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This study is an analysis of cultural lexical borrowing of nominals in Lubukusu from English, their morphological assimilation into the language and the resultant vitality of Lubukusu. Its objectives were: to identify the cultural lexical nominals that Lubukusu has borrowed from English; to examine how the cultural lexical nominals borrowed from English have been adapted into the morphological system of Lubukusu and to establish the vitality of Lubukusu as a result of these borrowings. Two theories guided this study: the Borrowing Transfer Theory as propounded by Terrence Odlin (1989) which demonstrates that when languages come into contact, transfer or diffusion of material from one language to another takes place, and The Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory as advanced by Giles et al (1977), which highlights three indicators of a language's vitality: demography, status and institutional support. This theory aids this study in establishing the vitality of Lubukusu as a result of borrowing cultural lexical nominals from English.

Primary data was collected by use of semi structured interviews with twenty four Lubukusu-English bilinguals who are native speakers of Lubukusu- these were tape recorded; and tape recording of radio broadcasts in Lubukusu from local FM radio stations. Secondary data was collected from written literature in Lubukusu namely the Bukusu bible and the Bukusu-English dictionary. Recorded data was transcribed and then analyzed together with the written data using the stated theories. A total of 157 cultural lexical borrowed nominals were identified and classified into nine semantic fields. Their morphological assimilation into Lubukusu and the resultant vitality of the language were also examined. Frequencies of occurrence of these borrowed nominals were compiled in regard to semantic fields, data source, gender and age of respondents using SPSS version 17. The results were presented in tables and figures. The findings of the study revealed that Lubukusu has borrowed cultural lexical nominals in different semantic fields and these are assimilated into the Lubukusu morphological system hence increasing its expressive power.
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EV: Ethnolinguistic Vitality

EVT: Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory
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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Borrowing:

The incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native language by speakers of that language.

Core borrowing:

The incorporation into a language, of foreign items for which the borrowing language already has viable equivalents.

Cultural borrowing:

The incorporation into a language, of foreign objects or concepts which are new to the borrowing language culture.

Borrowing transfer:

The influence a second language has on a previously acquired language, which is typically one’s native language.

Language vitality:

The range and importance of the symbolic functions a variety serves, that is, the degree to which a variety is used.

Prestige:

The level of respect accorded to a language or dialect as compared to that of other languages or dialects in a speech community.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction.

When languages come into contact, there is some degree of cultural contact, however limited (Bynon 1977). As a result, there is bound to be some sort of language change both negative and positive. Borrowing, bilingualism, code switching, code mixing, pidgins, creoles, language shift and language death are some of the products of language contact. The focus of this study is linguistic borrowing as a result of contact between two languages: Lubukusu and English. The study seeks to identify some of the cultural lexical nominals borrowed in Lubukusu from English, their morphological adaptation and the resultant vitality of Lubukusu.

1.1 Background to the Study

Borrowing

Borrowing is the incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native language by speakers of that language: the native language is maintained but is changed by the addition of the incorporated features (Thomason and Kaufman (1988) in Meyers-Scotton (2002)). In a borrowing situation, the first foreign elements to enter the borrowing language are words since of all sectors of language; it is the lexicon which reflects the culture of its speakers most closely. Words adopted in this way are called borrowings or loanwords. Of these, nouns are the most borrowed category (Meyers-Scotton 2002).
Closely related to and often confused with borrowing is code switching and the dividing line between the two is very thin. Young (2008) defines code switching as a linguistic term denoting the concurrent use of more than one language variety in conversation. However, not all the speakers who use borrowed forms need to be bilingual as is the case for code switching. In addition, a borrowed form has a status in the recipient language and though one cannot predict when it will reoccur, one can predict it definitely will reoccur. The same cannot be said for code switching forms; they have no predictive value. The borrowed form is also widely used in the speech community and has achieved a certain level of recognition or acceptance (Meyers-Scotton 2002:41; Poplack (1988). Code switching however is beyond the scope of this study.

All languages borrow and this occurs at various rates at all linguistic levels: phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic and/or semantic. Meyers-Scotton (1993: 169) identifies two types of borrowing: Cultural borrowing which represents objects or concepts new to the borrowing language culture for example ‘baisikeli’ (‘bicycle’ in Swahili) and core borrowing which represents items for which the borrowing language already has viable equivalents for example ‘epia’ (‘beer’ in Lubukusu. Its viable equivalent is ‘kamalwa’). While cultural borrowings fill lexical gaps in the borrowing language or dialect, core borrowings are borrowed because they are felt to be prestigious or just novel. Having such words as part of one’s own repertoire is a means of identifying with the donor-language culture (ibid).
Lubukusu

The Babukusu (speakers of Lubukusu) are a sub-tribe of the Luhyas ethnic group of Western province of Kenya (Were 1967). They are of the Niger-Congo family group and classified by Guthrie (1948) as E31c. They constitute the largest dialect of Luhyas speakers and make up about a third of the whole Luhyas population. The other Luhyas dialects are Lutiriki, Luloogoli, Lukhayo, Lumarachi, Lukisa, Lutsotso, Lukabarasi, Lutachoni, Luwanga Lunyala, Lusamia, Luisukha, Lutakho, Lutura, Lunyore and Lumarama (August 2009 national population and housing census; Angogo 1980) (See Appendix 1a). These dialects are more or less mutually intelligible. Though considered a dialect (Angogo 1980; Kebeya, 1997; Nandelenga 2000 and Barasa 2001), for purposes of this study Lubukusu shall be treated as a language.

According to the 2009 national census, Lubukusu has 1,432,810 speakers. They currently inhabit Bungoma and Trans-Nzoia counties though a few others have settled in the neighbouring counties, formally districts, of Kakamega, Lugari, Busia, Uasin Gishu, Mt Elgon and Teso (Nandelenga 2000:5). The language has three main variations:

i. The dialect spoken North of Kimilili area, with its heaviest influence being noted in the region around Kitale.

ii. The dialect spoken west of Webuye town, with its purest form in the region around and to the west of Bungoma town. This region borders Uganda to the West and Kakamega to the east.
iii. The dialect spoken east of Webuye town extending to Kakamega and Lugari counties.

This study shall be based on the dialect spoken North of Kimilili area and any reference to Lubukusu shall be referring to it.

**English**

English belongs to the West Germanic branch of the Indo-European group of languages (Grimes 1996). It is an international language and has become a lingua franca in many parts of the world. In its interaction with other languages, it has been a donor to many languages and a recipient of quite a number of borrowed items from others. For example, 'altar' has its origin in the Latin 'altäre' while 'chef' has its origin in the French 'chef (de cuisine') meaning 'head cook' (Bynon 1977).

English first came to Kenya through European explorers, Christian missionaries, traders and the British colonialist (Owino 2003). During the colonial period (1920-1963) the language was taught to native Kenyans by native English teachers in schools (Muthwii, 1994). Later, The Ominde Report of 1964 recommended that children receive their education in their mother tongue during their initial years of training that is, classes 1-3 (Lubukusu was one such language) and class four onwards in English (Mbaabu 1996).

In Kenya just like in India, Singapore, Jamaica and Hong Kong among many other countries, English has been assigned a special role. It has been made the official language of the country, to be used as a medium of communication in such domains as government, the law courts, the media, and the educational system (Furaha, 2007), and provision is made for this in the current constitution. Proficiency in English is a
requirement for white-collar-jobs and is associated with the educated, economically powerful and the influential. English in Kenya is therefore prestigious and occupies a culturally and socio-economically dominant position. Its influence after independence remains and it is elevated and given a higher status than other languages. As such, it enjoys a certain amount of prestige. This kind of prestige makes it a likely donor for many less prestigious languages like Kiswahili and Lubukusu among others, as illustrated above. Hock (1986) augments this argument in his lexical principle: Lexical borrowing usually takes place from the more to the less prestigious culture.

**Assimilation of Borrowed Words.**

It is common for words to be assimilated in some degree to the items already in the borrowing variety (Hudson 1980:59). This assimilation could be phonological for example ‘sitofu’ (‘stove’ in Lubukusu), where a consonant cluster and closed syllable have been modified to fit into the typical Lubukusu syllable which is open and has few consonant clusters. It could also be morphological such as ‘esofaseti’ (‘sofa set’ in Lubukusu), where the borrowed word acquires a Lubukusu (Bantu) nominal prefix and can fit into one of the Lubukusu noun classes. Assimilation can also be syntactic and/or semantic.

Most of the inflectional morphology of Bantu languages is encoded in nouns and verbs. Bukusu, like most Bantu languages, assigns every noun to one class in a gender system where each class is identified by a unique prefix structure or morpheme (Mutonyi, 2000 and Nurse & Philippson, 2003). For example, class 1 nouns are identified by the prefix structure /o-mu-/, as in omuxaana (girl). The prefix structure not only marks the
affiliation of a noun but also indicates number; that is, it says that there is either a single or multiple occurrence of the referent. A noun borrowed into Lubukusu therefore would be morphologically assimilated into one of the twenty noun classes, for example ‘omukaatuliki’ (a catholic person- class 1). It would also take appropriate pronominal and locative indicators and follow the Lubukusu system of concordial agreement where the noun or pronoun governs the agreement of the words associated with it in a syntactical relationship. These are such as verbs, adjectives, demonstratives, numbers, possessive pronouns and quantifiers. As such, a word associated with the noun or pronoun generally tends to have the same prefix as they do.

Language Vitality

According to Ryan and Giles (1982:4) in Meyers-Scotton (2002:50), a language’s vitality is defined as the range and importance of the symbolic functions a variety serves, that is, the degree to which a variety is used. The measure of such vitality is based on demographic, status and institutional support factors such as: how many speakers the language has, whether or not it is standardized, if it has a literary tradition, if it has status in government and education and so on. Related to this is ethnolinguistic vitality (EV), which Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) in Meyers-Scottton (2002) define as that which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in intergroup situations. Language contact situations are intergroup situations hence the need to assess the vitality of Lubukusu in relation to cultural lexical borrowing of nominals from English.
1.2 Statement of the Problem.

Borrowing in languages in contact is inevitable and this is one of the ways in which languages grow. Several studies have been done on lexical borrowing but none to date, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, has specifically focused on the cultural borrowing of nominals, their morphological adaption into the morphological system of the borrowing language, and how this borrowing results into positive language vitality in one single borrowing language. To fill this gap, this study therefore sought to identify some of the cultural nominals that Lubukusu has borrowed from English, examine how these borrowings are morphologically adapted into Lubukusu and examine how they have enriched the language hence its vitality.

1.3 Research Questions.

The study was guided by the following questions:

1. What are some of the cultural lexical nominals that Lubukusu has borrowed from English?
2. How have the borrowed cultural lexical nominals been adapted into the morphological system of Lubukusu?
3. What is the vitality of Lubukusu as a result of the cultural lexical borrowing of nominals?
1.4 Objectives

1. To identify some of the cultural lexical nominals that Lubukusu has borrowed from English.
2. To examine how some of the cultural lexical nominals borrowed from English have been adapted into the morphological system of Lubukusu.
3. To establish the vitality of Lubukusu as a result of borrowing cultural lexical nominals from English.

1.5 Assumptions

1. Lubukusu has borrowed cultural lexical nominals from English.
2. Borrowed cultural lexical nominals in Lubukusu from English are morphologically adapted into the Lubukusu morphological system.
3. Borrowed cultural lexical nominals from English have enriched Lubukusu and resulted into the language’s positive vitality.

1.6 Justification of the Study.

Languages grow. One of the ways in which a language shows growth is through the number of vocabulary items that are added to its lexicon. One of the processes by which this is done is through borrowing (Fasold and Linton 2006). A good example of this is Kiswahili, a Bantu language, which has borrowed from other languages such as Arabic and English (Zawawi 1975) and has grown to become an East African regional language and a lingua franca. It is also the only language of African origin among the official working languages of the African Union. In addition, it is used in the media, in education
and on the internet to name just but a few of its domains of use. When words are borrowed into a language, they are assimilated into the phonological, morphological, syntactic and/or semantic system of the borrowing language. As this happens, the language is expected to remain effective in communication.

Studies have been done on lexical borrowing and particularly its negative effects such as shift and death of the borrowing languages. Following Kisembe (2003) who examines the negative effects of English on Luhya languages, this study sought to investigate the other side of the coin: that although core borrowing has a negative impact on the borrowing language, cultural borrowing is positive and does enrich and strengthen a language hence better communication. This is because it enhances the speaker’s ability to express new concepts, experiences and objects that are alien to their culture, for which they lack native words. This study therefore adds to the existing knowledge on the topic of lexical borrowing.

When both monolingual and bilingual speakers are confronted with “new” material, they modify it to fit into the borrowing language. This gives a glimpse of the nature of their native linguistic constraints (Owino 2003). This study examines the cultural lexical borrowing of nominals in Lubukusu and how these are morphologically adapted into the language. It therefore shades some light on the internal morphological pattern of Lubukusu and particularly of borrowed words.

In a society in which ethnic languages are threatened by “more prestigious” languages like English and Kiswahili, and even the foreign languages taught in school, this study is an attempt to conserve and document Lubukusu. This enriches the existing linguistic data
base and serves as a basis for future (comparative) studies for linguists interested in studying the language.

1.7 Scope and Limitation

Borrowing can be done at different levels such as lexical, phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, or orthographic levels. This study however focuses on lexical borrowing only because as Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 37) observe, in a borrowing situation, the first foreign elements to enter the borrowing language are words. The study focuses on nominals only and not the other types of content and/or functional morphemes such as verbs, adverbs, adjectives conjunctions and so on. This is because, according to studies carried out (Poplak, Sankoff, and Miller (1988) and Treffers-Daller (1999; 9) in Meyers-Scotton (2002; 240)) nouns are borrowed more than any other category. This ensured availability of sufficient data.

According to Meyers-scotton (2002) two types of content morphemes can become borrowed forms: cultural borrowings which are words for objects and concepts new to the culture of the recipient language and core borrowings, which are words that more or less duplicate already existing words in the first language. This study focuses on lexical cultural borrowings as these enrich the borrowing language with vocabulary for expression hence its increased vitality.

Assimilation of borrowed items into the recipient language could be phonological, morphological or syntactic (Bynon 1977, Fasold & Linton, 2006). This study examines the assimilation of the borrowed words into the morphological system of Lubukusu. This is in an attempt to delimit the scope and enable a thorough analysis of data collected. This
is also in view of the fact that earlier studies such as Kisembe (2003) have focused on the phonological adaptation of borrowed words in Lubukusu.

Lubukusu speakers co-exist with speakers of Kiswahili and English the national and official languages of Kenya respectively and other ethnic languages like Tachoni, Nyala, Nandi, Sabaot, Gikuyu and Pokot. This study examines the borrowed forms from English only because as Hock (1986) puts it, lexical borrowing usually takes place from the more to the less prestigious culture, prestigious in the sense that the languages afford greater upward social and economic mobility than others. These other languages are less dominant socio-economically and have less prestige as compared to English which is culturally and socio-economically more dominant than they are, hence a likely donor for Lubukusu. English is also likely to offer sufficient data for analysis.

Borrowing in Lubukusu and other languages can be found in various aspects of human existence (Kisembe 2003, Wamalwa 1997 and Poplack et al 1988). The focus, however in this study, is borrowed vocabulary in nine areas only. These are religion, science and technology, clothing, administration, transport, business, household items, education and medicine. These areas were selected because they either initially were alien to the Bukusu culture or existed in a different form such as traditional African religion, clothing and informal education as opposed to Christianity, western clothing and formal education respectively. For this reason, there is a high likelihood of getting words in these areas that are not of Lubukusu origin. Meyers-Scotton (2002) attests to this argument. She argues that cultural borrowed forms are words for objects new to the culture. Since
aspects of these areas are associated with the coming of the white man there is a high likelihood of them being of English origin.

The focus of this chapter has been on the background to the current study. The next chapter shall focus on a review of literature related to linguistic borrowing, morphological assimilation of borrowed nominals and language vitality. The theoretical framework that guided the study shall also be discussed.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is the review of literature and studies related to the topics of linguistic borrowing, the morphological assimilation of borrowed words and language vitality. In addition to this, the theoretical framework informing the study is discussed.

2.1 Literature Review

2.1.1 Studies on Borrowing

Borrowing is a phenomenon resulting from language contact. Borrowing has been defined by different scholars in different ways. Crystal (1987) defines borrowing as the introduction of a word or other linguistic feature from one language or dialect to another. Haugen (1989:197) in Meyers-Scotton (2002) defines borrowing as the general and traditional word used to describe the adoption into a language of a linguistic feature previously used in another language. Gumperz (1982) in Kamwangamalu (2000:89) defines borrowing as the introduction of single words or short, frozen idiomatic phrases from one language into another. Words adopted by speakers of one language from a different language are called ‘borrowings’ or ‘loanwords’.

Thomason and Kaufman (1988) in Meyers-Scotton (2002) define borrowing as the incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native language by speakers of that
language: the native language is maintained but is changed by the addition of the incorporated features while Mesthrie et al (2000) define it as a technical term for the incorporation of a linguistic item from one language into another. These various definitions are relevant to this study.

According to Haugen (1989:213) in Meyers-Scotton (2002) borrowing is a process and not a state though he acknowledges that most of the terms used in discussing it are ordinarily descriptive of its results rather than of the process itself. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) advance this thought further by emphasizing three features about borrowing that imply process: i) speakers who borrow elements still maintain their L1, ii) the extent of borrowing and, more important, the types of elements borrowed depend on the degree of cultural contact and iii), borrowing includes structural borrowing, that is, incursions into the phonology, morphology or syntax of the recipient language. The current study seeks to establish whether or not this is the case for borrowings in Lubukusu from English.

Meyers-Scotton (1993) identifies two types of borrowing: Cultural borrowing which represents objects or concepts new to the borrowing language culture and core borrowing which are items for which the borrowing language already has viable equivalents. According to her, cultural borrowed forms usually appear abruptly in a language when influential individuals or groups begin using them. They may appear frequently in two outcomes: in the monolingual speech of either bilinguals or monolinguals (speaking the recipient language) or in the code switching of bilinguals. Core borrowed forms usually begin life in the recipient language when bilinguals introduce them as singly occurring
code switching forms in the mixed constituents of their code switching. This study focuses specifically on the first type: cultural borrowing.

Appel and Muysken (1987) identify different social and cultural contexts in which borrowing takes place such as invasions, conquest and domination by a majority culture, limited culture contact, limited immigration and economic dependence and coexistence in a colonial setting (as is the case for Lubukusu as earlier mentioned in the background to the study). In each case, the extent, type and sociolinguistic effect of borrowing are different.

Studies have also been done on borrowing in Luhya languages by various scholars. For example, Ochwaya (1992) in her study on the influence of English on the phonological features of Lunyala looks at differences and similarities that exist between the language of those Banyala who have never received formal education and those who have had formal education at school where they have been exposed to the English language. Her main focus however is on the phonological features of the two varieties spoken. Her study is relevant to this study as it is based on the Borrowing Transfer Theory as propounded by Terrence Odlin (1989) which this study adopts.

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, the 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 the major motivating principles for Kiswahili-Lubukusu borrowing. This study is a follow-up on two of these principles: the need to express a new concept and the need to
express oneself with linguistic economy. Unlike her study, however, the current study focuses on borrowing from English to Lubukusu. Her work is also important since it is based on the Borrowing Transfer Theory which this study adopts.

Kisembe (2003) examines the linguistic effects of English on Luhya languages of western Kenya, which she identifies as borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing, and language shift resulting to language death in some cases. She argues that English is detrimental to the development of ethnic languages in ways such as substantial reduction in stylistic expressions within ethnic languages, reduced lexicon with a lot of intrusions, changes in ethnic language phonology (prosodic and phonetic features), decrease in competence of ethnic languages, and loss of linguistic and cultural identity. While her work examines borrowing in general (core and cultural) her findings are restricted to the negative effects of borrowing on the borrowing languages. Worth noting also is that her focus is on the phonological adaptation of the borrowed words. This study looks at borrowing in greater detail by focusing on one type of borrowing only namely cultural lexical borrowing. Unlike her study, it also examines the morphological adaptation of the borrowed words into the morphological system of Lubukusu. In addition, it examines the positive effect of lexical borrowing on the recipient language.

2.1.2 Studies on Assimilation of Borrowed Words

According to Hudson (1980), it is common for borrowed items to be assimilated in some degree to the items already in the borrowing variety. Borrowed words can undergo assimilation to fit into the grammatical, morphological, phonological and/or syntactic systems of the borrowing languages, and this need not be total.
Phonological and morphological assimilation of borrowed words often go hand in hand. Fasold & Linton (2006) observe that often borrowed items are changed to conform to native linguistic rules, a process known as adaptation. Foreign sounds occurring in loanwords are replaced by their nearest phonetic equivalents in the borrowing language, a viewpoint Kisembe (2003) agrees with in her study. She looks at how borrowed vocabulary from English is phonologically adjusted to conform to the phonotactic constraints of Luhya languages. She observes that when pronouncing a foreign word or expression, the phonology of the ethnic language is used and two things are bound to happen: each of the segments in the foreign word is interpreted in terms of the native segment systems and that no strings arise that violate the syllable structure constraints or any phonotactic constraints of the ethnic language are permitted. In view of Kisembe’s study, phonological assimilation is beyond the scope of the current study.

According to Smeaton (1973), a loanword undergoes modification of morphological structure to achieve harmony with the established predominant pattern and root system of the borrowing language. This study sought to establish whether or not this observation is applicable to nominals borrowed into Lubukusu from English.

In some cases in morphological assimilation, lexical borrowings must be adapted to the morphological categories of the receiving language. The borrowing of nouns into languages with a gender or noun-class system is one type of example in which the borrowing process involves a reconfiguration of the borrowed material into new categories. Barkin (1980) studied the gender assignment of borrowed nouns from English into Spanish. He found that the assimilation of borrowed words requires gender
assignment. In Swahili, borrowed words from German were studied by Pasch and Strauch (1998) in Hafez (1996). They discovered animacy to be a major factor in class assignment. Going by these findings, this study sought to establish whether and how the borrowed words from English fit into the assigned noun clauses in Lubukusu.

Meyers-Scotton (1993:191) observes that borrowed lexical forms show different patterns of morphological integration: (a) not all forms show complete morphological integration (b) when there is incomplete morphological integration, it may characterize borrowed forms in contrast to indigenous forms and (c) borrowed forms show syntactic integration. She further supports this view in Meyers-Scotton (2002:42) that most borrowed forms are entirely – or almost entirely- morphosyntactically integrated into the recipient language. She however notes that there are exceptions. For example some borrowed forms retain some system morphemes from the donor language for example ‘alchemy’ is a borrowing originally from Arabic ‘al kimiya’ with ‘al’ as a definite article. This study sought to examine the different patterns of morphological integration of English borrowings in Lubukusu.

She also observes that some borrowed forms may not retain their original set of inflections, but they fail to conform to all the morphological requirements of the recipient language, for example, Arabic adjectives as borrowed forms in Swahili that do not receive the agreement prefixes that indigenous Bantu adjectives receive. They however follow Swahili word order. She concludes that borrowed lexical elements must leave behind their levels of predicate-argument structure and morphological realization patterns
unless they match those of the recipient language. This study forms a basis for comparison with the current study.

Poplack et al observe that in order for borrowed material to be fully integrated into the recipient language it must be adapted into the existing patterns of that language. They give the example of English words borrowed into French. They must be assigned to a grammatical category. For example, nouns and eligible adjectives must be assigned a gender and if plural, inflected for number. Verbs must be inflected for mood, tense and person. It will be interesting to compare the findings of this study with those of the current one.

Mosha in Whiteley (1971) identifies different sociolinguistic reasons why Kiganda borrows from English and Swahili. He identifies these as the non-existence of indigenous vocabulary for new and alien material objects and abstract ideas that have been coming into Kiganda from other cultures, the prestige of the source language, the need to differentiate semantic fields, the desire by the government and other institutions to avoid undesirable designations and connotations and the quest for recognition and acceptance. He also shows how the words are phonologically and morphologically integrated into Kiganda. He observes that phonetic, phonological, and morphological Lugandanization typically forces loan words into the Luganda patterns. He goes on to note that Luganda, unlike English and Kiswahili, seems to have hardly any new sounds or morphological units except the introduction of the empty morph -iŋ- and roots longer than -CVC-. It is interesting to compare these findings with those of the current study.
Zawawi (1974) examines loanwords and their effect on the classification of Swahili nominals. He looks at how these are morphologically assimilated into the Swahili language. His study presents a descriptive analysis of the classification of nominals in Swahili and discusses the variations that have occurred in their system of concordial agreements. The non-Bantu words which appear in the language are modified to fit into the Swahili system of concordial agreement and, therefore, besides their undergoing some phonological changes, these words acquire Bantu nominal prefixes, take appropriate pronominal and locative indicators and follow the Bantu system of concordial agreement. Notably however, he does not examine the vitality of the recipient language, an aspect the current study does.

2.1.3 Studies on Language Vitality.

Arnold (1982) defines vitality as the degree to which a variety has visible interaction networks that actually employ it natively for one or more essential functions. The more numerous and more important the functions served by the variety for the greater number of individuals, the greater is its vitality. Fishman (1971) re-echoes this in his observation that the status of a language variety rises and falls according to the range and importance of the symbolic functions it serves. This study seeks to establish the vitality of Lubukusu by identifying the different functions for and domains in which it is used.

Muysken and Appel (1987) identify four factors influencing language maintenance. One of these is status factors which refer to economic, social, sociohistorical and language factors. Demographic factors refer to the number of members of a linguistic minority group and their geographical distribution, while institutional support factors include mass
media, religion, governmental, or administrative services and education. The fourth factor they identify is cultural (dis-) similarity: when cultures involved are similar there is a greater tendency for shift than when they are less similar. This study sought to establish the vitality of Lubukusu as a result of borrowings from English in the light of these factors.

Lin (2007) looks at a Sociolinguistic Study on Yami Language Vitality and Maintenance. (Yami is one of the indigenous languages spoken in Taiwan). This study found that the teenagers seldom speak Yami in most of the situations and most can’t speak Yami very well. Although teenagers from the most conservative village use more Yami and speak it better, their Yami ability seems to decline as they advance with age. The decreasing Yami language use and proficiency indicates that the vitality of Yami is decreasing. The focus of the study was on teenagers. This study however examined a broader age group (20-50) to make the study more representative. It will also be interesting to compare the findings of this study with those of an African language as is the case in this study.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

Two theories guided this study: The Borrowing Transfer Theory by Terence Odlin (1989) and the Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory (EVT) by Gilles et al (1977)

2.2.1 The Borrowing Transfer Theory

In this model, Odlin (1989) states that when languages come into contact, transfer or diffusion of material from one language to another takes place. Such spreading of linguistic features from community to community (or from class to class) presupposes communication by means of the spoken or written word, that is, by hearing or seeing;
hence communication is a necessary condition for the spread of linguistic features. Communication does not however determine the direction of the ‘flow’ which results from the socio-cultural factors and socio-culturally conditioned attitudes of the communicating speakers.

Odlin sees transfer as the influence which results from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously acquired. He also notes that this transfer is usually from the superior to the inferior language, whatever its extent; diffusion from higher to lower social levels is the rule. The prestige and usefulness of the ‘upper’ language or dialect are the determining factors. Such a direction of flow may be altered only by a social revolution.

Odlin (1989) differentiates between two types of transfer: borrowing transfer and substratum transfer (Thomason and Kaufman 1988). Borrowing transfer refers to the influence a second language has on a previously acquired language (which is typically one’s native language) while substratum transfer is the influence of a source language (typically the native language of a learner) on the acquisition of a target language, the ‘second’ language regardless of how many languages the learner already knows. Borrowing transfer therefore involves the process where foreign linguistic elements are adapted to the native system. Odlin thus generalizes borrowing transfer as the influence found in a person’s native language that is due to subsequent acquisition of another language. Borrowing transfer is usually found within bilingual contexts.

Language contact always presupposes some degree of cultural contact, however limited. Odlin observes that borrowing transfer normally begins at the lexical level, because the
influence of one language on another begins with the onset of strong cultural influences from speakers of another language.

This study makes use of only one type of transfer which has been described as ‘borrowing transfer’, that is, the influence of a second language on one’s native language. This model helps explain the borrowing of English (a second language) lexical items into Lubukusu, the native language of the researcher.

2.2.2 The Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory.

Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) define Ethnolinguistic vitality (EV) as structural characteristics of status factors, demographic representation and institutional support related to a language. In their model, they propose a combination of these three main factors that influence language maintenance. They argue that the vitality of an ethnolinguistic group is that which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in intergroup situations. This means the more vitality a group has, the more likely it will 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 predicative power as well.

Status variables pertain to the ‘prestige’ of the linguistic group in the intergroup context along certain dimensions: economic, social, sociohistorical and linguistic. Muysken and Appel (1987: 33) argue that economic changes, that is, modernization, industrialization and urbanization are important variables in the description of language maintenance and shift. Where groups of minority language speakers have a relatively low economic status, there is a strong tendency to shift towards the majority language. They however also
observe that economic changes might also affect language maintenance positively, according to a study carried out by Paulsen (1981).

A group's social status, which here refers to the group's self esteem, depends largely upon its economic status. A group with low social status will tend to shift towards the language of a group which has the connotations of higher social status.

Sociohistorical status is derived from the ethnolinguistic group's history. Many groups can refer to periods in which they had to defend their ethnic identity or their independence. These historical instances can be viewed as mobilizing symbols which inspire individuals to struggle for their common interests as members of an ethnolinguistic group, as group members in the past did.

Language status can be an important variable in bilingual communities. It is easier to preserve a language with a high status in a community than one with a low status. If speakers of a language view themselves highly and are proud of whom they are, chances of preserving their language are higher than if they feel inferior to speakers of other languages. Social status usually influences language status.

Demographic factors refer to the number of group members and their distribution throughout the territory. If the absolute number of speakers of a language decreases, it implies decreasing usefulness of the language in question, which in turn gives way to shift away from the minority language (Muysken and Appel 1987). They also observe that occurrence of mixed or inter-ethnic marriages can strongly influence the percentage of speakers maintaining a minority language. In such marriages, the most prestigious
language generally has the best chance to survive as the language of the home, hence the first language of the child.

Geographical distribution of a minority group members generally affects language maintenance and shift considerably. Minority groups have better chances of maintaining their language as long as they live concentrated in a certain area. Generally, rural groups tend to preserve a minority language much longer than urban groups (Hill and Hill 1977).

In multilingual contexts, the number of domains in which a minority language is used would be important in its maintenance or shift. Fishman (1972) defines a domain as a sociocultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationships between communicators, and locales of communication, in accord with the institutions of a society and the spheres of a speech community.

Speakers choose which language to use every time they interact within a given domain such as home, cultural events, social events and so on or sub domain such as instruction or correction at home.

Institutional support variables relate to the extent of representation, both formal and informal, of the group in a wide variety of institutions such as mass media, religion, government or administrative services and education. Mass media can affect language shift considerably. However, broadcasting, publishing of books, newspapers and so on in minority languages can boost these languages.

When the minority language is also the language of religion, this will help in its maintenance. Similarly, providing governmental or administrative services in the mother
tongue can stimulate maintenance. In education, if children’s proficiency in the minority language is fostered at school, and they learn to read and write in it, this will contribute to maintenance (Muysken and Appel 1987)

According to Giles et al (1977), these three types of variables ‘interact to provide the context for understanding the vitality of ethnolinguistic groups’. The more status, demographic representation and institutional support an ethnic group enjoys in society, the greater its ethnolinguistic vitality (EV) would be. Conversely, an ethnic grouping that does not score highly on these variables would experience a shift towards those with more vitality; the worst case scenario being that they could, eventually, be absorbed into the ethnolinguistically more vibrant group(s) (Mann 2000).

Guided by this model, ‘The Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory’, this study seeks to establish the vitality of Lubukusu, an ethnic language spoken in Western Kenya, as a result of cultural borrowing from English.

In this chapter, the focus has been on review of literature related to the topics of linguistic borrowing, the morphological assimilation of borrowed nominals and language vitality. The theories guiding this study have also been discussed. The next chapter is a discourse of the research methodology adopted for this study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

To meet the objectives of this research, this chapter examines the research design, area of study, sampling procedure, sample size, informants, data collection techniques and data analysis and presentation adopted therein.

3.1 Research Design

This study adopted both a qualitative and quantitative research design that enabled the researcher to identify the cultural lexical borrowing of nominals in Lubukusu from English, and describe their morphological assimilation and the resultant vitality of Lubukusu. The researcher used both primary and secondary data.

3.2 Area of Study

The area in which the study was located was Trans-Nzoia County where Lubukusu is spoken by a large percentage of its inhabitants. Specifically the study was carried out in Bikeke village, approximately eight kilometers from Kitale town, the headquarters of the county. This area was chosen because of its proximity to the town. This means its inhabitants, majority of whom are Lubukusu speakers, have access to activities in and around the town such as buying provisions, using public transport to and from work and college and so on. There would be a high propensity to use terminologies in science and
technology and the other semantic fields earlier identified. In spite of this proximity to the urban centre, the village still exhibits some degree of rural life. The area was also familiar to the researcher, having been brought up and partly educated there. This enabled the researcher select her sample and create rapport with the respondents.

3.3 Sampling Procedure

A pilot study using an informal interview was carried out to identify the relevant sample. The researcher used purposive sampling technique. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) this technique allows the researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of their study. The researcher enlisted the help of two research assistants who, together with her, visited several houses of people staying in the area identified. The researchers then identified in advance speakers who fitted a specified category in terms of languages spoken, age, educational background and occupation. Potential informants were recruited from these.

3.4 Sample Size

Labov (1966) in Milroy (1987) argues that a linguistic trait does not require a massive number of subjects for it to be noticed or traced. He says that variations can emerge even from samples as small as twenty-five speakers. Other linguists like Trudgil (1974) and Stubbs (1983) cited in Ochwaya (1992) are in agreement with this and also lay emphasis on the need for adequate rather than enormous data, and a detailed analysis of the data obtained.
In the light of such views, a sample drawn from twenty four respondents was deemed sufficient to enable an exhaustive study of cultural lexical borrowed nominals in Lubukusu. It is the reasoning in this study that the samples from these respondents will reflect the general linguistic pattern of borrowing, morphological assimilation and language vitality of the majority of Lubukusu speakers. From recorded interviews with each of the respondents, cultural borrowed nominals from the nine semantic fields identified were drawn; hence a total of 157 words were collected for analysis.

In addition to the twenty four respondents, two more respondents aged 70 and 74 respectively and native speakers of Lubukusu were identified to verify that the identified nominals are indeed cultural borrowings and that no native equivalents exist in the Lubukusu lexicon. This choice was based on the view that speakers of this age are considered the custodians of a language’s purity and would know which words are borrowed, and amongst these, which are cultural and which are core.

3.5 Informants

Data was collected from Lubukusu-English bilinguals who are native speakers of Lubukusu. This is in accordance with Christophersen’s (1956) view in Ochwaya (1992) that someone speaking or writing in his mother tongue is allowed to take liberties with the language, since after all, ‘it is his own language’. But somebody who has acquired the same language as a second language will be felt by many to be wrong to do the same; it will be an improper liberty to take since ‘it is not his own language’.

The respondents were also required to have a minimum of secondary school O-level education as by this level, the respondents would have acquired sufficient proficiency in
English to borrow from the language. The researcher also avoided Lubukusu native speakers who were fluent in other neighbouring Kenyan languages. This would eliminate the prospect of informants using lexical items borrowed from those other languages.

Informants ranged between the ages of twenty and fifty and of these there was an equal representation of gender. In this study, respondents aged 20-35 are treated as ‘younger’ speakers and those aged 36-50 as ‘older’ speakers. Labov (1966), Trudgil (1974) and Chambers (1995) use a similar approach. Amongst the respondents were teachers, farmers, shopkeepers, business people, medical practitioners, housewives and students. This enabled the researcher to collect data drawn from the various semantic fields identified in chapter one.

3.6 Data Collection

Primary Data

Semi-structured interviews in Lubukusu were used to collect data. These enabled flexibility as the researcher could probe or modify questions at natural points in the flow rather than having rigid schedules of questions to follow. The interviews were based on the use of an interview guide. The interviews were on a wide range of topics relating to the respondents’ language (Lubukusu), their attitude towards it and generally the status of the language. The questions were also on the respondents’ occupation and hobbies. The informality ensured a natural and spontaneous interaction. Questions were asked and responses given in Lubukusu. The interviewer was at liberty to use borrowed words herself although the interviewees did not know the specific words the interviewer was interested in. These interviews were tape recorded.
More data was collected from Lubukusu radio broadcasts on two local FM radio stations namely Mulembe FM and West FM. These were also tape recorded and transcribed.

**Secondary Data**

Secondary data was collected from books written in Lubukusu, specifically the Lubukusu dictionary ‘Bukusu- English Dictionary’ (Marlo and Wasike, 2008) and the Lubukusu Bible ‘Ebibilia Endakatifu’ (1986). Lubukusu assigns every noun to one class in a gender system where each class is identified by a unique prefix structure. It is these unique prefixes that guided the identification and selection of nominals from the dictionary. The nominals identified were selected from sections of the dictionary with entries bearing the unique nominal prefixes.

The books of the Bible can be divided into nine broad categories namely law, history (Old Testament), poetry and wisdom, Major Prophets, Minor Prophets, gospels, history (New Testament), letters of Paul, general letters and prophecy. The first chapter of the first book of each of the ten broad categories of the books of the bible was sampled.

From the mentioned sources, lexical items and information relevant to this study was extracted.

### 3.7 Data Analysis and Presentation

Data collected was analyzed at three different levels: cultural lexical borrowing of nominals, morphological assimilation of borrowed lexical items into Lubukusu and language vitality. The tape recorded data was transcribed in Lubukusu orthography. This was studied to identify cultural borrowed nominals, using the researcher’s native speaker...
competence. All single words of English origin occurring naturally in an otherwise Lubukusu context were extracted in accordance with the Borrowing Transfer Theory (Odlin, 1989). From these, cultural lexical borrowings were identified by the researcher and verified by the two respondents of 70 and 74 years. The lexical items were then classified into the various semantic fields identified in chapter one alongside their English equivalents (Appendix 5).

From this complete list of borrowed cultural lexical nominals, a detailed analysis of the frequency of occurrence of the borrowed cultural nominals against the identified variables of data source, gender and age is given. This information is presented in tables. Another detailed analysis is then done to examine the morphological assimilation of some of the cultural lexical borrowings. These were drawn from the semantic fields with the highest and lowest number of borrowings for purposes of comparison. Of particular interest was the nominal's assignment to a noun class and its inflection for number through affixation, its internal structure such as the stem and prefix structure, its pattern of concordial agreement if any and so on. These are studied to account for the morphological assimilation of the English nominals into Lubukusu.

Data collected from the interviews is analyzed to establish whether or not cultural lexical borrowing of nominals from English has increased the expressive power of Lubukusu by expanding the lexicon. This is done in reference to the findings in the tables with the frequencies as mentioned above. The analysis is done in accordance with the tenets of the EVT. Indicators of categories are identified in informants' responses in relation to the three indicators of language vitality as put forward by Giles et al (1977): demographic
factors, status factors and institutional support. These are named and coded. The codes are compared to find consistencies and differences. These findings are then categorized, worked out in percentages, presented in a chart and discussed. Frequencies and percentages are computed using the SPSS, a statistical computer programme. Generalizations and conclusions are made based on the findings of the study.

Having discussed the methodology that this study has adapted, the chapter that follows attempts to analyze the data collected during field work to meet the objectives of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and discussion of data collected as discoursed in the previous chapter. The chapter comprises of four sections. The first deals with data presentation after identification and categorization of the borrowed nominals into nine semantic fields. It also gives an analysis of the borrowed nominals in regard to data source, gender and age. The second deals with an analysis of how the borrowed nominals are adapted into the Lubukusu morphological system. The next is a discussion on the vitality of Lubukusu as a result of borrowing while the last gives a summary of the content of this chapter.

4.1 Borrowed Cultural Lexical Nominals

A total of 157 borrowed cultural lexical nominals were identified from the data collected. Below is a sample list of the nominals collected from each of the nine semantic fields. For the entire list refer to Appendix 5.

i) Science and Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etiibi/ediestiibi</td>
<td>television/DSTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebidio (kamera)</td>
<td>video (camera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekompyuta</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edibidi</td>
<td>DVD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ii) Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purofesa</td>
<td>professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echoka</td>
<td>chalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erejesta</td>
<td>register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etaimutebo</td>
<td>time table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## iii) Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ekaunti (kanso)</td>
<td>county (council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eripoti</td>
<td>report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efomu</td>
<td>form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esatifiketi</td>
<td>certificate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## iv) Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litoka</td>
<td>(motor) car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einjini</td>
<td>engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekilachi</td>
<td>clutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omundereba</td>
<td>driver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## v) Clothing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eobaroli</td>
<td>overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esikati</td>
<td>skirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elong’i</td>
<td>long (trouser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lishaati</td>
<td>shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Religion</td>
<td>Bukusu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omukuristo/Omukuristaayo -</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisakaramendi -</td>
<td>sacrament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebangeli/ebibilia -</td>
<td>bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwitembeli -</td>
<td>in the church/temple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vii) Household items</th>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efuriji -</td>
<td>fridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esofaseti -</td>
<td>sofa set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egilasi -</td>
<td>glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethamosi/eflaski -</td>
<td>thermos flask</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>viii) Business</th>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esitoko -</td>
<td>stock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehotel -</td>
<td>hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erendi -</td>
<td>rent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esupamaketi -</td>
<td>supermarket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ix) Medicine</th>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omunasi -</td>
<td>nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethieta -</td>
<td>theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efamasi -</td>
<td>pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muekisireyi -</td>
<td>in the x-ray room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the borrowed nominals identified, it is observed that some semantic fields had more borrowings than others. This forms the basis of the presentation and discussion that follows. The table below presents the frequency of occurrence of the cultural lexical nominal borrowings per semantic field. For a list of the actual words refer to appendix 5.

Table 1: Frequency of borrowed cultural lexical nominals per semantic field in regard to data source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMANTIC FIELD/ DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>News Bulletin</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Bible</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Items</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL/ %</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>178\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} Actual total number of borrowed items: 157. Current figure as a result of some items appearing in more than one data source.
The table above shows that a total of 178 lexical items were identified from four data sources namely interviews, the Bukusu-English dictionary, news bulletins in Lubukusu and the Lubukusu bible. The highest cultural lexical nominal borrowings occur in the discourse drawn from interviews. They constitute 66.3% of the total number of borrowings. This is followed by the Bukusu-English dictionary which accounts for 16.9% of the total borrowings. News bulletins carry the third highest number of borrowings and elicit 14% of the total number of borrowings. The data source with the least number of borrowings is the Lubukusu bible with only 2.8% of the total borrowings.

There are also varying numbers of borrowings from the different semantic fields identified. The field of education for example has the highest number of such borrowed items standing at 15.7% and is followed by the semantic field of religion with 14% of the total borrowings. Following closely are the transport and administration semantic fields from which the borrowed items account for 13.5% and 12.9% of the total borrowings respectively. The field of business contributes next with 10.1% while science & technology and medicine tie at position six with 9.6% of the borrowings. The semantic fields of clothing and household items elicit the least number of borrowings with only 7.3% each.

4.1.1 Variations in the Number of Borrowed Items per Data Source

A possible explanation for the high number of borrowings drawn from interviews is the liberty with which speech in conversation is produced. In natural speech, individuals may not be very particular about their choice of words and would probably utter words that first come to their mind, especially if they are in a relaxed atmosphere as is the case for
their speech is also not controlled or influenced by a second or third party unlike the case with the other data sources which form the source of this study data.

The language or lexical items used in the other three data sources is/are regulated by external forces. The Bukusu-English dictionary (2008) which comes second after interviews, for example, has been controlled and influenced by editors. The final output is not the result of a single individual’s effort. The language and words used are carefully selected and have to meet certain standards to be published and circulated for use. It is also possible that being a dictionary in one of the indigenous languages, the authors may have wanted to restrict themselves to the indigenous words only to be of help to both first and second language learners of the language to learn both the spoken and written standard language.

News bulletins take third position with just 14% of the total number of borrowings. This could be as a result of media house style and the fact that news broadcasters do not speak off the cuff but are aided by an autocue during any live broadcast. In this case, they do not use words that readily come to mind but read what has carefully been prepared in advance, to suit the style of the house and the task at hand. The style of language used is dictated by the occasion, particular task and purpose of speech among others. As such, news broadcasts would call for formal style (Joos, 1961). In the case of the current study, the media houses are vernacular broadcasting radio stations and the words used may have been carefully selected to minimize borrowings.

Out of the total number of cultural lexical nominals borrowed the Lubukusu bible elicits only 2.8%. This low number can be attributed to the external influence necessary for the
translation, editing and publishing of work of this magnitude. It is also likely that the choice of words in the Lubukusu bible is dependent on the original version from which it is translated; hence this has a bearing on the use of borrowed cultural lexical nominals. It is also worth noting that written language is more formal than spoken, thus great care tends to be taken in writing and/or translating the Lubukusu bible.

4.1.2 Variations in the Number of Borrowed Items per Semantic Field

It is clear from table 1 (cf Sub-section 4.1.0) that borrowed nominals in the different semantic fields identified in this study range between 15.7% and 7.3% of the total borrowings. This implies that the rest of the data from the different sources comprises of indigenous Lubukusu words. A further implication is that Lubukusu as a language, even without the borrowed cultural lexical nominals, has a strong expressive ability.

In spite of the argument above, there are several logical reasons as to why the semantic field of education would have more borrowings than the other semantic fields. To begin with, education was among the first forms of and reasons for contact between Lubukusu and English. This contact has lasted through the years to date. English has over the years been the language of instruction in education in Kenya, apart from mother tongue in lower primary school (Mbaabu 1996). It is worth noting that even this teaching of/in mother tongue, according to studies carried out, is more in policy than practice since it is downplayed in education (Muthwii 2002). Because of the constant contact between the two languages however, there has probably been more room for borrowing than coinage. Education has had the highest influence on the contact between the two languages and thus the increased need for borrowing.
Another reason for the higher percentage of borrowings in education is that all the respondents interviewed have had access to formal education at least up to Form Four hence their competence in English. The logical thing to do when faced with a situation where there is no native equivalent for an English concept they wish to express in Lubukusu is to borrow the term and make it sound Bukusu through assimilation.

Religion, just like education, is among the first forms of and reasons for contact between Lubukusu and English. This was accomplished through European Christian missionaries in Kenya. This contact through the years has enabled Lubukusu speakers borrow concepts and words which Lubukusu did not have. This explains why religion has the second highest number of borrowings.

Respondents frequently use some form of modern transport in their day to day activities. Consequently, it is necessary for them to name the concepts in this field hence the need to borrow. This is a possible reason why this field has the third highest number of borrowings.

The fields of administration and business which come next are in this position for similar reasons as those given above. As the respondents live in an area governed by local administration, terminologies in the field are frequently used by both the residents and administrators. It is also notable that in the past, Lubukusu speakers had a system of administration albeit one different from the European's (Were 1967); hence this percentage of cultural borrowed items. In the semantic field of business, the frequency with which the respondents transact business on a daily basis as consumers or otherwise has created the need to name things in this field.
The borrowed nominals in science & technology and medicine each make up only 9.6% of the total borrowings because of the complexity of the fields. Since these are technical fields, laymen would have very little to say about them. This also has a bearing on the number of lexical items borrowed. Unlike the other fields above in which almost all the respondents have something to say, this field is restricted to its experts. Another reason for the low number of borrowings would be that since the terminologies are very complex, coinage tends to be easier than borrowing. Finally, terminologies in these fields are less frequently used as compared to the other fields discussed above. This results in lower frequency of borrowing.

Clothing and household items were in existence long before the initial contact between Lubukusu and English speakers. Also, in these fields, there has not been too much cross cultural interaction between speakers of the two languages. There are Lubukusu equivalents in use for many concepts in English in these fields and this explains the small number of borrowings in this field.

From the discussion above it is evident that amongst the four sources from which data is elicited, interviews yield the highest number of borrowed cultural lexical nominals. This is because respondents are at liberty to express themselves in the most natural way possible without being conscious of what they are supposed or not supposed to say. It is also clear that there are variations in the numbers of borrowed cultural lexical nominals in the nine semantic fields.
4.1.3 Cultural Lexical Nominal Borrowing and Gender

The table below presents the frequency of occurrence of the cultural lexical borrowings in relation to the gender of respondents per semantic field. A longer list of the actual words is found in Appendix 5.

Table 2: Frequency of occurrence of cultural lexical nominals borrowed in regard to gender of respondents per semantic field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMANTIC FIELD/RESPONDENT’S GENDER</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Items</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL/%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>135²</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 above indicates that out of the total 118 borrowed lexical items that are elicited from interviews (66.3% of the total number of the borrowed cultural lexical nominals

² Actual number of total lexical items drawn from interviews: 118. Percentages are calculated from this figure. The figure of 135 is a result of some lexical items being drawn from respondents of both genders.
identified in the study), 68.6% are elicited from male respondents while 45.8 are from their female counterparts. A possible rationale for this is that the Bukusu community, just like many other African communities, is a patriarchal one in which men are the heads of the families and therefore have the responsibility of fending for them. If they are not in formal employment they still have to get out of the home and earn a living.

Women on the other hand have many of their activities going on in and around the home. Such activities include household chores, care giving and/or working in the shamba as is the case with some of the respondents in this study. This exposes them to less contact with the outside world and other languages such as English hence less borrowing. This also explains why most of the semantic fields identified in this study are male dominated thus the use of more borrowed words by the male respondents than the female ones.

These findings agree with linguistic patterns in studies carried out in different communities where it has been found that males borrow more than females. The argument behind this is that women are more conservative and tend to be slow in adapting to changes in progress (Labov, 1972; Trudgil 1974, 1986; Romaine, 1984; 1978; Milroy and Milroy 1978; Milroy 1980; Chambers 1995 and Kebewa 2008)

A further observation of the same table reveals the reversed borrowing patterns of the two genders in the different semantic fields. For example, while male respondents borrow more in certain semantic fields such as transport (100%), science & technology (93.8%) and administration (90.9%), their female counterparts borrow more in the semantic fields of medicine (100%), household items (100%) and clothing (85.7%). Whereas the male respondents borrow the least in the semantic fields of clothing (14.3%) and household
items (0%), the female ones borrow the least in the semantic fields of administration (18.2%) and transport (5%).

A possible argument for the borrowing patterns above is the fact that for a long time the fields of transport, administration and science & technology in Kenya have been male preserves. It is also believed that men are better versed with technological developments than women. Naturally, the male respondents would have more to say in these fields than their female counterparts. For this reason, the male respondents tend to borrow more than their female counterparts.

A potential explanation for the high borrowing trend by female respondents in the fields of medicine, household items and clothing respectively is that women traditionally are care givers and home makers. In spite of the man being the bread winner, the specific responsibility of clothing the family and ensuring the home/ house is comfortable enough for them is the woman’s. In addition, if a child or family member fell ill, it would be the mother or another female relative that would care for them and ensure they get the appropriate medical attention. For this reason the responsibility of the family’s health is charged to them. Consequently, in their discharging these duties, they are exposed to vocabulary items in these fields. These would naturally come up in their conversation. This argument explains why naturally male respondents borrow the least in these semantic fields.
### 4.1.4 Cultural Lexical Nominal Borrowing and Age

Table 3: Frequency of occurrence of cultural lexical nominals borrowed in regard to age of respondents per semantic field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMANTIC FIELD/ AGE OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>20 - 35</th>
<th>36 - 50</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borrowings</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Borrowings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Items</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL/ %</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above is a presentation of the frequency of occurrence of the cultural lexical borrowings in relation to the age of respondents per semantic field. A list of the actual words is found in appendix 5.

---

3 Actual number of total lexical items from interviews: 118. Figure of 148 a result of some lexical items occurring in data drawn from both age groups.
From the table it is evident that from the total 148 borrowed cultural lexical items elicited from interviews, the older respondents aged between 36-50 years borrowed more (60.1%) than the younger ones aged between 20-35 years (39.9%). A possible explanation for this is the earlier argument in chapter one that there has been contact between Lubukusu and English for a long time and borrowing is an effect of this contact that continues to be felt to date. It is also worthy noting that the focus of this study is borrowed lexical nominals that have no native equivalents in Lubukusu. Because of the advantage of age, older speakers have had longer exposure to this contact hence their higher use of cultural lexical borrowed nominals in speech than the younger speakers.

It is clear from Table 3 above that there are variations in the borrowing patterns between the two age groups in the different semantic fields. Whereas the younger speakers borrow more in the semantic fields of science & technology (78.9%), business (55.6%) and transport (47.1%), their older counterparts borrow least in the same: science & technology (21.1%), business (44.4%) and transport (52.9%). While the younger speakers borrow the least in the semantic fields of household items (0%) and administration (15.4%), the older ones borrow more in the very fields: household items (100%) and administration (84.6%).

A likely reason for this trend could lie in the very age factor. For instance, most technological developments are quite recent hence the younger speakers are more familiar with them. Top on the list of such developments would be the use of social sites on the internet such as face book and twitter. This is mainly a preserve of the younger generation hence the reason why even non-experts in this field would have something to say about it. The high number of borrowings in the semantic fields of business and
transport could be attributed to the agility and aggressiveness of youth hence their disposition to do business more than the older speakers. This same disposition inclines them towards the (public) transport business. Since the younger speakers are more involved in these semantic fields, they tend to borrow more than their older counterparts.

The logic behind older speakers borrowing more in the semantic fields of household items and administration, just like in the argument above, is the age factor. Most administrators, especially in a rural environment, would be older speakers because of their experience and the authority that age commands.

Although research carried out previously has found that younger speakers are more prone to borrowing (Poplack 1988), in this study the findings are the exact opposite. Older speakers borrow more than younger speakers. This could be so because borrowed cultural lexical nominals, which this study focuses on, have no native equivalents in the borrowing language. As such, if these borrowed concepts have to be discussed then the borrowed nominals have to be used albeit in their assimilated forms. Since contact between the two languages in the study is not a recent phenomenon, the older speakers have been exposed to it longer than their younger counterparts.

4.2 Borrowed Cultural Lexical Nominals and Lubukusu Morphology.

From the presentation of data in the previous section, it is evident that there are consistencies in the frequencies of borrowings per semantic field vis-a-vis the identified variables of data source, gender and age. Consistently among the semantic fields with the highest number of borrowings are the semantic fields of education and transport.
Consistently in the last two positions are the semantic fields of household items and clothing albeit interchangeably. Although all the borrowed items identified in the nine semantic fields undergo some morphological process so as to fit in the Lubukusu morphological system, for comparison purposes only four of them shall be discussed: the ones mentioned above.

4.2.1 Education

This is the semantic field with the highest number of borrowings: 15.7% of the total number of borrowings identified in this study. In the categorizations of gender and age it still emerged the semantic field with the highest number of borrowings (cf. Tables 2 and 3 in sub sections 4.1.3 and 4.1.4).

An examination of the morphological structure of some of the borrowed items in this semantic field reveals that the words, like words in other languages such as English and Lubukusu, are made up of morphemes. A morpheme is a minimal unit of meaning or grammatical function. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etamu</td>
<td>term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Lubukusu word for term ‘etamu’ is made up of two morphemes: a bound morpheme e- which is a prefix typical of Lubukusu, the recipient language in this study. It not only distinguishes grammatical class but also number in the nominal class. The other morpheme is the free morpheme tamu which is the root/stem of the lexical item. The stem tamu is an assimilated version of the English source word term. The prefix e- identifies the nominal etamu as belonging to grammatical Class 9 and also marks
singularity. Its plural form as marked by the prefix *chi*- hence the word ‘*chitamu*’ would belong to Class 10.

Lubukusu concordial agreement can be seen from the context in which the same word is used:

- Nono khuli nende bitabu ebio bibili, silala, nisyo opanga *etamu* emufu nesisindi nisyo oandikamo ekasi yoo yebulinyinga.
  
  *Now we have books those two, one that which you organize term whole and the other which you write in work yours every day.*
  
  (We have these two books: one for the whole term and the other for the day.)

The concordial prefix *e*- (Noun Class 9 prefix marker) in the word *etamu* ‘term’ is attached to the adjective *-mufu* to form *emufu* ‘whole’. *Emufu* ‘whole’ is a dependant of the nominal *etamu* ‘term’ hence the same concordial prefix *e*- which also marks singularity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bukusu</strong></th>
<th><strong>English Gloss</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edikishonari</td>
<td>dictionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘*Edikishonari*,’ Lubukusu for *dictionary*, consists of two morphemes: *e*- a bound morpheme which is a prefix that distinguishes both grammatical class and number, and ‘*dikishonari*’ a free morpheme which is the root form of the borrowed word. The prefix *e*- marks the nominal as a singular form belonging to Class 9. Its plural form would belong to Class 10 marked by the prefix *chi*-.

‘*Edikishonari*’ in one of its contexts of use changes its form through the process of affixation. This is the process by which a linguistic element is added to a word to produce an inflected or derived form. In the case of *edikishonari*, the prefix *e*- is replaced with
the prefix \textit{mu-} ‘in’ to form the new lexical item \textit{mudikishonari ‘in the dictionary’}. The derived nominal belongs to Class 18 Nouns (Locative ‘in’) as marked by the prefix \textit{mu-}. This class in not marked for number.

There is also evidence of concordial agreement in the use of the same borrowed nominal as illustrated below:

- \textit{Wakati ekindi neyola ebe raisi mbo newenya kamakuwa kosikosi nekaba nekahulumile onyala wacha wabona sindu enga ereferensi \textit{mudikishonari} warusiamo.}

\textit{Some time other when it reaches it is easy that when you want words any when they become difficult for you can go and see something like a reference in the dictionary you remove from it.}

(There should come a time when you can easily get the meaning of difficult words from references \textit{in the dictionary}.)

In the sentence above, the concordial prefix (Noun Class 18 prefix marker) \textit{mu-} as used in the nominal \textit{mudikishonari ‘in the dictionary’} is also attached to the verb \textit{warusiamo ‘you remove from it’} and realized as –mo ‘it’ (the dictionary) to mark concordial agreement in the sentence.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Bukusu} & \textbf{English Gloss} \\
Purofesa & professor
\end{tabular}

Unlike the two examples discussed above, \textit{purofesa ‘professor’} has only one morpheme: the free morpheme. This is an assimilated form of the word in the source language and belongs to Class 1 nouns which refer to human beings. This class is ordinarily marked by the preprefix \textit{o-} and prefix \textit{mu-/mw-} which mark singularity. However, some nominals like \textit{purofesa ‘professor’} do not exhibit the Class 1 prefix and only exhibit the Class 2
prefix. Mutonyi (2000) makes a similar observation and adds that in this case the Class 2 prefix ba-, which ‘bapurofesa’ the plural form of purofesa would take, is optional.

Just like in the illustrations above, evidence of Lubukusu concordial agreement can be seen in the use of this borrowed nominal as exemplified below.

- Nono lundi nocha muBabukusu, enjeeyi onyola khuli nende badaktari bali bakali sana, khuli nende bapurofesa bali Babukusu.

Now again when you go to the Bukusu out there you find we have doctors that are many very, we have also professors that are Babukusu.

(Amongst the Bukusu you will find many doctors and professors.)

The concordial prefix (Noun Class 2 prefix marker) ba- found in bapurofesa ‘professors’ is attached to the verb –li ‘be’ to become bali ‘they are’ and the nominal Babukusu ‘the Bukusu (plural). This concordial prefix in these two occurrences is used as a pronoun refering back to the noun bapurofesa ‘professors’.

**Bukusu**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kamakisi</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>marks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two morphemes that make up the word kamakisi ‘marks’ are the bound morpheme ka- and the free morpheme makisi ‘mark’. Ka- besides being the Class 6 prefix marker also distinguishes number, in this case plurality. The singular form of this nominal would be liliakisi and belong to Class 5 with the prefix structure li-li-.

The use of this nominal in context displays concordial agreement as evidenced below:

- Banyolile kamakisi kamalayi kekhucha muyunibasiti bosi babe munafasi yekhwiyyeta

Those who marks good to take to the university also to be in a position of helping themselves
(Those with good marks that enable them go to the university are in a position to fend for themselves.)

The concordial prefix \textit{ka-} also the noun class 6 prefix marker is attached to the noun -\textit{makisi 'mark'}, adjective -\textit{malayi 'good'} and verb \textit{khucha 'to go'} to form the noun \textit{kamakisi 'marks'}, adjective \textit{kamalayi 'good'} and post modifier \textit{kekhucha 'that can take to'} respectively. Since the adjective and post modifier here are tied to the head word \textit{kamakisi 'marks'} they both take its prefix \textit{ka-}.

4.2.2 Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omundereba</td>
<td>driver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nominal \textit{omundereba 'driver'} comprises of two morphemes just like majority of the other nominals already discussed: the free morpheme \textit{omu-} that comprises of the preprefix \textit{0-} and the prefix \textit{–mu-}. This prefix structure is characteristic of Class 1 nouns in Lubukusu and is one of the noun classes that display full double prefixes. The prefix structure also marks number, which is singular. The other morpheme is the free morpheme \textit{ndereba} drawn from the source language nominal \textit{‘driver’}. The plural form of this nominal is \textit{baandereba 'drivers'} and belongs to Class 2 nouns characterized by the prefix structure \textit{baa- / ba-ba-}. Apart from class, this prefix structure also indicates number, which is plural in this case. Nouns belonging to these two classes refer to human beings.

The use of this borrowed nominal displays concordial agreement just like the other examples already discussed as evidenced below.
Things are ther many very that a driver that has gone to school and learnt should to do.

(There are many things that a driver who has gone to driving school should do.)

The concordial prefix o- attached to -(mu)ndereba 'driver' is also attached to the verb phrase -(wa)cha 'gone' to form the nominal omundereba 'driver(singular)' and the relative clause that post modifies it owacha 'that has gone(singular) respectively. Concordial agreement is also seen in the prefix ka- attached to the verb soma 'learn' which in addition to distinguishing number (singular) also distinguishes tense hence kasoma 'learnt' which is the perfective in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litoka</td>
<td>motor car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This nominal is made up of three morphemes: the free morpheme li- which is also a Class 5 prefix marker. This prefix also marks number, singular in this case. The other two morphemes are free morphemes: moto 'motor' and kaa 'car' and are the assimilated versions of the source language words. The stem -toka '(motor) car' is formed from the process of blending. Blending refers to the process of combinding two separate forms to produce a single new term by taking the beginning of one word and joining it to the end of the other word. In this case, the last syllable of the word motor is blended with the word car to form the stem toka '-torcar'. This is then marked for number through the process of inflection. The prefix li- is attached to mark singularity hence the nominal -litoka 'car' and ka-ma- to mark plurality hence the nominal kamatoka 'cars'.

There is evidence of concordial agreement in the context of use of this nominal:
• Abola ali wakala abe nende kamatoka kamakali niko buyinda bwewe.

He/she says that maybe he/she cars many that are riches his/her

(Maybe he/she (other tribes) would consider many cars as wealth.)

The prefix ka- attached to (-ma-)-toka ‘car’ is also attached to the adjective –makali to form kamakali ‘many’ and ni- to form niko ‘that are’. This prefix marks plurality hence there is concord in the resultant sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sipana</td>
<td>spanner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sipana the Lubukusu term for ‘spanner’ is made up of two morphemes: the bound morpheme si- which is the Class 7 prefix marker and also distinguishes number as singular. The other morpheme –pana is also a bound morpheme as it can not stand on its own. It is the assimilated form of the source language word ‘spanner’. The plural form of sipana is bipana ‘spanners’ and fits into the Class 8 nouns which have the prefix marker bi-.

In its context of use, the borrowed nominal bipana ‘spanners’ functions as the direct object and not the subject of the sentence. It has no other words that are dependent on it hence there being no need for concordial agreement between it and its dependants. This explains why the concordial prefix bi- in the example below is not attached to any other word in the sentence in reference to this head word.

• Endurumikhila bipana khufungula einjini.

I use spanners to open the engine.

(I use spanners to open up the engine)
The nominal *tielubi* is derived from the source language *TLB (Transport Licencing Board)* acronym. An acronym is a word derived from the initials of several words and is pronounced as the spelling indicates or if this is not possible, by sounding out each letter. This borrowed nominal comprises of two morphemes: the free morpheme *e*- which not only marks Class 9 nouns but also distinguishes number. The other morpheme is the free morpheme *tielubi* which is the assimilated form of the English acronym *TLB*. The plural form of this nominal, *chitielubi ‘TLB licences’* belongs to Class 10 nouns with the prefix marker *chi*-. This prefix also marks number, which is plural in this case.

**4.2.3 Household items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esofaseti</td>
<td>sofa set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Lubukusu word *esofaseti ‘sofaset’* comprises of three morphemes: bound morpheme *e*- and free morphemes *sofa ‘sofa’* and *seti ‘set’*. The free morpheme *e*- marks Class 9 nouns and also distinguishes number, singularity in this case. The free morphemes *sofa ‘sofa’* and *seti ‘set’* are assimilated forms of the source language words. The lexical item *sofaseti ‘sofaset’* is a compound noun comprising of the two nouns *sofa ‘sofa’* and *seti ‘set’. Its plural form belonging to grammatical Class 10 would be *chisofaseti ‘sofasets’* marked by the prefix *chi*-. There is evidence of Lubukusu concordial agreement in the use of the borrowed nominal *chisofaseti ‘sofasets’*:  
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- Echino **cho**si lisina lirumikhasana khuchilanga khuli **chisofaseti**.
  
  *These ones the name that is used mostly we call them sofasets*
  
  (We call all these **sofa sets**.)

The prefix *chi-* attached to *sofaseti* ‘sofaset’, *echino* ‘these ones’ and *khuchilanga* ‘we call them’ marks plurality and refers back to the nominal *sofaseti* hence corncordial agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Echaki</td>
<td>jug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Echaki* ‘jug’ just like the other nominals discussed comprises of two morphemes: *e-* and *chaki* ‘jug’. While *e-* is the Class 9 prefix marker and indicator of singularity, *chaki* is the stem and assimilated form of the English word ‘jug’. The plural form of *echaki* ‘jug’ falls in Class 10 nouns with the prefix marker *chi-* hence the nominal *chichaki* ‘jugs’. The context of use of this borrowed nominal shows corncordial agreement too as showed below:

- Khuliao nende **echaki** eng’eneyi yekhusuta kamechi omukeni naenyia khunywa.
  
  *We have here a jug that one is for holding water visitor*
  
  (There is also a **jug** that is used to carry drinking water for visitors.)

The corncordial prefix *e-* is attached to *eng’eneyi* ‘that one’ in agreement with the number indicator in the head word *echaki* ‘jug’ (singular). This is in agreement with the rules of Lubukusu corncordial agreement.

**4.2.4 Clothing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eobaroli</td>
<td>overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eobaroli, Lubukusu for overall belongs to noun Class 9 because of its prefix marker e-. This prefix also distinguishes number as singular. The prefix is a free morpheme which combines with the bound morphemes oba ‘over’ and roli ‘all’ to form the word obaroli ‘overall’

Concordial agreement is evident in the contextual use of this nominal as seen below:

- **Eobaroli elanjeta sendeyakha eoi Nende egirisi khumubili kwange tawe**
  
  Overall it will help me I will soil myself with oil and grease on body mine not

  (The overall helps me protect my body from oil and grease)

The concordial prefix e- is attached to both the nominal obaroli ‘overall’ and the verb and first person pronoun –lanjeta ‘will help me’ to become eobaroli ‘overall’ (singular) and elanjeta ‘it will help me’. In elanjeta ‘will help me’, the prefix e- becomes the pronoun ‘it’ referring back to the nominal eobaroli ‘overall’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lishaati</td>
<td>shirt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lishaati ‘shirt’* is made up of two morphemes: the bound morpheme li- and the free morpheme shaati ‘shirt’. The morpheme li- is a noun Class 5 prefix marker and also indicates number – singularity in this case. The free morpheme shaati is an assimilated form of the English borrowed word ‘shirt’. The plural form of lishaati ‘shirt’ is kamashaati ‘shirts’ and fits in grammatical class 6. This class is distinguished by the prefix structure ka- (preprefix) and ma- (prefix).

The findings discussed above are similar to those of previous studies on the morphological assimilation of borrowed words (Smeaton, 1973; Barkin, 1980; Meyers-scotton, 1993 & 2002 and Fasold and Linton, 2006) which argue that borrowed forms
undergo some degree of morphological assimilation to fit into the system of the recipient language.

It is interesting to note that 67.5% of the borrowed nominals identified in all the semantic fields belong to the grammatical class 9 and 10 nouns which are characterized by the prefix e- (singular) and chi- (plural) respectively. The other grammatical classes account for the remaining 32.5%. It is also worth noting that classes 9 and 10 nouns mainly consist of non-human objects and borrowed nouns (Mutonyi, 2000). This implies that basic concepts in Lubukusu do have Lubukusu native names that refer to them and the borrowed nominals in this class do not replace any existing native equivalent. In other words, these native Lubukusu nominals are not threatened by the borrowed nominals. Out of a total 20 Bukusu noun classes (Mutonyi, 2000) only 11 classes are represented by the borrowed nominals, an indicator that Lubukusu still has so many native words that belong to the other classes not represented. This is a clear indicator that the borrowed nominals in the semantic fields identified only add to the existing Lubukusu lexicon and increase its expressive ability.

From the discussion above, it is apparent that all the borrowed nominals in the semantic fields discussed have undergone some degree of assimilation into the Lubukusu morphological system. This is evidenced by their structure which is similar to the Lubukusu noun structure that has a (pre)prefix and a stem/root. Each of the borrowed nominals also fits into to a Lubukusu grammatical class and some are marked for number in the same way native Lubukusu nouns are. In addition, the nominals follow the rules of Bukusu concordial agreement in the sentences in which they appear. These features are evident across the age and gender dimensions discussed in the previous section, an
indication that regardless of the age or gender of the speaker, borrowed cultural lexical nominals are made to conform to the Lubukusu morphology hence behave like native Lubukusu nominals. This also suggests that the borrowings identified, whether in the semantic fields with the highest or lowest number of borrowings, all undergo morphological adaptation into the Lubukusu system. This in turn increases the Lubukusu lexicon hence the vitality of the language.

4.3 Cultural Lexical Nominals and Vitality.

According to Giles et al's (1977) Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory, the three indicators of a language's vitality are institutional support, demography and status. In this sub section, borrowing in the semantic fields identified in the study is related to these indicators of vitality.

4.3.1 Institutional Support

From the interviews carried out, Lubukusu is one of the languages used in dominant domains in society such as the home, school, work place and town/market among others. Use of language in these domains is manifested through different areas such as education, mass media, administration, business, religion, at ceremonies and so on. These correspond to the semantic fields under discussion in this study.

The semantic field of education, for example emerges the one with the highest number of borrowed cultural lexical nominals (cf Table 1 in sub section 4.1). This is an indicator that communication in Lubukusu in this domain relies to some degree on borrowed cultural lexical nominals. This is also evidenced by the existence of printed literature in Lubukusu such as the Lubukusu bible, the Bukusu- English dictionary, story books and
oral literature books with riddles, proverbs and sayings as drawn from the interviews carried out.

Mass media which also falls under this indicator relies to a great extent on Lubukusu and by extension borrowed cultural lexical nominals (cf Table 1 sub section 4.1). The respondents interviewed demonstrate an awareness of and interest in two FM radio stations namely West FM and Mulembe FM which broadcast in Lubukusu.

The semantic field of administration also relies to some extent on borrowed cultural lexical nominals (cf Table 1 in sub section 4.1). From the interviews carried out, respondents have attended public meetings locally and cite the main languages spoken as either Lubukusu or a mixture of Lubukusu and Kiswahili depending on those who attend the meeting. Muysken and Appel (1987) and Giles et al (1977) argue that providing governmental or administrative services in the mothertongue (Lubukusu in the case of this study) can stimulate its maintenance.

In other different domains such as the home, work place, church, town/ market and at ceremonies such as weddings, funerals and circumcision ceremonies, 70.3% of the respondents say the main language of use is Lubukusu while the remaining 29.7% cite other languages, mainly Kiswahili followed by English. The home and ceremonies domains exhibit the highest use of Lubukusu while the church exhibits the lowest use with Kiswahili being spoken more. It is also observed that respondents are consistent in the language they speak with different people; these are spouses, children, siblings, parents, grandparents, friends and colleagues. They mainly speak Kiswahili with their children and Lubukusu with the others if they are Lubukusu speakers.
The argument above implies that borrowed cultural lexical nominals in Lubukusu from English add to the vitality of the language since Lubukusu is one of the dominant languages in the dominant domains in society.

4.3.2 Demographic Factors

Giles et al (1977) identify demography as an indicator of the vitality of a language. The higher the number of speakers of a language, the greater its vitality. The Kenya Population and Housing Census carried out in August 2009 revealed that Lubukusu has 1,432,810 speakers (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2010). Being the Luhya dialect with the highest number of speakers, this makes up 26.83 % of the entire Luhya speakers’ population. In second position is Luloogoli with 618,340 speakers. According to the same census report Kenya has a total population of 38,610,097. The Gikuyu language has the highest number of speakers standing at 6,622,576 (17.15%) followed by the Luhya languages with 5,338,666 (13.82%) speakers (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2010).

According to Muysken and Appel (1987) if the absolute number of speakers of a language decreases, it implies decreasing usefulness of the language in question, which in turn gives way to shift away from the minority language. This implies that the reverse is also true and that in the case of the current study the high number of Lubukusu speakers means an increase in the usefulness of the language, hence its vitality.

The geographical distribution of a group of people over a territory also determines the vitality of their language. According to Hill and Hill (1977) minority groups have better chances of maintaining their language as long as they live concentrated in a certain area.
and this is the case for speakers in the current study. Speakers of Lubukusu mainly inhabit Bungoma and Trans Nzoia counties though a few others have settled in the neighbouring counties and other parts of the country (Nandelenga, 2000; see also Appendices 1a and 1b). Respondents cite agricultural productivity and employment opportunities as reasons for the settlement outside their ancestral land.

4.3.3 Status Factors.

The third indicator of vitality according to Giles et al (1977) is the status factor. The status of a language can be determined by speakers’ (lack of) pride in their language. All the older speakers and 75% of the younger speakers liked speaking Lubukusu for various reasons such as taking pride in the language, the ability to communicate better, feeling good about the language and the desire to teach the language to their children. 25% of the younger speakers gave such reasons as having non-Lubukusu speaking friends, fear of offending non-Lubukusu speakers and not knowing the language well enough for their reservations.

75% of both the older and younger speakers felt other Lubukusu speakers were proud of speaking the language. Some of the reasons given for this were that they spoke it a lot wherever they went and that the language promoted their traditions and cultural practices. 25% of both the older and younger speakers cited reasons such as not speaking the language much and feeling too educated to do so as some of the reasons why some Lubukusu speakers were not proud of speaking the language.

Both the younger and older speakers felt it was important to learn and speak Lubukusu for various reasons such as cultural identity, preservation of the language, communication
with the elderly and ability to communicate secret information in the presence of non-
Lubukusu speakers. They all wished to see the language promoted through such means as
teaching it in schools, use in the media, parents speaking it to and with their children and
its use in more social functions or forums.

Lubukusu speakers have a rich and unique cultural identity that they take pride in as
evidenced through their unique cultural practices. 100% of the older speakers and 91.7%
of the younger speakers could identify one such practice. Among those identified were
the elaborate circumcision ceremony, the marriage ceremony, burial rites and political
unity among others. These practices demonstrate their strong social status. Related to this
is economic status with 75% of the younger speakers and 83.3% of the older speakers
believing that Lubukusu speakers stand as good a chance as other language speakers to
prosper economically and that one’s economic mobility mainly depended upon one’s
hard work. When asked to compare the economic welfare of Lubukusu speakers vis á vis
that of other luhya dialect and Kenyan language speakers 66.6% of the younger speakers
felt Lubukusu and other Luhya dialects speakers are economically at the same level while
53.3% of the older speakers felt that Lubukusu speakers’ economic status was higher than
that of other Luhya dialect speakers. While 66.6% of the younger speakers maintained
that the economic status of Lubukusu speakers and that of other Kenyan language
speakers was the same, 58.3% of the older speakers felt other Kenyan language speakers
such as Gikuyu were economically better off than Lubukusu speakers.

In relation to the sociohistorical status of the Babukusu, 58.3% of both the younger and
older speakers knew of a period when the Babukusu had to defend their ethnic identity
and cited such incidents in history as land issues in which they fought the Batachoni in
the Chetambe war, the Bawaanga and the Baloogoli among other Luhya dialect speakers. They also fought to retain their political identity and unity (resisted the colonial master who had teamed up with Nabongo Mumia, a Wanga king, to politically rule them and take over their land) and maintenance of cultural practices such as circumcision.

4.3.4 Borrowing and Language Vitality

Figure 1 below is a representation of the responses given by respondents in regard to borrowed words used and Lubukusu language vitality. A key for this figure is found on the page that follows. For the actual questions refer to Part E of the interview schedule in Appendix 2. For a key to the coded responses refer to Appendix 4.

Figure 1: Borrowing and Lubukusu Vitality

![Bar Chart](image)

**Responses**
Key

Q 1: Reasons for using (borrowed) English words.
Q 2: Reasons for Lubukusu (in) sufficiency.
Q 3: Effect of borrowing on Lubukusu.
Q 4: Are there Lubukusu native equivalents of borrowed English nominals (I)?
Q 5: Lubukusu native equivalents of borrowed English nominals (II).

When asked to explain why they have used some English words yet they are speaking Lubukusu 54% of the respondents said there are no Lubukusu equivalents for the English words they had used. Of these 66.6% are male while 33.3% are female. 21% say they only know the word in English, 17% say the English word is more readily available while 8% cite other reasons such as the concept requiring a lengthy explanation in Lubukusu and the need to accommodate the non-Lubukusu speaker. One respondent even insisted that the English word is actually a Lubukusu word.

Responding to the question on whether the respondents felt Lubukusu alone was sufficient in discussing their occupations (when speaking to other Lubukusu speakers), 88% admitted that it wasn't. 63% felt that this was because they would not communicate effectively and make themselves understood while 8% said it was because they were just used to using English words. 13% felt Lubukusu alone was sufficient because it had viable equivalents for the English words borrowed though they had not used these themselves. 17% cited other reasons for Lubukusu alone not being sufficient. Some of these were that using some English words in Lubukusu made it sound nice and complete and that since the speaker spoke other languages (English and Kiswahili) it was only natural that they should use these while speaking Lubukusu.
When asked what effect they thought this kind of borrowing had on Lubukusu, 57% felt that this kind of borrowing strengthened Lubukusu. 42% of these thought this was the case because it helps speakers express themselves and communicate although they also felt Lubukusu should get native words for these concepts. 39% felt this kind of borrowing weakens Lubukusu. 22% thought so because they felt there were Lubukusu equivalents for the English words used and that where there weren’t, Lubukusu should come up with them. 4% gave other explanations for the positive effect of this kind of borrowing on Lubukusu such as borrowed nominals being made to sound like Lubukusu words through assimilation and increasing the vocabulary of Lubukusu.

Interestingly, only 25% of the respondents felt there are native equivalents for the borrowed English words they used. However, only 1% was able to give viable equivalents while the ‘viable’ equivalents given by 8.3% of the respondents were themselves words borrowed from English. They insisted the words they had used such as ebangeli ‘bible’ (from the verb ‘evangelize’), lubaso ‘verse’ and eromani ‘roman’ (Catholic Church) were native Lubukusu words. 38% of the respondents feel there are no native equivalents for the borrowed words they have used while 21% are not sure. 17% give other reasons.

When all the respondents were asked to give what they thought were viable Lubukusu equivalents of some of the borrowed words they had used 91% were unable to do so; only 9% did as demonstrated in figure 1 above.

From the discussion above it emerges that Lubukusu lacks native words to express concepts that are foreign to the Bukusu culture hence the need for speakers to use
borrowed cultural lexical nominals from English while speaking the language. It is also clear that these borrowed lexical items increase the expressive power of the language since speakers are able to express ideas and concepts which they otherwise would not have since their language lacks native equivalents for these foreign concepts or ideas.

4.4 Summary

In this chapter data collected to facilitate this study has been presented, analysed and discussed. The focus has been on identifying some of the cultural lexical nominals that Lubukusu has borrowed from English, how these are assimilated into the Lubukusu morphological system and how this kind of borrowing strengthens Lubukusu. It has emerged that when borrowed lexical items are used in the recipient language they adapt the language’s morphological features. They are also significant to communication in the borrowing language in that they increase its expressive power hence the increased vitality of the language. It is also apparent that the findings of this study are similar to those of earlier studies which show that sex and age are social factors known to influence language use in many societies (Trudgil, 1974; Abdulaziz, 1982; Milroy, 1987 and Chambers, 1995). The next chapter shall give a summary of the research findings presented. From these, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research shall be given.
CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the current study. The aim of this study was to identify some of the cultural lexical nominals that Lubukusu has borrowed from English, examine how these cultural lexical nominals have been adapted into the morphological system of Lubukusu and to establish the vitality of Lubukusu as a result of this borrowing.

5.1 Summary of Findings

From the data analysis in chapter four, several findings come forth. These have been presented and discussed under three different sections. In the first, a total of 157 cultural lexical nominals borrowed from English into Lubukusu were identified and categorized into nine semantic fields: religion, science and technology, clothing, administration, transport, business, household items, education and medicine. Frequencies of these were then compiled in regard to the variables of data source, gender and age. It was observed that out of the four data sources namely interviews, news bulletins, the Bukusu-English dictionary and the Lubukusu bible, the interviews elicited the highest number of borrowed cultural lexical nominals due to the liberty with which speech is produced in conversation while the Lubukusu bible elicited the least due to the external influence necessary for the translation, editing and publishing of work of that nature.
It was also observed that there are variations in the number of borrowings in the different semantic fields with the highest number of borrowings being drawn from the semantic field of education while the semantic field of household items had the least. It was observed too that there were variations in the borrowing patterns of the different genders and age groups. Male respondents were found to borrow more than their female counterparts while the older respondents borrowed more than the younger speakers.

In the second section in which the assimilation of the borrowed cultural lexical nominals identified in the study was discussed, it was observed that these nominals are assimilated into the Lubukusu morphological system and behave like native Lubukusu nominals. To begin with, the borrowed cultural lexical nominals take up Lubukusu prefixes which mark grammatical class in Lubukusu nominals. For this reason, the nominals belong to distinct Lubukusu nominal classes. In addition to this, the prefixes also mark a number distinction in the borrowed nominals just like in native Lubukusu nominals. Similarly, the nominals exhibit concordial agreement with the other elements in the sentences in which they occur. This is in accordance with Lubukusu concordial agreement rules.

In the third section the borrowed cultural lexical nominals are discussed in relation to the vitality of Lubukusu. This study found that in accordance with the tenets of the Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory borrowed nominals increase the expressive power of Lubukusu hence its vitality. It was also found that Lubukusu lacks native words to express concepts that are foreign to the Bukusu culture hence the need for speakers to use borrowed cultural lexical nominals from English while speaking the language. It is also clear that these borrowed lexical items increase the expressive power of the language.
since speakers are able to express ideas and concepts which they otherwise would not have since their language lacks native equivalents for these foreign concepts are ideas.

5.2 Conclusion

Borrowed cultural lexical nominals identified and discussed in this study indicate that Lubukusu borrows heavily from English and that these borrowed items are assimilated into the Lubukusu morphological system and increase the Lubukusu lexicon hence its expressive ability and vitality. It has been argued in earlier studies that borrowing has a negative effect on the borrowing language. However this study has proved that indeed there is the other side of this coin: that cultural lexical nominal borrowing does actually strengthen a language and increases its vitality.

5.3 Recommendations

From the findings in this study, it is evident that the notion that borrowing is detrimental to ethnic languages is not entirely true. Cultural borrowing, which is the focus of this study, is indeed beneficial to the recipient language as it increases the recipient language's expressive ability. Cultural borrowing in Lubukusu should be encouraged as this is one sure way in which the language can increase its vitality.
5.4 Suggestions for further research

The scope of this study was limited to cultural lexical nominals borrowed from English into Lubukusu, their morphological assimilation and the resultant vitality of Lubukusu. There are however other related areas on which future research work could be done. For example:

1. This study has focused on nominals only; there are other grammatical classes that can be studied such as verbs, adjectives and adverbs.

2. Lubukusu speakers co-exist with speakers of other Kenyan ethnic languages. This study has focused on borrowings from English; a study could be done on borrowings from the other ethnic languages and their effect on Lubukusu.

3. Borrowing is only one of the many word formation processes. A study on the other word formation processes of Lubukusu nominals and their effect on the language could be considered.

The focus of this study has been on the Lubukusu, a Bantu language. Further research can be done on the effect of cultural borrowing on non-Bantu African languages.
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Appendix 2: English Interview Schedule

Thank you for accepting to be part of this study. The information given will be used with confidentiality only for this linguistic study.

A: Respondent’s particulars

Age: __________________________ Place of birth: ________________

Occupation: ________________________________

Education level: __________________________

Languages: ________________________________

Marital status: ________________________________

Gender: ________________________________

B: Demographic factors.

1. Do you know of any other:

   a) Luhya dialects? Please name them.

      Out of these, which is/are considered ‘big’ and why?

   b) Kenyan indigenous languages. Please name them.

      Which are considered ‘big’ and why?

      In terms of dominance, what do you think of Lubukusu?

2. i) Do you know of any other areas in Kenya apart from your own occupied by Lubukusu speakers?

   ii) If so, please name them.

   iii) Do you consider these places attractive to live in? Please explain.
3 a) In what domains and with whom do you speak Lubukusu?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>School/work place</th>
<th>Church/other place of worship</th>
<th>Market/town</th>
<th>Ceremonies (weddings, burials, circumcisions and so on)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Do these people speak any other language(s)? Please explain.

C. Status factors

1. a) Do you like speaking Lubukusu? Please explain.

   b) In your opinion, are other Lubukusu speakers proud of speaking it? Please explain.

2. Do you think it is important to learn and speak Lubukusu? Please explain.

3. Would you wish to see Lubukusu promoted? Please explain why/why not and how.

4. a) Generally, how educated are Lubukusu speakers in your opinion?

   b) Do you know of any prominent Bukusu people; say political leaders, academicians and so on? Please explain.

5. What are some of the cultural practices that the Lubukusu speakers have vis-à-vis the other Kenyan codes?
6. Do you know of a period in the history of the Babukusu when they had to defend their ethnic identity? Please explain.

7. i) How does Lubukusu promote or hinder economic mobility?

   ii) How would you compare the economic welfare of Lubukusu speakers with:

   a) Speakers of other Luhya dialects?

   b) Speakers of other Kenyan indigenous languages?

D. Institutional support

1. a) Do you know of any radio or television stations that broadcast in Lubukusu?

   b) Please name them.

   c) Do you listen to or watch them? Please explain.

2. Have you attended any public meetings locally? What is the language spoken?

3. Do you know of any printed literature in Lubukusu?

   a) Please give examples.

   b) Have you read any of it?

4. a) Is Lubukusu taught in schools?

   b) If so, up to what level?

   c) In your view, is this sufficient or insufficient? Please explain.
E: Informant’s occupation

1. a) What does your occupation involve?
   b) Please describe your typical working day.

2. How do you get to your place of work?

3. i) What challenges do you face at your place of work?
   ii) How do you deal with these?

4. How do you spend your free time?

5. You have used certain words that don’t sound Bukusu, such as... (Mention a few of the borrowed words used). Could you please explain why?

6. Do you think Lubukusu alone is sufficient in (discussing) your occupation without using words from other languages like English? Please explain.

7. What effect do you think this kind of borrowing has on Lubukusu?

8. i) Are there equivalents of the English words you have used in Bukusu?
   ii) Please give specific examples.
Appendix 3: Lubukusu Interview Schedule

Nasimile buyeti bwoo lukali mumilimo kino. Kamakhuwa nikokhukachula ano kalarumikha mumasomo kongene.

A: Omubolesyi

Kimyaka ___________________________ Ekhusalwa ___________________________

Kimilimo ____________________________

Kamasomo: ____________________________

Chindomo ____________________________

Khubeela/khubeisia: ____________________________

Wesisecha/Wesikhasi ____________________________

B: Demographic factors

1. i) Kholo sina chichindi nichoomanyile:

   a) che Buluya? Muchino, ndala sina nicho ‘chikhongo’ nesikila si?

   b) chikhali che Buluya ta. Nosima chibalekho.

   ii) Lubukusu lubalikha muchindomo che kamani? Balayisyakho.

2. i) Lubeka sina lulundi muKenya nilwo Babukusu bamenyile?

3. a) Olosianga lulomo sina nende nanu mala waena?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engo</th>
<th>Esikuli/Emilimo</th>
<th>Syekanis a/Abundu wekhusu bila</th>
<th>Khusok o/Mutuini</th>
<th>Mubisel elo (Arusi, kamasik a, sikhebo ne bibindi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omulosi/omusakhulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basasi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuka ne kukhu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babasyo emilimo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Babandu bano balosianga chindomo chichindi? Nosima balayisyakho.

C. Status factors


    b) Khulondekhana nawe, Babukusu babandi bekhoyelanga khulomaloma Lubukusu? Balayisyakho


3. Wakhasimile obone Lubukusu ne lukhula? Mungila sina? Sina sikila?

4. a) Okanakana oli Babukusu baasoma bulayi sina?
b) Omanyile Babukusu bosibosi bamanyikhane Lukali enga bakhongo namwe basomi? Nosima balayisyakho.

5. Biselelo sina nibyo Babukusu balinenabyo nibyo chikholo chichindi muKenya chikhali nenabyo tawe?


7. i) Lubukusu luyeta namwe lukhingilila luriene omundu khurura mumutambo khucha mubuyinda?

ii) Olekhasya oriena buyinda bweBabukusu nende:

a) Baluya babandi?

b) Chikholo chichindi muKenya?

D. Institutional support

1a) Omanyilekho esitesheni yeeredio namwe etivi ye Lubukusu?

b) Nosima chibalekho.

c) Ochirekeresyanga namwe khuchilola? Balayisyakho.

2. Wabelekho musikhasyo namwe kumukutano kwosikwosi musirekere ? Baloma lulomo sina?

3. Omanyile bitabu byosibyosi bye Lubukusu?

a) Bibalekho.
b) Wabisomakho?

4. a) Basomianga Lubukusu mubikuli?
   b) Kabakario, paka mukilasi sina?
   c) Khulondekhana nawe, sikelo sino sitosia naamwe ta? Balayisyakho.

E. Informant's occupation (Kimilimo)

1. a) Kimilimo kyoo kibechangamo sina?
   b) Elesya esiku yoo yekhukhola kimilimo.

2. Wolanga oriена syemilimo woo?

3. a) Makhako sina kakhunanianga emilimo woo?
   b) Okholanga oriена khumakhako kano?

4. Okholanga sina mubise bye khuulukha?

5. Kaliyo kamakhuwa niko orumikhile kafwana enga kamakeni enga 'khuparedi, elongi, musikuli nende litoka'. Nosima balayisyakho sikila.

6 Nopara, Lubukusu lwongene lunyala lwa rumikha mumilimo kyoo nokharumikhila lulomo lulundi enga Lusungu tawe? Balayisyakho?

7. Khurumikhila kamakhuwa enga keLusungu khuyeta namwe khukhingilila khuriena Lubukusu khukhula?

8. i) Kalio kamakhuwa keLubukusu kekamakhuwa niko orumikhile keLusungu?
   ii) Onyala wamba malala
Appendix 4: Responses to Borrowed Words Used and Lubukusu Language Vitality

Q 1: Reasons for using (borrowed) English words.
   a) No Lubukusu equivalent.
   b) Word only known in English.
   c) English word more readily available.
   d) Other reasons.

Q 2: Reasons for Lubukusu (in) sufficiency.
   a) Inability to communicate effectively.
   b) Used to using English words while speaking Lubukusu.
   c) There are viable equivalents for English words used.
   d) Other reasons.

Q 3: Effect of borrowing on Lubukusu.
   a) Strengthens Lubukusu.
   b) Weakens Lubukusu.
   c) Other kind of effect.

Q 4: Are there Lubukusu native equivalents of borrowed English nominals (I)?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) Maybe
   d) Other.

Q5: Lubukusu native equivalents of borrowed English nominals (II).
   a) Could give equivalents.
   b) Could not give equivalents.
Appendix 5: List of Borrowed Words

List of borrowed cultural lexical nominals in identified semantic fields.

1. **SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etiibi/ediestiibi</td>
<td>television/ DSTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebidio (kamera)</td>
<td>video (camera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekompiuta</td>
<td>computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edibidi</td>
<td>DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esikirachi</td>
<td>scratch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etepu</td>
<td>tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esoftiwea</td>
<td>software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esibaiba</td>
<td>cyber (café)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eintaneti</td>
<td>internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fesibuku</td>
<td>face book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebihechesi</td>
<td>VHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lishini/Emashini</td>
<td>machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eantivairasi</td>
<td>antivirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esitetasi</td>
<td>status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esidi</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinema</td>
<td>cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaini ye lusimu</td>
<td>sim card</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purofesa</td>
<td>professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echoka</td>
<td>chalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erejesta</td>
<td>register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekoleji</td>
<td>college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etaimutebo</td>
<td>time table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyunibasiti</td>
<td>university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaiburari</td>
<td>library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etikirii</td>
<td>degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamakisi</td>
<td>marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edikishonari</td>
<td>dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epihechidi</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edipuloma</td>
<td>diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligazeti</td>
<td>gazette (news paper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekilasi</td>
<td>class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esabujekiti</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edesiki</td>
<td>desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mupuraimari</td>
<td>in primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musekendri</td>
<td>in secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejometrikoseti</td>
<td>geometrical set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erula</td>
<td>ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etamu</td>
<td>term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enasari</td>
<td>nursery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egiredi</td>
<td>grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eripoti</td>
<td>report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekosi</td>
<td>course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efisi</td>
<td>fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekichara</td>
<td>lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **ADMINISTRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ekaunti (kanso)</td>
<td>county (council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eripoti</td>
<td>report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efomu</td>
<td>form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esatifiketi</td>
<td>certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eofisi</td>
<td>office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabana</td>
<td>governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buseneta</td>
<td>senatorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansola</td>
<td>councilor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khusidiefu</td>
<td>CDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edisturikiti</td>
<td>district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epolisi</td>
<td>policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epasitola</td>
<td>pistol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esitambu</td>
<td>(rubber) stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekambeini</td>
<td>campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afisa bapolisi</td>
<td>police officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ng'isi (Bukushu)</td>
<td>English Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puraimuminista</td>
<td>prime minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meya</td>
<td>mayor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. TRANSPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litoka</td>
<td>motor (car)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einjini</td>
<td>engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eoili</td>
<td>oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekilachi</td>
<td>clutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omundereba</td>
<td>driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekia</td>
<td>gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondakita</td>
<td>conductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tielubi</td>
<td>TLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekilomita</td>
<td>kilometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sipana</td>
<td>spanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanika</td>
<td>mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girisi</td>
<td>greese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroli</td>
<td>petrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mupaking’i</td>
<td>parking lot/ car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esitatı</td>
<td>ignition (starting the engine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mupistoni</td>
<td>in the piston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inishuarensi</td>
<td>insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaiseni</td>
<td>licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etikiti</td>
<td>ticket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukusu</td>
<td>English Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebasi</td>
<td>bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekalabati</td>
<td>culvert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **CLOTHING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eobaroli</td>
<td>overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esweta</td>
<td>sweater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esikati</td>
<td>skirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elong’i</td>
<td>long (trouser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lishaati</td>
<td>shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esookisi</td>
<td>socks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebesti</td>
<td>vest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etaulo</td>
<td>towel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komufota</td>
<td>comforter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likoti</td>
<td>coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lijaketi</td>
<td>jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejampa</td>
<td>jumper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **RELIGION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omukuristo/Omukuristaayo</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisakaramendi</td>
<td>sacrament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebangeli/ebibilia</td>
<td>bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwitembeli</td>
<td>in the church/temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omusiraeli</td>
<td>Israelite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Esabato - Sabbath
Esapuri - psalm/ rosary
Omumisieni - missionary
Omukatuliki - catholic
Libatisya - baptism
Omupisikopi - bishop
Divai -
Ekorani - Koran
Omupurotestandi - protestant
Omusatukayo - Sadducee
Omuyaudi/omuyuta - Jew
Yusu Kristo - Jesus Christ

7. HOUSEHOLD ITEMS

Bukusu English Gloss
Efuriji - fridge
Esinki - sink
Esofaseti - sofa set
Egilasi - glass
Ethamosi/eflaski - thermos flask
Ewoluuniti - wall unit
Eturee - tray
Echaki - jug
Epeseni - basin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esosiru</td>
<td>- saucer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekabati</td>
<td>- cupboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lirungeti</td>
<td>- blanket</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esitoko</td>
<td>- stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehoteli</td>
<td>- hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erendi</td>
<td>- rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebajeti</td>
<td>- budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esupamaketi</td>
<td>- supermarket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilioni</td>
<td>- million (shillings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erisiti</td>
<td>- receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esosoda</td>
<td>- soda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasitoma</td>
<td>- customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etauni</td>
<td>- town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisendi/chisilingi</td>
<td>- cents/ shillings (money)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloni</td>
<td>- loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenji</td>
<td>- change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. MEDICINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omunasi</td>
<td>- nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethieta</td>
<td>- theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efamasi</td>
<td>- pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elabaratori</td>
<td>laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muekisireyi</td>
<td>in the x-ray room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekiliniki</td>
<td>clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panadoli</td>
<td>panadol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakitari</td>
<td>doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewodi</td>
<td>ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehosibito</td>
<td>hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erifaro</td>
<td>referral (hospital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esibitali yebamisyeni</td>
<td>mission hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>