 7:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in Neighborhood with percentage representation.....	39
<b>Table 8:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in market/transaction with percentage representation .....	40
<b>Table 9:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in health center with percentage representation.....	41
<b>Table 10:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in education with percentage representation.....	42
<b>Table 11:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in workplace/employment with percentage representation .....	43
<b>Table 12:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in religion with percentage representation.....	43
<b>Table 13:</b> Respondents' language use behavior in court with percentage representation .....	44
<b>Table 14:</b> Respondents' language use behavior with authorities in percentage representation.....	45
<b>Table 15:</b> Respondents' use of MTs in different topics/situations .....	46
<b>Table 16:</b> Respondents' opinion about use of languages .....	48
<b>Table 17:</b> Chart of Afar-af phonemes .....	60

### List of Acronyms

1PL	-1 <sup>st</sup> person plural (we)
1S	-1 <sup>st</sup> person singular (I)
2 MS/F	-2 <sup>nd</sup> person masculine/feminine (you)
3FS	-3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular feminine (she)
3MS	-3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular masculine (he)
ADJ	-Adjective
ART	-Article
CM	-Code mixing
CS	-Code switching
Eth.n	-Ethiopian
DEMO	-Demonstrative
IMPER	-Imperfective
LM	-Language maintenance
LS	-Language shift
ML	-Matrix language
N	-Noun
NEG	-Negative
PERF	-Perfective
PL	-Plural marker
POSS	-Possessive
PREP	-Preposition

## Abstract

In the linguistically heterogeneous Ab'ala town, the dwellers use diversified languages in different domains. In Ab'ala town, over four distinct Ethiopian languages are in use. These are Afar-af, Tigrinya, Amharic, Afan Oromo, and Saho. Of these languages, Afar-af and Tigrinya are the two indigenous local languages in the research area. On the other hand, Amharic, Afan Oromo, and Saho are non-indigenous languages. Amharic which is used as the main official language, both in the town and the region, functions in the powerful domains as language of public services ( in office, school, health center). and authorities (in police station and courtroom). However, Afar-af functions only in certain domains. It is used as the de-jure regional language and restricted only to the domains under grass root level (less powerful). It functions in the family domain, among couples of the same ethnic group (intra-marriage), and in religious domain (along with Arabic). In other words, Afar-af developed in the less-affluent domains. This shows the language seizes so many important domains at the expense of Amharic. Besides, Tigrinya to a greater degree and Afar-af to lesser degree are the two most commonly used languages in the domains of market. On the other hand, in the case of less powerful domains language use does not seem to be consistent in all the domains. This is evident in the family domain in which three languages are predominantly used by respondents while interacting with various participants in this domain. Respondents use Amharic extensively while communicating with children, spouses/husbands and siblings. Tigrinya and Afar-af are also the two commonly used languages between parents and respondents. Language use in neighborhood seems to have two features. These are while Tigrinya is predominantly used in Wuhdet kebele, Afar-af is used in Wakrigubi kebele. In addition, the friendship domain is one of the less powerful domain in which Amharic is predominantly used. In general, in the powerful domains, Amharic to a greater degree and Afar-af to a lesser degree are used as languages of wider communication.

Similar to many other urban settings where ethno-linguistic groups live together, Ab'ala is a place where different languages are in contact. Therefore, in Ab'ala town ethnic-groups such as Afar, Tegar, Amhara, Oromo, and Irob are in contact in a sophisticated and unstable manner. In turn, this gives rise to the legacy of the different language contact phenomena such as switching, mixing, borrowing, and shift. The dwellers exhibited code switching or mixing, and borrowing extensively in their day-to-day communication.

## CHAPTER ONE

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Background of the Study

The day after the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) come to power, Ab'ala<sup>1</sup> town is the administrative center of zone two, which is one of the five administrative zones in the Afar regional state. Ab'ala town is situated in the transitional zone between the eastern Tigray escarpments and the northern Afar lowlands. It is located in the north-east of Ethiopia, especially, in the northern part of the capital of the regional state at 638 kms, adjacent to Mekelle-the administrative center of Tigray region at about 55 kms, and 835 kms, north of Addis Ababa. It is encircled by several woredas' of Afar, such as Kunaba, Barhle and Dallol in the north, Irebti and Afdera, in the southeast, Magale in the southwest as well as Quiha and Mekelle in the northwest from the neighboring region (Tigray).

Ab'ala town being a multi-ethnic and multi-lingual area, it is made up of three major linguistic groups. These are Afar: the indigenous people of the region with their respective language Afar-af, Tegar: indigenous people of neighboring region with their language Tigrinya (the official language in Tigray), and Amhara: people who are indigenous in Amhara region with their respective language Amharic, which is an official language particularly in the town and in the federal government of Ethiopian. As a result, people in Ab'ala town are always characterized by contact between members of these different language groups living together and with people in the border areas for various economic and social reasons. For instance, every Thursday (market day) people from the rural settlements and from the neighboring areas, such as the towns of Mekelle and Quiha, including their rural settlements, flow to the market place. On the other hand, the people of Ab'ala town also stream to these places for the same purpose. Consequently, mainly Tigrinya, Afar-af, and Amharic come into contact in Ab'ala. Of these languages, Afar-af belongs to the Lowland East Cushitic sub-family of Afro-Asiatic, which is also named Saho-Afar (<http://www.wikipedia>). Besides, Bender (1976:5) classifies the language under Lowland East Cushitic. He also puts Amharic and Tigrinya under Ethio-Semitic (Bender 1976:5-13).

According to Loren, Bliese (1967:133) Afar<sup>2</sup> is the name of the people inhabiting the

---

<sup>1</sup> According to municipality of the town, which is established in 1991, "Shiket" was the former name for Ab'ala town.

<sup>2</sup> Bliese (1970:1) the Arabic and European name "Danakil", the Ethiopian Amharic name "Adal" the Afar name themselves both the people and the their language Afar.

desert regions of the Red Sea Coast from Djibouti north to Mitsiwwa and extending west to the foothills of the Ethiopian plateau, and of the language they speak. However, to the best of my knowledge, the term “Afar” only refers to the people and the compound or hyphenated word (Afar-af) refers to the languages. Bender (1976:5) also calls the language Afar-af (Afar mouth). In the course of this study (hereafter) the researcher will use the term Afar to refer to the Afar people and the term Afar-af to their language. In a similar fashion, the term Tegar<sup>3</sup> will consequently be used to refer to the Tigray people and the term Tigrinya to their language, the term Amhara will be used to refer to the people and Amharic to their language. In researches, so far languages in this area have received too little attention. This makes the research area an interesting location in which to study language contact. The major consideration is linguistic heterogeneity. This study makes its focus only on the urban center, as it would be very difficult to observe linguistic diversity in the rural settlements as in most cases societies in the rural settlements are monolinguals.

### 1.2. The Study Area

In the census (1996) the total population of Ab'ala Woreda is 24, 291 (Kelemework, 2006). According to him the total population in the town comes to 3,300. of which 2,765 (Tigray), 405 (Afar), 55 (Amhara) and the rest belongs to other ethno-linguistic groups. In the more recent census of the 2007 Population Housing Census of Ethiopia, the total population of the Woreda is 37,943. Among these the two kebeles (Wuhdet and Wakrigubi) in Ab'ala town constitutes a total population of 10,288. The population at the level of the settlements is 6,963 and 3, 325, respectively. Of these Wuhdet has 3,475 (male) and 3,488 (female) whereas Wakrigubi has 1,705 (male) and 1,620 (female). In the following table, I have summarized the total population size of Ab'ala woreda on the bases of urban and rural, and male and female.

No	Woreda/Kebele	Urban +Rural			Urban		
		Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female
1	Ab'ala Woreda	37,943	20,469	17,474	10,288	5,180	5,108
2	Wuhdet Kebele	-----	-----	-----	6,963	3,475	3,488
3	Wakrigubi Kebele	-----	-----	-----	3,325	1,705	1,620

Table (1) Population size in kebele, and woreda level

*Source: Summary and Statistical Report of the 2007 Population and Housing Census and the 2007 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia Results for Afar Region at Kebele Level.*

<sup>3</sup>The people speaking Tigrinya call themselves as “Tegar<sup>3</sup>” and their language “Tigrinya” Roza Hailu (2009).

According to some elderly people who belong to Afar, “Ab'ala town” got its name from the term ‘abqa’, which literally means ‘spring’ in Afar-af. The name corresponds with the spring water find between two big mountains in the area.

Ab'ala town is established on a big flat plain lowland, which is intermittently interrupted by few rising and falling hills surrounded by another elongated ridges, and high broken hills with very few outlets joined to other areas. The area is covered with sandy and salty soil. In general, the area has a semi-arid type of climate, when compared to other woredas’ in the zones and the region. It has a moderate weather condition. It is situated approximately in between 13<sup>o</sup> 15' and 13<sup>o</sup>30'N latitude and 39'and 39<sup>o</sup>55' longitude (Diress et al.1999). Ab'ala woreda's land area is approximately 1,182.30 Km<sup>2</sup> with a population density of 32 (2.7 %, 2007 census).

Different ethno-linguistic and religious groups reside in the town. The principal ones are Afar, Tegarü and Amhara. Regarding their religious compositions, the Afar are wholly followers of Islam religion and mostly reside in one of the neighborhood (i.e., Wakrigubi) whereas the Tegarü and Amhara reside predominantly in Wuhdet with a composition of three religions. Here it is worth mentioning that this does not mean that the ethnic groups do not live together in the same Kebele. As to their religion Tegarü are composed of Orthodox Christians and Muslim, the Amhara incorporate followers of Islam, Orthodox Christianity and the Protestant beliefs.

In the town, there is one Orthodox Christian church and three mosques. Besides, there are one kindergarten (KG), two first cycles or lower level elementary schools (grades 1-4), one-second cycle or upper primary school (grades 5-8) one general and preparatory school (grades 9-12). The medium of instruction in both the kindergarten (KG) and the two lower elementary schools is Amharic, while Afar-af is given as a school subject. In the case of the upper primary schools, the medium of instruction which has been Amharic is changed into English in grade 7 and 8, yet still Afar-af has remained only as a school subject. To put it another way, the region in general and the area in particular are one of the regions that apply English as medium of instruction at the level of primary second cycle school (grades 7 and 8). In both high school and preparatory school, English functions as the medium of instruction along with

Amharic as supplementary language (school subject). Hence, from the above it can be noted that Tigrinya has no role in all the educational levels.

The Ab'ala population livelihood is mostly based on tending livestock. However, currently, the people of Ab'ala town are primarily engaged in agro-pastoral economy whereby both livestock and crop production are practiced. In addition some of the people are engaged in small business, and others work as daily laborers and as government employees and earn extra income.

### **1.3. Statement of the Problem**

Even though there is no clear-cut information about when languages of the globe came into contact, it is believed that languages have been in contact ever since the time human beings started dispersing out into independent sub-groups (Smelser, 2000: 8325). According to him, there are two principal ways in which languages come into contact:

[One of which] at an earlier time in human history, some language contacts must have been established when groups met after moving into previously unoccupied territory; now that the world has no unoccupied habitable territory, this mode of contact onset is no longer available.

Another way is in most recent human history, probably the most common way in which language comes into contact, is the movement of groups of individuals into other people territory (Ibid: 8325).

Ab'ala town is a place where groups of people from different ethno-linguistic groups flock for different purposes. As a result, the great majority of the urban dwellers who are the chief concern of this study are bilinguals who are proficient in at least two languages, their ethnic language and one other language. In such urban settings where many ethno-linguistic groups co-exist with their respective languages, there is a need to give serious attention. This makes Ab'ala town a convenient location to study language use and contact.

From the ranges of interesting outcomes of language contact phenomena, code-switching and code-mixing, maintenance, shift, and borrowing are few of language contact outcomes which are the concerns of the present study. These phenomena are likely to occur in multilingual settings. Moreover, these phenomena have drawn a considerable attention and have certainly aroused the curiosity of many researchers in

recent years. So, the people in Ab'ala town display these phenomena in their speech while speaking their indigenous languages. Besides, attitude towards languages is another appropriate issue to study in such multilingual society. So, the researcher believes that such facts have great input to the field of study, wants to investigate the forgoing issues in the said area.

Furthermore, the fact that there is no research conducted in the area regarding the sociolinguistic study in general and language use and language contact phenomena in particular, this study can lend support for the necessity of such an investigation.

### **Research Questions**

Based on the objectives, the study intends to answer the following questions:

- How are the language proficiency of speakers' in each language described in Ab'ala town?
- What are the domains and/or circumstances in which the community utilizes a particular language?
- How do the dwellers of Ab'ala town employ language (s) in both intra-and inter-group communications?
- To what extent is Afar-af being in use in the research area?
- What language (s) is/are appropriate to what purpose in the town?
- How do the Ab'ala town dwellers express their motive behind the use of the different languages, the alteration of codes, and borrowing?
- What language is the donor or source language (s) for borrowing?

### **1.4. Objectives of the Study**

The study sets out to meet the following general and specific objectives:

#### **General Objectives:**

- 1) To describe the present language use situations such as language proficiency, language use in different domains/contexts/, and language attitudes in the Ab'ala town;
- 2) To examine language contact phenomena such as code switching, code-mixing, language maintenance and shift, and borrowing in Ab'ala town, more specifically in Wakrigubi and Wuhdet kebeles.

### **Specific Objectives:**

- 1) To understand the language proficiency of Ab'ala town dwellers in each language;
- 2) To determine language (s) most suitable for situations such as daily communications, sociopolitical, cultural, academic etc. contacts in the locality;
- 3) To investigate the role of language (s) in the community in both intra-group and inter group communications;
- 4) To investigate whether the Afar community is maintaining their ethnic language in the town;
- 5) To identify attitudes of the community towards each language;
- 6) To investigate and analyze the motives behind the use of different languages, the alteration of codes, and borrowing;
- 7) To describe the nature of borrowing, code switching, code mixing, and borrowing and to identify the source language in the research area.

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

This study relies on Ab'ala town dwellers. It focuses on the populations of two urban kebeles (Wuhdet and Wakrigubi) where diversified ethno-linguistic groups and substantial population size are living together. The coverage and depth of analysis is determined by the availability of some data gathered through questionnaire, participant observation, and recording from the total population of 190 town dwellers. The study cannot claim the selected samples are representative as regards to population size in the two kebeles. However, it is believed that the samples present good sample of the diverse nature of language use in the town.

### **1.6. Significance of the Study**

First of all, the significance of this study lies on the absence of any previous sociolinguistic works in the area in general and on the lack of any study about language use and contact phenomena in particular. The study will have the following significances:

- 1) It may be used by governmental and non-governmental organizations that are making interventions in the various development activities of the society as the linguistic behaviors of the members of the society are points of entry to various social activities;

- 2) Policy makers, curriculum designers, and teaching and learning material producers will benefit from the findings of the study;
- 3) The study will have significant value and could help other researchers who are interested in studying related topics;
- 4) The study could also help as a reference to the students of sociolinguistics at higher educational institutions.

## **1.7. Methodology and Procedure of the Study**

This section consists of discussion on three major techniques used in the study. These are data gathering technique, sampling technique, and data analysis technique.

### **1.7.1. Data Gathering Technique**

The data for this study was gathered through three techniques. Among them self-reported questionnaire was the principal means of data gathering used for sociolinguistic inquiries in chapter three. It allows inclusion of large number of participants and enables the involvement of relatively high degree of variation within the sample in terms of the variables. It was suitable to secure information from a large number of people. The questionnaires were prepared in English and translated into Amharic. However, participant observation and sound recording are used to gather linguistic data for interference in chapter four. During data gathering for interference through the two methods, nobody was aware that the conversation being recorded for sociolinguistic study. Moreover, data gathered through sound recording and participant observations were used to supplement the data obtained through questionnaire. Fraenkel and Wallen (2000), states that participant observation is a key ingredient in ethnographic research. In line with this, participant observation employed to verify the actual linguistic behavior in the social domains.

### **1.7.2. Sampling Technique**

In general, the sample chosen for this study is limited to the Ab'ala town dwellers. Due to language contact, Ab'ala town is a multilingual setting where different languages are at play. Dawn (1984:49) states that there are no universal set of domains applicable to all speech communities. Examples of possible domains are the school, the family, the employment, the playground, the street, government administrations and so on. As a result, to study the present language use situation, 200 respondents were taken randomly from the most important domains—the public

serves (schools, health centers, workplace and religious institutions); the authority (Police station and the court); the family; the market; home; neighborhood, and friendship domains . One of the most frequently used methods in sociolinguistics is random sampling (Šabec, N. 1997:139). According to her, this is the appropriate type of sampling to accommodate the different variables prevailing in the whole population in a city. Two Kebeles have been selected through purposive sampling technique from the 11 Kebeles in the woreda (see table 1). These were Wuhdet and Wakrigubi

### **1.7.3. Data Analysis Techniques**

The obtained data is analyzed both in quantitative and qualitative methods. In order to meet the purpose of this study the researcher gathered the intended information through the three methods—the questionnaire, participant observation and tape recording. In the first step, the data gathered through questionnaire was analyzed using simple statistics—tallying, and then putting them into percentage, mean, and tables. In the second step of data, gathered through participant observation and recording, that is, the data, which are expected to constitute words, sentences, utterances and dialogues from different subjects in different social contexts, were described and analyzed by using qualitative technique. Percentage is used to explain the demographic factors of the respondents. The weighted mean is calculated to identify the significant differences of language proficiency and language attitude of respondents. This in turn has helped to determine the significant mean differences between the research respondents attitude for each language.

### **1.7.4. Procedure of the Research**

The following steps were viable to achieve the intended outcomes. First, different literatures on the topic were reviewed. The objectives and research questions were organized in such a way that they were given clarity to the investigation and enable the researcher to speculate about the findings. Based on the nature, the objective and the problem statement of the study the appropriate data collecting instruments such as questionnaire, participant observation and recording were developed and employed on the samples. Finally, the data so obtained are described, analyzed and interpreted. The findings are described in the summary and conclusion.

## CHAPTER TWO

### 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, RELATED WORKS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS

#### 2.1. Review of Related Literature

##### 2.1.1. Language Contact

The following are some of the available literature on language contact and its resultant phenomena. Different scholars define language contact differently. However, many scholars in the field of language contact, prefer to cite Weinreich's (1953:1) language contact definition, that is, when two or more languages get into contact they have to be used alternatively by the same person. Fasold (1984) points out that language contact refers to a situation when different people with diversified linguistic behaviors come into contact, not only the people interact but also their languages interact. Appel and Muysken (1987:1), state that language contact inevitably leads to bilingualism. Hence, language contact is a prerequisite for bilingualism.

According to Haugen cited in Kamwangamalu, Nkonko M. (2000:88) when two or more languages come into contact, as is the case in multilingual communities in Africa and elsewhere in the world. they color one another. He termed this coloring inter-lingual contagion, manifesting itself in language contact phenomena such as borrowing, code switching, code mixing, language change, pidginization, creolization and diglossia.

As Coulmas (1997) states language contact focuses on the traces that can be detected in linguistic system of the contact and interact of neighboring speech communities through bilingual members. Coulmas (1997:282) defines that language contact is "a prerequisite for language shifts". Language contact is "any situations in which speakers of two or more languages communicate with each other usually in person, but sometimes in writing (including e-mail)" (Smelser, 2000: 8325). Appel and Muysken (1987:5-6) have listed down situations that lead to language contact-linguistic border, colonial expansion, ethno-linguistic enclaves, and post colonial migration. The main means of language contact however, in the present research area seems to be border and trade.

The present study focuses on some of the result of language contact phenomena, which rise controversy in defining them, and draws separating lines that distinguish them from each other. These involve code switching, code mixing, and borrowing. Other linguistic consequences such as bilingualism and language maintenance and shift are also the concern of this study. Prior to discussing code switching, it gives importance to mention some of the descriptions made by scholars. As can be read in the vast literature, code switching has become one of the most intensively investigated topics in the studies of contact phenomena (Kamwangamalu, 200: 94). Code switching (or code mixing) has been the objective of considerable attention in recent years; the topic has certainly aroused the curiosity of many researchers and a host of different aspects of it has been studied (Hoffman, 1994. Appelle and Muysken, 1987, Šabec, 1997:129, Kamwangamalu, 2000: 93-94). In line with this Zelalem Leyew (1998:199) states, "Code switching has flourished in recent years as part of a growing emphasis on sociolinguistic code switching". First, among the language contact phenomena code switching is regarded as an infant phenomenon. According to Appelle and Muysken (1987:117) code switching has been studied in considerable detail since 1970, from a sociolinguistic code switching point of view--why do people switch between languages; from a psycholinguistic point of view--what aspect of their linguistic capacity enables them to switch and to have not simply introduced an element from another language into their linguistic system? However, the present study is concerned with the first viewpoint to identify social factors that lead to code switching.

### **2.1.2. Language Use/Choice**

Language choice is the next notion discussed in the present study, as it is one of the outcomes of language contact in a multilingual setting. Sociolinguistic code switching, social psychologists and anthropologists have studied the sociolinguistic aspect of language choice. Generally, a number of variables such as location, community structure, situation, topic and participants determine language choice.

As cited in Fasold (1984:183) one way of examining language choice from the sociologist's point of view is introduced by Joshua Fishman (1964, 1965, and 1968). Fishman proposes that there were certain institutional contexts, called domain, in which language varieties are more likely to be appropriate than another. According to him, "domains are taken to be constellations of factors such as location, topic, and participants". Coulmas, F. (1997: 308-309), states those multi-linguals' choices of

languages are determined according to: interlocutors', relationship, topic, domain venue, channel and phatic functions.

When talking about language use or choice in a multilingual setting or nation, it is of interest to discuss the concept of domain. Different scholars defined this concept differently. Domain is medium of communications in different situations. For example, Fishman (1971) cited in Downs (1984: 49) "a major figure in the sociology of language" has developed the notion of domain of language use. Downs (ibid: 49) defines domain as:

A domain is a grouping together of recurring situation types in such a way that one of the languages or varieties in a repertoire, as opposed to the others, normally occurs in that class of situations. Moreover, members of the speech community judge that the use of that variety, and not the others, is appropriate to that domain.

He further notices that there is no universal set applicable to all speech communities. Examples of possible domains are the school, the family, employment, the playground and street, government administrations and so on. Regarding this Fishman (2001) cited in Gebre Hishe language use domains classified into two main categories: powerful domains and less powerful domains. Powerful domains include employment, higher education, mass media, and government institutions. In contrast, less powerful domains include family, friendship, neighborhood, community institutions and in some cases pre-school or elementary schools.

On the other hand, Wolff (2000: 307) defines domains of language use as the use of the same linguistic variety, by the same set of participants and in a particular setting or socio-cultural context on a topic, which is also typical for that occasion. According to Assebe (1981: 24) domain is an institutionalized sphere of activity in which language behavior occurs, such as family, education, religion, and so on. Appel and Muysken (1987:41) states that domain intrusion is a clear representative of language shift. Similarly, Fasold (1984:213) states, "when a speech community begins to choose a new language in domains formerly reserved for the old one, it may be a sign that language shift is in progress". Regarding language use behavior in bi-or-multilingual speech community, Downs (1998:62) points out that the more a minority language is limited in its use the more it is subject to shift. The situation gets worse when the

intrusion of the dominant language extends to the home domain (Ibid: 63). Similarly, Dittmar (1976: 178) states “usually a language (variety) that is not used in the family has less chance of being retained than one which is”. Thus language use in family domain has a determinant role in language maintenance (LM). In line with this Appel and Muysken (1987: 24) and Holmes (1992: 262) state functional reduction of certain language could inevitably result in poor proficiency of the speaker.

### **2.1.3. Language Attitude**

Attitude is one of the determinant factors that cause variation in language choice. People draw attitude towards languages (i.e., both to their own and to other languages). According to Dworetzky (1988: 581), attitude is a social psychological concern: a social attitude is a relatively enduring system of feelings, beliefs, and behaviors with respect to social objects. The attitudes that a person has about other people can be powerful influence in social situations. According to Fasold (1984:148), language attitudes are at variance from other attitudes in that they are precisely about language:

- (a) Some language attitude studies are strictly limited to attitudes towards language itself;
- (b) Most often, the definition of language attitude is broadening to include attitudes towards speakers of a particular language or dialect;
- (c) Further broadening of the definition allows all sort of behavior concerning language treated, including attitudes towards language maintenance and language planning.

Fasold (1984: 148) states that attitudes towards languages are often the reflection of attitudes towards members of various ethnic groups. Appel and Muysken (1987: 12), states that if a language has social meaning, people will evaluate it, in relation to the social status of its users. Their language attitude will be social attitude. Here the underlining assumption is that in a society social (or ethnic) groups have certain attitudes towards each other, relating to their differing social positions. These attitudes affect attitudes towards cultural institutions or patterns characterizing these groups such as language, and carry over to and reflected in attitudes towards individual members of the group. Dworetzky (1988: 582) states that investigators depending on the approach they follow, often measure attitudes by means of questionnaires or scales. If the questionnaires or scale is worded carefully, and is used properly, it can

provide much valuable information about attitude.

Generally, there are two theoretical approaches to the study of language attitude: the behaviorist and the mentalist. According to the former view, attitudes should be studied by observing the responses to certain language, i. e., to their use in actual interaction. Attitudes found simply the responses people make to social situations. This view makes research easier to undertake, since it requires no-self report or indirect inference. The latter view, considers attitude as internal, mental, state, which may give rise to certain forms of behavior. It described as “an intervening variable between a stimulus affecting a person and that person’s response” (Fasold, 1984: 147). He further states that nearly all researchers in the field of language attitude adhere to this latter view. Although it poses serious research problems because internal, mental states cannot be directly observed, but have to be inferred from behavior or from self-reported data, which are often of questionable validity and inferences from behavior take the researcher one-step away from what he has actually observed.

#### **2.1.4. Bilingualism**

One of the most common outcomes of language contact is bilingualism. In defining bilingualism, there are two extreme and well-known definitions of bilingualism given by scholars. These are Bloomfield’s 1935 and Macnamara’s 1969 definitions (cited in Appel and Muysken (1987:2). Bloomfield defines “a bilingual should possess “native-like” competence of two or more languages”. Quite opposite to Bloomfield’s definition, Macnamara proposes that somebody should be called bilingual if he has some second language skill in one of the four modalities (listening, speaking, reading and writing) other than in his mother tongue. As opposed to Bloomfield’s and Macnamara’s definition, Weinreich’s (1968: 1) defines bilingualism as “The practice of alternatively using two languages” and, the person involved, bilingual. However, there are many intermediated definitions between the definitions above. For instance, Smelser (2001: 117) defines “Bilingualism” is the regular use of two languages, and bilinguals are those people who use two languages. More specifically, he notes bilingualism refers to the individual competence of comprehension and production of two (natural) languages (language variants like dialects).

Harmers and Michel (1989: 8) have distinguished two dimensions of bilingualism based on relative competence and age of acquisition, among other dimension. The first dimension includes:

- **Balanced Bilingual:** refers to a person who has equivalent competence in both languages.
- **Dominant Bilingual:** refers to a person's competence is one of the languages, more often in the mother tongue which is superior to his competence in the other.

The second dimension involves:

- I) **Compound:** implies two sets of linguistic signs come to be associated with the same set of meaning.
- II) **Coordinate:** refers to translation equivalents in the two languages correspond to two different sets of representations.

On the other hand, Spolsky (1998: 48) distinguishes three natures of bilingual competence: compound, co-ordinate and mixed. According to him the former has a single meaning system with two sets of words, while the latter is assumed to have two meaning system each with its own set of words. The third is mixed nature of bilinguals in this situations bilinguals often develop a mixed code.

Rubin (1968: 353) provides three categories of bilingualism:

- **Co-ordinate Bilingual:** is one who speaks and understands both languages well.
- **Subordinate Bilinguals:** are those who lack fluency and good understanding, but able to speak.
- **Incipient Bilinguals:** are those only good at understanding, but they do not speak.

Similarly, Smelser (p. 1170) states that there are three types of bilingualism: balanced bilingualism--having balanced full competence in both languages; imbalanced bilingualism--having dominance of one language; and semi-balanced bilingualism--having imperfect competence in both languages.

#### 2.1.4.1. Why Do Bilinguals Code switch (CS)

Prior to considering the reasons for bilinguals code switch (hereafter CS), it would be appropriate to deal with the two scholarly views. The first (purist) view of scholars considers (CS) as bad. The second (non-purist) view sees (CS) as linguistic ability. Regarding the former view, traditionally, CS was viewed as a strategy to compensate

code switching as bad mannered and shows disrespect to the routine culture of uttering and using language. The switch mainly made due to the mood of speakers or he/she might feel that a particular part of the conversation can best be conveyed by switching to. However, the second view asserts CS as natural bilinguals' ability; almost everyone is engaged in CS every day. This is because we all deal with different kinds of people, with whom we have different levels of relationships in contexts of all sorts all the time. In this respect, Baker (2001) mentioned bilinguals are accessed to job opportunities, and can have different cultural experience.

With regard to reasons why bilinguals code-switch in the present study I will rely on using the functional framework model of Jakobson (1960) and Halliday et al. (1964) both cited in Appel and Muysken (1987:118). According to this model, switching can have the following functions:

- a) **Referential Function:** refers to speakers' lack of knowledge in one language or lack of facility in that language on a certain subject. Certain subjects more appropriately discussed in one language, and the introduction of such a subject may lead to a switch. This is the type of switch that bilingual speakers are most conscious of.
- b) **Directive Function:** this type of CS involves the hearer and have two roles: to include certain person by using her/his language (i. e. accommodation) or to exclude certain person by using other language.
- c) **Phatic function:** the typical example is comedian who tells joke in a standard variety, but brings the punch line in a vernacular type of speech.
- d) **Meta-linguistic Function:** this type of CS comes into effect when used in one way or another way on the language involved. Many examples of this kind of switches are found in the public domains: performers, circus directors, market salespeople.
- e) **Poetic function:** it serves the poetic function of language.

#### 2.1.5. Accommodation

In the course of interaction between individuals and groups in a multilingual setting, speech accommodation is likely to occur. Giles et al., 1973 and his colleagues (Appel and Muysken, 1987: 28) first developed the notion of accommodation. In respect to this phenomena Šabec, N (1997: 168) states that accommodation can be explained within the theoretical framework of the audience design (Bell, 1984) and the interpersonal accommodation theory (Giles and Jhonson 1981, 1987; Giles et al. 1986). According to the former, the speaker designs his or her speech in such a way as

to accommodate his or her addressee. This is done by style shifting, which a bilingual situation translates into a choice between two codes/languages. According to the latter theory, something very similar happens. The interlocutors generally adopt their speech style to each other's, when there is an affinity between them; when they want to bridge the social or personal gap between them. As they expect some potential benefit from the interaction (which may be anything from possible future cooperation to simply enjoying each other's company), they attempted to move closer to each other by resorting to their shared ethnic language. In line with this, Fasold (1984: 188) mentions that there are two forms of accommodation--convergence and divergence. Convergence refers to a situation when a speaker uses a language or language variety that seems to suit the need of the person addressed. While divergence refers to a situation, in which a person makes no effort at all to adjust his speech maximally unlike the other person. This will happen when the speaker wants to emphasize his loyalty to his own group and dissociate himself from his interlocutors' group. Spolsky (1998: 42) states that accommodation occurs in conversation between people with differing pronunciation; it is noted that there is a common tendency for the pronunciation of the two to move slightly closer together. He also stated that accommodation involves the use of some features often converge-speech choice of vocabulary, grammatical forms, and even pronunciation-moves towards that of one's interlocutor. The opposite effect occurs, when a speaker chooses not to converge but diverge, by moving his or her speech away from the other party. Wolff (2000: 303-304) sees accommodation as a linguistic behavior that is equally applicable for accents within the same language because the various lects (i.e. dialects) are not homogeneous.

On the other hand, Giles (1973) and Giles and Powesland (1975) all cited in Hamers and Michel (1986: 136) mention that accommodation focuses on the underlying social cognitive process mediating the individual's perception of the communication and his communicative behavior. Holmes (1992: 255) in his part defines accommodation theory as a process that refers the similarity of individuals in their speech. Similarly, Downs (1984: 229) defines accommodation theory as the process of modifying their speech in interactions with respect to listeners, by becoming more like the listener or less like the listener. He further states that the two principal factors behind accommodation involve identifying its maintenance as distinct from that of the recipient, or a wish to be seen as similar to the recipient and hence with social approval.

### 2.1.6. Language Maintenance and Shift (LM and LS)

Another very common effect of language contact in many bilingual countries or settings is language maintenance (hereafter LM) and language shift (hereafter LS). Language shift refers to the decision of a linguistic community to replace its own language by another language. To put it into other words, LS refers to the process in which a community gives up a language completely in favor of another. Moreover, Coulmas (1997: 321) dichotomize LS into two forms. First, some languages have form of disappearing with the extinction of the entire monolingual community. Second, some languages survive the LS in certain domains. On the other hand, Webb and Kembo-Sure (2000: 13) state that LS refers to a process in which the speakers of one language begins to use a second language for more and more function, until they eventually use only the second language. Similarly, Holmes (1992: 64) defines LS as a process by which one language displaces another in the linguistic repertoires of a community. Fishman (1991:1) cited in Kamwangamalu (2003:72) states that LS refers to speech communities whose native languages are threatened because their international continuity is preceding negatively, with fewer and fewer users (speakers, readers, writers, and even under-standers) or uses every generation.

Regarding LS Appel and Muysken (1987: 32) notes that 'shift' can be equated with 'shift towards the majority or prestigious language', but in fact 'shift' is a natural concept, and also shift towards the extended use of the minority language can be observed. Hoffman (1994: 186) defined LS as when a community does not maintain its language but gradually adopts another one. Hoffman (1991:186) mentions that "when a community does not maintain its language, but steadily adopts another one, we speak about LS while "LM refers to circumstances where members of a community try to keep the language (s) they have always used". Furthermore, he stated that under some conditions such as cultural, political, and social situation a community might decide on to transform a linguistic element at the expense of another. On the other hand, Edward (1996) suggests that when cultures come into contact and competition over resource developed, LS is inevitable. According to him, LS will also move to favor the language that provides the most power, prestige, and economic gain. This is true to all indigenous languages of the world.

### **2.1.6.1. Factors Influencing Language Maintenance and Shift**

According to Edward (1996) factors such as power, prestige, and economic gain causes LS. Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor (1977) all cited in Appel and Muysken (1987: 33) have mentioned status, demographic, and institutional supports are three main factors influencing LM. They are known as 'ethno-linguistic vitality'. Linking up with ethno-linguistic vitality, that minority groups that have little or no group vitality would eventually cease to exist as distinctive group. On the contrary, the more vitality a linguistic group has, the more likely it will survive and thrive as a collective entity in an inter group context.

Similarly, Yagmur, Kutlay and Mehmet-Aliakinci (2003: 108) state LM is influenced by the ethno linguistic vitality (EV) of a linguistic minority group. According to Giles et al. (1977:108) "...low vitality groups are most likely to go through linguistic assimilation may not be considered a distinctive collective group (Brouhi et al.1981) whereas high vitality groups are likely to maintain their language and distinctive cultural traits in multilingual settings".

As opposed to LM, there are various factors that lead to LS. Among them, the principal one is intermarriage. To this end, Kloss (1966) states exogamy as a clear factor that lead to LS.

### **2.1.7. Code switching (CS)**

Different scholars define code switching (hereafter CS) differently. Hudson (1980: 56) defines CS as the use of different varieties at different times by the same speaker. Myers-Scotton (1997: 150) defines CS as "the selection by bilinguals or multi-lingual's of forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation". According to Gumperz cited in Solé, M. (2003: 1) CS is "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical system or subsystem". Weinreich, 1953 cited in Šabec (1997: 130) states CS as switching "from one language to another according to appropriate change in the speech situation (interlocutor, topic etc.), but not in an unchanged speech situation, and certainly not within a single sentence".

In different literature, scholars use different names for various types of CS. For instance, Appel and Muysken (1987:119) distinguish three types of CS:

- a) **Intra-sentential Switches:** occurs within a sentence.
- b) **Inter-sentential Switches:** occurs among sentences.
- c) **Tag-switches:** involve a tag, exclamation, or a parenthetical in another language than the rest of the sentences.

On the other hand, Gumperz and Blom cited in Hudson (1980:56) states three types of code switching:

- a) **Metaphorical CS:** a speaker switches his/her language to a variety or varieties of language, which best suits for particular purpose.
- b) **Conversational CS:** every instances of switch closely related to a change in the situations.
- c) **Situational CS:** refers to the relative appropriateness of different varieties of language in different situations.

### 2.1.8. Code mixing (CM)

Code mixing (hereafter CM) is another result of language contact phenomenon. Fasold (1984) defines code mixing as the use of at least two languages together to the extent that interlocutors change from one language to another in the course of a single utterance. Wolff (2000: 317) defines CM as a particular phenomenon, which is intimately linked to individual multilingualism and has attracted much attentions referred to by terms such as code-choice, code-change, and code mixing. For his purpose, he used the term code mixing to refer to any instances of interchanging usage of two or more languages within the same conversation or discourse by the same bilingual speaker.

Among the scholars, little consensus has been reached regarding the usage and functions of the terms CS and CM. Some scholars have attempted to make distinction between the two language contact outcomes (CS and CM). For instance, Kamwangamalu (2000: 92) attempts to put distinction between CS and CM. While CS refers to language alteration across sentence boundaries, CM is language alteration within sentence boundaries. In the contrary, some scholars admit similarity between the two terms. In other words, some scholars use either term to denote the same practice. For example, Wolff (2000:317) sees the two phenomena as the same and used CM as a cover term for terms such as code-change, code choice and code mix.

### 2.1.8.1. Matrix Language

Grosjean 1988 and Myers-Scotton 1993b cited in Finlayson and Slabbert (1997:74) stated ML as a process by bilinguals indicates, "While a bilingual's two languages are both turned 'on' during language processing; one language is a 'base' language. ... There is some evidence that both bilinguals have direct access to a common conceptual store. This "base" language then defined as the ML during code switching. Besides, Myers-Scotton 1993b cited in Finlayson and Slabbert(1997: ibid) stated "The ML is the language of more morphemes in interaction types including intra-sentential CS".

Regarding ML and EL, Eastman (1992) cited in Zelealem (1989:202) that ML is a language in which the majority of morphemes in a given conversation occur. Besides, Gumperz and Bokombo (cited in Zelealem (1998:198)) dichotomize CS and CM into inter-sentential and intra-sentential.

### 2.1.9. Borrowing

Borrowing is not a new phenomenon. Speaker of one language take words and any linguistic elements or properties such as sound, phonological rules, grammatical morphemes, syntactic patterns and semantic associations from another language. This process is called borrowing (Campbell, 1989). Gumperz (1982) cited in Kamwangamalu (2000: 89), defines borrowing as the introduction of single words or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases from one language into another. Spolsky (1998: 49) also states that the switching of word is the beginning of borrowing, which occurs when the new word is more or less integrated into the second language. According to Wardhough (1977: 237), borrowing is adding new items to a language or dialect by taking them from another language or dialect. From this definition we can infer that borrowing can occur both at dialect and at language level.

Kamwangamalu (p. 91) by citing Spolsky (1978) defines nonce borrowing as the use of linguistic items from one language in discourse in another language that shown no sign of adoption in the borrowing language. This kind of borrowing is said to be nonce borrowing. According to Haugen (cited in Appel and Muysken (1987:164)) there are three types of borrowing:

- a) **Loanwords:** morphemic in-portion without substitution.
- b) **Loan blends:** both morphemic substitution and in-portion,

- c) **Loan shift:** morphemic in-portion without substitution and only meaning, single or composite is imported.

According to Campbell (1998: 69-70) there are criteria that addresses the question about how we identify and determine loanwords? These are:

- A) **Phonological Clues:** this is the strongest evidence for loanword identification and the directions of borrowing. It is concerned with phonological patterns of the language. Words containing sounds which are not normally expected in native words are candidates for loans
- B) **Morphological Complexity:** deals with the cases of borrowing, when the form in one language is morphologically complex (composed of two or more morphemes), but the form in the other languages has no morphological analysis. Then usually the donor language is the one with the morphologically complex form and the borrower is the one with the monophonic form.
- C) **Geographical and Ecological Clues:** refers to associations of the words suspected of being loans whether they are borrowed and what the identity of the donor language is.

There is a hot debate with in bilingual studies in differentiating CS from borrowing. In making distinction between the two language contact results Winford (2003:107) supplies two major criteria in which CS and borrowing are distinguished. These are "degree of use by monolingual speakers" and "morphophonemic integration". Kamwangamalu (2000: 92) states that one of the criteria that sets CS apart from the language contact phenomena is non-integration or nonce borrowing. Sirdhar and Sirdhar (1980) (cited in Kamwangamalu (2000: 93)) states that CS is different from borrowing in the following important respects. First, in CS, the switched elements do not fill 'lexical gap' in the host language. Second, they are not restricted to a more or less limited set of lexically assimilated items accepted by the speech community of the host language; and thirdly, they are not adopted necessarily into the host language by regular phonological and morphological process. Besides, Šabec (1997:131) states that the only valid criterion that distinguishes CM from borrowing is the one that regards borrowing as phenomena that may take place in both bilingual and monolingual contexts, whereas CS is a category that is available only to bilinguals. Similar, but not identical criteria was offered by Myers-Scotton and Gumperz (cited in Meckacha (1993)).

A) Borrowing is the one that takes place by both monolinguals and bilinguals while CS takes place only by bilinguals.

B) Borrowing occurs by the need to bridge lexical gap, but the need in CS occurred by such a need subtle;

c) Borrowing is phonologically and morphologically adapted to the borrowing language while CS structures are not.

He further forwards CS should be distinguished from borrowing, where morphological assimilation of lexical items from the donor language into the recipient language is of essence and there we are basically dealing with one not with two linguistic systems. Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987:172) suggest that in the classical views CS and borrowing can easily be kept apart: with CM the non-native items are not adopted morphologically and phonologically, with borrowing they are. According to Fasold (1984:181). orthographic and pronunciation are conventions used as criteria for separating borrowing from switching.

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

To ensure the relevance of the present study the researcher has reviewed some of the previously worked research. Among them, two researches are on Ethiopian languages and one on a foreign language. Hence, the most related work to this study is the work of Samuel (2009), which studied language use pattern in Shone town. The chief objective of his study was:

To describe the pattern of language use among different ethno-linguistic groups in Shone town; to examine the patterns of language use in the town; to describe the nature of borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing in the linguistic behaviors of the town dwellers; to examine the attitude of different language speakers in Shone town.

He took representative samples from the dwellers of Shone randomly and assessed their language use pattern in different domains. The data were collected through questionnaire, interview and observation and were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative methods. The researcher has put the following findings:

a) First, Shone town is a multilingual setting where seven languages are in use. Second, among these languages Amharic is the most commonly learned language as second language by different ethno-linguistic groups. Third, fathers are more bilinguals than mothers are due to the fact that, fathers have more exposure to

participate in outdoor activities. Fourth, children are primarily bilinguals in both Amharic and Haddiyyisa. Fifth, all MTs are used between the respondents; parent; and spouses. On the other hand, the shift to Amharic is evidenced during the respondents language use with their children and siblings. Furthermore, Haddiyyisa is the main language for urban-rural family communication while Amharic is widely use in different domains.

b) While Haddiyyisa is the most predominantly used language in the indoor domain such as schools, health centers, street, bus stations, cafés and market places. Amharic and Haddiyyisa are alternatively used in governmental offices with Amharic to a greater degree and Haddiyyisa to a lesser degree. Haddiyyisa dominantly occupies the domains of neighborhood and public meeting settings. In religious domain, the sole use of Amharic and alternate use of Amharic with Haddiyyisa are apparent in the town. In general he concluded that Amharic to greater extent and Haddiyyisa to a lesser extent are the widely used languages in different domains. Finally, he stated that Amharic is found to be a lingua franca among various linguistic groups. However, the present study is different from Samuel's work in that it assesses the present language use situations--language proficiency, language use in different domains and language attitude in the Ab'ala town. Besides, the main departure is rely on examining language contact phenomena—code switching, borrowing, language maintenance and/or shift in Ab'ala town, more specifically in Wakrigubi and Wuhdet.

Assebe Bule (1981) conducted a research on “Bilingualism in Kistane Nationality”. The main purpose of this study was to assess what language (s) the Kistane uses in different situations and what are the attitudes of the Kistane towards their own language and towards other languages in both Soddo and Addis Ababa. His findings showed that KistaniNNa is the language of the home while Amharic is the preferred language for education, officialdom, work; religion etc. in both Soddo and Addis Ababa. The similarity between Assebe's work and the current study lies on the investigation of language use in different situations. Yet, the work of Assebe is interested on the study of one linguistic community (Kistane) in both Soddo and Addis Ababa. While this study is at variance from Assebe's work, in that it will takes into account different linguistic communities in Ab'ala town (Afar-af, Tegar, Amhara and others) and investigates the language use patterns in different situations.

One of the works related to the present study is Greenfield's research (1972) cited in Fasold (1984:183) on the study of language choice that utilize domain analysis on the choice between Spanish and at least three congruent components: person, place and topic. In this study, the researcher tried to test whether a combination of the three factors were actually associated in the minds of members of the community. To do this the researcher distributed a questionnaire in which subjects were given two congruent factors and asked to select the third, along with the language that would be best suited in that combination of circumstance. For example subjects were let to assume topics of discussion with parents regarding family issues and were asked to opt the best place out of the given alternatives 'home', 'beach', 'church', 'school' and 'workplace'. From this particular case, his finding shows that 100 percent of their subjects selected the expected 'home' location, with one exception (selection of 'beach' as the appropriate location for friendship domain). Besides, the expected congruent third component was selected by at least 81percent of the subjects. According to this study, the obtained result tends to confirm the validity of the five domains as real in the minds of the subjects. Furthermore, subjects were asked to indicate which language went with that domain on a five-point scale very similar to the semantic-differentials scale used in language-attitude research.

### **2.3. Conceptual Frameworks**

As conceptual framework, this study relies on Fishman's (1971) domain of language use and Wolff's (2000) patterns of language use.

Downs (1984: 49) defines a domain is a grouping together of recurring situation types in such a way that one of the languages or varieties in a repertoire, as opposed to the others, normally occurs in that class of situations. Moreover, members of the speech community judge that the use of that variety, and not the others, is appropriate to that domain. Fishman (1971: 19) states that there is no unified domain applicable to all multilingual settings as language behavior reflecting socio-cultural patterns. The most common domains are: family, school, worship places, literature, press, military, court, and government administration. According to him "who speaks to whom" refers to participants, "what" refers to the topic, "where and when" refers to the setting and socio-cultural context, "why and what" refers to the pragmatic function of particular variety 'lect' 'code' register which is being used.

The Wolff's (2000) language use pattern includes the five "WII" questions (what, who or whom, when, where, and why).

## CHAPTER THREE

### 3. SOCIOLINGUISTIC INQUIRY

#### 3.1. Data Description, Analysis and Interpretation

In this study, attempts are made to evaluate the language use patterns in Ab'ala town. The data are collected through such methods as questionnaires, participant observations and recordings. During data gathering, 200 questionnaires were administered to participants to gather and analyze the patterns of language use in Ab'ala town. The questionnaire has three main parts. The first part is concerned with self-reported questions about respondents' language proficiency and demography; the second part is concerned with respondents' language use in different domains and respondents' mother tongue use in different domains; the third is concerned with attitude statements. The questionnaires are translated into Amharic. This was made because the researcher has observed from the preliminary study that the dwellers have difficulty in (reading and writing) all the languages other than Amharic including their own languages (mother tongue). Therefore, participants could pick either of the two languages (i.e. English and Amharic) in providing answers to the questions outlined in the questionnaires.

It is of interest to note that the language selected for responding the questionnaire was entirely a choice that respondents were free to make. Hence, out of 200 questionnaires, 110 and 90 were distributed in Amharic and English respectively. Of the total number of questionnaire administered, 190 were returned successfully. However, out of the total questionnaires administered, 10 questionnaires came back with unsatisfactory responses. These 10 questionnaires were discarded for lack of complete information. Therefore, the data analysis of this study relies on the responses of the 190 respondents.

#### 3.2. Analysis and Discussion of the Demographic Characteristics

Part one of the questionnaire aims at eliciting personal information to make the task of categorizing possible. Besides, it portrays language proficiency of the subjects to examine the degree of bi-or-multilingualism, patterns of the language maintenance and shift.

The major characteristics of respondents in the study sample are summarized in table (1), below. Respondents in this research claimed the use of mother tongues: Afar-af, Amharic, Tigrinya, Afan Oromo and Saho. In response to the research question number (4), "What is your first language?" respondents claimed having one of the five languages (see table, 1). As the respondents' mother tongue (hereafter MT) were several in number and difficult to comprehend, for the sake of convenience-in terms of categorization, respondents MT were categorized as indigenous and non indigenous languages. The former includes Afar-af and Tigrinya whereas, the latter includes Amharic, Afan Oromo, and Saho. The former category involves over 139 (73.1%) of respondents in the research area. On the other hand, the latter category covers 51(26.7%) of total respondents.

A close assessment to the data obtained from respondents of indigenous MT demonstrates that Tigrinya MT and Afar-af MT speakers were greater in number. To put these in figure, 82 (43.1%) and 57 (30%) of respondents were Tigrinya and Afar-af MT speakers, respectively. From this data, one can understand that Tigrinya and Afar-af are the two languages having many first language speakers in the town. This could imply the dominance of Tegararu demographically in the town. It also indicates demographically Tigrinya speakers have high ethno-linguistic vitality (EV) in the locality.

Concerning the data on ethnic group distribution of respondents the data in table (1) shows that, different language speakers were residing in Ab'ala town. Of the various ethno-linguistic groups living together the striking feature reveals the dominance of Tegararu, Afar and Amhara respectively in the research area (Ab'ala town). In contrast, Oromo and Saho live to a lesser extent in the town. Therefore, these two ethno-linguistic groups have less ethno-linguistic vitality.

Occupation is one of the important factors that determine language use behaviors in a multilingual setting. It accelerates contact among ethno-linguistic groups. Participants of this research are characterized by different occupations. In turn, this inevitably led individuals to operate in different languages in their daily interactions. Subsequently, by occupation participants of this research were farmers, government employees, traders, students, teachers, public workers, and shopkeepers (see table 1). One unique

occupation probably that is uncommon in other urban areas is farming. Respondents occupation in this study area were dichotomized into governmental (employee, public workers, teachers, and students) and non-governmental (farmers, merchants, and shopkeepers) for convenience. Of these immense numbers of occupations, respondents were selected randomly from the above stated domains and most of them were students followed by employees.

Religion assumed to play significant role in influencing language use behavior among different religion followers while carrying their religious activities. Hence, the number of people adhering to different religions is displayed in (table 2). As designated numerically in the table below there were significant differences between the uses of language patters across different religions. Most of the respondents, which is, nearly half of the total population of respondents, *i.e.*, 94 (49.4%) were Muslims. This implies that Muslims exceed followers of other religion in the research area. This is due mainly to the fact that the Afar are exclusively Muslims, while other ethnic groups were significantly composed of Muslims, despite the fact that they also have members that follow other religions.

Generally, the respondents of this research were dwellers of Ab'ala town. According to administration of the woreda the two kebeles were mixed up to form one. As a result, the two kebeles were unevenly distributed in terms of ethnic composition. However, as mentioned in the background section, the Afar is predominantly resided in (Wakrigubi) kebele. Consequently, Afar-af is the presumably the language to be used extensively in this kebele. Likewise, in Wuhdet, the dwellers are principally Tegarü and tend to speak Tigrinya.

Intermarriage or cross marriage is one of the variables resulting in internal stratification of the community that can extremely affect their language use pattern. Concerning intermarriage elderly people asserted that intermarriage with Afar is less frequent as compared to intermarriage among other ethnic groups. Intermarriage has only one direction (*i.e.*, Afar men can marry outside their ethnic groups whereas women are not). This is because of two reasons, one being cultural influence and the other being religious influence. In relation to the former factor men are culturally permissible to marry from other ethnic groups (outside their ethnic group), whereas females are not. The second factor manifests that inter-ethnic marriages among Afar

men and Muslim women of other ethnic groups are occasional occurrences. This shows the case that men inter-marriage is conditioned by the sameness in religion. Therefore, in the present study, language use of only Afar men with partners from other ethnic groups will be the object of this research. The data show there is no intermarriage between Afar and Irob. This may have to do with the two ethnic groups (Afar and Saho) are overpoweringly followers of two distinct religions Muslim and Orthodox Christian. According to the respondents, intermarriages occurred between ethnic groups of the same religion. See the characters of participants presented thus far in the following table.

Items		No	%	Total	No %
Mother-tongue: <sup>4</sup>					
Indigenous local language (s)					
• Afar-af		57	30		
• Tigrinya		82	43.1		
Non-indigenous language (s)				190	100%
• Amharic		33	17.4		
• Afan Oromo		10	5.3		
• Saho		8	4.2		
Ethnic group:					
• Afar		57	30		
• Tegar		82	43.1		
• Amhara		33	17.4		
• Oromo		10	5.3	190	100%
• Irob		8	4.8		
Occupation:					
• Farmers		13	6.8		
• Merchant		32	16.8		
• Student		59	31.1	190	100%
• Teacher		18	9.5		
• Shopkeeper		12	6.3		
• Public worker		16	8.5		
• Employee		40	21		
Religion:					
• Muslim		94	49.5		
• O. Christian		73	38.4	190	100%
• Protestant		17	8.9		
• Catholic		6	3.2		
Residence:					
• Wuhdet		105	55.3	190	100%
• Wakrigubi		85	44.7		
Marital status:					
	Unmarried	120	63.2	190	100%
	Married	70	36.8		
	• Intra-ethnic marriage	52	74.3		
	• Inter-ethnic marriage	5	7.1	70	100%
-Afar with Tegar		11	15.7		
-Afar with Amhara		2	2.9		
-Afar with Oromo					

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of respondents by their mother tongue, ethnic group, occupation, religion, residence, and intermarriage

<sup>4</sup> Afar-af and Saho are claimed as dialects Beliese (1981:133) and Bender (1976:5)

### 3.2.1. Respondents Language Proficiency

Under this section items were included that asked the respondents to rate their language proficiency. Respondents' language proficiency are categorized into the four integrated language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) by using three point scales. Table (3) presents data on language proficiency of respondents.

According to David, et al. (2003: 10) language proficiency self-assessment could best predict the levels of LM and LS.

	Language (s)	Proficiency						Total	
		G		F		P			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Listening	Afar-af	67	45.3	41	27.7	40	27.0	148	100%
	Tigrinya	70	37.8	84	45.4	31	16.8	185	100%
	Amharic	86	45.7	90	47.9	12	6.4	188	100%
	Afan Oromo	9	8.5	12	11.3	85	80.2	106	100%
	Saho	42	30	44	31.4	54	38.6	140	100%
Speaking	Afar-af	63	34.1	72	38.9	50	27.0	185	100%
	Tigrinya	57	30.8	81	43.8	47	25.4	185	100%
	Amharic	79	41.5	91	47.9	20	10.5	190	100%
	Afan Oromo	3	4.9	8	13.1	50	82	61	100%
	Saho	30	21.4	50	35.7	60	42.9	140	100%
Reading	Afar-af	44	29.5	65	43.6	40	26.9	149	100%
	Tigrinya	10	8.6	46	39.3	61	52.1	117	100%
	Amharic	80	42.1	99	52.1	11	5.8	190	100%
	Afan Oromo	2	2.0	17	17.2	80	80.8	99	100%
	Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%
Writing	Afar-af	22	16.6	60	45.1	51	38.3	133	100%
	Tigrinya	8	6.3	34	27	84	66.7	126	100%
	Amharic	111	58.4	76	40	3	1.6	190	100%
	Afan Oromo	1	1.3	20	27.4	52	71.2	73	100%
	Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Table 3. Respondents' self-rated proficiency in each language<sup>5</sup>

NB. No. = Number

Scale: 3= Good (G)

2= Fair (F)

1= Poor (P)

$\mu$ =Expected Mean Score= 1.5

Respondents' mean scores of four-language proficiency in each language:

Afar-af: listening (2.3) speaking (2.1) reading (2.1) writing (1.7)

Tigrinya: listening (2.2) speaking (2.1) reading (1.6) writing (1.4)

Amharic: listening (2.5) speaking (2.3) reading (2.4) writing (2.6)

Afan Oromo: listening (1.2) speaking (1.2) reading (1.2) writing (1.3)

Saho: listening (1.4) speaking (1.1) reading (-) writing (-)

<sup>5</sup> Afar-af and Saho are claimed as dialects Beliese (1981:133 ) and Bender (1976:5)

Respondents provide their proficiency in each language as presented in the above table (3). The respondents' language proficiency for each language presented in the above table (3) thus far are described below.

-Regarding their speaking proficiency in each language respondents rate themselves as follows:

#### **☞ Respondents' Listening Proficiency in Each Language**

The obtained mean score calculated for the respondents' listening proficiency in Afar-af and Tigrinya, 2.3, 2.2, are nearly equal to one another, and significantly exceed the expected mean score, 1.5. The respondents do have relatively equal proficiency in listening skill in the two languages (Afar-af and Tigrinya). Besides, the mean score calculated for the respondents listening proficiency in Amharic, 2.5 greatly exceeds the expected mean score, 1.5. On the other hand, the mean score that is calculated for the respondents' proficiency in the same skill in Afan Oromo, 1.2 is lesser than the expected mean score. Besides, respondents' calculated proficiency in listening Saho 1.4 is, less than expected mean score. This indicates respondents' have good proficiency in listening the above stated languages in varying levels except in Afan Oromo and Saho.

#### **☞ Respondents' Speaking Proficiency in Each Language**

Regarding the respondents speaking proficiency, the obtained calculated mean score in Afar-af and Tigrinya is exactly the same, that is, 2.1. This shows that the respondents proficiency significantly exceed the expected mean score (i.e., 1.5) in the two languages. Respondents' proficiency in Amharic is much greater than Afar-af, that is, 2.3. In Afan Oromo and Saho the respondents' proficiency (1.2 and 1.1, respectively) is less than the expected mean. This shows that respondents from Afan Oromo and Saho are not proficient in the speaking skills. From the above discussion, it is possible to infer that regardless of the respondents' proficiency in Afar-af and Tigrinya; respondents are more proficient in Amharic than the two languages

#### **☞ Respondents' Reading Proficiency in Each Language**

Concerning respondents proficiency in reading skill the mean score for Amharic and Afar-af, is (2.4 and 2.1) respectively. This denotes that the respondents' proficiency in reading significantly exceeds the expected mean score in the two languages. On the other hand, the mean score of respondents' proficiency in Tigrinya and Afan Oromo is

(1.6 and 1.2) respectively. While respondents' reading proficiency in Tigrinya is relatively equal with the expected mean score (i.e. 1.5), the proficiency of Afan Oromo by the language speakers is less than the expected mean. However, respondents do not show their reading proficiency of Saho language. This indicates that respondents have a good reading skill in both Afar-af and Amharic; however, they are more proficient in reading Amharic than Afar-af. This has to do with the fact that a language used as a means of instruction in education, where respondents are more proficient and are less proficient in cases where, the languages are not used in education.

#### ☞ Respondents' Writing Proficiency in Each Language

With respect to respondents' writing proficiency in Amharic, the mean score (2.6) significantly exceeds the expected mean score (1.5). However, the obtained mean score for respondents' writing proficiency in Afar-af, (1.7) is relatively equal to the expected mean score whereas respondents' proficiency in Tigrinya and Afan Oromo (1.3 and 1.4) are relatively equal and less than the expected mean score. In Saho respondents do not show their reading proficiency. Generally, this finding reveals that respondents have good ability in Afar-af even though not as good as Amharic. In other words, the degree of bilingualism is varying.

To summarize, the above discussions it is evident that respondents have better proficiency in the first two skills (the oral skills) in the majority of languages in question, whereas they have lesser proficiency in the two latter language skills (in reading and writing or the literacy skills). This is due to the reason that the languages (Amharic and Afar-af) have significant roles in the education system. While Afar-af is only given as school subject in elementary school, Tigrinya, Afan Oromo and Saho have no role to play in the education system of the region in general and the research area in particular. However, respondents are proficient in Tigrinya language due to its ethno linguistic vitality in the research area. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the first two skills (listening and speaking) are skills in which respondents are proficient. Besides, the figure in table (3) shows knowledge of Amharic is much more common in the town: there is also substantial bilingualism between the three main languages (Amharic, Afar-af and Tigrinya). The consistent good proficiency of respondents' shown for the majority of participants both in Amharic and Afar-af have mainly emanated from the educational role the two languages play in the research area.

Generally, this finding may be concluded by the idea of Macnamara cited in Appel and Muysken (1987: 2), that someone should be called a bilingual if he/she has some second language skill in one of the four modalities (listening, speaking, reading and writing). Therefore, in this regard Ab'ala town dwellers are bilinguals in the three languages.

### **3.3. Domain of Language Use**

Under part two of the questionnaire an attempt is made to elicits the language use patterns and mother-tongue use of respondents in different domains.

As indicated in the preceding section, domain is a sociolinguistic factor. which determines the language choice of multilingual people. In this section, respondents have been asked to indicate the language (s) they use most often in different domains in the course of interaction with different people. Thus, the respondents' language use shows variation in language use of respondents' among different participants. Fishman 1964, 1965, 1968 all cited in Fasold (1984:183) states that domains are comprised of factors such as location, topic and participants. To this end, in collecting data on the language use behavior of Ab'ala people three things have been taken into consideration. These are setting, topic and participant. Responses on language use pattern in domains such as family, friendship, neighborhood, market; authority domain (judge and police); public serves (health center and governmental office, school, and mosques/churches) are the concern of the study. The results of the responses for each variables are presented in tables (4-17). Parasher (1980) cited in Fasold (1984: 185) categorizes family, friendship, neighborhood as low domains whereas education, government, employment are grouped under high domain. Furthermore, he states that transaction domain might be rather low or high. For the purpose of this study, the responses give with respect to language use pattern of respondents in several domains, that is, in questions ranging from (11-24) were grouped into two categories as powerful and less powerful domains. Furthermore, the powerful domains are subdivided into public services and authorities. The data about the respondents' language use pattern in less powerful domains are summarized in items percentage in tables 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 whereas language use pattern in powerful domains are summarized in table, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. Each question/item will be presented and analyzed in the following section.

### 3.3.1. Less powerful Domains

#### 3.3.1.1. Language Use in the Family Domain with Different Interlocutors

Home is the most important domain of language use reserved for the minority languages. In line with this Dittmar (1976: 17) states that often a language (variety) that is not used in family domain has less chance to be retained than the one, which is used. According to Fishman (2001:69) family domain is one of the less powerful domains. In line with this, respondents were asked “Which language (s) they use in each of the less powerful domains during their interaction with different interlocutors. The following table presents data on language use pattern of respondents’ with different interlocutors in the home domain.

Language(S)	Language spoken with different interlocutors							
	Spouse/husband		Children		Parents		Brother/ sister	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Afar-af	9	12.9	3	7.5	8	26.7	5	10
Tigrinya	28	40	10	25	10	33.3	17	34
Amharic	21	30	15	37.5	7	23.3	23	46
Afan Oromo	3	4.3	2	5	1	3.3	2	4
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Afar-af/Amharic	5	7.1	5	12.5	2	6.7	1	2
Tigrinya/Amharic	3	4.3	4	10	2	6.7	2	4
Afan Oromo/ Amharic	1	1.4	1	2.5	-	-	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	70	100%	40	100%	30	100%	50	100%

Table 4. Respondents language use behavior in family<sup>6</sup> domain

Of the 70 (100%) respondents who have responded to have spouses, that is, the number of respondents who have responded to use Tigrinya and Amharic in the family domain with their spouses’ 40 % and 30 % respectively and husbands’ were significantly higher than those who have responded to use other languages with their spouses in this domain. Thus, it is evident from the table (4), that Tigrinya is a relatively dominantly used language among respondents and their spouses. However, the number of respondents claimed to use other language alternatively are insignificant in number. Therefore, in this case shifting to non-indigenous languages has not been exhibited.

<sup>6</sup> Fishman (2001) cited in Gebre Hishie (2008:16) domains of language use are divided into two: powerful and less powerful. The former includes employment, higher education, mass media and government institutions whereas the later include family, friends, neighborhood, community institutions and in some cases pre-school or elementary education

Again, one can see a very marked difference between the language uses of respondents in this domain with their children. Of the respondents who have responded to have children 40 (100%), Amharic and Tigrinya respectively are the two more often used languages when parents wish to speak with their children. 37.5% and 25% of the respondents claimed to use Amharic and Tigrinya respectively with their children at home. On the other hand, it is evident that Afar-af and Afan Oromo are seldom used when parents speak with their children. This shows that the indigenous language (s) of the research area is seldom used and the use of non-indigenous language (s) is more prevalent when compared to the language use of respondents with their spouses. In other words, when we compare language uses of respondents with their cohorts and with their children shift towards Amharic is exhibited.

In response to question 12, asking what language they speak with their parents the majority of respondents indicated that they use Tigrinya 33.3% and Afar-af 26.7 %. Besides, respondents considerably use Amharic (i.e. 23.3) when they speak with their parents. In this regard the use of the indigenous languages of the research area shows some dominance. This shows that indigenous languages of the vicinity (Tigrinya and Afar-af) are used more as languages of interaction in the family domain among respondents and their parents. Therefore, MT is used between respondents and their parents in the family domain.

Concerning respondents language use with their siblings, 23 (46%) of respondents claimed that they use Amharic, whereas 17 (34%) of the respondents claimed that they use Tigrinya with their siblings. The third largest number of respondents, that is, 5 (10%) respondents claimed that they use Afar-af with their siblings. This shows that the non-indigenous language (Amharic) has the sole of a means of wider communication among siblings. In other words, shift towards Amharic is apparently observed from respondents while communicating with their siblings.

In general, in the family domain respondents claimed that they predominantly use three languages with all interlocutors. Of these languages, Amharic gets the highest position while respondents communicating with their children and their siblings. Tigrinya dominantly used language with spouses and parents followed by Afar-af.

### 3.3.1.2. Language Use in the Home Domain and Intermarriage

As has been mentioned in the preceding section (part one) of this study under the characteristics of respondents, participants of the study were dichotomized as married and unmarried. Again, those ones married have been categorized into intra-ethnic group marriage and inter-ethnic group marriages. Among the respondents 120 (63.1%) were unmarried while 70 (36.8%) were married. Furthermore, 52 (74.2%) were married to their ethnic group cohorts while 18 (25.7%) were married outside their ethnic group. The following table presents data on language use of both marriage patterns of respondents.

Ethnic groups	Language (s)	Interethnic marriage		Total		Language (s)	Intra-ethnic marriages		Total	
		No	%	No	%		No	%	No	%
Afar and Amhara	Amharic	7	38.9	18	100	Tigrinya	18	34.7	52	100
Afar and Tegar	Tigrinya	5	27.8			Afar-af	25	48		
Afar and Oromo	Afar-af	2	11.1			Amharic	9	17.3		
Afar and Irob	Afar-af/Oromo	1	5.6			Amharic/Afar-af	-	-		
	Afar-af/Amharic	2	11.1			Tigrinya/Amharic	-	-		
	Afar-af/Tigrin	1	5.5			Afan Oromo/Saho	-	-		

Table 5. Respondents' intermarriage vs. language use at home

The above table depicts that two types of marriage are practiced. In the case of intra-ethnic marriage, the majority 18 (34.7) of respondents who are inter-ethnically married couples have stated that they dominantly use Tigrinya at home. On the other hand, considerable number of respondents 25 (48%) have responded that they frequently use Afar-af at home. Besides, relatively small numbers of respondents 9 (17.3%) have stated that they use Amharic at home. This indicates that since the cohorts are from the same ethnic background, each of the couple have reported to use their ethnic languages alone. Here, language maintenance is observable at home by couples of the same ethnic groups.

As has been mentioned in the previous section only Afar men can be married with other ethnic groups. Thus, a language use of Afar men having other wives was investigated. Of the Afar men married with other ethnic group wives the majority 7 (38.9%), have claimed to use Amharic at home. 5 (27.8%) have reported to use Tigrinya at home. Only insignificant number of respondents 2 (11.1%) have reported to use Afar-af at home. However, the same number of respondents, 2 (11.1%) have reported to use Afar-af and Amharic alternatively at home. Regarding alternate use of languages Afan Oromo and Tigrinya along with Afar-af is very rare, that is, only 1 (5.5) respondents claim they use the languages. This implies that Amharic is the most commonly used language between couples of varying ethnic groups.

It is also possible to infer in the first type of intermarriage (inter-ethnic marriage) it is likely that language maintenance is prevalently observed. However, in the second type of marriage (intra-ethnic marriage) language shift is revealed with mainly the shift towards Amharic being most frequent. Generally, it is revealed that intra-ethnic marriage contributes a lot for language maintenance whereas inter-ethnic marriage causes language shift. Hence, Afar-af is not being maintained by couples of mixed marriage. This can be generalized the following by the idea of Kloss (1966) that exogamy is factor for language shift. This is also the case in Afar community in Ab'ala town. Therefore, intermarriage is one of the principal factors for language shift from Afar-af to Amharic and Tigrinya.

### **3.3.1.3. Language Use in the Friendship Domain**

Friend ship is one of the domains in which complicated nature of language use is exhibited. This domain is build up with various ethnic group members in a

multilingual setting. In the table below data on respondents' language use is presented.

Language (s)	Language spoken with	
	Friends	
	No	%
Afar-af	26	13.7
Tigrinya	66	34.7
Amharic	94	49.5
Afan Oromo	4	2.1
Saho	-	-
Afar-af/Amharic	-	-
Tigrinya/Amharic	-	-
Afan Oromo/ Amharic	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-
Total	190	100%

Table 6. Respondents' language use behavior in friendship with percentage representation

According to responses of participants displayed in the above table, the majority of respondents, 94 (49.4%) claimed that they use Amharic in the course of interaction with their friends. 66 (34.7%) of the respondents stated that they use Tigrinya during their interaction with friends. A significant number of respondents 26 (13.6%) claimed to use Afar-af with their friends. But only a small number of respondents, 4 (2.1%) respond that they use Afan Oromo with their friends. The data also reveals that no respondent has reported to use Saho in friendship domain. This implies respondents use Amharic extensively and Amharic is a widely used language between friends.

One interesting condition that can be inferred from the above table (4) is that in the friendship domain respondents never use languages alternatively. In other words, all of the respondents have responded they use one of the said languages solely. According to Appel and Muysken (1987:41) the intrusion of one language into the domain of another language is a clear representative of language shift. Therefore, the dominance of Amharic is prevailing in the domain of friendship which has been supposed to be dominated by the indigenous local language (s) (Afar-af and Tigrinya) as they have vitality demographically. This implies that respondents shift <sup>to</sup> towards Amharic while interacting within the friend ship domain. This could be attributed that again shift towards Amharic is observed. This implies that respondents shift towards Amharic while interacting with peers in the friend ship domain.

### 3.3.1.4. Language Use in the Neighborhood

In the two kebeles (Wuhdet and Wakrigubi) two ethno-linguistic groups apparently reside. These are Afar and Tegarú respectively. Due to the fact that ethno-linguistic groups are distributed unevenly in the kebeles, the Tegarú are predominant in the former kebele while the Afar are predominant in the latter one. The table below shows language use of speakers in the two kebeles. As indicated in the previous section (part one) respondents of this study were people residing in the kebeles. Consider the data in the following table.

Language (s)	Language spoken with							
	Neighbors							
	Wuhdet			Wakrigubi				
	Total			Total				
No	%	No		%				
Afar-af	28	26.6	105	100%	38	44.7	85	100%
Tigrinya	60	57.1			10	11.8		
Amharic	8	7.6			5	5.9		
Afan Oromo	1	1			2	2.4		
Saho	-	-			-	-		
Afar-af/Amharic	-	-			15	17.6		
					8	9.4		
Tigrinya/Amharic	5	4.8			-	-		
Afar-af/Tigrinya	3	2.9			7	8.2		
Afan Oromo	-	-			-	-		

Table 7. Respondents' language use behavior in Neighborhood<sup>7</sup>

As depicted in table (5), in Wuhdet kebele Tigrinya and Afar-af more often used in the neighborhood domain. In this domain, 60 (57.1%) and 28 (26.6%) of respondents use the two languages respectively in the course of interaction with their neighbors. The use of languages such as Afan Orom, Saho and the alternate use of these languages seldom found. Amharic is used in this domain in both kebeles when the neighborhoods do not share the MT. Thus, it is possible to generalize that an important factor MT governs the subjects language use in the domain. In the other kebele, the respondents overwhelmingly use (Wakrigubi) Kbele Afar-af. Another 38 (44.7%). respondents use Afar-af solely followed by 10 (11.8%) respondents who use Tigrinya. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that residence and MT conditions the language use patterns of respondents.

<sup>7</sup> Fishman (1971:248) stated neighborhood as an informal domain of language use.

### 3.3.1.5. Language Use in the Market Domains

Generally, the Ab'ala market is a setting where people of different ethnic backgrounds flock into, from different directions, once a week. As the town is situated at the border area of the Tigray region, people come from the surrounding localities of this bordering region. Respondents were asked to report language use in market domain. The following table represents data on respondents' language use pattern in this particular domain.

Language(s)	Language spoken with								Total
	Buyers or sellers								
	Afar-af	Tigrinya	Amharic	Afan Oromo	Saho /Amharic	Afar-af/ Amharic	Afar-af/Tigrinya	Afan Oromo/ Amharic	
No	10	34	5	1	-	2	5	-	57
%	17.5	59.6	8.8	1.8	-	3.5	8.8	-	100%

Table 8. Respondents' language use behavior in market

As can be seen in table (8), respondents show different language use pattern in this domain. Out of 57, 34 (59.6%) respondents use Tigrinya in this domain with buyers and sellers; whereas 10 (17.5%) respondents use Afar-af for market purposes. The sole use of Amharic and the alternate use of Afar-af along with Tigrinya however is said to be used by 5 (8.8%) respondents. Of the respondents 1 (1.8%) use Afan Oromo and 2 (3.5%) respondent claimed to uses Afar-af alternatively with Amharic. No one responded the use of Saho with buyers and sellers in this domain.

From this diverse language use pattern of respondents, it is evident that Tigrinya is the most commonly used language in this domain. In this domain Tigrinya functions as a language, which is used among interlocutors (buyers and sellers) to facilitate their communication or to carry out marketing activities. This is due to the reason that especially in the market day Tigrinya speaking people bring what they have to the market not only from Ab'ala, but also from the neighboring Tigray region. Because of this in the market place, Tigrinya is more likely used language when the ethno-linguistic background of an individual not known. However, the alternate use of language seems to indicate the sellers use the buyers' language (i.e., seller's accommodate). In the case of market in Ab'ala town Tigrinya speakers (Tegaru)

accommodate towards Afar-af since Tegarū are predominantly sellers and Afar are buyers. The finding of the present study supports the view that sellers utilize the buyers' language.

### 3.3.2. Powerful Domains

#### 3.3.2.1. Language Use in the Public Service Domains

##### 3.3.2.1.1. Health Center

Public service domains are domains where diversified ethnic group member go to in order to gain services they want. During this process, they interact with different interlocutors. In the case of this particular domain, respondents were asked, "which language (s) they used with health professionals in the health center?" The respondents' language use pattern in the health center is presented as follows:

Language (s)	Language spoken with Physicians									
	Afar-af	Tigrinya	Amharic	Afan Oromo	Saho	Afar-af/ Amharic	Tigrinya/ Amharic	Afan Oromo/ Amharic	Saho/Afa-af	Total
No	5	17	92	-	-	10	2	-	-	126
%	4	13.5	73	-	-	7.9	1.6	-	-	100%

Table 9. Respondents' language use behavior in health center

In this domain, Amharic is the most commonly used language. Of the 126 respondents, 92 (73%) reported that they use Amharic often when they visit a doctor. Those who responded using Tigrinya were 17 (13.5%). 5 (4%) respondents reported to have used Afar-af in this domain. Some of the respondents replied that they use different languages alternatively with health professionals' when they interact.

Therefore, from this we can conclude that Amharic is the most widely used language in this domain by the respondents.

##### 3.3.2.1.2. School

School is one of the powerful domains in which speakers used a particular language. As mentioned above, this is a domain in which all the members of societies are served. As a result, most students coming from different ethnic background are obliged to learn languages other than their MTs. As has been mentioned in the chapter

on the background, Amharic and English are the sole mediums of instruction in elementary and in high schools respectively. However, Afar-af remains the school subject (see chapter 1). In the subsequent table, language use of respondents' in the school is presented.

Language (s)	Language spoken with			
	Student		Teacher	
	No	%	No	%
Afar-af	15	25.4	3	16.7
Tigrinya	10	16.9	5	27.8
Amharic	25	42.4	7	38.9
Afan Oromo	-	-	-	-
Saho	-	-	-	-
Afar-af/Amharic	7	11.9	1	5.5
Tigrinya/Amharic	2	3.4	2	11.1
Afan Oromo/ Amharic	-	-	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-	-	-
Total	59	100%	18	100%

Table 10. Respondents' language use behavior in education

Large numbers of student respondents, 25 (42.4%) indicated that they use Amharic with their peers. Among the total student respondents, out of the total sample size 15 (25.4%) replied that they use Afar-af with their fellow students. While 10 (16.9%) use Tigrinya with students. Again, other respondents indicate that they use Afar-af/Amharic and Tigrinya/Amharic 7 (11.9%) and 2 (3.4%) respectively. Regarding teachers language use behavior in this domain, 7 (38.9%) use Amharic with students. The second dominantly used language by teachers in this domain is Tigrinya, 5 (27.8%) followed by Afar-af, 3 (16.6%).

Generally, Amharic is the most extensively used language with both students and teachers. However, with students Afar-af is used relatively to greater extent. This attributes to the reason that Amharic has greater role in the medium of instruction in the whole of the education system.

### 3.3.2.1.3. Office

This is one of the settings where people of different languages interact. The table below presents data on language use of respondents.

language(s)	Language spoken with									
	Boss or colleague									
	Afar-af	Tigrinya	Amharic	Afan Oromo	Saho Saho	Afar-af/ Amharic	Tigrinya/ Amharic	Afan Oromo/ Amharic	Saho/Afar-af	Total
No	10	5	21	-	-	3	1	-	-	40
%	25	12.5	52.5	-	-	7.5	2.5	-	-	100

Table 11. Respondent language use behavior in workplace

As the data in table (11) indicates, 21 (52.5%) respondents use Amharic with their boss. Many respondents 10 (25%) replied that they use Afar-af and 5 (12.5%) respondents use Tigrinya with their boss. Again, others 3 (7.5%) claimed to use Afar-af along with Amharic. Of the respondents, an insignificant number of respondents, 1 (2.5) use Tigrinya along with Amharic while interacting with their boss.

Generally, in this domain overwhelmingly respondents' use Amharic. The reason for this is mainly that Amharic is the working language in the research area.

#### 3.3.2.1.4. Mosques/churches

Religion is one of the areas of language use where people show different languages interactions. The table below shows the report of language use of respondents in the Mosques and the churches.

Language (s)	Language spoken with			
	Sheiks or		priests	
	No	%	No	%
Afar-af	32	36.8	-	-
Tigrinya	13	15	30	46.2
Amharic	9	10.3	13	20
Afan Oromo	-	-	-	-
Saho	-	-	-	-
Arabic	5	5.7	-	-
Ge'ez	-	-	-	-
Afar-af/ Arabic	22	25.3	-	-
Ge'ez/ Tigrinya	-	-	21	32.3
Afar-af/Amharic	4	4.6	-	-
Tigrinya/Amharic	2	2.3	1	1.5
Afan Oromo/ Amharic	-	-	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-	-	-
Total	87	100%	65	100

Table 12. Respondents' language use behavior in religion domains

In this domain, 32 (36.8%) respondents replied that they use Afar-af with the sheiks. Of the respondents 13 (15%) answered that they use Tigrinya with sheiks whereas 9 (10.3%) replied that they use Amharic. 5 (5.7%) replied that they use Arabic with sheiks with Sheikhs. However, among the respondents no one claimed that he/she uses Afan Oromo or Saho in the domain in question while interacting with Sheikhs and priests. Another considerable number of respondents 22 (25.3%) asserted that they use Afar-af along Arabic with sheiks whereas no respondent responded to use Arabic with priest. Conversely, while there are 4(4.6%) and 2 (2.3%) respondents who responded the use of Afar-af and Tigrinya respectively alternatively with Amharic.

On the other hand, 30(46.2%) respondents reported that they use Tigrinya with priests. Other respondents 13(20%), reported that they use Amharic. Considerable number of respondents, 21 (32.3%) claimed that they use Ge'ez alternatively with Tigrinya they use Ge'ez alone with priests. Only 1 (1.5%) responded the use of Tigrinya alternatively with Amharic. Therefore, the two indigenous languages have dominant functions in the religion domain along with Arabic and Ge'e and with Sheikhs and Priests respectively.

### 3.3.2.2. Language Use in the Authority Domains

#### 3.3.2.2.1. Courtroom

As law is the supreme power, whenever people face problems it is customary to go to courtrooms and made charge of people against law. In such circumstances. In Ab'ala town members of several ethnic groups are likely to interact with judges. The following table presents data on respondents language use.

	Language spoken with									Total
	Judges									
	Afar-af	Tigrinya	Amharic	Afan Oromo	Saho Saho	Afar-af/ Amharic	Tigrinya/ Amharic	Afan Oromo/	Saho/Afar -af	
No	4	1	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	13
%	30.8	7.7	53.8	-	-	7.7	-	-	-	100%

Table 13. Respondents' language use behavior in court

As indicated in the above table a greater number of respondents use Amharic in the court domain. Among the 13 respondents, 7 (53.8%) claimed to use Amharic, whereas 4 (30.8%) claimed to use Afar-af with judges. Besides, 1 (7.7%) respondent reported

use of solely Tigrinya and Afar-af along with Amharic in this domain.

Generally, it is possible to conclude that Amharic is the most commonly used language in this domain. Here, the alternative use of languages shows the respondents are bilinguals in Afar-af and Amharic. This enables interlocutors to use more appropriate language while interacting.

### 3.3.2.2. Police station

Another setting where people contact with authorities is the police station.

Respondents' language use with the police is presented in the table below.

Language (s)	Language spoken with	
	Police	
	No	%
Afar-af	5	25
Tigrinya	3	15
Amharic	10	50
Afan Oromo	-	-
Saho	-	-
Afar-af/Amharic	2	10
Tigrinya/Amharic	-	-
Afan Oromo/ Amharic	-	-
Saho/Afar-af	-	-
Total	20	100%

Table 14. Respondents' language use behavior with police authorities

As the data in table 14 indicates, 10 (50%) respondents reply they use Amharic with police officers in this domain. Next, the use of Afar-af in this domain covers a relatively larger proportion, that is, 5 (25%). On the other hand, the number of respondents that indicated they use other languages in this domain shows insignificant number, for example, Tigrinya 3 (15%). Besides, some respondents, 2 (10%) indicated that they use both Afar-af and Amharic alternatively. From this, it is possible to generalize that Amharic is the most dominantly used language in this domain since Amharic is both the working language and language of wider communication.

### 3.3.3. Respondents' Mother Tongue Use in Different Topics (Contexts)

In this section, we endeavor to discuss some topics and contexts in which respondents prefer the use of their MT. Under this section, the language use behavior of each language group is investigated.

Answers for the questions No. 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 respondents give the following figures.

Language use in different situations (contexts)		Often		Sometimes		Never		No response		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
24	<b>In oaths</b>										
	Afar-af	11	19.3	13	22.8	27	47.4	6	10.5	190	100
	Tigrinya	13	15.9	39	47.6	23	28.0	7	8.5		
	Amharic	20	60.6	8	24.2	-	-	5	15.2		
	Afan Oromo	3	30	1	10	4	40	2	20		
Saho	1	12.5	2	25	3	37.5	2	25			
25	<b>In dream</b>										
	Afar-af	5	8.8	16	28.0	12	21.1	24	42.1	190	100
	Tigrinya	8	9.7	35	42.7	20	24.4	19	23.2		
	Amharic	5	15.2	2	6.0	17	51.5	9	27.3		
	Afan Oromo	2	20	3	30	5	50	-	-		
Saho	-	-	3	37.5	4	50	1	12.5			
26	<b>In the extents of viewing TV program</b>										
	Afar-af	35	61.4	18	31.6	-	-	4	7.0	190	100
	Tigrinya	46	56.1	9	11	27	32.9	-	-		
	Amharic	25	75.8	4	12.1	3	9.1	1	3.0		
	Afan Oromo	2	20	3	30	5	50	-	-		
Saho	-	-	-	-	7	87.5	1	12.5			
27	<b>For letter writing</b>										
	Afar-af	14	24.6	15	26.3	27	47.4	1	1.7	190	100
	Tigrinya	6	7.3	19	23.2	32	39.0	25	30.5		
	Amharic	31	94	1	3.0	-	-	1	3.0		
	Afan Oromo	-	-	1	10	4	40	5	50		
Saho	-	-	-	-	6	75	2	25			
28	<b>For counting</b>										
	Afar-af	8	14.0	20	35.1	13	22.8	16	28.1	190	100
	Tigrinya	4	4.9	41	50	37	45.1	-	-		
	Amharic	30	91	3	9	-	-	-	-		
	Afan Oromo	-	-	2	20	3	30	5	50		
Saho	-	-	1	12.5	3	37.5	3	37.5			

Table 15. Respondents' use of MT in different topics/situations

As can be seen from the above table respondents provide the following responses regarding their MTs use. Five ethnic groups given in table (3) above showed that the patterns of their MT uses are different among the groups. The Amhara ethnic group uses their MT (Amharic) in oaths, for letter writing and for counting more often than the rest of the ethnic groups. Tegarü on the other hand, uses their MT (Tigrinya) more often than the rest of ethnic groups in dream. The Afar use their MT more often than other ethnic languages in TV viewing. This reflects in most cases that languages such as Afar-af, Tigrinya etc. reduces their function in favor of Amharic. This seems there is a shift of Afar-af to Amharic. The findings of the present study shows respondents use new language in domains which were reserved by the old one and limitation of languages in function. Downs (1998:62) claims that the more a minority language is limited in its function the more it is subject to shift; when speech community begins to choose a new language in domains formerly reserved for the old one, it may be a sign that language shift is in progress.

### **3.4. Attitude**

Under part three of the questionnaire, the data collected is presented and analyzed using tables and percentages.

In a situation, where several languages are spoken in the same area speakers will inevitably develop attitudes towards language(s), that is, one may like or dislike a language (Haugen 1956:95 cited in Tsehaye Tefera (1977:1) In other words, one may have positive or negative attitudes to a certain language. People assign various attributes to language forms. According to Apple and Muysken (1987:17), most research on language attitudes follows the mentalist perspective. Respondents' language attitude towards different languages can be assessed by administering close-ended questionnaire for all languages in the town. Backer (2006:210) argues that language revitalization, decay or death is conditioned by speakers' attitudes towards them. In other words, there is a correspondence relation between language maintenance and attitudes of MT speakers towards their language. If speakers have positive attitude towards their MTs it is plausible that a language will be maintained and the vice versa. Downs (1998:65) and Holmes (1992:69) state a positive attitude towards a language encourages its maintenance and Backer (2006:213) on the other hand, claims that, "negative attitude to a minority language may be a prime cause of parents' not passing on the heritage language to a child".

Topics or contexts	Responses										Total
	5		4		3		2		1		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
<b>Daily topics</b>											
Afar-af	36	21.9	40	24.4	14	8.5	48	29.3	26	15.9	164
Tigrinya	34	19.6	41	23.6	18	10.3	43	24.7	38	21.8	174
Amharic	86	45.2	64	33.7	-	-	18	9.5	22	11.6	190
Afan Oromo	-	-	-	-	-	-	83	44.8	102	55.1	185
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	90	47.3	100	52.6	190
<b>Academic topic</b>											
Afar-af	38	22.1	41	23.8	8	4.7	43	25	42	24.4	172
Tigrinya	57	39.3	60	41.4	3	2.1	15	10.3	10	6.9	145
Amharic	8	4.2	10	5.3	2	1	95	50	75	39.5	190
Afan Oromo	76	44.4	93	54.4	2	1.2	-	-	-	-	171
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sexuality</b>											
Afar-af	38	20.3	44	23.6	20	10.7	47	25.1	38	20.3	187
Tigrinya	30	17	39	22	14	7.9	49	27.7	45	25.4	177
Amharic	9	5	10	5.6	4	2.2	89	49.4	68	37.8	180
Afan Oromo	42	22.1	148	77.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	190
Saho	20	11.1	160	88.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	180
<b>Sociopolitical issues</b>											
Afar-af	17	9	24	12.7	-	-	86	45.5	62	32.8	189
Tigrinya	34	24.8	40	29.2	6	4.4	29	21.2	28	20.4	137
Amharic	3	1.6	7	3.7	-	-	100	53.2	78	41.5	188
Afan Oromo	87	45.8	100	52.6	3	1.6	-	-	-	-	190
Saho	90	48.4	96	51.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	186
<b>Cultural issues</b>											
Afar-af	13	7.1	17	9.3	4	2.2	85	46.7	63	34.7	182
Tigrinya	21	12	22	12.6	2	1.1	78	44.6	52	29.7	175
Amharic	56	29.5	80	42.1	-	-	31	16.3	23	12.1	190
Afan Oromo	72	44.2	91	55.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	163
Saho	77	45.3	91	53.5	2	1.2	-	-	-	-	170
<b>As vehicular</b>											
Afar-af	90	47.4	72	37.9	2	1	11	5.8	15	7.9	190
Tigrinya	66	39.5	50	29.9	-	-	26	15.6	25	15	167
Amharic	118	64.8	60	33	-	-	-	-	4	2.2	182
Afan Oromo	-	-	-	-	2	1	85	44.7	103	54.2	190
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	80	88.9	10	11.1	90
<b>Most prestigious</b>											
Afar-af	29	15.8	37	20.2	2	1.1	62	33.9	53	29	183
Tigrinya	33	17.6	58	30.9	4	2.1	48	25.5	45	23.9	188
Amharic	5	2.6	10	5.3	-	-	81	42.6	94	49.5	190
Afan Oromo	168s	90.8	17	9.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	185
Saho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	187	100	187

Table 16. Respondents' attitude about the different languages

1. Scale: Strongly disagree (SD) = 5, Disagree (D) = 4, Undecided (UN) =3, Agree (A) =2, and strongly agree (SA) = 1,
2. N=190
3. M= Mean
4.  $\mu$ = Expected Mean Score

We will discuss each of the above statement one by one.

- I do not support using Afar-af in daily topics  
I do not support using Tigrinya in daily topics  
I do not support using Amharic in daily topics  
I do not support using Afan Oromo in daily topics  
I do not support using Saho in daily topics
- I feel good when I use Afar-af in academic topics  
I feel good when I use Tigrinya in academic topics  
I feel good when I use Amharic in academic topics  
I feel good when I use Afan Oromo in academic topics  
I feel good when I use Saho in academic topics
- It gives me pleasure when I use Afar-af in sexuality  
It gives me pleasure when I use Tigrinya in sexuality  
It gives me pleasure when I use Amharic in sexuality  
It gives me pleasure when I use Afan Oromo in sexuality  
It gives me pleasure when I use Saho in sexuality
- I think Afar-af is appropriate to use in socio-political issues  
I think Tigrinya is appropriate to use in socio-political issues  
I think Amharic is appropriate to use in socio-political issues  
I think Afan Oromo is appropriate to use in socio-political issues  
I think Saho is appropriate to use in socio-political issues
- I prefer to use Afar-af in cultural issues  
I prefer to use Tigrinya in cultural issues  
I prefer to use Amharic in cultural issues  
I prefer to use Afan Oromo in cultural issues  
I prefer to use Saho in cultural issues
- I do not prefer using Afar-af as vehicular language  
I do not prefer using Tigrinya as vehicular language  
I do not prefer using Amharic as vehicular language  
I do not prefer using Afan Oromo as vehicular language  
I do not prefer using Saho as vehicular language
- I believe Afar-af is the most prestigious  
  
I believe Tigrinya is the most prestigious

I believe Amharic is the most prestigious

I believe Afan Oromo is the most prestigious

I believe Saho is the most prestigious

For the entire questions respondents showed negative attitude in the two languages (Afan Oromo and Saho). However, in the three languages (Afar-af, Tigrinya and Amharic) they showed variation of attitudes.

Items 1 and 6 were stated negatively, while the remaining (2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8) were presented positively. For analysis purpose, the responses of the negatively stated items are reversely scored. Thus, in the responses, frequencies of agree and strongly agree categories for negatively stated items show the negative opinion (perception) of the respondents. Similarly, response frequencies of disagree and strongly disagree categories indicated the positive opinion while the undecided category indicates neutral perception.

Of the questions presented positively respondents assert their agreements in Afar-af only for questions 4, 5, and 7. These questions were agreed by more than 50 % of respondents (agree and strongly agree) with the calculated mean score of 3.4, 3.6, and 3.8 respectively. However, for the negatively presented questions respondents report their (disagreement and strongly disagreement), (i.e., they give positive attitudes) in the same language for question 6. This question was disagreed by more than 50 % of respondents (disagree and strongly disagree) with the calculated mean score of 4.

Similarly, from questions presented positively respondents assert their agreements in Tigrinya only for question 5. This question was agreed by more than 50 % of respondents (agree and strongly agree) with the calculated mean score of 3.3. However, for the negatively presented questions respondents showed that their (disagreement and strong disagreement), (i.e., they give positive attitudes) in this language for question 6. These questions were disagreed by more than 50 % of respondents (disagree and strongly disagree) with the calculated mean score of 3.2.

Finally, out of the questions presented positively respondents assert their agreements In Amharic in questions such as 2, 3, 4, and 7. All these questions agreed by more than 50 % of respondents (agree and strongly agree) with the calculated mean score of 4, 4, 4, and 4.2 respectively. Even though respondents have stated positive attitude in

Afar-af for questions (2 and 7), they favor Amharic much more than Afar-af. However, for the negatively presented questions respondents report their (disagreement and strongly disagreement), (i.e., give positive attitude) in Amharic language for questions 1 and 6. These question were disagreed by more than 50 % of respondents (disagree and strongly disagree) with the calculated mean scores of 4.5 and 3.6 respectively.

The mean rating value of these questions in each language is substantially more than the expected mean score, which is 3. This shows that the respondents have a positive attitude with the issue under question. Even if the respondents assert positive attitudes in questions presents negatively (1 and 6) in the above three languages the calculated mean score is prevalent in Amharic than other languages.

In response to the questions why respondents assert positive or negative attitudes towards languages, some of the respondents reported the follows reasons:

- Regarding Afar-af, a summary of participants' reasons for supporting (i.e., agree) with the above statement is offered as follows:
  - Afar-af is most preferable language to communicate with monolingual Afar people that inhabit the surrounding districts.
  - One means of keeping Afar-af alive is using it in day-to-day activity and we have to make an effort to use it in Ab'ala.
- Some of the responses of participants' who showed negative attitude towards Afar-af for the above statement give the following reason:
  - Because there are no words that can represent scientific terms,
  - This is one of the languages which is least developed
- Here are some of the responses of participants asserting negative attitude towards Afar-af. They give the following main reasons:
  - Because it is not a working language
  - It is not a language of education
- Among the reasons provided by respondents asserting positive attitude towards Amharic the salient reason are:
  - Majority of respondents adopt the majority language (Amharic) as their regular vehicle of communication, often mainly because they expect that speaking that language gives better chances for upward social mobility and economic success.

-Only Amharic can commonly satisfy the common interest of interlocutors in day-to-day interaction.

Generally, from the above data we can conclude that Amharic is the most commonly used language in contexts (situations) such as daily interactions, academic issues, sociopolitical issues, sexualities, and preferred for a vehicular and prestigious language. This implies that Amharic gains more positive attitude by respondents. From the above analyses, it is possible to infer that the majority of the research participants have negative attitudes towards Afar-af. Therefore, findings of the present study can support Backer's (2006:210-13) and Down's (1998:65) statement and Holme's (1992:69) "... positive attitude towards a language encourages its maintenance" view that "...if speakers have positive attitude towards their MTs it is plausible that a language will be maintained and the vice versa".

## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4. INTERFERENCE<sup>8</sup>

This chapter touches upon a few language contact resultants such as CS and borrowing. It also assesses whether Afar-af is being maintained or not in the locality. The data for this chapter are mainly obtained from recording and participant observation.

#### 4.1. Code Switching and Borrowing

As mentioned in the preceding section (i.e., review of related literature), there are several outcomes of language contact. Among them, the most prevalent outcomes that draw considerable attention of scholars are CS and borrowing. Therefore, this section is devoted to these language contact phenomena. Due to rapid social mobility, human beings exist in different corners of the world together and it is likely that linguistic, cultural, and social contacts, among others are exhibited. Because of this, language contact results of the ethno-linguistic groups that are coexisting in Ab'ala town are assessed. Of the ethno-linguistic groups that are in contact, Afar, Tegarū and Amhara are the dominant ones. A set of quantitative data, reported in this section, are obtained through participant observation and by taking notes. The following CS and borrowing data have been collected from Ab'ala community members in the course of their interaction with each other. The data from the community have been generated from naturally occurring conversations. The researcher also recorded several exchanges from the community members in various circumstances. In the occasion of data gathering nobody was aware that the conversations were being recorded for sociolinguistic study.

##### 4.1.1. Code Switching

Code switching refers to switching back and forth between two or more languages in the course of conversation depending on the situation or conversation pattern. Myers-Scotton (1997: 150) defines CS as “the selection by bilinguals or multi-linguals of forms from embedded variety (s) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation”. Besides, she states, (ibid: 150) that CS can be either intra-sentential or inter-sentential.

---

<sup>8</sup> Interference is traditional name for one of the language contact phenomena that involve phonetic, lexical, morph-syntactic or semantic materials transferred from one language to another (Sole, M 2003).



On the other hand, we were informed by the vast literature, relating to the issue of switching or mixing languages, that there are a number of levels. These are CS between conversational turns, CS between sentences, CS between clauses, CS between phrases and intra-word CS. However, as realized in the present study, the overwhelming number of speakers took part in intra-sentential CS to Afar-af. In this particular study, there were slight or rare occurrences of the levels of inter-sentential CS. This is ascribed to the respondents' lack of proficiency in the coexisting languages. Concerning this, Myers-Scottn (1993), cited in Finlayson and Slabbert (1997:70) state that intra-sentential CS is "simple" insertion of allowable embedded-language islands according to unconsciously "known" constraints. In line with this in the following section, inter-sentential and intra-sentential switching will be assessed.

In the present research area, the most visible switching is among Afar-af and Amharic the majority of data deals with intra-sentential CS. Hence, this study devotes a great deal of attention to analyze the Afar-af speaking bilinguals' speech both in intra-sentential and inter-sentential CS. According to Myers-Scotton (1997: 150), the concept of ML is relevant in all CS. Both in intra-sentential CS or in CM there are a matrix language and an embedded language.

#### 4.1.1.1. Inter-sentential

Inter-sentential CS manifests switch/mix between languages at sentence level. Finlayson and Slabbert (1997: 70) remarked that inter-sentential CS is the more "skilled" code switching. In other words, this level of CS would seem to involve the more skilled production, the speaker must produce entire, well-formed sentence. Similarly, Myers-Scotton (1993: 147) mentioned that in this type of switching, to switch proficiently one needs to have a familiarity with both languages in the CS interaction. The examples listed down below have been collected through participant observation from telephone conversation in Ab'ala town.

a) be:ra                      saku                      burah                      yol                      ama:y, *kāza*                      *bī:ro*  
*abrān*  
tomorrow                      morning                      home.PREP me.PREP                      come,                      then                      office  
together  
*in ihādālān*  
IMPERF.go.IPL

come to my home tomorrow and then we will go together to the office

b) awak ta:ma liyoh, *bähu<sup>w</sup>ala inn igänaññ*

now work have.IS. latter meet.IMPERF.IPL

Now I am at work, we shall meet later

c) sora bahtem ka takku akkewaytu, *käz ih bähu<sup>w</sup>ala yihdirgit  
inday iddäggäm*

mistake commits 3MS or not, hereafter DEMO.action should.NEG. happen  
again

Whether he commits the mistake or not, this action should not happen again

Thus, the above examples are indicative of the idea of Myers-Scotton (p. 147) and Slabbert (1997: 70) that is inter-sentential CS requires good proficiency of the languages under question. Concerning reasons behind the switch of respondents' in the above examples seems to do with one of the functional modalities (met linguistic code switching) suggested by Apple and Muysken (1987:20), that is, speakers switching takes place to show their linguistic abilities.

Other CS levels that apparently occurred in the research area are language alteration across clauses and phrases. Consider the following data. In distinguishing CS from borrowing, throughout this study, it is important to know the words underlined without bolding refers to CS instance whereas the bold words, which underlined referred to borrowing instance.

d) wo ba:teh innte saga **milikkitih** mañalukten  
DEMO missed say.2M/F cow **sign**.any what.have.PERF  
Does the miss.PERF cow have any signs?

This extract is from unstructured conversation during the "Afar Daagu" 'traditional way of exchanging information among ethnic members' of two old men. They were discussing about their cattle which are in the country side. One of them tells to the other that one of his cattle is missing and asks his friend whether or not he saw or heard anything about his cow. The other person asks whether the cow has a unique sign to identify it with.

#### 4.1.1.3. Intra-sentential CS

Intra-sentential CS refers to switching of languages in the middle of sentences. It occurs when CS takes place between different languages at the sentence level. It refers to mixing or switching of languages in the middle of a sentence. Myers-Scotton, 1993b cited in Finlayson and Slabbort (1997:75) stated that in intra-sentential CS, “all sentences have a ML”. The examples below (1-24) indicate intra-sentential switches between languages. Remember once again in the following data the underlined ones are instances of CS elements and the bold underlined ones are borrowed form.

In this section, examples extracted from Afar-af conversation collected from the target population at different times and in different techniques, mainly through participant observation are presented. The languages involved are English, Tigrinya and Amharic switched into Afar-af.

##### Data taken from bureau head and unemployed young boy<sup>9</sup>

- 1) atu naharak sira limd litomantu  
2MS/F first work-experience have.2MS/FS.or.NEG  
First, do you have work experience or not
- 2) toke:k k'it'ir dabdabe koh aktubäno  
then appoint **letter** 2MS/FS.PREP write.IMPERF.1PL  
Then, we can issue you a letter of appoint
- 3) a bi:ro dumak: kabital-badet dago  
DEMO **office** from the very beginning **capital-budget** lacks  
This office from the very beginning lacks capital budget
- 4) digri ke: dibloma yalle:nimih, ta tama mageyan  
**degree** and **diploma** even if.they.have DEMO job find.IMPERF.NEG.they  
Even though they are degree and diploma holders, they will not get this job
- 5) sirfat dabbahay bi:ro<sup>1</sup>k yokaweŋ  
**law** obey.and **office**.PREP get out.PREP.my  
Obey the law and get out of my office
  - Data gathered from farmer community members in the town
- 6) kimal rade rob mahares nek bayse

---

Note that items that are offered in bold and underlining were found to be identified by monolingual Afar-af speakers

yesterday rained rain plowing us.PREP stop

The rain that rained yesterday, stopped us from plowing

7) biri rob bikkultih mameŕe

yesterday night's rain new shoots.PREP good.NEG

The rain that rained yesterday-night is not good for new shoots

- Data taken from conversation of head of woreda municipal with one community member

8) atu naharak mamälkäčča nelba:ha:y koh bihsenno

2MS/F first application letter bring.1PL.and 2MS/FS.PREP process.IS.IMPERF.  
it

- Data collected from Wakrigubi youth association

9) akkel tammullem ŕunda:neytah moral hato abtam anewaytama

here what observed.is youth.PREP **moral** help work present.NEG

Here there is no one who helps for morality of the youth

- Data collected from collective members of the community in outdoor domains

10) num ŕalama yellek fareikke gufam du:dah

man objective has wherever reach.3MS can.3MS

A man with an objective can reach any where he sets his mind on

Note that this transcription is made according to central dialect (Bender (1076), and Mahaffy (1952) cited in Belies (1976).

As clearly depicted in the above examples, it is noted that speakers make intra-sentential CS in Afar-af and Amharic. In the majority of examples, massive numbers of Amharic lexical items have infiltrated into Afar-af. For example, in (1) speakers mix N; (2) N; (3) N; (4) N; (5) N; (7) N; (8) N; (9) N; (10) ADJ; (11) ADJ.

From the above examples, it is possible to understand nouns have more susceptibility to CS into Afar-af. For instance in example (1), the speaker begins in Afar-af, then switches in the same sentence to Amharic noun 'siralimd' which is completely inserted into the host Afar-af structure. In example (2) the speaker begins with Afar-af and switches into the Amharic phrase 'k'it'ir däbdabä'.

According to Apple and Muysken (1987:172) cited in chapter two of this study with

CM, non-native items are not adopted morphologically and phonologically while with borrowing they are. This view confirms completely with the above examples. For instance, (2) is persistent with this. In other words, the non-native phonemes *k'* and *t'* (ejective sounds) were not adopted phonologically. Based on the above examples CS into Tigrinya is not observed apparently. This might be because Tigrinya has less prestige in the research area as compared to Amharic.

As can be observed from the above data there are examples involving borrowed elements from different languages. Of these languages the dominant and prominent donor language is Amharic. Amharic borrowed elements are massively used in the host Afar-af to facilitate communication and as to fill lexical gap. From the above data, words which are underlined and are bold are striking examples of borrowed words in the host language Afar. These involve words like *capital budget*, *degree diploma*, and *moral*, which are borrowed from English, and words like *däbdabä'*, *sirpat*, and *ḥalama* are loan words in Afar-af from Amharic. Besides, the term *bureau* is a loan word from French in via Amharic.

Monolingual Afar-af speakers identify all the borrowed lexicons from the said languages into Afar-af. This is consistent with the idea of Winford (2003:107), which states that CS and borrowing can be distinguished from one another by the degree of use by monolinguals and by their morphophonemic integration. šabac (1997:131), borrowing takes place both in monolinguals and bilinguals. However, bilinguals also know the rest of the borrowed lexical items.

Furthermore, in (5) the Amharic noun is borrowed with Afar-af suffix (-*k*) and in the (12) Amharic noun is borrowed with Afar-af suffix (-*i*) which has an equivalent meaning with the English definite article “the”. These suffixes are incorporated into the Amharic words.

In the example, only a few CS elements of Tigrinya into Afar-af were seen. These indicated examples in (7) and (8), *maḥräs* and *buk'ult*. In Afar-af the first borrowed element “*maḥras*” is adopted with the change of /ä/ →/a/ and the latter lexical element is *buk'ult* →*bukult* ‘New shoots’ is not adopted to Afar-af.

In order to analyze the phonetic treatment of the loanwords first we have to examine the phonetic system of Afar-af. As has been clearly depicted in the above examples

Amharic loan words have extensively infiltrated into Afar-af and for all practical purposes they have become Afar-af words.

Hence, it is useful to compare and contrast Amharic phonemes with Afar-af phonemes. For the purpose of this study most important phonemes that are susceptible to change will be discussed below. We shall now investigate the treatment of the Amharic phonemes in the Afar-af loanwords. The correspondences deal only with the consonant phonemes.<sup>10</sup>

**Affricate:** Amharic *ñ, š, ž, č* = Af. *n, s, d, and s*

**Ejectives:** Amharic *k', t', p'* = Af. *k, t, b*

All the above stated Amharic phonemes are replaced by the nearest sound in the recipient language Afar-af (see table 17). The following reasons can be drawn. First, this modification process primarily means to give the borrowed words new shapes different from the donor languages and to make the form compatible with the host language. Second, the need to change the phoneme has to do with the absence of the phoneme in the phoneme system of Afar-af. The third reason seems to fill the lexical gap. Similarly, there is another modification of borrowed word. For instance, in example (11), the word “chat” changed into “gat”. In this /č/ sound is substituted by /g/ and this reason is similar to the second reason in the above demonstration.

The following chart consists of the consonant inventory of Afar-af phones.

---

<sup>10</sup> The names of languages are abbreviated as follows: Af. = Afar-af, Tnya. = Tigrinya, Eng. = English, and Ar. = Arabic

Consonants	Bilabial	Labiodentals	Dental	Alveolar	Retroflex	Palatal	Velar	Pharyngeal	Glottal
stop: voiceless			t				K		
voiced	b		d		d (ḍ)		G		
Nasal	m		n						
fricative: voiceless		f		s				x (ħ)	h
voiced								c (ʕ)	
Lateral			l						
flapped/rolled				r					
Glides	w					y			

table 17: chart of Afar-af phonemes

(Adopted from Bliese 1981)

Concerning the vowel quantity it should be kept in mind that Afar-af preserves the short and long vowel system at variance from Amharic. In other words, Afar-af like many Cushitic languages has a five vowel systems. These are:

<u>vowels:</u>	short	long
	i	ii (i:)
	ee	ee (e:)
	a	aa (a:)
	u	uu (u:)
	o	oo (o:)

Note that the above chart (17) is adopted from Bliese (1981:1-2) with the exception of a handful phonemes shown in parentheses. In the case of consonant phonemes, phoneme /d/ with bar inside the circle is no more in use in the current orthography of Afar-af and substituted by /x/=ḍ/. Besides, despite the fact that phonemes /c/ and /ʕ/ exist in the present orthography they represent different sounds. In other words, as can

be seen from the above formerly /x/ used to be equivalent with /h/ and /c/ used equally with /ʕ/. However, now this is not the case and while /c/ is equivalent with /h/, /x/ is equivalent with /d/. For example, the term ‘Afar’ used to be written as (cafar), but now it is written as Afar (self-name Qafar).

Another data for CS found from the press conference is held on 12 March, ETV Afar Program by Ali Ibrahim head of Afar Pastoral, Agriculture and Rural Development Office in Ab'ala woreda. In the data CS Afar-into-Amharic has been observed. The following two sentences illustrate this.

25) dolat            neh            tehehtan        männoh            arahal  
 government 1PL.PREP give.PERF animal nutrition.PREP place.PREP  
atkilttite ke: firafire    aysabakuk        geytimna  
 fruit.PL and up.IMPER fruit.PL    grow.PROG    find.1PL

We are planting trees and nursing fruits in the place where the government gave us land for animal nutrition

26) barri kebelelah            mango silt'ānani amhawuk    geytimta  
 rural kebeles.PL.PREP    many training.PL undertaking find.IMPERF  
 For rural kebeles much trainings are being undertaken

The above two examples illustrate the existence of CS between two languages. For instance, in (25) the ML is Afar whereas the switched element /fire/ 'fruit' with its reduplicated form 'fira-fire/ 'fruits' that encode plurality, that is, commonly used both in Amharic and Tigrinya is a CS element.

In the case of example (26), in similar fashion the switched code is Amharic and the suffix /-ni/ which Afar-af plural marker is added. The evidence for the switched term from Amharic is the presence of the ejective /t'/. In the same sentence, there is an instance of borrowing, which is /kebele/ 'small village' taken by the ML Afar-af.

#### 4.1.2. Borrowing

Borrowing is a universal phenomena and very common for all languages of the world. Campbell Lyle (1998:62) states borrowing, "... is not restricted to just lexical items taken from one language to another; any linguistic material--sounds, phonological rules, grammatical morphemes, syntactic patterns, semantic associations, discourse strategies or whatever-can be borrowed, that is, can be taken over from a foreign language so that it becomes part of the borrowing language". Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987: 164) states, "it is hard to imagine a language that has not borrowed words from some other language, just as there is no culture that has developed entirely without acquiring some structural property from another language that is contemporary to it. The acquired language will be called "borrowing language," the language from which the property is acquired will be called "source language". Winford, (2003) cited in Mesfin Wodajo (2009:18) identifies the type of borrowing between languages, as structural or lexica, and indicates that they are determined by the degree of contact. Intense contact may enhance structural borrowing while casual contact is limited to lexical borrowing. Biliese (1970:7) states that lexical evidence of borrowing has a special place in pointing out sources of cultural innovations. The evidence of borrowing can often be found in unusual phonological pattern, or whether the language has a long recorded history, in the introduction of a term pre-existent only in a contact language. Different languages vary in the degree of their willingness to accept lexical borrowings from other languages. But unless some nationalistic pride, culturalist language borrowing, hardly any language will remain "pure" where cultures are in contact.

Apple and Muysken (1987:165-166) mentions the following reasons why borrowing takes place in many different social and cultural contexts:

- a) Cultural influence result because of the dominance of minority languages by the majority culture. An existence of cultural loans in a recipient language to represent new concept can be taken as evidence;
- b) In existence of two native words sounding so much alike, there is a need to replace one by a foreign word so as to resolve potential ambiguity;
- c) A word could be introduced unconsciously into recipient language by intensive bilingualism.

In line with this, Haugen, 1969, cited in Grosjean, (1982:312) dichotomize lexical borrowing as necessary and unnecessary. According to him, the former fills lexical gap in the borrowing language and the latter shows the borrowing language speakers' ignorance of their language. Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987:174) state that "...ignorance may lead to low esteem to the recipient language which on the other hand causes language loss".

The present study will deal with loan words from different languages into Afar-af. However, the study only concerned with lexical borrowing since the contact among the ethnic groups seems to be casual. As Amharic lexicon is pervasively observed in Afar-af, the prime focus of this study deals with borrowing elements in Afar-af from different languages and mainly from Amharic.

When a certain element of a language is borrowed from another language, it can be either with modification or without. In the following examples borrowing of elements both modified and unmodified were pointed out by taking some loan words from Amharic, Tigrinya and Arabic into Afar-af. For the purpose of this study the types of borrowing we are going to deal with has dichotomized into two categories as superfluous elements and loans elements. Superfluous borrowing is kind of borrowing in which certain lexical element is borrowed by the speaker of other language speakers in the presence of genuine equivalent term.

Amharic loan words in Afar-af pass through some phonological and morphological processes of modification.

<u>Phonological Process</u>				
27)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
a)	higg	higgi	'law'	i → i and suffix (-i)
b)	timhirt	timhrti	'education'	i → i and suffix (-i)
c)	wānjäl	wendeli	'crime'	i → e and suffix (-i)
d)	māngist	mingisti	'government'	i → i and suffix (-i)
e)	silk	silki	'phone'	i → i and suffix (-i)

As evident from the above examples (27), Afar-af takes some sort of modification, which is, adding suffix /-i/ into the Amharic loan word. All the above examples have

undergone a phonological process in the language. It is a phonological process since it merely added at the end of the word with no meaning. In examples (a-e), the roots have undergone this process. For example, *higg* 'law' is borrowed from Amharic into Afar-af with no variation in meaning and only by adding suffix /-i/. We observe from the above examples that Afar-af consists of many loan elements from Amharic with certain modification.

Another kind of phonological process which is carried out when certain loan words from Amharic are taken into Afar-af has to do with another kind of phonological modification, which passes through some adaptation of foreign elements into the host language--Afar-af.

28)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
f)	kätäma	katama:	'town'	ä → a
g)	däbtär	dabtar	'book'	ä → a
h)	läslassa	laslassa	'beverage' (soft drink)	ä → a
i)	däbdabbe	dabdabe	'letter'	ä → a
j)	si bsäba	sabsaba	'meeting'	i & ä → a
k)	bärbärre	barbare	'pepper'	ä → a

The above data shows that in the course of borrowing Amharic loan words into Afar-af the vowel forms changes are visible. Due to the reason that Afar-af does have mid central vowels /ä/ and (i) in its vowel system, these vowels change the into low front vowel /a/, the front vowel (-i) as shown in the examples.(see the vowel system of Afar-af in the preceding section).

### Morphological Process

The greatest numbers of loan words coming from other languages into Afar-af in the case of nouns take some kind of modification. The most common morphological structure in Afar-af is affixation of roots that are drawn from Amharic and other donor languages. The striking examples are:

29)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
	mämhi ranočč	mamhirwa	'teachers'	očč→wa
	mäsrbetočč	misrabetwa	'offices'	očč→wa
	hakimočč	hakimwa	'doctors'	očč→wa

exist in the present orthography they represent different sounds. In other words, as can be seen from the above formerly /x/ used to be equivalent with /h/ and /c/ used equally with /ʕ/. However, now this is not the case and while /c/ is equivalent with /h/, /x/ is equivalent with /d/. For example, the term ‘Afar’ used to be written as (cafar), but now it is written as Afar (self-name Qafar).

Another data for CS found from the press conference is held on 12 March, ETV Afar Program by Ali Ibrahim head of Afar Pastoral, Agriculture and Rural Development Office in Ab'ala woreda. In the data CS Afar-into-Amharic has been observed. The following two sentences illustrate this.

25) dolat        neh        tehehtan    männoh        arahal  
 government 1PL.PREP give.PERF animal nutrition.PREP place.PREP  
atkilttite ke: firafire    aysabakuk    geytimna  
 fruit.PL and up.IMPER fruit.PL grow.PROG find.1PL

We are planting trees and nursing fruits in the place where the government gave us land for animal nutrition

26) barri kebelelah        mango silt'ānani    amhawuk    geytimta  
 rural kebeles.PL.PREP many training.PL undertaking find.IMPERF  
 For rural kebeles much trainings are being undertaken

The above two examples illustrate the existence of CS between two languages. For instance, in (25) the ML is Afar whereas the switched element /fire/ 'fruit' with its reduplicated form 'fira-fire/ 'fruits' that encode plurality, that is, commonly used both in Amharic and Tigrinya is a CS element.

In the case of example (26), in similar fashion the switched code is Amharic and the suffix /-ni/ which Afar-af plural marker is added. The evidence for the switched term from Amharic is the presence of the ejective /t'/. In the same sentence, there is an instance of borrowing, which is /kebele/ 'small village' taken by the ML Afar-af.

#### 4.1.2. Borrowing

Borrowing is a universal phenomena and very common for all languages of the world. Campbell Lyle (1998:62) states borrowing, "... is not restricted to just lexical items taken from one language to another; any linguistic material--sounds, phonological rules, grammatical morphemes, syntactic patterns, semantic associations, discourse strategies or whatever-can be borrowed, that is, can be taken over from a foreign language so that it becomes part of the borrowing language". Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987: 164) states, "it is hard to imagine a language that has not borrowed words from some other language, just as there is no culture that has developed entirely without acquiring some structural property from another language that is contemporary to it. The acquired language will be called "borrowing language," the language from which the property is acquired will be called "source language". Winford, (2003) cited in Mesfin Wodajo (2009:18) identifies the type of borrowing between languages, as structural or lexica, and indicates that they are determined by the degree of contact. Intense contact may enhance structural borrowing while casual contact is limited to lexical borrowing. Biliese (1970:7) states that lexical evidence of borrowing has a special place in pointing out sources of cultural innovations. The evidence of borrowing can often be found in unusual phonological pattern, or whether the language has a long recorded history, in the introduction of a term pre-existent only in a contact language. Different languages vary in the degree of their willingness to accept lexical borrowings from other languages. But unless some nationalistic pride, culturalist language borrowing, hardly any language will remain "pure" where cultures are in contact.

Apple and Muysken (1987:165-166) mentions the following reasons why borrowing takes place in many different social and cultural contexts:

- a) Cultural influence result because of the dominance of minority languages by the majority culture. An existence of cultural loans in a recipient language to represent new concept can be taken as evidence;
- b) In existence of two native words sounding so much alike, there is a need to replace one by a foreign word so as to resolve potential ambiguity;
- c) A word could be introduced unconsciously into recipient language by intensive bilingualism.

In line with this, Haugen, 1969, cited in Grosjean, (1982:312) dichotomize lexical borrowing as necessary and unnecessary. According to him, the former fills lexical gap in the borrowing language and the latter shows the borrowing language speakers' ignorance of their language. Similarly, Appel and Muysken (1987:174) state that "...ignorance may lead to low esteem to the recipient language which on the other hand causes language loss".

The present study will deal with loan words from different languages into Afar-af. However, the study only concerned with lexical borrowing since the contact among the ethnic groups seems to be casual. As Amharic lexicon is pervasively observed in Afar-af, the prime focus of this study deals with borrowing elements in Afar-af from different languages and mainly from Amharic.

When a certain element of a language is borrowed from another language, it can be either with modification or without. In the following examples borrowing of elements both modified and unmodified were pointed out by taking some loan words from Amharic, Tigrinya and Arabic into Afar-af. For the purpose of this study the types of borrowing we are going to deal with has dichotomized into two categories as superfluous elements and loans elements. Superfluous borrowing is kind of borrowing in which certain lexical element is borrowed by the speaker of other language speakers in the presence of genuine equivalent term.

Amharic loan words in Afar-af pass through some phonological and morphological processes of modification.

<u>Phonological Process</u>				
27)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
a)	higg	higgi	'law'	i → i and suffix (-i)
b)	timhirt	timhrti	'education'	i → i and suffix (-i)
c)	wänjäl	wendeli	'crime'	i → e and suffix (-i)
d)	mängist	mingisti	'government'	i → i and suffix (-i)
e)	silki	silki	'phone'	i → i and suffix (-i)

As evident from the above examples (27), Afar-af takes some sort of modification,

which is, adding suffix /-i/ into the Amharic loan word. All the above examples have undergone a phonological process in the language. It is a phonological process since it merely added at the end of the word with no meaning. In examples (a-e), the roots have undergone this process. For example, *hi gg* 'law' is borrowed from Amharic into Afar-af with no variation in meaning and only by adding suffix /-i/. We observe from the above examples that Afar-af consists of many loan elements from Amharic with certain modification.

Another kind of phonological process which is carried out when certain loan words from Amharic are taken into Afar-af has to do with another kind of phonological modification, which passes through some adaptation of foreign elements into the host language--Afar-af.

28)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
f)	kätäma	katama:	'town'	ä → a
g)	däbtär	dabtar	'book'	ä → a
h)	läslassa	laslassa	'beverage' (soft drink)	ä → a
i)	däbdabbe	dabdabe	'letter'	ä → a
j)	sibsäba	sabsaba	'meeting'	i & ä → a
k)	bärbärre	barbare	'pepper'	ä → a

The above data shows that in the course of borrowing Amharic loan words into Afar-af the vowel forms changes are visible. Due to the reason that Afar-af does have mid central vowels /ä/ and (i) in its vowel system, these vowels change the into low front vowel /a/, the front vowel (-i) as shown in the examples.(see the vowel system of Afar-af in the preceding section).

### Morphological Process

The greatest numbers of loan words coming from other languages into Afar-af in the case of nouns take some kind of modification. The most common morphological structure in Afar-af is affixation of roots that are drawn from Amharic and other donor languages. The striking examples are:

29)	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>	
	mämhiranočč	mamhirwa	'teachers'	očč→wa
	mäsrbetočč	misrabetwa	'offices'	očč→wa

hakimočč                      hakimwa                      ‘doctors’                      očč→wa

As can be seen from the above the examples, suffix /-očč/ ‘PL’ marker in Amharic is changed into Afar-af /-wa/ which has equivalent meaning in Afar-af.

Languages can make the contacts with one another in numerous situations. These will be presented present sequentially. For the purpose of this study, of the numerous ways in which lexical borrowing can be viewed the researcher looks for loan words in the areas of political, transactional, commodities, furniture, educational, and religious instances. Doing so the main purpose of this study is to show whether Afar-af is making language shifting or not in the research area.

**Data gathered from political terminologies**

30) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u> <sup>11</sup>
l) girazmačč	giradmat	‘commander of the left (title of distinction)
m) k’aññazmačč	kennadmat	“                      right                      ”
n) däččazmačč	deddadmat	“
o) fitawrari	fitawra:ri	“
p) balabbat	balabbat	‘land lord’
q) nigus	nagus	‘king’ <sup>12</sup>
r) mäk <sup>w</sup> anint	makabantu	‘noble’
s) mängist	mingist	‘government’

This list shows there is borrowing of lexicon (vocabulary) from Amharic. An interesting examples from in the above examples is change of (čč→dd; z→d; j→d; čč→t). These loan words indicate that there was casual contact between the two ethno-linguistic groups (see Winford, 2003). Besides, the words mentioned above give traces of the Amhara had prestige over the Afar in terms of their political interaction. The implication of this lexical borrowing seems to have function of filling the lexical gaps through borrowing the newly imported terms by making little

<sup>11</sup> For instance, in the research area the researcher found Afar individuals many of them were sons and grandsons of *Kennadmat* Abdalla and one of them was the grandson of *Gradmat* Haydera. (government).

<sup>12</sup> Blicse, Loren (1970:15-16) stated that the lack of cohesion and national unity of the Afar through history most likely means they had no national political structure and thereby had no use for terms such as *nagus*, *makabantu*, *misili* (local governor), *bolus* (police), *askartu* (servant or national guardsman), *bosta* (letter), *mingist* (government).

phonological modifications.

#### Data gathered from names for commodities

In line with this, additional sources came via Amharic loan words from commodities purchased. We find the following Amharic loans in Afar-af:

31) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
birtukan	burtukana	'orange'
lomi	lomunu	'lemon'
karot	karutu	'carrot'
timatim	timatimi	'tomato'
šinkurt	sungurti	'onion'
samuna	sabuna	'soap'
bärbäre	barbare	'pepper'
k'ibat	kibata	'ointment'
širo	siro	'shiro' (an Eth.n stew)
zäyit	deyti	'oil'

Some of these words have borrowed regardless of Afar terms in use. In relation to the first four loan words, they are already loan words in Amharic, which have now gone from Amharic to Afar-af. The rest of the loan words are directly from Amharic. For instance, the genuine Afar term for the term "onion" is *basal*. Therefore, the purpose of the above Amharic loan words in Afar-af seems to have filling lexical gap, since most of these terms are produced and coined names by the producers and traders. In other words, this borrowing seems to have emanated from lack of concepts and linguistic forms.

#### Data collected from market place during interaction

Another very important set of borrowing lexicons emanated from trade (transactions). This is particularly evident in the contact through trade between the Afar and Tegar. Because these two groups have lived together for a long time in the town, it is likely that these people have had extensive contacts. As was noted in the preceding section, in particular concerning language use pattern of respondents in the market domain, it has been proved that Tigrinya is extensively used in this domain. The following is a case in point.

In the situation in which several languages are spoken in the same area and mostly by

the same people for a long time, it is likely that language to influence each other. The coexistence of Tegarü with Afar inhabitants have led to considerable lexical influence:

32) <u>Tnya.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u> <sup>13</sup>
dunku <sup>w</sup> an	dukkan	‘shop’
šärf	serfi	‘change’
mänzo	mendo	‘25 cent’
ʔalad	alad	‘75 cent’

As the data clearly signify these words are borrowed from Tigrinya. In Afar the equivalent term for “shop” is *bada š-araḥa*; for the term exchange of money is *ma:li-barsa* ; for 25 cents is *laba:tana ke: kona šastiya*; for “shilling”, *konttom šastiya*; and for “Alad” *malhina taban ke: ko:na šastiya*. In this particular situation, all of the lexical items that are borrowed from Tigrinya to Afar-af imply the use of Tigrinya loans though genuine lexical elements exist.

#### Superfluous words

Some words are borrowed from the donor language (Amharic in this case) in the existence of genuine words in the recipient language (Afar-af). This kind of borrowing is usually termed as superfluous borrowing. Consider the examples below in (33, 34, and 35).

#### Data gathered from names of furniture

Furniture is another source for loanwords from Amharic. The three loan words below come from furniture.

33) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
wänbär	wanberi	‘chair’
alga	alga	‘bed’

Some of these words have been borrowed in spite of the fact that Afar its own terms in used. For example, *korsi* is the most commonly use Afar term for chair, and *šarkayto or ka šada* is the word for bed. In addition, some phonological modifications, are also made.

#### Data gathered from educational terminologies

Modern education is another determinant factor (source) of loan word in Afar-af.

34) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
-----------------	------------	--------------

---

Amharic loan words borrowed into Afar are: *gebaya* “market”, *midan* “scale”, *safari* “to weight”, *siling* “shilling” (Bliese, 1981:16).

timhirt	timhirti	'education'
mämhir	mamhiri	'teacher'
timhirt-bet	timhirtibeti	'school'

The equivalent terms in Afar to the above stated loan words are read as *baritto* for education; *barse:na* for teacher; and *baritto bura (ʕari)* for school.

35) <u>Amh.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
killil	killil (raka:ay)	'region'
zone (originally English)	donu (rasu)	'zone'
wäräda	warada (daʕa:ra)	'woreda/district'
k'äbäle	kabale (awda)	'kebele' <sup>14</sup>

In the above-cited examples, the words inside parenthesis are the native lexicons of Afar-af for the borrowed words, which are under question. These superfluous words show the existence of Amharic loan words in Afar-af. In these particular cases, the Amharic loan words used without any modification. Most of the terms recently introduced into the Afar, have had indigenous names. However, the data reveals that Amharic loan words are used instead of the equivalent Afar terms.

#### Data gathered from religious based terminologies<sup>15</sup>

Another main source of borrowing in Afar-af is due to religious contact with Arabic. In other words, the religious influence has led to numerous loan words via the religion. According to Leslau (1990: 27) there are various reasons for the existence of Arabic loanwords in Ethiopic. Besides, he stated that Arab speakers found commercial opportunities in Ethiopia and became the merchants of the country. They also found political entities there, and converted certain segments of the Ethiopian population to Islam. Consequently, the Arabs<sup>16</sup> overall live dispersed within their Ethiopian neighbors. This may be the case for contact between Afar and Arab speakers. For all the reasons mentioned by Bliese (1970), it is likely to find certain number of Arabic loan words in Afar-af. Consider the following examples:

36) <u>Ar.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
----------------	------------	--------------

<sup>14</sup> Kebele smallest administrative unit

<sup>15</sup> Edward Ullendorff cited in Bliese (1970:17) states the entrance of Islam into the coastal areas of Ethiopia from the 10 th to 12 th c.

<sup>16</sup> It is often difficult to know whether an Arabic loan word in Amharic comes directly from an Arabic or through intermediary of another Semitic Ethiopic or Cushitic language Leslau (1990 )

šäk	se:ki	'an individual who know holy Quran'
ʕalim	ʕalim	'religious knowledgeable person'
ramadan	ramadan	'month fasting'
ʕulama	ʕoloma	'religious knowledgeable persons'
zuhur	dohri	'7 o' lock prayer'
ʕasir	ʕasri	'10 o' lock prayer'
maXrib	magrib	'1 o' lock prayer'
ʕiša	ʕisa	'2 o' lock prayer'
adduniya	addoniya	'possession of this world'
ḥayat	ḥayat	'being alive'
duʕa	duʕa	'benediction'

These loan words fully adopted in the Afar-af as religious are principal indicators of the existence of Arabic loan words in Afar-af. Besides, to adopt the loan words Afar change (z→d and š→s). Furthermore, religion is the main means of language contact.

Another source of borrowing is observed in terminologies related with crown.

37)	<u>Ar.</u>	<u>Af.</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
	rais	amoyta	'emperor'
	sult'an	sultan	'king'

In the case of the first example, that is, *amoyta* 'emperor' the borrowing type is quite different from the rest of the examples. It is loan shift borrowing. The meaning adopted as it is while is the form substituted into the native Afar-af (see Appel and Muysken). However, in the case of second example the borrowing type is loan borrowing since this example exhibits both the meaning and the form (see also Appel and Muysken).

In line with this, the majority of proper nouns (personal names) are highly borrowed from Arabic including my full-name Mohammed Ibrahim Usman.

38)	<u>Ar.</u>	<u>Af.</u>
	hawa	hawa
	ʕabdu	ʕabdu
	ʕaiša	ʕeysa
	ʕali	ʕali

As seen in the above examples, some of proper nouns that are mentioned and a myriad number of names, not mentioned, are loan words from Arabic into Afar-af.

On the other hand, because of language contact, an immense number of very interesting phenomena are experienced. The present vivid social mobility brings forth extensive contact between cultures and languages, this leading to leveling differences and mixing of languages, and bringing instability and variation. Eventually, people try to reduce these variations through mixing codes and through assimilations (borrowing) in their course of interaction. According to Weinrich, Uriel (1968: 90), 'the relationship of the culture to one another in a particular geographic habit determines what one group learns from the other and defines such gaps in the vocabulary of each group as may need filling by borrowing'. In line with this issue, Bilese (1970:1) states that the close relation between a culture and its vocabulary is obvious enough for it to be generally assumed that an acquaintance with the other. He further states that the relation between a lexicon and culture is obvious when one recalls the list of Eskimo words and Arabic words for camel, which ethnographers have used to show cultural interest. In all the above examples, we have seen Afar-af is the borrowing language. However, in example (38) a few examples of words borrowed by Amharic from Afar-af are presented. The following examples are striking ones.

39) <u>Af.</u>	<u>Amh.</u>	<u>Gloss</u> <sup>17</sup>
gile	gile	'big knife'
bakal	bäkäl	'goat-kid'

As has been mentioned in chapter two, Campbel (2000: 73) geographical and ecological clue is one of the clues in which borrowed item or element of a language can be identified. In line with this that, the word /gile/ refers to one of the cultural assets (value) of Afar the people. Others particularly Tigray and Amhara people, in the research area also commonly use this term. The motive behind the borrowing seems to be to fill the cultural gap between ethnic groups. In other words, because these two

---

<sup>17</sup> Joseph Greenberg cited in Bliese (1970:4) in many ways a lexicon "mirror" to culture.

ethno-linguistic groups do not possess /gile/ as a cultural value or it is only confined to (a core) value for Afar, it is possible to say this word is borrowed from Afar. This type of borrowing is loanwords (Haugen cited in Appel and Muysken, (1987: 164)).

In a similar fashion, the word /bakal/ 'small goat' refers to male and believed to be Afar because of the reason that this people are predominantly pastoral whose way of life is engaged in animal rearing. Afar is known by the practice of eating the meat of /bakel/. They also provide the meat of /bakel/ for honorable guests. In spite of this, other linguistic groups, in particular, Amhara borrows the word, but in this case, the mode is adoption with slight modification that is the change of /ä/ into /a/. However, the meaning remains unchanged.

To sum up from the whole lot of examples above it is remarkable that many Amharic, few Tigrinya and considerable Arabic elements have been borrowed into Afar-af. In light of the above stated scholars (Alitchison, 1981; Grosjeena, 1982; and Appel and Muysken, 1987) views all cited in Mesfin (2009: 19-20), the adoption of elements from these languages signify language shift. This is also evident in the preceding section (i. e., language use). In general, the linguistic data offered in this section demonstrate a linguistic sign of shift of Afar-af in favor of the above stated languages in Ab'ala town.

In the examples above the functions of borrowing being diverse is concerned mainly with the functional value that the respondents allocate to borrowing between English and Amharic. English has different roles from the borrowing of Amharic. While English has the highest status, as an international language of education and in the higher institutions of the education system in the country borrowings are marked indications of this. Amharic is used the official language of both sthe country and the region and widely used in interactions among various ethnic groups.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### 5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

#### 5.1. SUMMARY

The main objective of this study was to assess the language use pattern in Ab'ala town with respect to the town dwellers. In order to achieve the stated objective, basic questions were raised regarding proficiency, choice of language in different domains, use of MTs, and perception of respondents towards each language. In attempting to address the questions, data were collected through self-reported questionnaires, participant observations, and recordings from the targeted population.

Chapter two concerned the review of related literature and related works so as to make a basis for the discussions of the findings. The review of related literature involves language contact results such as CS, borrowing, LM and language shift. Besides, some related works are reviewed in order to ensure the importance of this study.

The third chapter was devoted to data analysis on language use patterns. The study employed mixed (qualitative and quantitative) survey method to analyze the data based on the basic research questions. The obtained data were calculated using percentage, tables, and mean scores. The remaining data are analyzed qualitatively. After analysis and interpretations of data are made both quantitatively and qualitatively, the findings were drawn.

The fourth chapter emphasizes on a few language contact results. These are CS, CM and borrowing. The fifth relies on conclusions and recommendations.

#### 5.2. CONCLUSION

Based on the major findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

The patterns of language use are analyzed in Ab'ala town. Despite the considerable differences in the language use behavior of the population in the town as the current data indicates the difference of respondents' proficiency in each language in the four language skills reveals that there is varying standards of proficiency among respondents. Majority of respondents have better skills (in listening and speaking)

languages such as Amharic, Tigrinya, and Afar-af. This reveals that respondents' proficiency in Amharic is much more than their proficiency in the rest of languages. They are slightly less proficient in reading and writing skill in the same languages. The good proficiency in these languages is emanated from difference in role of the two languages (Amharic and Afar-af) in education and ethno-linguistic vitality (in demography) of Tigrinya speaking community in the area. However, they are not proficient in all the skills in Afan Oromo and Saho. Therefore, listening and speaking are the two first learned skills.

The Amharic MT speakers use their MT more often in contexts of Oaths, letter writing, and counting. Similarly, Tigrinya MT speakers use their MT more often than the rest MT speakers in dream. Besides, Afar-af MT speakers used their MT more often in the context of TV viewing. This shows Afar-af and Tigrinya speakers reduce the use of their MT in favor of Amharic. Therefore, this seems a clear shift of languages in the area including Afar-af to Amharic.

In the less powerful domains, that is, market Tigrinya is used predominantly followed by Afar-af. This is because of the simple reason that the number of Tigrinya speakers is greater than that of the rest of the languages spoken in the town. Afar-af is used exclusively in Wakrigubi Kebele while use of solely Tigrinya has been exhibited in Wuhdet Kebele. Despite the use of Afar-af and Tigrinya in the family domain, Amharic is the dominantly used language in the family domain. In intermarriage respondents use mostly Amharic at home. On the other hand, Amharic has shown dominance even in less powerful domains (i.e. friendship) domain.

On the other hand, in the powerful domains such as school, office, health center, police station, and courtroom Amharic is used as dominant language. Hence, Amharic is the de-facto official language in Ab'ala town. Besides, in a religion domain respondents predominantly use Afar-af alternatively with Arabic to communicate with Sheikhs and Tigrinya alternatively with Ge'ez used to communicate with Priests. Generally, Amharic dominates in the domains that are in question. In other words, Amharic is likely to have dominant function in all the powerful domains. This implies that Amharic is the major means of communication in Ab'ala town.

All of the respondents showed negative attitude towards Afan Oromo and Saho in all the raised issues. However, among positive statements, in statements such as academic issues, sexual issues, sociopolitical issues, and most prestigious language in

the town, the majority of respondents express favorable attitude with the use of Amharic. On the contrary, in one of the positive statements, that is, in cultural issues, majority of respondents revealed negative attitude. On the other hand, regarding negative statements, respondents showed their positive attitude of using Amharic in daily topic and using as vehicular language. Concerning Tigrinya language in for positive statements, only in one statement (i.e. in cultural) majority of respondents replied their positive attitude towards Tigrinya whereas from the negatively stated statements in statement (i.e. Tigrinya as vehicular) respondents replied positive attitude. Finally, as the study indicates the majority of respondents reflected positive attitude towards Afar-af in sociopolitical, cultural, as the most prestigious language in Ab'ala, and equally the most vehicular. Generally, respondents have positive attitudes in both Amharic and Afar-af in the majority of attitudinal statements.

As resultant from language contact, CS between Amharic and the host language Afar-af was exhibited. Even though the speaker first language was Afar-af the more active (dominant) languages such as Amharic, English, Tigrinya and Arabic determine the speech behavior of speakers in the town. The overwhelming majority of lexicons are borrowed into Afar-af either directly or indirectly taken from Amharic. However, Arabic through religious contact; English through education are dominant languages as sources of loan words in Afar-af. Tigrinya is a less contributing language in terms of borrowing into Afar-af. This may reasonably be accounted for by bilingualism of the population in Ab'ala town, whose first languages are Afar-af, Tigrinya, Afan Oromo, Saho who obtain their formal education in Amharic. Although many of their every day interactions involve their MT language, words and concepts of Amharic become more accessible than Afar-af (MT) language.

The motives for borrowing lexical items from the said languages have to do with the lack of concepts and linguistic form in the MTs. Concerning the reason behind code C S and two main reasons can be drawn: One and the most common reason for the occurrences of CS has to do with speakers having no competence for using the target language properly for a particular lexical item. This process correlated with the lack of proficiency in the target language (Afar-af). In such occasions speakers employ CS in which lexical elements from other languages bridge the gaps resulting from language incompetence. This mechanism functions as defensive mechanism for speakers as it gives opportunity to continue communication or in order to avoid gaps. The second need for CS has to do with speakers' lack of concept in the target language and speakers have no term, which is well expressive, equivalent for using the target language explanation for a particular lexical item.

## REFERENCES

- Afshar, Iraj. 1989. *The Farsi Language in Azerbaijan (in Farsi)*. Tehran: Baniade Moghoofate Dr. M. Afshar Yazdi. An introduction to Language and Linguistics of Africa. Oxford: University press. *An introduction*. Cambridge: University press.
- Appel, René and Peter, Muysken. 1987. *Language contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Assebe Buli. 1981. "*Multilingualism in Kistanne Nationality*". MA Thesis (unpublished). AAU.
- Backer, C. 2006. "Psycho-Social Analysis in Language Policy". In: Ricento, T. (Ed.). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Black-well publishing, 210-228.
- Baker, C. 1992. *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Beliese, L. 1976. Introduction. Bender, et al.(eds.). *Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. London: Oxford university press.
- Bender, Lionel. 1976. Introduction. *Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopian*. In Bender, M.L. et al. (eds.). , London: Oxford university press.
- Bliese, Loren F.1976. Afar. Bender et al. *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. USA, Michingan State University.
- Bloomfield, L. 1935. *Language*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Campbell, Lyle. 2004. *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh University.
- Cooper, L, R. and Carpenter, S. 1976. Language in the Market. In Bender, et al. (eds.). *Language in Ethiopia*. London: Oxford University press, 244-255.
- Cooper, L.R. 1970. The Description of Language Use in Ethiopia. In Tom Gorma (ed.). *Journal of the Language Association of Eastern Africa*. Nirobi.
- Coulmas, Florian. 1997. *The Hand Book of Sociolinguistics*. Berlin: Blackwell publisher.
- CSA. (2007). *Statistics Abstract*. Addis Ababa.
- Dworetzky, Jhon P. 1988. *Psychology (third edition)*. St. Paul; West Publishing Company.(ed.).
- Edwards, J., Ed. 1996. "Symbolic ethnicity and language". J. Hutchinson and A. Smith (eds). *Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fasold, Ralph. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Fishman, J.A. 1971. The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Social Science. In Fishman, J. A. (ed.). *Advances in Sociology of Language*. (pp.217-404). Paris: Mouton-The Hague.
- Fishman, J.A. 2001. "Why it is so hard to save a threatened language?" J.A. Fishman(ed.). *Can Threaten Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, revisited: A 21<sup>st</sup> centenary perspective (pp.1-22)*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Fraenk, Jack R. and Norman, E. Wallen. (200). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). USA: The McGraw-Hill companies, Inc.
- Gada Melba. 1988. *Oromia: An Introduction*. Kartoum, Sudan.
- Gebre Hishe. 2008. *Language use and Identity of Children Born to the Tigrinya Speaking Community Living in Addis Ababa*. Un Published MA Thesis. Addis Ababa.
- Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life with Two Languages. An Introduction to Bilingualism*. England: Harvard University Press Hague.
- Hoffmann, Charlette. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. New York: London Group UK Limited.
- Holmes, Janet. 1992. *An introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman publisher.
- <http://www.wikipedia>, the free encyclopedia
- Hudson, R.A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*: Cambridge. Cambridge: University press.
- Kamwangamalu, Nkonko. 2000. Language in contact. Webb and Kcmbo-sure (eds.). *African Voices: An Introduction to the language and linguistics of Africa*: Oxford University Press.
- Kelemework Tafere. 2006. "*Indigenous institutions of conflict resolution among the Ab'ala Afar of*". Un published MA Thesis. Addis ababa.
- Keshavard, M. 2001. The Role of Social Context, Intimacy, and Distance in the Choice of Formsof Address. *International Journal of the Sociology of language*. Rudolf F. and Damir, K. (eds.). PP 5-18. New York: Mouton De Gureyter.
- Leslau, W. 1990. *Arabic Loan words in Ethiopian Semitic*. Germany: Ottoharrassowitz. Wiesbaden.
- Macnamara, J. 1967a. *The Bilingual Linguistic Performance*. Journal of Social Issues, 23, 58-77.
- Mesfin Wodajo. 2009. *Language maintenance Among Afan Oromo Speakers in Addis Ababa*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Addis ababa.
- Myers-Scottn. 1997. "We just mix: CSin a South Africa township". *International Journal of the Society of Languages, Moha, Ennaj and Joshua A. Fishman*

- (eds.), 65-69 New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Myers-Scott. 1997. "We just mix: CSin a South Africa township". *International Journal of the Society of Languages*, Moha, Ennaj and Joshua A. Fishman (eds.), 65-69 New York: Mouton de Gruyter. *north-eastern Ethiopia" people*. MA Thesis (unpublished). AAU. Perspective (pp.1-22). Toronto: Multilingual matters.
- Rubin, J. 1968. "Acquisition and Proficiency". In: Pride, J. B. and Holmes, J (1972) 'Sociolinguistics',. Penjuin Book New York: Oxford University Press, 350-366.
- Šabec, Nada. 1997. Slovene-English language contact in the USA. Moha, Ennaji and Joshua A. Fishman (eds.), *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, pp 129-181. New York: Mouton De Gruyter. Science, vol.12, p 8325.
- Smelser, Neil and Baltes, Paul(eds.). 2001. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral*
- Sole, Mireia Galindo. 2003. *Selected Proceedings of the First Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, Lotffi Sayah, 19-29. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceeding Project. #1004
- Stilwell, Jean. 1999. Language and Age. Linda Thomas and Shan Wareing (eds.). *Language, Society, and Power: An introduction*. London and New York. Routledge: *threatened language be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21<sup>st</sup> century*
- Warduogh, Ronald. 1986. *An introduction to Sociolinguistics*: Blackwell publisher.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Language in Contact: findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1968. *Language in contact*. Mouton: The Hague.
- Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. India: Blackwell publisher.
- Wolff, Ekkehard H. 200. "Language and Society". Heine, B and Nurse, D. (eds.). *African Languages: An Introduction* (pp303-304) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zealelem Leyew. 1998. Code-switching: Amharic-English. *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, vol.11,(199), pp 197-213.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX-A

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND PHILOLOGY

#### QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire focuses on language use situation and the role of each language in Afar regional state Ab'ala town. The questionnaire is helpful to describe the Ab'ala people use which language, where, with whom and at what circumstance etc. Hence, the main objective of this research is to study language use situations of the area. To make this research successful, your engagement in filling this questionnaire will have great contribution. Therefore, I request you to suggest information that you assume as correct. Since, any information that you suggest will only used for this research, I guarantee you no information from this questionnaire will used for any other purpose or pass to anybody. No need of writing your names.

**Thank you in advance for your cooperation!!!**

#### PART ONE:

##### A) Self-reported questionnaire

For the questions from 1-7, please put “√” mark in the box preceding each information that is compatible with your personal information, whereas for questions 7-8 write an answer that you assume correct

1. Ethnic group: (    ) Afar (    ) Tegar (    ) Amhara  
(    ) other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
2. Marital status (    ) Single (    ) Married
3. Mother tongue: (    ) Afar-af (    ) Tigrinya (    ) Amharic  
(    ) other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Your husband's/spouse's? \_\_\_\_\_
5. What is the dominant language at your home? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Residence : (    ) Wakrigubi (    ) Wuhdet
7. Religion: (    ) Muslim (    ) Orthodox Christian (    )  
Catholic (    ) Protestant (    ) other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

##### B) Self-evaluation of respondents' proficiency in each language

Read the questions below thoroughly and answer the following questions based on the instruction.

**Instruction:** Regarding your ability or skill in each language below are questions along with alternatives. Put “√” mark in your right alternative in the space provided

- 8 a) when I listen to people speaking in Afar-af my skill or proficiency is
- b) When listen to people speaking in Tigrinya my skill or proficiency is
- c) When listen in people speaking in Amharic my skill or proficiency is
- d) Please specify your listening ability/skill if any other than the language that are stated above by writing the name of the language

Poor	Fair	Good

- 9 a) When I speak to people in Afar-af my skill or proficiency is
- b) When I speak to people in Tigrinya my skill or proficiency is
- c) When I speak to people in Amharic my skill or proficiency is
- d) Please specify your speaking ability/skill, if any other than the languages that are stated above by writing the name of the language

Poor	Fair	Good

10. a) When I speak to people in Afar-af my skill or proficiency is
- b) When I speak to people in Tigrinya my skill or proficiency is
- c) When I speak to people in Amharic my skill or proficiency is
- d) Please specify your reading ability/skill, if any other than the languages that are stated above by writing the name of the language

Poor	Fair	Good

- 10 a) When I write in Afar-af, my skill or proficiency is
- b) When I write in Tigrinya, my skill or proficiency is
- c) When I write in Amharic, my skill or proficiency is
- d) Please specify your writing ability/skill, if any other than the languages that are stated above by writing the name of the language-

Poor	Fair	Good

**PART TWO: Questions related to language use situations or preferences**

In the following questions alternatives are given, put “x” mark against your right choice and if your answer is “other” please specify the name of the language

<b>I. Questionnaire regarding language use in different domains</b>					
<b>Which language (s) do you use</b>		<b>Afar-af</b>	<b>Tigrinya</b>	<b>Amharic</b>	<b>Other</b>
11	<b>Family domain</b>				
	Which language do you use with your spouse/husband at home				
	Which language do you use with your parents at home				
	Which language do you use with your children at home				
	Which language do you use with siblings				
12	Which language do you use with your neighbors				
13	Which language do you use with your friends				
14	<b>Education</b>				
	Which language do you use with your fellow students at school				
	Which language do you use with your teachers in school				
15	<b>Market</b>				
	Which language do you use with buyer in the market				
	Which language do you use with sellers in the market				
16	<b>Religion</b>				
	Which language do you use with Sheiks in the mosques				
	Which language do you use with Priests in the Church				
17	<b>Health center</b>				
	Which language do you use with Physicians in health center				
18	<b>Employment</b>				
	Which language do you use with your colleagues in office				
	With your boss in office				
19	<b>Authorities</b>				
	Which language (s) do you use with police man in police station				
	Which language (s) do you use with judge in court room				
<b>II. Questionnaire regarding domains of mother-tongue use</b>					
	<b>Situations (contexts)</b>	<b>Often</b>	<b>Some times</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>No response</b>
20	<b>In oaths</b>				

	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				
21	<b>In dream</b>				
	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				
22	<b>In the extent of viewing TV programs</b>				
	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				
23	<b>For letter writing</b>				
	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				
24	<b>For counting</b>				
	-Afar-af				
	-Tigrinya				
	-Amharic				
	-Afar Oromo				
	-Saho				

### III. Questions referring to the perceptions of respondents for each languages

Each of the statements below expresses an attitude towards each language spoken in Ab'ala. Please tick ( ) your attitude/opinion with respect to each statements for each language in only one of the five alternatives (i.e., 5= SA, 4 = A, UD=3, 2= D, and 1= SD)

	Topics (contexts)	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
25	<b>Daily topics</b>					
	I do not support using Afar-af in daily topics					
	Why?					
	I do not support using Tigrinya in daily topics					
	Why?					
	I do not support using Amharic in daily topics					

	Why?					
	I do not support using Afan Oromo in daily topics					
	Why?					
	I do not support using Saho in daily topics					
	Why?					
26	<b>Academic topics</b>					
	I feel good when I use Afar-af in academic topics.					
	Why?					
	I feel good when I use Tigrinya in academic topics.					
	Why?					
	I feel good when I use Amharic in academic topics.					
	Why?					
	I feel good when I use Afan Oromo in academic topics.					
	Why?					
	I feel good when I use Saho in academic topics.					
	Why?					
27	<b>Sexuality</b>					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Afar-af in sexuality					
	Why?					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Tigrinya in sexuality					
	Why?					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Amharic in sexuality					
	Why?					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Afan Oromo in sexuality					
	Why?					
	It gives me pleasure when I use Saho in sexuality					
	Why?					
28	<b>Sociopolitical issues</b>					
	I think Afar-af is appropriate to use in socio-political issues.					
	Why?					
	I think Tigrinya is appropriate to use in socio-political issues.					
	Why?					
	I think Amharic is appropriate to use in socio-political issues.					
	Why?					
	I think Afan Oromo is appropriate to use in					

	socio-political issues.						
	Why?						
	I think Saho is appropriate to use in socio-political issues.						
	Why?						
29	<b>Cultural issues</b>						
	I prefer to use Afar-af in cultural issues						
	Why?						
	I prefer to use Tigrinya in cultural issues						
	Why?						
	I prefer to use Amharic in cultural issues						
	Why?						
	I prefer to use Afar Oromo in cultural issues						
	Why?						
	I prefer to use Saho in cultural issues						
	Why?						
30	<b>As vehicular</b>						
	I do not prefer using Afar-af as vehicular language						
	Why?						
	I do not prefer using Tigrinya as vehicular language						
	Why?						
	I do not prefer using Amharic as vehicular language						
	Why?						
	I do not prefer using Afan Oromo as vehicular language						
	Why?						
	I do not prefer using Saho as vehicular language						
	Why?						
31	<b>Most prestigious</b>						
	I believe Afar-af is the most prestigious						
	Why?						
	I believe Tigrinya is the most prestigious						
	Why?						
	I believe Amharic is the most prestigious in						
	Why?						
	I believe Afan Oromo is the most prestigious						
	Why?						
	I believe Saho is the most prestigious in						
	Why?						

**አባሪ - B**  
**የሰነ ልሳንና ፊሎሎጂ ትምህርት ክፍል**  
**የቋንቋዎች ጥናት ተቋም**  
**ኣዲስ አበባ**

የጥናት መረጃ አሰባሰብ መጠይቅ

ይህ መጠይቅ በዋናነት የሚያተኩረው በአፋር ክልል በአብካላ ከተማ ያለውን የቋንቋ አጠቃቀም ሁኔታንም በመርመር እያንዳንዱ ቋንቋ ያለውን ሚና ለማወቅ የሚያስችል መረጃ የሚሰጥ ነው። ይህ ማለት ሕብረተሰቡ የትኛው ቋንቋ በየትኛው ቦታ፣ በምን ሁኔታ፣ በምን ርዕሰ ጉዳይ፣ ከማን ጋር፣ ወዘተ እንደሚጠቀም ለመግለጽ የሚረዳን ነው። የጥናቱ ዋነኛ አላማ የአካባቢው ቋንቋዎች ነባራዊ ሁኔታን በማጥናት የአፋርኛ ቋንቋ (አፋር-አፍ) በተጠቀሰው ቦታ (በአብካላ ከተማ) ውስጥ በምን አይነት ሁኔታ እንደሚገኝና በሕብረተሰቡ ምን አይነት አገልግሎት እንዳለው በተለይም የቋንቋው ባለቤት የሆኑት አፋር ቋንቋቸውን እየተጠቀሙበት መሆኑንና አለመሆኑን ለማወቅ የሚያስችል ነው። ጥናቱ ተገቢውን ውጤት ያስገኝ ዘንድ እርስዎ ይህንን መጠይቅ በመሙላት የሚያበረክቱት አስጸዋጽኦ ክፍ ያለ ነው። ስለዚህ ያመነ-በትና ትክክለኛ ያሉትን መረጃ እንዲሰጡ በታላቅ አክብሮት ይጠየቃሉ። የሚሰጡት ማንኛውም መረጃ ለዚህ ጥናት ብቻ የሚውል ስለሆነ ለማንኛውም ሁለተኛ ወገን ተላልፎ የማይሰጥ መሆኑን ከወዲሁ ላረጋግጥልዎ እወዳለሁ። ስምዎን መጻፍ አይኖርብዎትም።

**መጠይቁን በመሙላት ስለተባበሩን ክልብ አመሰግናለሁ**

**ክፍል አንድ:**

**ሀ. ግላዊ መረጃ**

ከዚህ በታች ከ 1-6 ለቀረቡት ጥያቄዎች ከተሰጡት አማራጮች የእርስዎን ግላዊ መረጃ በያዘው ፊት ለፊት ባለው ክፈት ቦታ ላይ “√” ምልክት በማድረግ ይግለጹ። መልስዎ "ሌላ" ከሆነ የቋንቋውን ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

1. ብሔረሰብ፡ አፋር-አፍ ( ) ተጋሩ ( ) አማራ ( ) ሌላ \_\_\_\_\_
2. የጋብቻ ሁኔታ፡ ያገባ/ች/ ( ) ያላገባ \_\_\_\_\_
3. አፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ፡ አፋር ( ) ትግርኛ ( ) አማርኛ ( ) ሌላ \_\_\_\_\_
4. ቤት ውስጥ በዋናነት የምትጠቀሙት/ሚው? \_\_\_\_\_
5. የባልሽ /የሚሰትህ አፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ? \_\_\_\_\_
6. መኖሪያ፡ ዋክሪጉቤ ( ) ውህደት ( ) \_\_\_\_\_
7. ሃይማኖት፡ እስላም ( ) ኦርቶዶክስ ( ) ካቶሊክ ( ) \_\_\_\_\_  
 ኘሮቴስታንት ( ) ሌላ \_\_\_\_\_

**ለ. የቋንቋ ክህሎትን በተመለከተ የቀረቡ ጥያቄዎች።**

ከዚህ በታች ያሉትን ጥያቄዎች በጥንቃቄ በማንበብ በሚከተለው መመሪያ መሰረት መልስዎን ያስቀምጡ።

**መመሪያ:** በእያንዳንዱ የቋንቋ ችሎታዎን በተመለከተ ከዚህ በታች ለቀረቡት ጥያቄዎች አማራጮች ተቀምጠዋል፡ ከተሰጡት አማራጮች ስር ባሉ ክፍት ቦታዎች ይህንን “√” ምልክት በማኖር ምርጫዎን አሳዩ።

8. ሀ) በአፋርኛ የሚናገሩ ሰዎች ሣዳምጥ ያለኝ ችሎታ
  - ለ) በትግርኛ የሚናገሩ ሰዎች ሣዳምጥ ያለኝ ችሎታ
  - ሐ) በአማርኛ የሚናገሩ ሰዎች ሣዳምጥ ያለኝ ችሎታ
- መ) እባክዎ ከተሰጡት ቋንቋዎች ውጪ በሌላ ቋንቋ ያልዎት የመስማት ክህሎትዎን የቋንቋውን

ጥሩ	መካከለኛ	ዝቅተኛ

ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

9. ሀ) በአፋርኛ ያለኝ የመናገር ችሎታ  
 ለ) በትግርኛ ያለኝ የመናገር ችሎታ  
 ሐ) በአማርኛ ያለኝ የመናገር ችሎታ  
 መ) እባክዎ ከተሰጡት ቋንቋዎች ውጪ በሌላ ቋንቋ ያልዎት የመናገር ክህሎትዎን የቋንቋውን ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

ጥሩ	መካከለኛ	ዝቅተኛ

10. ሀ) በአፋርኛ ያለኝ የማንበብ ችሎታ  
 ለ) በትግርኛ ያለኝ የማንበብ ችሎታ  
 ሐ) በአማርኛ ያለኝ የማንበብ ችሎታ  
 መ) እባክዎ ከተሰጡት ቋንቋዎች ውጪ በሌላ ቋንቋ ያልዎት የማንበብ ክህሎትዎን የቋንቋውን ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

ጥሩ	መካከለኛ	ዝቅተኛ

11. ሀ) በአፋርኛ ስጽፍ ያለኝ ችሎታ  
 ለ) በትግርኛ ስጽፍ ያለኝ ችሎታ  
 ሐ) በአማርኛ ስጽፍ ያለኝ ችሎታ  
 መ) እባክዎ ከተሰጡት ቋንቋዎች ውጪ በሌላ ቋንቋ ያልዎት የመጻፍ ክህሎትዎን የቋንቋውን ስም በመጻፍ ይግለጹ።

ጥሩ	መካከለኛ	ዝቅተኛ

**ክፍል ሁለት፡**

የቋንቋ አጠቃቀም ሁኔታን በተመለከተ የቀረቡ ጥያቄዎች

ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች እባክዎ ከቀረቡት አማራጭ ቋንቋዎች ስር "X" ምልክት በማኖር ትክክለኛውን መልስ ይግለጹ። መልሶ "ሌላ" ከሆነ የቅንቋውን ስም ይግለጹ።

IV. ስለቋንቋ አጠቃቀም የሚመለከቱ ጥያቄዎች				
የትኛውን ቋንቋ /ዎች/ ይጠቀማሉ	አፋር-አፍ	ትግርኛ	አማርኛ	ሌላ
12	ቤት			
	ከቤት ውስጥ ከባለቤትዎ ጋር			
	ከቤት ውስጥ ከወላጅ ጋር			
	ከቤት ውስጥ ከልጆችዎ ጋር			
	ከቤት ውስጥ ከወንድምዎ/እህቶችዎ/ ጋር			
13	ጎረቤት			
	ከጎረቤትዎ ጋር			
14	ጓደኛ			
	ከጓደኛዎ ጋር			
15	ትምህርት ቤት			
	ትምህርት ቤት ውስጥ ከተማሪዎች ጋር			
	ትምህርት ቤት ውስጥ ከመምህራን ጋር			
16	ገበያ			
	ከገዥዎ ጋር			
	ከሻጭዎ ጋር			
17	ቤተክርስቲያን /መስጊድ/			

	ከቆሶች ጋር				
	ከሸክ ጋር				
18	ጤና ጣቢያ				
	የጤና ባለሙያዎች ጋር				
19	ቢሮ				
	ቢሮ ውስጥ ከስራ ባልደረቦች ጋር				
	ቢሮ ውስጥ ከአለቃዎ ጋር				
20	ሕግ ማስከበሪያ ቦታዎች				
	ፖሊስ ጣቢያ ውስጥ ከፖሊሶች ጋር				
	ከፍ/ቤት ውስጥ ከዳኞች ጋር				
II	የአፍ መፍቻ ቋንቋ የሚጠቀሙባቸው ሁኔታዎች	የአጠቃቀም ሁኔታዎች			
	ሁኔታዎች	ሁልጊዜ	አልፎአልፎ	ፍጹም አልጠቀምም	መልስ የለም
21	በመሃላ ጊዜ				
	አፋር-አፍ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				
22	በሕልም ጊዜ				
	አፋር-አፍ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				
23	ቴሌብዥን በሚመለከትበት ጊዜ				
	አፋር-አፍ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				
24	ደብዳቤ ስንጽፍ				
	አፋር-አፍ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				
25	ቁጥር ስንቆጥር				
	አፋር-አፍ				
	አማርኛ				
	ትግርኛ				
	አፋን ኦሮሞ				
	ሳሆ				

III ለቋንቋዎች ያላቸው አመለካከት የተመለከቱ ጥያቄዎች ከዚህ በታች በአብዛላ ከተማ ውስጥ ስለሚነገሩ ቋንቋዎች ማህበረሰቡ ለእያንዳንዱ ቋንቋ ያለው አመለካከት በተመለከተ ሃሳቦች ተዘርዘረዋል። እባክዎ ለእያንዳንዱ ቋንቋ ያልዎት አመለካከት የ“√” ምልክት በማድረግ አመልክቱ።


	ርዕሰ ጉዳይ	በጣም አልሰማም	አልሰማምም	አልወሰንኩም	እስማማለሁ	በጣም እስማማለሁ
26	በዕለት ተዕለት ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋር					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
ለምን						
27	ትምህርታዊ ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋር					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
ለምን						
28	በጾታዊ ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋር					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
ለምን						
29	በማህበራዊና ፖለቲካዊ ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋር					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					

	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					
30	በባሕላዊ ጉዳዮች					
	አፋር-አፋ					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					
31	እንደ ዋነኛ ቋንቋ					
	አፋር-አፋ					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					
32	የበላይ ቋንቋ					
	አፋር-አፋ					
	ለምን					
	አማርኛ					
	ለምን					
	ትግርኛ					
	ለምን					
	አፋን ኦሮሞ					
	ለምን					
	ሳሆ					
	ለምን					

## DECLARATION

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

Name: Mohammed Ebrahim

Sig 

Date 18/10/2010

Place: Department of Linguistics and Philology Addis Ababa University.

Date of submission \_\_\_\_\_

### Approval

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

Name: Graziano Savá (Ph. D)

Sig \_\_\_\_\_

Date 18/10/2010