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ABSTRACT

This study is an analysis of lexical borrowing of nominals in Sabaot from Kiswahili. The two languages under study differ from each other in significant ways. Kiswahili for example is a language of the Niger-Congo family classified by Ethnologue as ISO 639-3: SWA (Lewis 2009) while on the other hand Sabaot belongs to the Southern Nilotic group who occupy the Mount Elgon area (Appleby, 1961). This research was guided by the following specific objectives; to investigate the spoken language of young, middle-aged and older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilingual speakers in order to identify and describe core and cultural borrowing in Sabaot from Kiswahili. Attempts were also made to establish non-linguistic factors that motivate the Sabaots to borrow from Kiswahili and finally the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has adopted to revitalize the Sabaot language were determined. This research was guided by two theories namely Borrowing Transfer Theory by Terence Odlin (1989) and Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory (EVT) by Giles and Taylor (1977). As a way of data collection, a wordlist and questionnaires were issued to 30 Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals of Chepyuk ward in Bungoma County, Kenya. The results of the wordlist analysis indicated that there were extensive core borrowings of Kiswahili nouns into Sabaot language. The findings further showed that the core borrowing of nouns was more among the younger and middle-aged than among the older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals. In addition, the findings also revealed that the attitude of the younger and middle-aged were negative towards Sabaot which threatens the survival of Sabaot language. Finally, the results further showed that, the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ (a language nest) is playing an important role in trying to revitalize the Sabaot language through documentation, teaching the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals how to read, write and also creating more awareness among Sabaot/Kiswahili on the importance of Sabaot language through a radio station (Bikaab Koreet FM). This indicates that there is hope for the Sabaot language to regain its vitality among its speakers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Mount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVT</td>
<td>Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Bilingualism**: The use of at least two languages by an individual speaker or society.

**Intergroup contact**: Contact between members of different groups.

**Kapkugo**: A Kalenjin term literally translated as ancestors’ place/home.

**Lingua franca**: A shared language of communication used between people whose main languages are different.

**Subset of speakers**: Some of the speakers.

**Sumaneet Centre**: ‘Sumaneet’ is a Sabaot word meaning education and hence it is a centre where the Sabaot language is being revitalized to avoid death.

**Loanword**: A word that is borrowed from one language into another one.

**Core borrowing**: A word which expresses a concept which has an equivalent in the target language.

**Cultural borrowing**: A word that expresses a concept that is not necessarily found in the target language.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter has several sections which include: the background to the study, statement of the problem, research objectives and research assumptions. This is then followed by the rationale of the study and lastly the scope and limitations.

1.1 Background of the Study

A language is a combination of symbols and sounds we use to express our ideas, experiences and emotions (Bruce, 2008). We need a language to communicate with people around us, express our identity, and also carry out trade. Often, when different languages come into contact through their speakers, the effects of language contact are realized as: language maintenance, language shift, borrowing, bilingualism, death and code switching. For the purpose of this research we concentrated on language borrowing as a result of contact between Sabaot and Kiswahili, in western Kenya.

According to Mesthrie et al. (2000, p.243), “borrowing is a technical term for incorporation of an item from one language into another, for example, words, grammatical elements or sounds.” Kamwamangulu(1989) defines borrowing as an integration of the borrowed items into the borrowing language system. Thomason and Kaufman (1988, p. 37), for instance, refer to borrowing as “the incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native by speakers of that language; the native language is maintained, though is changed by the addition of incorporated features.”
The language that borrows a language feature is referred to as, the “recipient language.” Alternatively, the language which provides a language feature is the “source language” (donor language) (Winford2003, p.12).

In a borrowing situation, the first foreign element to enter the borrowing language is the lexicon, which depicts the culture of its speakers. Words adopted this way are called loanwords or borrowings. Out of the borrowed words, nouns are the most borrowed category (Myers-Scotton, 2002). Borrowing of lexicon is a marker to show that a language grows (Fasold& Linton, 2006). Kiswahili, a Bantu language, has borrowed from other languages, especially English and Arabic (Zawawi, 1975), and has grown to become an East African regional language and a lingua franca.

This current research, focused on nouns borrowed from Kiswahili into Sabaot, because as Hock (1986) puts it, lexical borrowing usually takes place from the more, to less prestigious culture (prestigious language affords greater upward social and economic mobility than others).

According to Myers-Scotton (2006), two types of borrowing are evident; cultural and core borrowings. Cultural borrowings constitute words which express concepts that do not exist in the lexicon of the recipient language. For example, the word “sahani” (plate), is culturally borrowed from Kiswahili and is referred to as “sahaniit” in Sabaot language. On the other hand, core borrowings are words that are already expressed by an equivalent lexical item in the recipient language (ibid) for instance, the word “barabara” (road) is core borrowed from Kiswahili into Sabaot, and is referred to as “barabaret”, and yet the Sabaot language has a word for it as “keldo/areet.”
While cultural borrowings from Kiswahili enrich the Sabaot language in terms of vocabulary, core borrowings on the contrary, endanger the Sabaot language. This research therefore, investigated the core and cultural nominals borrowed into Sabaot from Kiswahili by Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals. An investigation of the non-linguistic factors motivating the Sabaots to borrow from Kiswahili was done and finally the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre,’ has adopted to revitalize the Sabaot language were found out.

The investigation of language contact phenomena between the Sabaot and Kiswahili bilinguals in western Kenya can prompt extraordinary advantages, both practical and theoretical. By studying the languages in contact, it provides one with the understanding that there are attributes that prompt a language to borrow from other languages, for instance, issues of identity and prestige of the lending language. Comprehension of the social powers that guide and oblige languages in contact to borrow are of fundamental significance both to language planning in sectors such as; education, politics, and to understand the ways languages change.

Borrowing is usually distinguished from Code-Switching. Lipski (2005) notes that borrowing means the donor language words have been incorporated into the lexicon of the recipient language and is therefore part of the linguistic competence of the speakers of the target language. On the other hand, Code-Switching includes; linguistic items that occur spontaneously in the target language discourse, but which are not part of the lexicon of the recipient language. It is apt to point out that the scope of Code-Switching was beyond the scope of this research.
1.1.1 Language Situation in Kenya

Kenya exhibits linguistic and cultural diversity. The number of indigenous languages in Kenya ranges between 42 and 68 (Myers-Scotton 1993; Mbaabu, 1996). This difference is due to dialect/language controversy.

According to Obiero (2008), statistically Bantu comprise 65%, Nilotic languages 32% while Cushitic languages are 2%. In Kenya, ethnic affiliation is closely tied to linguistic affiliation (Kebeya, 2008). Thus individuals with Kuria ethnicity for example will have Kuria as their mother tongue (language of heritage).

In Kenya, the following languages are either endangered or extinct. Boni, Burji, Dahalo, *Elmolo, *kinare, *kore, *Lorkot, Omotik, Ongamo, *Sogoo, Suba, Terik and *Yaaku (UNESCO, 2003 & Mosley, 2010). Those marked with asterisk are already extinct, while the rest are seriously endangered.

In Kenya, Kiswahili is the national and co-official language alongside English. Mugambi (2002) notes that given the functionality in terms of prestige, English and Kiswahili surpass the local languages, and have expanded considerably in the recent past to disadvantage the indigenous languages. Additionally, Kiswahili language serves as a symbol of national unity among Kenyans, and that is why in public rallies, political leaders usually switch to Kiswahili because, they are sure to reach out to the masses that tend to have a limited grasp of English language.

Since languages are assigned value according to the contexts in which they are used, it is not surprising that English is a prestige code (Myers-Scotton, 1993) for it is often
associated with public domains, which are normally beholden with a lot of political and socio-economic power. On the other hand, indigenous languages are relegated to private domains such as, home posing a threat to indigenous languages in Kenya.

Due to prominence given to English and Kiswahili, indigenous languages are losing their speakers to official and national language due to competing factors such as; economic changes, status, demography and institution support (Giles et. al, 1997; Appel & Muysken, 1987). It is because of these reasons for instance that Sabaot a minority language in Kenya is trying to remain relevant by core borrowing from Kiswahili.

1.1.2 History of Sabaot

The Sabaot are the only Southern Nilotic group who occupy the Mount Elgon area, which is referred to by other Kalenjin speakers as ‘Kapkugo’ (literally translated as ancestors place/home). The majority of the Southern Nilotes are in the Great Rift Valley (Appleby, 1961). The Sabaot people have lived in Mount Elgon and the neighbouring Districts for example; formerly Bungoma and Transoia for many centuries (Goldschmidt, 1976; Huntingford, 1953; Kipkorir, 1973; Kipsisey, 2005).

The Sabaot speakers have a population of 194,767 persons (males 97,305 and females 97,462) as at 2013 and thus has a population density of 204 persons/Km². (First Bungoma County Integrated plan 2013-2017). The Sabaot language has seven dialects, which can be categorized into three clusters: The Northern dialect comprising of kupsapiny, mbay and sor found on northern side of Mount Elgon and partly in Uganda. The Central dialectentailssomek and kony while the Southern one comprises of pok and bong’om
(Creider, 1982). The dialects of Sabaot language are mutually intelligible. The focal point of this research, is the Sabaots living in Chepyuk Ward in Mt. Elgon Sub County (Pok and Kony dialects), since “Sumaneet Centre,” (a place where the Sabaot language is being revitalized) is located.

The Sabaot were originally semi-pastoralist but currently practice mixed farming. In the 1880s, the Bantu groups (Bagisu and Kitosh) from Eastern Uganda began encroaching into Sabaot territories on the North and South West frontiers of Mount Elgon. The result was an increase of the Bantu element in Sabaot territory. One of the Sabaot dialects (Bong’om) was absorbed by the in-coming Bantu groups (Kakai, 1992).

The names of places, geographical features and present Districts have their names from Sabaot language, for example, Bungoma town (coined from ‘bong’om’ one of the dialects of Sabaot southern dialect), Kiboswa,(coined from ‘tobosweet’ a type of a tree in Sabaot language which grew in this area), Kamukuywa (formed from a type of tree in Sabaot called ‘mokoyuet’ which was in plenty in this area), Kimilili( formed from the Sabaot word ‘Kimelil’ which stands for a place where we used to have many leopards) and Kapchai(a Sabaot word which stands for a place where the Sabaot youths were taken for Sabaot rituals/ceremonies before they were circumcised). Majority of the names of municipalities, towns, and villages in western Kenya presently have Sabaot origin. This is evidently showing that the Sabaot language was a major lingua franca in the western Kenya before the establishment of Bantu groups (Kipsisey, 2010).
1.1.3 Kiswahili

Kiswahili is a language belonging to Niger-Congo family which Ethnologue has categorized as ISO 639-3: SWA (Lewis, 2009). It is a common language (linguafranca) in Central and Eastern Africa (Rwanda, Burundi and Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania. Currently, Kiswahili is also spoken in some parts of Southern Africa countries, for instance, Malawi, Zambia and Mozambique. Presently, it has reached Southern Sudan through refugees coming from Kenya. Furthermore, Kiswahili is also taught in some Universities in Southern Sudan and Radio Stations (Choge, 2007-2008 & Kishe, 2003).

It is argued that, Kiswahili has about 15 dialects spoken all over Central Africa and Eastern Africa (Chiraghdin & Mnyampala, 1977). All these dialects are believed to be mutually intelligible (Bakari, 1985). The dialects that are found in East Africa include: Kiunguja (Zanzibar), Kimrima (Tanzania), Kimvita, King’are and Kijomvu (spoken on Mombasa Island).

Kiswahili has made huge strides in its usage in Kenya. It has been entrenched in the Kenyan constitution as both national and co-official language according to the Republic of Kenya (2010). In addition, it is the language used in parliament together with English. Furthermore, it is a medium of instruction in lower primary school, and a compulsory and examinable subject up to the end of secondary cycle of education in Kenya (ibid). Webb and Kembo (2010) argue that due to the spread of Kiswahili language, it is now spoken by about 65% of the Kenyan population.
Kipsisey (2005), argues that, though no Swahili community exists in the immediate neighbourhoods of Mt. Elgon, many Sabaots understand, and speak Kiswahili. Kiswahili was thus introduced in Mt. Elgon region by pastors within or those posted to Sabaot areas by Mainstream Roman Catholic, Pentecostal and Anglican Church who use Kiswahili in rendering their sermons. Since Kiswahili is also taught as a Curriculum subject in Schools, the children through their interaction with people at home enhanced the learning of the language by other people.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Borrowing is a marker to show that languages are dynamic and are ever growing. A number of studies have been carried on lexical borrowing in Kenya. For instance, Wamalwa(1997) accounts for the sociolinguistic principles that govern Kiswahili lexical absorption into Lubukusu while Kisembe (2003) examines the negative effects of English on Luhya language but none to date according to the findings of the researcher has focused on the core and cultural borrowings of nominals as a result of Sabaot/Kiswahili contact situation. 

To fill this gap, this research examined effects of language contact involving Sabaot / Kiswahili in Bungoma County of Kenya. Specifically, the researcher administered questionnaires and a word list to 30 Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals in order to establish core and cultural borrowings into the Sabaot language. In addition, attempts were also made to establish how the non-linguistic factors of age and attitude correlate with borrowing. Lastly, an investigation into the strategies adopted by ‘Sumaneet Centre’
(a language nest) in the Sabaot speaking region to revitalize the Sabaot language was undertaken.

1.3 Research Objectives

This research had the following objectives:

a) To determine core and cultural borrowings in Sabaot from Kiswahili on both genders among the younger, middle-aged and older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals

b) To examine the non-linguistic factors that motivates Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals to borrow from Kiswahili.

c) To investigate the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has adopted to revitalize the Sabaot language in Bungoma County.

1.4 Research Assumptions

This research assumed that:

a) There are core and cultural borrowings on both genders in the Sabaot language from Kiswahili.

b) There are non-linguistic factors motivating Sabaots to borrow from Kiswahili.

c) There are strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has adapted to revitalize Sabaot language.

1.5 Justification and Significance

Earlier studies on language contact in Kenya have preferred to deal with urban communities (Parkin, 1974b; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Kebeya, 1997). This current study
examined language contact of Sabaot and Kiswahili in the rural set-up of Mt. Elgon Sub County in western Kenya. To be more specific, it looked at the linguistic outcome of Sabaot/ Kiswahili contact which was lexical borrowing.

The findings from this research could aid any other language that is suffering from core borrowing in Kenya and beyond to revive itself. Additionally, it has also enriched the literature of existing sociolinguistic studies in Kenya and serve as a base for comparative studies for linguists interested in studying the Sabaot language.

1.6 Scope and Limitation

In terms of linguistic features to be studied, the focus for this research was on nominals only borrowed from Kiswahili (a Bantu language) into Sabaot (a Nilotic language) and hence other borrowings from Luhya, English and Iteso which Sabaot has come in contact with were not considered. The reason for the choice of nominals was based on Myers-Scotton (2002) who asserts that nouns are borrowed more often than any other category and hence this ensured availability of enough data for analysis.

From the large sample population of Sabaots, this research was only confined to 30 respondents from Chepyuk ward in Mt. Elgon Sub County for drawing generalizations (refer to figure A in the appendix), because that is where we have “Sumaneet Centre” (a place where the Sabaot language is being revitalized). This research was further limited to only Sabaot speakers of Mt. Elgon region, and not those who reside outside the Sub County.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

In this section, literature concerning definition of core/cultural borrowing, related studies on linguistic borrowing and ultimately previous studies carried on Sabaot language have been reviewed. This research was guided by two theories namely; Borrowing Transfer Theory by Terence Odlin (1989) and Ethno linguistic Vitality Theory (EVT) by Giles and Taylor (1977).

2.1 Core/Cultural Borrowing

Borrowing is a phenomena resulting from language contact. Crystal (1987) defines borrowing as the introduction of other linguistic features, or word from one language to another.

Myers-Scotton (2002) identifies two types of borrowing namely; core and cultural borrowing. According to her, core borrowing refers to borrowings, which have corresponding equivalents in the target language (p.41). It is believed that speakers who adopt core-borrowed words do so as to benefit from the prestige associated with donor language. An example of core borrowing is the English word “manager” which has been core-borrowed into Dutch because of its high status yet the native Dutch language has its equivalent that is *beheerder* and *leider* (Haspelmath, 2009:48).
On the other hand, Cultural borrowing refers to adoption of a new concept from the source language into the target language, since it lacks it (ibid). With cultural borrowings the outcome is usually "insertion" of a vocabulary into the recipient language, and hence, it enriches the target language's vocabulary. The word “computer” is an example of a culturally borrowed word into Dutch from English (Haspelmath, 2009:49).

The researcher of this research examined the core and cultural borrowing as a result of Sabaot/ Kiswahili contact situation.

2.2 Related Studies on Linguistic Borrowings

Studies have been done on borrowing in different languages by different scholars. Myachina (1981) while studying contact between Arabic and Swahili asserts that Arabic words populate the Swahili lexicon from the extensive contact. Arabic loan words cover a wide variety of semantic fields. He found out that many loan words relate to life: ahera ‘the next world,’ Mola ‘God’, imani ‘faith’, all derived from Arabic words. These semantic categories of loanwords provide an insight into the cultural contact between Arabic and Kiswahili. It will be interesting to find out how this study relates with the current research of Sabaot/Kiswahili contact whereby there exists some Kiswahili vocabularies in Sabaot language for instance the word ‘sahaniit’ (plate) was derived from Kiswahili word ‘sahani.’

Appel and Muysken (1987) identified the different social and cultural contexts in which borrowing takes place such as invasion, conquest and domination by a majority culture, limited culture contact, limited migration and economic dependence and co-existence in a
colonial setting. In each of the mentioned cases, the extent and the type of sociolinguistic effect of borrowing are different. The findings of Chinazom aided the current researcher, to find out the non-linguistic factors that were responsible for Sabaot borrowing from Kiswahili.

Premawardhena (2003) investigated the impact of English loanwords on the modern Sinhala with examples from literary and spoken Sinhala. His findings revealed that, some changes occurred in Sinhala language because of English borrowings. Similarly, the borrowings from Kiswahili have affected the Sabaot language as a result of existence of vocabularies which were previously non-existent in Sabaot language.

Proshina (2005) studied the contact between English and Russian language. His findings reveals that due to the demand of new markets for British merchandise, the Russian merchants began incorporating the first English loan words into Russian words such as; mister, alderman and earl. From this study it is clear that a language may be forced to borrow from another language due to the demands of the market. The findings of Proshina provide reasons why a language may be forced to borrow which the current research intends to establish.

Sew (2007) conducted a study on Globalization, and a shifting Malay while focusing on lexical borrowing. Her study observed that borrowing which takes place in Malay language is influenced by external factors which include foreign investment which prefers English to Malay and the language policy that is used in education. This is important for the current research as it shows how the language policy in education has contributed to the Sabaots borrowing from Kiswahili.
Lin (2007) evaluates the vitality and maintenance of Yami language (one of the mother tongue languages used in Taiwan). This research found out that the youths rarely speak Yami language in most cases and a good number of them are incompetent in the language. In spite of the fact that young people from the most preservationist town utilize more Yami and talk it better, their Yami language appears to diminish as their ages increases. This research concentrated mainly on the youths but the current research explores a wider group (between 16-51+ years). It seeks to find out how the findings of this research correlates with the findings of Sabaot/Kiswahili contact situation in Kenya.

Chinazom (2012) investigated the sociolinguistic implication of language contact using Igbo as an example. He found out that Igbo language had come in contact with Hausa, Efik and Igalu. The findings from this study revealed that the Igbo speakers had started involving themselves in excessive borrowing. It further highlights that if these negative influences are not controlled then the Igbo language will suffer from shift and eventually death of the language. The negative issues as a result of languages coming into contact as mentioned by Chinazom provides a rationale why the current research seeks to investigate the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre,’ has adopted to minimize the Core borrowing in Sabaot from Kiswahili.

Wamalwa (1997) accounts for the sociolinguistic principles that govern Kiswahili lexical absorption into Lubukusu. She identifies the need to disambiguate two closely related ideas resulting from borrowing that there is need to express oneself with linguistic economy and ease, the need to portray a prestigious social status and the need to express a new concept as a major motivating principle for Kiswahili-Lubukusu borrowing. This
study was a follow-up on the two principles; the need to express a new concept and the need to express oneself with linguistic economy. Unlike her study, however, the current research focused on borrowing from Kiswahili to Sabaot. Her work was important for the current research since it was based on borrowing transfer theory which this study adopts.

Mosha in Whitely (1971) identifies different sociolinguistic reasons why Kiganda borrows from English and Swahili. He identifies these as the non-existence of indigenous vocabulary for the new and alien material objects and abstract ideas that have been coming into Kiganda from other cultures as a result of: the prestige of the source languages, the need to differentiate semantic fields, the desire by the government, and other institution to avoid undesirable designation and connotations, the quest for recognition and acceptance.

It is worth noting that studies have been done on lexical borrowing particularly its negative effect such as shift and death to borrowing languages. Kiseembe (2003) examines the negative effects of English on Luhya language, for example, (beer) as ‘epia,’ instead of ‘kamalwa’ and (bicycle) as ‘baisikeli’ instead of ‘entika.’ This current research investigates the negative effects of core borrowing into Sabaot language from Kiswahili and moves a notch higher to examine the strategies that “Sumaneet Centre” has adopted to minimize core borrowing into Sabaot language from Kiswahili.

2.3 Previous Studies on Sabaot Language

Van Ginkel (2008) conducted a study on transfer reading from the language of wider communication to the first language. The study particularly focused on the linguistic and
socio-cultural environment of the Saboat of western Kenya. His study revealed that transfer reading is affected by factors that are context related for example the socio-cultural context and economic context. This current research aims at finding out whether the same factors that influenced transfer reading may have contributed to Saboat language borrowing from Kiswahili.

Jones (2010) investigated the impact of conflict experienced in Mt.Elgon region on the vitality of the Saboat language and its identity. Her study informed the current research because it argues that Saboat language has been disadvantaged due to prominence given to English and Kiswahili and hence it laid the basis for the current plight facing the Saboat language.

Kipsisey (2010) did a study on “Reviving marginalized languages in Kenya: A case study of the Saboat of Mount Elgon”. He found out that the youths are graduating from learning institutions and moving to urban centres/areas in search of better life which has endangered the transmission of mother-tongue to the next generation consequently impacting negatively on the survival of Saboat language. The findings of Kipsisey were important for this research since it gives the situation of Saboat language as at present.

### 2.4 Theoretical Framework

This research was guided by two theories namely Borrowing Transfer Theory by Terence Odlin (1989) and Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory (EVT) by Giles and Taylor (1977).
2.4.1 The Borrowing Transfer Theory

In this Model, Odlin (1989) points out the outcome of languages coming in contact are usually diffusion of materials from one language to the next or transfer is the case. He reiterates that, when two communities engage in communication then the transfer of linguistic features is likely to take place in the form of hearing, written or spoken word.

He not only views communication as the sole factor responsible for the direction of “flow” of linguistic features which starts with lexical items first, but also, considers attitudes of the speakers as playing an important role. Furthermore, he states that the transfer of linguistic features is usually from the language of a higher status (superior) to a lower status (inferior) language.

According to Odlin (ibid), there are two types of borrowing. Firstly, there is Borrowing Transfer which is the influence of second language on the first language (in this research it is the influence of Kiswahili on Sabaot language) and secondly, Substratum Transfer which is the influence of previously acquired language (native) on the acquisition of the second language.

This research only made use of ‘Borrowing Transfer,’ that is, the influence of Kiswahili (second) language on Sabaot (native) language. Thus this theory assisted in explaining objective one of this research which dealt with the borrowing of Kiswahili lexical items (nominals) into Sabaot language by the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals.
2.4.2 Ethno linguistic Vitality Theory

Giles and Taylor (1977) define Ethno linguistic Vitality (EV) as “structural characteristics of status factors, demographic representation and institutional support related to the language”. In their model, they propose that a combination of these three factors impacts on language maintenance.

This means the more a speech community sticks together as a group, the more vitality it is going to have and hence is likely to survive and thrive as a collective entity in an intergroup context. The theory provides a framework into which a group can be placed and provides a certain degree of predictive power as well.

According to Giles et al. (1977), it is evident that, if a speech community enjoys more of status, demographic representation and institutional support as a group then the greater its ethno linguistic vitality and vice-versa. Contrary, (Mann, 2000) argues that if a speech community has lower ethno linguistic vitality then it is likely to be swallowed by a speech community with higher ethno linguistic vitality.

The Ethno linguistic Vitality Theory was used to explain the findings of objective two of this research which sought to investigate the non-linguistic factors that had motivated the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals to borrow from Kiswahili. Finally, it was also used to explain objective three which investigated the strategies that the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ (a language nest) had adopted to revitalize Sabaot language in Bungoma County.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This section concerns itself with describing the research design, variables, site of the study, study population, sampling technique and size, research instruments, data collection procedure and ethical consideration.

3.1 Research Design

For any research to be successful, it requires a design to act as a route map for the researcher. The research design for this study is eclectic in approach as it adopts both qualitative (descriptive) and quantitative. The rationale for the use of both approaches is in order to benefit from the advantages that emanates from the two designs (Gibbons, 1987; Gardner-Chloros, 1991 & Muthwii, 1994).

3.2 Variables

The linguistic variables for this research are the nouns borrowed from Kiswahili into Sabaot language. In addition to the linguistic variable, three non-linguistic variables of age and attitude were considered in this research since it was assumed by the researcher that the two aspects had an influence on Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals borrowing from Kiswahili.
3.3 Site of the Study

The present research was carried out in Western Kenya in Bungoma County. Bungoma County has the following nine Sub Counties namely: Kanduyi, Bumula, Kabuchai, Sirisia, Mt. Elgon, Tongaren, Kimilili, Webuye West and Webuye East. The physical location of the site of study is Mt. Elgon Sub County.

Mt. Elgon Sub County (formerly referred to as Mt. Elgon District was one of the eight Districts in Western province). It borders Uganda in the north and west, Trans-Nzoia Sub County to the East and former Bungoma District to the south (Mt. Elgon Strategic Plan 2005-2010).

Mt. Elgon Sub County covers an area of approximately 956.6 Km$^2$ and has a population of 194,767 people (males 97,305 and females 97,462) as at 2013 and thus has a population density of 204 persons/Km$^2$. The Sub County is majorly rural with its headquarters at Kapsokwony town (First Bungoma County Integrated plan 2013-2017).

According to the Mt. Elgon Strategic Plan (2005-2010), the Sub County is still underdeveloped, the main causes of poverty being landlessness, poor rural infrastructure, early marriages, inadequate piped water, insecurity, HIV/AIDS, poor marketing strategy and illiteracy. The main means of transport across the Sub County is motor bikes and a few matatus (public service vehicles) operating in the region. Furthermore, the number of schools available is inadequate to cater for school going children. It is also crucial to note that the entire Sub County has only one hospital, three health centres, with only six dispensaries. To get to the nearest health facility, one has to cover an approximate distance of 15km.
For administrative purposes, MT. Elgon Sub County is divided into four wards which include; Kaptama, Kapsokwony, Chepyuk and Cheptais. In figure A (see on the appendix for details about the site of study), Chepyuk ward where this study was conducted is circled in red. The area is approximately ten kilometers from Bungoma town; the headquarters of Bungoma County. At Makutano Centre in Chepyuk ward, people from different ethnic affiliations converge for trade. They include; Bukusus, Iteso and Sabaot and are of different age brackets and financial status. They communicate in various languages.

Bilingualism is also prevalent in most homes in Chepyuk ward and on important social functions like weddings; church services and funerals both Kiswahili and Sabaot are used simultaneously. This shows how Kiswahili language is important in the region. However, the reason for Kiswahili being mostly used in these cases has not been studied; hence this research intends to fill this gap. Furthermore, Chepyuk ward was selected for its multicultural and linguistic diversity. It has more cases of inter-marriages with its Lubukusu people due to the prolonged contact through trade which has increased the number of Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals. The area was therefore, rich in respondents who were used for this research.

It was also in this same locality where ‘Sumaneet Centre,’ (a language nest)’ was located. Thus, it was deemed appropriate for this research, which also sought to find out the strategies that ‘the Centre’ had adopted to revitalize the Sabaot language.
3.4 Target Population

The targets Population for this research were the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilingual speakers who reside in Mt. Elgon region. A total of 30 respondents, equal in number of both genders were sampled out purposively from Chepyuk Ward. They were then subjected to a wordlist and questionnaires. The respondents included the younger, middle-aged and the older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals.

3.5 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

In order to carry out this research, 30 respondents from Chepyuk Ward were sampled out purposively. This allows the researcher to use respondents with required information in relation to the objectives of the study (Mugenda, 2008). According to Milroy (1987), a number as low as 24 respondents are enough to enable a researcher make a generalization for a study. Therefore, 30 respondents were deemed appropriate for this research. He further points out that, the use of larger samples in dealing with linguistic surveys is not important, since it results in redundancy. He further reiterates that this brings problems when handling data, which results in diminished returns.

The respondents with the required traits were pegged on the variable of age and the typicality of one being a Sabaot/Kiswahili bilingual speaker. For the purpose of this research, anybody between the ages of 16-29 years was treated as younger; middle-aged is between the ages of 30-49 years while anybody above 51 years was treated as older (Contasti, 1980).
After identifying the first respondents purposively, these groups helped the researcher identify other Sabaot/Kiswahili bilingual speakers through the approach of ‘friend of a friend’ (Milroy & Milroy, 1972).

For the sake of coming up with a representative sample, the researcher used 15 males and 15 females as shown below.

**Figure A: A sample of respondents**

- **Younger group (10) (14 – 29 years)**
  - Male: 5
  - Female: 5

- **Middle-Age group (10) (30 - 49 years)**
  - Male: 5
  - Female: 5

- **Older group (10) (50 + years)**
  - Male: 5
  - Female: 5
3.6 Research Instruments

The research instruments that were adopted in this research were the use of word list and questionnaires (see appendix C). The choice of word list was preferred since, according to Kerswill (1994) and Gordon (2001), they highlight that, the use of a wordlist can be one way of obtaining a representative sample that can be used to investigate linguistic features under study. More so, it is argued that a wordlist may contain data that has multiple repetitions of similar words (Barney & Peterson, 1952), where systematic changes can be picked from lexical diffusion cases. Additionally, a questionnaire technique was preferred for this research because it collects a lot of information within a short time (Kombo and Tromp, 2006). The questionnaire is also less costly, easy to quantify and appropriate in summarizing the results (see appendix C for details).

3.7 Data Collection procedure

In order for the researcher to be allowed to undertake the study, he obtained an introductory letter from Kenyatta University which he took to the head of Mt. Elgon Sub County requesting to be allowed to carry out this research. During the visit, the researcher explained the purpose of the study to the respondents concerned.

Both a word list and a questionnaire were issued to each of the 30 respondents sampled out. The respondents were issued with a word list section investigating the core and cultural borrowings into Sabaot language from Kiswahili (for objective one) while the
questions on the questionnaires were examining non-linguistic factors motivating Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals to borrow from Kiswahili and the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ had adopted to revitalize the Sabaot language (for objective two and three respectively).

The word list/questionnaire was divided into five parts which include; A, B, C and D. Part A dealt with personal information, B was the word list that addressed borrowed nominals from Kiswahili into Sabaot selected randomly from different semantic fields, C dealt with attitudes towards Sabaot and Kiswahili. Lastly part D, dealt with questions about strategies adopted by ‘Sumaneet Centre’ (language nest) to revitalize Sabaot language (See appendix C).

3.8 Data Analysis and Presentation

The data collected was then analyzed as follows: To begin with, in order to determine the core/cultural borrowing into Sabaot from Kiswahili, the researcher came up with a 40-word list. According to Holman et. al (2008), they found out that a 40-word list was just as accurate as the Swadesh 100-word list. 34 out of the concepts selected were from Swadesh 100-word list (Swadesh, 1952). The concepts picked from Swadesh list are believed to be the most resistant to core borrowing. The other 6 (six) concepts were randomly picked from technology items. The words that constituted this word list fall under the following semantic categories; body parts (10), technology (6), kinship (6), physical world (7), food and drinks (6) and vegetation and Agriculture (5) (Haspelmath & Tadmor, 2009).
The 40-word list was then presented to 30 respondents, 10 of which were younger, 10 from middle-aged and lastly 10 from the older group (both male and female of equal numbers in each grouping) who were Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals. The respondents were asked to read the wordlist and then expected to write down how they will pronounce the same Kiswahili nouns in Sabaot in the most natural way. In cases where the respondents were not able to read, I read out the nouns to them in Kiswahili and asked them to tell me the Sabaot nouns equivalents which I was able to note down. The data collected was then converted into percentages and presented in tables per semantic field to aid in the interpretation of the data collected. In addition, an analysis was also carried out to determine the level of borrowing in different age groupings in relation to gender.

Secondly, to collect data for objective two and three, questionnaires bearing the questions on attitudes of Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot and Kiswahili and ‘Sumaneet centre,’ were presented to respondents. For clarity of explaining the aspects on language attitudes, the responses ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ were considered as just ‘agree’ while ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ as just ‘disagree. The data was further analyzed in line with the tenets of Ethno linguistic Vitality theory advanced by Giles et.al (1977). Finally, conclusions of this research will be made basing on the outcome of the findings.

3.9 Data Management and Ethical Consideration

The researcher assured the concerned respondents that the information given will only be used for research purposes and will be treated with utmost confidentiality. The researcher relied on the willingness of the respondents to get information. He also sought a research
permit from National Commission of Science and Technology (see appendix A & B for details.)
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.0: Introduction

This chapter is concerned with presentation, analysis and discussion of collected data. It is divided into three parts. The first part deals with presentation of data involving core/cultural borrowings in the Sabaot language from Kiswahili. The second part evaluates the non-linguistic factors motivating Sabaots to borrow from Kiswahili, and last part is an analysis of the roles of ‘Sumaneet Center’ (language nest) to revitalize the Sabaot language.

4.1: Results of the first Objective

The first objective of the research is “to determine core and cultural borrowings in Sabaot from Kiswahili among younger and older Sabaot /Kiswahili bilinguals.”

Core borrowing refers to loanwords that replace existing native words (Haspelmath, 2008:48). In the case of this research it is the Sabaot language borrowing words from Kiswahili which the Sabaot language has words already for those concepts. Core borrowing in Sabaot language is possibly motivated by prestige associated with the lending language (Kiswahili). On the other hand, cultural borrowing refers to borrowing of words for new objects and concepts (from Kiswahili) that the target language (Sabaot) does not have words for them. Cultural borrowing is meant to fill a lexical gap that exists in the target language. (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988:77)
4.1.0: Introduction

Before discussing the findings, a short description of the Sabaot language is given. According to Larsen (1986), the Sabaot consonant system encompasses 23 phonemes. The following consonants do not exist in the Sabaot language: p, d, j, q, and z. Unlike Kiswahili which has only 5 vowels: a, e, i, o, u, the Sabaot language has 20 vowels. The reason for this is because some vowels sounds are very short for instance bir (hit) while some are a bit prolonged, for example biir (defeat).

In terms of the syllable structure, Kiswahili has an open syllable for instance ccv mti (tree) whereas the Sabaot language has both closed for instance, cvccv ketit (tree) and open for example cvccv konta (eye). Therefore, it is important to mention that when Kiswahili words are borrowed into Sabaot language, they will be domesticated into Sabaot language system so as to end with consonants in most cases, which is contrary to the lending language (Kiswahili).

It is also of great essence to point out that the consonants ending in most Sabaot nouns are either “t” in singular noun or “k” when the noun is in plural. However, we have other exceptions, where the noun will end with a vowel for instance momo (mother). Nouns which end with vowels constitute a small number in Sabaot language as compared to the ones that end with consonants.

4.1.1: Presentation of data on core/cultural borrowing into Sabaot from Kiswahili

The data collected using the wordlist were further categorized into two parts; the new Sabaot (corrupted version) and old Sabaot (the standard Sabaot). The nouns that were
categorized as being new Sabaot involved core borrowed nouns from Kiswahili while the ones which were similar in both old and new Sabaot were either culturally borrowed or the issue of borrowing had not affected it at all (dominant variant). The frequency for each noun was then converted into percentage so as to aid in the analysis of data. The data collected in this part was both quantitative (percentages) and qualitative (nouns). The data collected was then presented and analyzed as shown in the following tables.

Table 4.1: Body parts nouns borrowed into Sabaot from Kiswahili

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns in Kiswahili</th>
<th>Gloss in English</th>
<th>New Sabaot</th>
<th>Token X/30</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Old Sabaot</th>
<th>Token X30</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Co/Cu/Dv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ulimi</td>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Ulimit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>Ng’alapta</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mdomo</td>
<td>Mouth</td>
<td>Mdomot</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>kutiit</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mkono</td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>Auut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Auut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mguu</td>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>Kirengeet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Kirengeet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Shingo</td>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>Shingot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Katiit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Moyo</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>Moyot</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Mukuloko</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Goti</td>
<td>Knee</td>
<td>Magotit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>Kutunynto</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mfupa</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Mfupet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>Koeet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mgongo</td>
<td>Back</td>
<td>Mgongot</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>Pateet</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kichwa</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Metiit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Metiit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

New Sabaot – corrupted version
Old Sabaot – standard/acceptable version
Co - core borrowed nouns
Cu – culturally borrowed nouns
Dv – dominant variant
X – number of respondents
4.1.2 Analysis of body parts nouns

From table 4.1 above, it is evident that only 3 out of the 10 nouns on body parts which includes mkono (hand), mguu (leg) and kichwa (head) that have not been core borrowed and are therefore the dominant variant and this constitutes 33.3% while the rest have been core borrowed. The other seven nouns on body parts which have not been core borrowed could be attributed to the fact that the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals are familiar with them and hence their correct usage. The core borrowing of body shown in the Sabaot language is a serious threat to the survival of the language. This is an argument that is strongly supported by Tadmor(2009) who argues that the lexical items relating to body parts are the least to be replaced by loanwords.

According to the Mt. Elgon strategic planning (2005-2010), Intermarriage between Sabaots and Bukusus/Iteso is a common phenomenon in Chepyuk ward (Makuatano centre). In such homes there are cases of parents and their off springs to using Kiswahili in their discourse at the expense of Sabaot language. However, in cases where they attempt to speak in Sabaot language, the new Sabaot (corrupted Sabaot language with a lot of core borrowed nouns) is used. This posesa great threat to the survival and transmission of Sabaot culture to the next generation.

The next semantic field that is analyzed is food and drinks as presented in table 4.2 below.
From table 4.2 above the nouns that have been core borrowed include: pombe(alcohol) as ‘pombe’ at 16.7% which is still at the level of code switching, ugali (ugali) as ‘ugalit’ at 13.3%, malenge (Pumpkin) as ‘malenget’ at 26.7%. The nouns which are the dominant variant include maji(water), maziwa (milk) and nyama (meat) as they are always used in the home domain. The reason why some Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals don’t know how the word malenge (pumkin) is referred to is because the vegetable is being replaced with modern ones (Kipsisey, 2010).

Technology items is the next semantic field that is analyzed as presented in table 4.3 below
Table 4.3: Technology nouns borrowed into Sabaot from Kiswahili

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns in Kiswahili</th>
<th>Gloss in English</th>
<th>New Sabaot</th>
<th>Token X/30</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Old Sabaot</th>
<th>Token X/30</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Co/Cu/Dv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 kompyuta</td>
<td>computer</td>
<td>kompyuteet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>kompyuteet</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 simu</td>
<td>phone</td>
<td>simuut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>simuut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 gari</td>
<td>car</td>
<td>kariit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>kariit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 baiskeli</td>
<td>bicycle</td>
<td>baiskilit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>ntikait</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 radio</td>
<td>radio</td>
<td>rediot</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>rediot</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 barua</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>baruet</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>bakalyeet</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of table 4.3 above reveal that 4 out of the 6 nouns on technology have been culturally borrowed into Sabaot language system. In terms of percentage this represents 66.6%. The Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals have culturally borrowed the words kompyuta(computer) into Sabaot as ‘kompyuteet’; simu (phone) as ‘simuut; gari (car) as ‘kariit’ and radio (radio) as ‘rediot’ since the Sabaot language lacks these vocabularies in their language systems because they have been brought about by technology and therefore the 4 Kiswahili nouns have been domesticated into Sabaot language system. This has been done to enrich the vocabularies of Sabaot language. This is an argument that is supported by Myers Scotton (2000:239), who points out that cultural borrowing fills a lexical gap, since these words do not exist in the target language.

In another instance, the findings reveal that 2 out of the 6 technological items have been core borrowed by some Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals. This include: baiskeli (bicycle) as ‘baiskilit’ at 36.7% instead of ‘ntikait’ and barua (letter) as ‘baruet’ at 23.3% instead of ‘bakalyet.’ The reason why letters are no longer common among the Sabaot/Kiswahili
bilinguals is because they are currently being replaced by other means of communication like internet and phones.

The next semantic field that is analyzed is the physical world nouns as presented in table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Physical world nouns borrowed into Sabaot from Kiswahili

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns in Kiswahili</th>
<th>Gloss in English</th>
<th>New Sabaot</th>
<th>Token X/30</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Old Sabaot</th>
<th>Token X/30</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Co/Dv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 mwezi moon</td>
<td>mweisit</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>araweet</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 moto fire</td>
<td>maata</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>maata</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 mvua rain</td>
<td>mvuet</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>ropta</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 njaa hunger</td>
<td>kamauut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>kamauut</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 moshi smoke</td>
<td>moshit</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>kiyetiit</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jifu ash</td>
<td>jifut</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>areek</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 kuni firewood</td>
<td>kunik</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>kweniik</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4.4 above, the core borrowed nouns from Kiswahili into Sabaot include mwezi (moon) as ‘mweisit’ at 23.3%, mvua (rain) as ‘mvuet’ at 30%, moshi (smoke) as ‘moshit’ at 26.7%, jifu(ash) at 30% and kuni (firewood) as ‘kunik’ at 10%. This constitutes 5 out 7 nouns which translate to 71.4% as far as core borrowing of physical world nouns is concerned. This could have been contributed by lack of storytelling sessions in most homes which used to help the children understand their physical environment better.
In addition, Kinship terms borrowed into Sabaot from Kiswahili are analyzed in table 4.5 shown below.

Table 4.5: Kinship terms borrowed into Sabaot from Kiswahili

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns in Kiswahili</th>
<th>Gloss in English</th>
<th>New Sabaot</th>
<th>Token X/30</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Old Sabaot</th>
<th>Token X/30</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Co/Dv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 baba</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>baba</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>aboo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mama</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>mama</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>momo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 mvulana</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>weriit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>weriit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 msichana</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>cheptoo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>cheptoo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 mjomba</td>
<td>uncle</td>
<td>maama</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>maama</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 shangazi</td>
<td>aunt</td>
<td>shangasit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>sengee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>Co</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of table 4.5 point out that core borrowed nouns include: baba (father) as ‘baba’ at 40%, mama (mother) as ‘mama’ at 43.3% and shangasi (aunt) as ‘shangasit’ at 46.7%. Again the two nouns mama (mother) as ‘mama’ and baba (father) as ‘baba’ are still at the level of code switching. The other three nouns mvulana (boy) as ‘weriit,’ msichana (girl) as ‘cheptoo’ and mjomba (uncle) as ‘maama’ are the dominant variants and are being used as expected.

Finally, the last semantic field of vegetation and agriculture is analyzed and presented in table 4.6 below.
From the results of table 4.6 above, 90% of the respondents who refers to mti (tree as ‘ketit’ in Saboat and 63.3% refers to msitu (forest) as ‘uyeet’ in Saboat while the rest refer to these terms using the new Saboat as ‘mitit’ (trees) at 10% and (msitut) at 36.1% respectively.

### 4.1.2 Summary of findings from the tables.

It is important to note the following from the data presented from table 4.1 to 4.6 above:

To begin with, 25 out of the 40-wordlist were core borrowed into Saboat language by some sabaot/Kiswahili bilingual which translates to 62.5%. This percentage is very high and sends a very strong message that the Kiswahili language is a threat to the existence of Saboat language.

Secondly, the core borrowing of basic vocabularies which are believed to be the most resistant according to Swadesh (1952) that are evidenced in Saboat language shows that Saboat language is on the brink of being absorbed by the Kiswahili language which is
deemed to be more prestigious than Sabaot. However, in as much as code-switching was beyond the scope of the research according to the assumptions cited in chapter one, some of them came up in these findings. For instance, pombe (alcohol) was referred to as ‘pombe’ by 16.7% of the Sabaot/ kiswahili bilinguals; baba (father) as ‘baba’ at 40% while mama (mother) as ‘mama’ at 43.3%. It can therefore be argued that the code-switches evident in the Sabaot borrowed nouns are in the initial stages of becoming loan words in Sabaot language (Gardner-Chloros, 2009).

The outcomes of this research was also analyzed in terms of age grading that is the core/cultural borrowing level among the younger (16-29 years), middle-aged (30-49 years) and older (51+ years) Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals. The differences in the level of borrowings among the three groups are presented in table 4.7 as presented below.

Table 4.7: Frequency of occurrence of Core/Cultural nouns borrowed into Sabaot from Kiswahili per semantic fields according to age grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic fields/Age of respondents</th>
<th>Younger group (16-29yrs.)</th>
<th>Middle-aged group (30-49 yrs.)</th>
<th>Older group (50+ yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male%</td>
<td>Female%</td>
<td>Male%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body parts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology items</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical world</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; drinks</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation &amp; agriculture</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined%(male+female)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: A complete list of actual words per semantic field is given in the appendix (see appendix C for details).

From table 4.7 above there are noticeable differences in the level of lexical borrowing among three age-grading clusters and also in terms of gender. The level of borrowing among the younger group (16-29 years) is 42.5%, the middle-aged group (30-49 years) is 37.5% while the older group (51+ years) is 20%. The differences among the three age groupings is evident and indicates that there is massive borrowing between the younger and middle-aged group, that is at 80%, and by the time they become older we expect them not to change in the way they speak as they will continue to use the core borrowed nouns from Kiswahili language even in their older age which indicates that Kiswahili is a serious danger to the existence of Sabaot language.

The findings further reveals that women in the three groupings borrow less as compared to their male counterparts, for instance, 20% in the younger group, 17.5% in middle-aged group and 5% in the older group. This is in support with the argument advanced by scholars that women are more conservative and are slower in embracing changes that can occur in a given language (Milroy, 1980 & kebeya, 2008).

In addition, the results reveal that the older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals have borrowed more in the semantic field of physical world at 7.5% as compared to other semantic fields. The motivation for this could be because the older speakers have had a longer duration interacting with the physical world than the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals and hence they have a better understanding about it.
On the other hand, the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals have borrowed more in the semantic field of technology items at 15% as compared to other semantic fields. The rationale for this could be that since technology is a recent phenomenon and hence the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili are embracing it more than the older speakers on the top of the list being the use of computers and phones.

From the findings, it is clear that the younger and middle-aged group have borrowed more than the older group. The outcome of this research agrees with (Poplack, 1988) who argues that the younger speakers are more likely to borrow more than the older speakers. It further agrees with Chambers (1995) who argues that younger speakers of a language tend to be more innovative for instance they overproduce the new terms in their speech than the older speakers in a speech community.

The higher levels of core borrowing of Kiswahili nouns into Sabaot among the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals could mean that Kiswahili language has a stronger identity and recognition more than the Sabaot language. This conveys a strong message that Kiswahili language is a threat to the existence of Sabaot language.

4.1.3 Conclusion

The outcome of this research supports the ideas postulated by Odlin (1989) in his model ‘Borrowing Transfer Theory’ which states when two languages come into contact, usually there is diffusion or transfer of materials from one language to the other. Furthermore, he states that the transfer of linguistic features is usually from the language of a higher status
/superior (Kiswahili) to a lower status/inferior language (Sabaot). Apparently, the first item to enter the borrowing (recipient) language is the nouns as in the case of Sabaot language borrowing nouns from Kiswahili.

The findings in the data analyzed in this part shows that there is extensive core borrowing of basic vocabulary items (nouns) from Kiswahili among the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals, which is a limelight to show that there is a weak urge of identity among the Sabaot culture as compared to Kiswahili (Greenberg, 1957:39). It is again evident that core borrowing is found to be more among the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals than among the older ones. The extensive core borrowing is as a major threat to the Sabaot language survival. It also emerged there were some loan nouns from Kiswahili into Sabaot which were still in the form of switches and were yet to be adopted into the phonotactics of Sabaot language systems.

4.2 Results for Objective two.

The second objective of the research is “to examine the non-linguistic factors that motivate Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals to borrow from Kiswahili.”

4.2.0 Introduction

The perception of Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot/Kiswahili language could be as a product of their attitude and age. According to the Longman Dictionary (Applied Linguistics) (1992), language attitude refers to the feelings that a speaker may have towards his or her own language or another language. It further explains that the
motivation of having a negative or positive feeling towards a given language could be as a result of social status, elegance or degree of importance associated with the language in question. The attitudes that the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals have towards Sabaot/Kiswahili reflects what they feel about the two languages.

This part will therefore assess the interplay between attitude and age in relation to Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals borrowing from Kiswahili. The analysis is divided into three parts; first is the attitudes of the younger (16-29 years) Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot/Kiswahili and the second part is that of the middle-aged (30-49 years) and finally the older speakers (50+ years) respectively.

4.2.1 Presentation of data on language attitudes towards Sabaot and Kiswahili.

A questionnaire concerning the attitudes of Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot and Kiswahili was presented to 30 respondents. The responses were divided into three parts (as described in section 4.2.0 above).

The responses for each of the four questions concerning the attitudes of Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot and Kiswahili were converted to percentages to aid in the interpretation of data. The results in the table below were presented by joining the responses ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ as just ‘agree’ while ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ as just ‘disagree.’ The first table, table 4.8 will present the findings of attitudes of younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot and Kiswahili while the second table, table 4.9 will present the findings of the middle-aged while table 4.10 presents findings of the older group as shown below.
Table 4.8: Language attitudes towards Sabaot and Kiswahili among the younger (16-29 years) Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on language attitude</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Attitude concerning Sabaot</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Sabaot language symbolizes my identity</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Sabaot language carries my culture, history and is prestigious</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Sabaot enables me to socialize freely with people around me</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Sabaot is important for me than Kiswahili</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Attitude concerning Kiswahili</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Kiswahili should be used in all situations</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Kiswahili is more important than Sabaot</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Fluency in Kiswahili is essential to succeed in my career</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Fluency in Kiswahili improves my social status</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first statement on attitude towards Sabaot language is: *Sabaot is a symbol of my identity*. The findings of table 4.4 above highlight that 93.4% believe that the Sabaot language is a symbol of their identity while 6.7% disagreed. On the other hand, nobody was undecided with this statement. The fact that the majority of younger
Sabaot/Kiswahili perceives Sabaot language as a source of their identity could be a sign of motivation for language maintenance among the ethnic group as argued by Giles et al. (1977) in EVT. Despite the fact that we have majority of the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals agreeing that Sabaot language is a symbol of their identity, the presence of 6.7% respondents who don’t agree that Sabaot language is symbol of their identity means that possibly they feel that another language (Kiswahili) other than Sabaot forms their identity.

The second statement on attitude towards Sabaot language is: Sabaot language carries my culture, history and is prestigious. 80% of the respondents agreed that the Sabaot language is prestigious as it carries their culture and history, 6.7% were undecided while 13.3% disagreed with the same statement. When the response of those who were undecided are combined with those who disagreed, this forms 20% of the total respondents who do not believe that the Sabaot language is a prestigious language and carries their culture. This could mean that they prefer the culture of another language which should be Kiswahili.

The third statement on language attitude towards Sabaot is: Sabaot enables me to socialize freely with people around me. 83% of the respondents agreed with this statement, 13.3% were undecided while 3.7% disagreed. Regarding the issue of Sabaot language being used as a tool for socializing with people around them, majority of them agree at 83% but however, the sum of those who are undecided and those who disagreed was at 17%. This is an indicator that some of them feel that the Sabaot language is not good enough to help them socialize fully with their peers. The rationale for this may be
supported by the fact that not all the peers that the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals interact with understand and can speak Sabaot language, for instance Bukusu and Iteso speakers.

The last statement on language attitude towards Sabaot is: *Sabaot language is more important for me than Kiswahili*. The findings in the table above also point out that 73.4% of the respondents believe that the Sabaot language is more important to them than Kiswahili because it carries their culture, symbol and identity. Contrary to this, 26.6% of the respondents disagreed. The justification why some younger Sabaot/Kiswahili are against Sabaot language as being more important to them than Kiswahili could be deeply rooted in the Kenya’s education policy which gives prominence to Kiswahili because it is a national and also a co-official language (Constitution of Kenya, 2010).

On the other hand, the attitudes of the younger Kiswahili/Sabaot bilinguals towards Kiswahili are somehow different from the one towards Sabaot language as discussed below.

To begin with the first statement concerns the attitude of younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals concerning Kiswahili language is: *Kiswahili should be used in all situations*. 68.7% of the respondents agreed with this statement while 1.9% was undecided about whether it is important to use Kiswahili in all situations. The percentage of those who disagreed with this statement was 29.4%. The reason for this could be that some respondents feel that there are situations which require the use of Sabaot language only for instance when conversing with the elderly Sabaot speakers. The justification for these negative attitudes towards Sabaot by the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals is because
of the issue of social mobility and survival coming in which can be easily achieved through the use of Kiswahili than when one uses Sabaot language.

The fact that majority of the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals want Kiswahili to be used in all situations implies that the Sabaot language is losing its vitality among its speakers and this creates room for a possible language shift towards Kiswahili. This is in agreement with EVT by Giles et al. (1977) on social status.

The second statement on the attitude towards Kiswahili is: *Kiswahili is more important than Sabaot*. Surprisingly enough, 100% of the respondents agreed with this statement. The overwhelming positive attitude by the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili towards Kiswahili could be informed by the notion that Kiswahili is Kenya’s national language and they therefore feel that they can express themselves in it very comfortably without secluding or offending the Bukusu and Iteso speakers who live with them since it is a neutral language (lingua franca).

Moreover, Kiswahili language carries with it Kenya’s cultural heritage and so its use makes them to be proudly identified as Kenyans. This is in line with (Prazak, 1999) who claims that there is a shift in attitude among the youths in Kenya towards their mother tongue. “By and large, they do not wish to follow in the footsteps of their ancestors, and tend to speak of the ways of the past as inferior, outmoded and insufficient for success in today’s world.” Prazak’s argument supports the notion why the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals are biased towards the native language (Sabaot).
The third statement on the attitude towards Kiswahili is: *Fluency in Kiswahili will help me to succeed in my career.* 53.4% of the respondents agreed with this statement while 46.6% disagreed with the same statement. The reason why 53.4% of the respondents agreed, could be that when it comes to job allocation those who can speak Kiswahili fluently will have a cutting edge over those who cannot since they can be employed to work in an area where Sabaot language is not spoken. On the other hand, 46.6% do not support the statement that Kiswahili helps one to succeed in his or her career. Possibly, there could be other factors that would enable one to succeed in his or her career other than Kiswahili.

The fourth statement on attitude towards Kiswahili is: *Kiswahili fluency improves my social status.* Though 66.6% of the respondents agreed with this statement, 20% were undecided while 13.4% disagreed with the same statement. The perception of the majority of the respondents at 66.6% is that to them Kiswahili has more advantages compared to Sabaot as it enables one to climb the social ladder unlike Sabaot language. Contrary to this, 33.4% of respondents do not agree with this statement since they feel just being fluent alone in Kiswahili may not improve one’s social status.

The next table 4.10 presents the findings about the attitudes of the middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot and Kiswahili.
Table 4.9: Language attitudes towards Sabaot and Kiswahili among the middle-aged (30-49 years) Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on language attitude</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Attitude concerning Sabaot</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Sabaot language symbolizes my identity</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Sabaot language carries my culture, history and is prestigious</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Sabaot enables me to socialize freely with people around me</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Sabaot is important for me than Kiswahili</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Attitude concerning Kiswahili</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Kiswahili should be used in all situations</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Kiswahili is more important than Sabaot</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Fluency in Kiswahili is essential to succeed in my career</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Fluency in Kiswahili improves my social status</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To start with, the language attitude of the middle-aged towards Sabaot shows that 83.4% believe that the Sabaot language symbolizes their identity, 3.6% are undecided while 13% disagree with the statement. Secondly, 70% of the respondents believe that Sabaot
language carries their culture while 3.7 are undecided. On the contrary, 26.3% disagree with the statement. On the third question, 73% believe that the Sabaot language enables them to freely interact with people around them, 3.3% are undecided while 23.7% disagree with the statement. Lastly, concerning Sabaot language being important to them than Kiswahili, 72.3% agree, 3.3% are undecided while 24.4% disagreed with the statement.

The attitudes of the middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili towards Kiswahili were analyzed as follows: 58.7% agreed that Kiswahili should be used in all situations, 3.9% were undecided while 37.4% disagreed. Secondly, 90% of the respondents agreed that Kiswahili is more important than Sabaot language, 3.3% were undecided while 6.7% agreed with the statement. Thirdly, 43.3% agreed that fluency in Kiswahili enables one to succeed in career, 3.6% were undecided while 4.7% disagreed with the statement. Lastly, 56.6% agreed with the statement that fluency in Kiswahili improves my social status, 3.4% were undecided while 40% disagreed with the statement.

From the results analyzed in tables 4.8 and 4.9 respectively, the attitudes of the younger and middle-aged Sabaot have a similar pattern. The attitudes of the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot/Kiswahili shows that they have a stronger preference for Kiswahili language in most situations than their Sabaot language since to them Kiswahili can improve their social status, economic survival and social mobility. These findings in line with Giles et al. (1977) theory of EVT who argue that negative attitudes towards an ethnic language is usually a catalyst that speeds up the process of language shift. This shows that Kiswahili language poses a serious danger to
the survival of Sabaot language as this will affect the transmission of Sabaot language to the next generation.

Table 4.10: Language attitudes towards Sabaot and Kiswahili among the older (50+ years) Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on language attitude</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Attitudes concerning Sabaot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Sabaot language symbolizes my identity</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Sabaot language carries my culture, history and is prestigious</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Sabaot enables me to socialize freely with people around me</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Sabaot is important for me than Kiswahili</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Attitudes concerning Kiswahili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Kiswahili should be used in all situations</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Kiswahili is more important than Sabaot</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Fluency in Kiswahili is essential to succeed in my career</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Fluency in Kiswahili improves my social status</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first statement on attitude towards Sabaot language is: *Sabaot is a symbol of my identity*. The results in table 4.9 above reveal that 96.2% of the respondents believe that
Sabaot language is a symbol of their identity while 3.8% disagreed with this statement. This therefore means that majority of the older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals have a high esteem towards Sabaot language since it carries their identity and they are proud to be associated with it. This is an argument that is strongly supported by (Fishman, 1977) who asserts that speakers of a given language will look for distinct characteristics that will brand them as being unique from speakers of another language and that is the role played by the Sabaot language.

The second statement on attitude towards Sabaot language is: *Sabaot language carries my culture, history and is prestigious.* 86.5% of the respondents agreed with this statement, 2% were undecided while 11.5% disagreed with this statement. The justification for this is that majority of the older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals believe that the Sabaot language is a vehicle that carries their culture and history and hence without the Sabaot language then there is no Sabaot culture.

The third statement on language attitude towards Sabaot is: *Sabaot enables me to socialize freely with people around me.* The percentages of those who agreed with this statement are 86.5%, 2% were undecided while 11.5% disagreed. The reason why we have a higher percentage of older Sabaot/Kiswahili supporting the statement that Sabaot language enables them to communicate with people around them is because they love Sabaot and is the only language they can communicate competently with the people around them. The existence of 13.5% who do not support this statement indicates that the Sabaot language cannot be used as a language of communication with everybody around
them. This is due to the fact that there are other speakers who are non-Sabaot and may be faced with the problem of language barrier.

The last statement on language attitude towards Sabaot is: *Sabaot is more important for me than Kiswahili.* 78.8% of the respondents strongly believe that the Sabaot language is more important to them than Kiswahili, 9.6% are undecided while 11.6% disagreed with this statement. The rationale for the 11.6% disagreeing could be because Kiswahili as a national language is known country wide and hence is more prestigious knowing it than Sabaot language.

About the attitude of the older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Kiswahili, they gave the following responses: Regarding the first statement concerning the language attitude towards Kiswahili which states: *Kiswahili should be used in all situations*, only 11.5% agreed with this statement while 88.5% disagreed. The simple reason why majority of the older speakers refused to agree with this statement is because this will impact negatively on the use of Sabaot language as the Kiswahili language will replace the use of Sabaot language in every domain and eventually the Sabaot language will be endangered.

The second statement on the attitude towards Kiswahili is: *Kiswahili is more important than Sabaot.* Majority of the older speakers at 96.2% disagreed with this statement with only 3.8% of the respondents being undecided. This clearly shows that the older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals appreciate the importance of Sabaot language and this is what they pride in and are not ready to let Kiswahili language replace the role of Sabaot language.
In relation to the third statement on the attitude towards Kiswahili which states that: *Fluency in Kiswahili will help me to succeed in my career.* The percentage of those who agreed with the statement was 15.4%, 7.7% was undecided while 76.9% disagreed with this statement. Contrary to this, 76.9% of the respondents do not agree that Kiswahili language can help one to succeed in his or her career but instead perceives career as a threat to the survival of Sabaot language.

Finally the fourth statement on the attitude towards Kiswahili by the older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals is: *Kiswahili fluency improves my social status.* 11.5% agreed with this statement, 19.2% were undecided while 69.3% disagreed.

In as much as both the younger and older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals feel that Sabaot is a symbol of their identity and it carries their culture and history with over 80% in both cases, something needs to be done because merely having a positive attitude towards Sabaot language is not enough to maintain it.

Another important finding was that the number of younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals who believe that Sabaot language is more important to them than Kiswahili is at 73.4% while for the older speakers is at 100% . The reason why there is lower number of younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals supporting the statement could be attributed to the fact that most of them do not see the need of speaking Sabaot language because it does not improve their social status.

The reason other reason why the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals have a negative attitude towards Sabaot unlike the older speakers is because possibly because of
inhibition of speaking Sabaot language in school, and failure to adhere to it earns one a punishment. On the other hand, the older generation has a positive attitude toward Sabaot language and wants it to be used nearly all domains. This is a pointer towards language maintenance while the negative attitude of the younger and middle-aged entails a language shift towards Kiswahili (superior language).

It is also important to note that the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals perceives the invading language (Kiswahili), as a symbol of a higher status in life and therefore chooses to associate with the culture it carries. The younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals hence look at their identity as having been “better symbolized by the invading language” (Kiswahili) as expressed by (Myers-Scotton, 1992). The outcomes of this research agrees with (Fishman, 1985) who argues that when a minority language like in this case the Sabaot comes into contact with a majority language for example Kiswahili, the minority (Sabaot) is swallowed by a majority language.

The outcome of this research also agrees with (Oshana, 2003) who claims that there is a connection between identity status and culture and since there was a very minimal connectivity between linguistic competence and identity status among the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals, this is a warning that something needs to be done to salvage the Sabaot language situation and that is where the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ (a language nest) comes handy.

The next table 4.10 presents the summary of core/cultural borrowing per semantic fields into Sabaot from Kiswahili according to age-grading.
Table 4.10: Frequency of occurrence of Core/Cultural nouns borrowed into Sabaot from Kiswahili per semantic fields according to age grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Attitudes</th>
<th>Younger group (16-25 yrs.)</th>
<th>Middle-aged group (30-49 yrs.)</th>
<th>Older group (50+ yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Attitude towards Sabaot</td>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Respondents with positive attitude</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Respondents with negative attitude</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Attitude towards Kiswahili</td>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>Male %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Respondents with positive attitude</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Respondents with negative attitude</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of table 4.10 above indicates that the percentage of younger and middle-aged who have a positive attitude towards Kiswahili is at 46.3% while those who feel negatively towards Kiswahili are 16.7%. In as much as the percentage of those having a positive attitude is also at 46.7% among the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals, merely being positive about Sabaot language is not adequate to maintain it. From these findings, it can be concluded that there is a likely trend that the younger and middle aged once they grow old they are likely not to change their positive attitude towards Kiswahili and this is going to endanger the survival of Sabaot language.

4.2.2 Conclusion

As Baker (1992) pointed out, attitudes are an important part of language life. Therefore, it emerged that the interplay between the attitude that the younger, middle-aged and older
Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals portray towards Sabaot/Kiswahili is determined by age. The outcome of this research also indicates that older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals are less adaptable to the linguistic environmental changes that have occurred in Sabaot language and so have language attitudes that depict them as reluctant to embrace changes that will affect the survival of Sabaot language. On the other hand, the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals appeared to welcome the linguistic storm which is Kiswahili drowning the Sabaot language. This could be considered to be a symptom of the gradual shift towards Kiswahili by the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals.

According to Giles et al. (1977) theory of EVT, it argues that if a language which bears a low status, socially and also economically, then the speakers of this language are more likely to abandon their language for another variety with a high status. This perhaps explains why majority of the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals prefer to use Kiswahili at the expense of their native language (Sabaot) to express themselves.

The next research question looks at the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has employed to revitalize the Sabaot language.
4.3 Results on ‘Sumaneet Centre.’ (Language nest)

The third objective of this research is ‘to find out the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has adopted to revitalize the Sabaot language’.

4.3.0 Introduction

‘Sumaneet Centre’ (a language nest) is a centre where the efforts to revive the Sabaot language from dying is taking place like in the case of Maori language in New Zealand. In this centre, the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals are exposed to only Sabaot language through one on one interaction with proficient speakers of Sabaot language. According to Johnston and Johnston (2002), this kind of interaction is meaningful because the younger members of a speech community are given an opportunity to learn their language. In this part, we shall look at the strategies that the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has put in place to revitalize the Sabaot language.

4.3.1 Presentation of data on the strategies adopted by the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ to revitalize the Sabaot language

As a way of data collection, a questionnaire with six questions concerning the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ was issued to 30 Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals both younger and older (male and female in equal numbers respectively). Their responses were also converted to percentages to assist in interpreting the data. The findings are analyzed as follows.

To begin with the respondents were asked whether they knew about ’Sumaneet Centre,’ 98% of the respondents affirmed yes and explained that it is a place for learning Sabaot
language/culture with only 2% responding having no knowledge of it. This is a clear indication that majority of the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals are aware of ‘Sumaneet Centre’ and they have embraced the role it is playing in revitalizing the Sabaot language.

Secondly, the respondents were asked about what is learnt at ‘Sumaneet Centre,’ 50% of the respondents said songs, 36.7% poems, 70% Bible studies while 26.7% said that they learnt hymns. When the respondents were asked in what language were the songs, poems, Bible studies and hymns conducted, 6.7% said it was in English, 10% Kiswahili and 93.3% said that it was written in Sabaot. These are some of the ways in which the people at the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ are using to create awareness to them about the different avenues of learning the Sabaot language.

If the Sabaot speakers can, for instance, sing a song in their language to other Sabaot Speakers, an interest will be created among to start developing positive attitude towards Sabaot language. The willingness of majority of Sabaot parents and their children to learn the Sabaot language at ‘Sumaneet Centre,’ is evident that the interest of maintaining the native language at the expense of Kiswahili will increase in future.

Thirdly, they were asked about the language used for documentation at ‘Sumaneet Centre,’ 95% of the respondents said that the Sabaot songs, poems, Bible Studies and Hymns were written in Sabaot language with only 5% saying it was written in Kiswahili. This therefore means that the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has done a lot to document the Sabaot language so that it can be used for future generation as a point of reference. Blair et al. (2002) asserts that it is important for minority languages to embrace documenting their language as this will help them preserve it before it dies for future generations’
consumption. Morrison and Peterson (2003) highlight that ways of documenting a language includes: taping of elder speakers, coming up with dictionaries for the language and developing Computer programs to assist in language teaching.

According to Giles et al. (1977) theory of EVT, they assert that one of the ways through which a minority language can increase its maintenance is through institutional support. The availability of printed reading/learning materials at the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ in Sabaot language is a clear evidence that the Sabaot language is on the path of reviving itself and hence increasing the vitality of Sabaot language among its speakers.

The respondents were also asked the reasons people meet at ‘Sumaneet Centre,’ 80% of the respondents said that they meet there to read in Sabaot language, 85% said they learnt how to write in Sabaot while 75% pointed out that they met there to learn how to be self-sufficient in life. Teaching the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals how to read and write by the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ is a very crucial aspect because one cannot claim to be competent in Sabaot language without knowing how to read and expressing oneself through writing.

The teaching of Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals ways of planting short-seasoned crops like onions and tomatoes so that they could sell and use the money to support their families is very important. Myers–Scotton (2006) and Holmes (2001) further argue that economic factors could determine the language shift of a speech community. This is because economic factors can make an ethnic community to either maintain or lose their native language. In order to curb the menace, the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ chose the path of educating the Sabaot/Kiswahili who attend reading/writing classes at the centre on how to be self-sufficient in life so that they will be economically stable and hence support their families.
without relying on anybody else and this in turn will help the Sabaot speakers to maintain speaking their ethnic language.

Furthermore, the respondents were asked if they owned a radio, TV or a computer and what they used it for. The findings revealed that 26.7% of them owned a TV, 80% owned radios while 16.7% owned computers. When the respondents were further asked about what is listened to on BikaabKoreet Radio FM, 33.3% said they listened to farming programmes while 96.7% of the respondents said that they were listen to programmes that taught them Sabaot language.

The radio programmes that are aired by Bikaab Koreet FM at Kapsokwony Centre offer a good platform to the majority of Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals to learn more about their ethnic language and therefore assist in preserving the Sabaot language. Stephen (1992) says that TV’s and radios have roles in preserving the minority languages. He further goes ahead and to cite an example of the workshop which took place in 2003 in Vietnam to discuss the role of the media in preserving the minority languages. The outcome of the workshop revealed that the radio and TV programmes were believed to be one of the ways of effectively preserving the minority language in Vietnam.

The Bikaab koreet radio station being used to promote the awareness about Sabaot language is something good as it helps the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals to understand the uniqueness of Sabaot language and hence the vitality of Sabaot language. However, caution needs to be put in place so as to prevent the radio station from being used to incite the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals against other communities living amongst them who are non-Sabaot.
In another instance, the respondents were asked about the resources found at the ‘Sumaneet Centre’. 93.3% of the respondents said it had a library while only 16% said it had a feeding centre. The reason why some respondents said that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ had a feeding centre was because those people who went to learn Sabaot language fed after the learning exercises as an incentive to attract many learners at the Centre. The ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has started initiating programmes that promotes the writing of songs, poems conducting Bible studies and hymns which were then documented in Sabaot language and kept in the library. The centre is preserving materials that can be used by learners and teachers of Sabaot language for reference (Asher, 2003).

Finally, the respondents were asked about the location of ‘Sumaneet Centre, 97% of the respondents said it was situated at Makutano Centre in Chepyuk ward while only 3% said it was found in kapkateny. The fact that majority of the respondents know where ‘Sumaneet Centre’ (language nest) is located is positive since they can access the place any time they want to learn more about Sabaot language.

4.3.3 Conclusion

The findings in part three of this research have shown that the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ is playing a crucial role in revitalizing the Sabaot language. The support they are offering towards promoting the teaching and learning of this language serves as a turning point in reviving the language which is being threatened by Kiswahili. In addition, by extension the Bikaab koreet radio station is also being used as a tool of teaching many Sabaot /bilingual speakers their language. I think from now henceforth the Sabaot speakers have
been provided with an opportunity to read, learn, write the Sabaot language and even listen to it. This will go a long way in preserving it for future generations.

4.3.4 General Conclusions for the Chapter

In this part the identification the core/cultural borrowings into Sabaot from Kiswahili among younger and older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals were determined. It emerged from the findings that there was extensive core borrowing from Kiswahili into Sabaot which serves as a major threat to the survival of Sabaot language. Secondly, the non-linguistic factors that motivate Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals to borrow from Kiswahili were determined. The data shows that age and attitude are the factors that contributed to Kiswahili borrowings into Sabaot. It also came out that the level of borrowing was higher among the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals than the older ones.

Lastly, the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has adopted to revitalize the Sabaot language in Bungoma County were found out. The findings revealed that the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ is trying to revive the Sabaot language through documentation, teaching the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals how to read and write and also creating more awareness about the language through Bikaab Koreet radio station. The following chapter presents a summary of the findings and from these conclusions and recommendations for areas that require further studies are proposed.
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter looks at findings, conclusions and recommendations for the present research. The rationale for this research was to identify and describe the spoken language of the younger and older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals, evaluate the factors motivating Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals to borrow from Kiswahili and finally determine the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ had adopted to revitalize the Sabaot language.

5.1 Summary of findings

Several findings came up as a result of analyzing data in chapter four. To begin with, the first objective of the research was “to determine core and cultural borrowings in Sabaot from Kiswahili among younger, middle-aged and older Sabaot /Kiswahili bilinguals.” In order to determine the core/cultural borrowing into Sabaot from Kiswahili, the researcher came up with a 40-word list. The concepts picked from Swadesh list (1952) which were believed to be the most resistant to borrowing. The 40-word list came up from different semantic fields which included. The words that constituted this word list fall under the following semantic categories; body parts (10), technology (6), kinship (6), physical world (7), food and drinks (6) vegetation and Agriculture (5).

From the findings it came up that the older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals have borrowed more in the semantic field of physical world as compared to other semantic fields at 11.5% motivation being that the older speakers have had a longer duration interacting with the physical world than the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals. On the other hand,
the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals have borrowed more in the semantic field of technology items at 30.8% as compared to other semantic fields. This could possibly be due to the fact that technology is a recent phenomenon and appeals more to them than the older counterparts. The use of computers and phones being top of the list.

This study agrees with studies conducted by (Poplack, 1988) which points out that the younger speakers borrow more than the older speaker just like in the case of Sabaot where the younger speakers are using new Sabaot (corrupted version of Sabaot) more than the older ones as a result of core borrowing.

The implication from this is that there is extensive core borrowing of basic vocabulary items from Kiswahili among the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals which is a limelight to show that there is a weak urge of identity among the Sabaot culture as compared to Kiswahili (Greenberg, 1957:39). This shows that Kiswahili is a major threat to the existence of Sabot language.

The second objective of the research is “to examine the non-linguistic factors that motivate Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals to borrow from Kiswahili.” As a way of collecting data, a questionnaire concerning the attitudes of Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot and Kiswahili was presented to 30 respondents. The responses were divided into three parts according to their ages, for instance, younger (16-29 years), middle-aged (30-49 years) and older (50+years).
The results of the analysis of the attitude of the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals towards Sabaot/Kiswahili shows that the younger and middle-aged have a higher preference for the Kiswahili language in most situations than their Sabaot language since to them Kiswahili can improve their social status, economic survival and social mobility. On the other hand, the results indicate that older Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals are less adaptable to the linguistic environmental changes that have occurred in Sabaot language and so have language attitudes that depict them as less willing to embrace changes that will affect the survival of Sabaot language. It also came out that age determines the attitude that a speaker has towards Sabaot/Kiswahili. The findings of this research agrees with prior studies on language contact which reveals that age and attitudes are non-linguistic social attributes that determine language use in many speech communities (Abdulaziz, 1982 and Milroy, 1987). The positive attitudes that the younger Sabaot/Kiswahili bilingual towards Kiswahili is a force that works against the survival of Sabaot language and something needs to be done to reverse the situation and this is where ‘Sumaneet Centre’ (a language nest) comes in.

The third objective of this research is: ‘to find out the strategies that ‘Sumaneet Centre’ has adopted to revitalize the Sabaot language. In order to collect data a questionnaire with six questions concerning the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ was issued to 30 Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals both younger and older (male and female in equal numbers respectively). The findings of the research showed that the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ is playing a very crucial role in revitalizing the Sabaot language. The support they are offering
towards promoting the teaching/learning of Sabaot language serves as a turning point of reviving the language.

The Bikaab koreet radio is being used as a tool of teaching many Sabaot speakers their language. In addition, to the teaching/learning, the resources documented in Sabaot language found in the centre now will act as archival materials which may be useful resource for those who will be interested studying the language and for the development of the syllabus that can be used in schools (Asher, 2003).

As a result of the strategies put in place, the Sabaot language situation is being salvaged by the ‘Sumaneet Centre.’ The findings show that there is hope for the Sabaot language to be passed to the new generations. However, for ‘Sumaneet Centre’ to continue flourishing it needs much support of the political good will and financial support from the government because it is at present being sustained by well-wishers to support its programmes which cannot be relied on for long.

5.2 Conclusion

Concerning core/cultural borrowings into Sabaot from Kiswahili, the data has revealed that there is extensive core borrowing of basic vocabulary items from Kiswahili among the Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals which shows that there is a weak urge of identity among the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals than the older counterparts on the Sabaot culture as compared to Kiswahili.
The findings of this research also reveal that the positive attitudes that younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals have towards Kiswahili appears to be the ‘linguistic wind’ which is sweeping Sabaot language. It can also be considered to be a symptom of the gradual death of Sabaot language which is what the older speakers are against. As way of reversing the situation, the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ was established to prevent the Sabaot language from Shifting towards Kiswahili and therefore strengthening the vitality of the Sabaot language.

5.3 Recommendations

The findings of this research have revealed that there is extensive core borrowing of Kiswahili nouns into Sabaot language mainly among the younger and middle-aged Sabaot/Kiswahili bilinguals. This has mainly been fueled by their positive attitude towards Kiswahili at the expense of their ethnic language which is Sabaot. For the sake of preserving the Sabaot language for future generations, then the efforts of ‘Sumaneet Centre’ (language nest) of trying to revitalize the Sabaot language must then receive support from all the stakeholders to supplement what the well-wishers are doing.

5.4 Suggestions for further research

This study was only limited to the nouns borrowed from Kiswahili into Sabaot language as a result of Sabaot/Kiswahili contact. It is good to point out that there are other areas which need research in Sabaot language for instance.
i) The study looked at borrowed nouns only from Kiswahili into Sabaot but other areas can also be studied for example: adverbs, verbs and adjectives.

ii) Sabaot has co-existed with other ethnic languages such as luhyá, Iteso, and English. A study to examine borrowed nouns from these languages is needed.
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I wish to inform you that am conducting a research on the topic, linguistic outcomes of Sabaot/Kiswahili contact in Mt.Elgon Sub County, in Bungoma County, Kenya. This is in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in the department of English and linguistics, Kenyatta University. Your sub county has been selected as a target area for research and I therefore wish to obtain permission to carry out the research. All the information provided will be treated with strict confidentiality and will only be used for the purpose of this study.
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Machani Abraham
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Dear participant,

I am Machani Abraham, a student at Kenyatta University, Department of English and linguistics, doing my Masters of Arts research as per the degree requirements. I am carrying out a research on linguistics outcomes of Sabaot/Kiswahili contact in Mt. Elgon sub county, Bungoma County, Kenya. You are kindly requested to take part in completing the attached word list/questionnaire.

The data will be kept confidential and used solely for the purpose of academic research.

Thank you so much for your cooperation

Best regards

Name Machani Abraham

Email: abumachani@gmail.com
PART A: Personal information.

Date of session___________________

(i) Biographic information

Sex   male ( )   Female ( )

Within which age bracket do you fall? Kindly tick the appropriate for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>16-29 years</th>
<th>30-49 years</th>
<th>50+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PART B: A wordlist**

Below is a list of Kiswahili nouns, kindly provide how each of the noun is referred to in Sabaot language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns in Kiswahili</th>
<th>Gloss in English</th>
<th>How are the nouns referred to in Sabaot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ulimi</td>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>*Ulimi/ng’alapta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdomo</td>
<td>Mouth</td>
<td>*Mdomot/kutit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkono</td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>auut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgŭu</td>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>kirenget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingo</td>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>*Shingot/katit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>*Moyot/mukuloko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goti</td>
<td>Knee</td>
<td>*Magoitit/kutunynito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfupa</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>*Mfupet/koeet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgongo</td>
<td>Back</td>
<td>*Mgongot/pateet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kichwa</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>metiit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pombe</td>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>*Pombe/mayiek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maji</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>beeko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugali</td>
<td>Ugali</td>
<td>*Ugalit/kimnyeet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazwa</td>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>cheeko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyama</td>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>bento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malenge</td>
<td>Pumpkin</td>
<td>*Malenget/mariangait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kompyuta</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>kompyuteet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simu</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>simuut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gari</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>kariiit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baiskeli</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>*Baiskiit/ntikaat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>rediot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barua</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>*Baruet/bakalyet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwezi</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>*Mwesit/araweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moto</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>maata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvua</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>*Mvuet/ropta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Njaa</td>
<td>Hunger</td>
<td>kamaaunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moshi</td>
<td>Smoke</td>
<td>*Moshi/kiyetiit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jifu</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>*Jifut/areek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuni</td>
<td>Firewood</td>
<td>*Kunik/kweniik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baba</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>*Baba/aboo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mama</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>*Mama/momo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvulana</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>weriit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msichana</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>cheptoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mjomba</td>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>maama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangazi</td>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>*Shangasit/sengee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mti</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>*Mitit/ketit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndizi</td>
<td>Banana</td>
<td>*Ndisit/ntotanteet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyasi</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>*Nyasit/susweek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msitu</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>*Msitut/uyeet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mchanga</td>
<td>soil</td>
<td>*Mchanget/tang’yiek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Nouns with asterisk are core borrowed into Sabaot language from Kiswahili.
PART C: Sociolinguistic Questionnaire on Language Attitude Towards Sabaot and Kiswahili

Please read the following statements and tick in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A. Attitude towards Sabaot</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>It is the symbol of my Sabaot identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>It is a prestigious language because it carries Sabaot culture and history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Sabaot enable me to socially communicate with people around me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>It is more important than Kiswahili for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B. Attitude towards Kiswahili</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>It is important to use Kiswahili in all situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Kiswahili is more important than Sabaot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Fluency in Kiswahili is essential to succeed in my career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Fluency in Kiswahili improves my social status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART D: SUMANEET CENTRE

a) Do you know Sumaneet Centre Yes ( ) No ( )

If yes what is it used for?

a)  

b)  

c)  

Kindly tick the correct answer in the following questions

1) What is learnt in SumaneetCentre?

a. Sabaot songs  

b. Poems  

c. Bible studies  

d. Hymns  

2) In what languages are the above written?

a. English  

b. Kiswahili  

c. Sabaot  

3) What are the reasons why people meet in Sumaneet Centre?

   a. Reading in Sabaot language
   b. Writing in Sabaot language
   c. Learning politics
   d. Learning how to be self-sufficient

4) i. Do you own any of the following?

   a. T.V
   b. Radio
   c. Computer

ii. Which programmes do you listen to on BikaabKoreet Radio (BK FM)?

   a. Vitimbi
   b. ViojaMahakamani
   c. Farming
   d. Learning Sabaot language

5) Which of the following resources does the ‘Sumaneet Centre’ have?

   a. Library
   b. Feeding centre
6) In Chepyuk ward, where is Sumaneet Centre relocated?

a. Kapsokwony
b. Kapkateny
c. Kaptama
d. Makutano Centre

END THANK YOU
APPENDIX C: A MAP OF MT. ELGON SUB COUNTY.

Source: ESRI Eastern Africa.
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