Abstract

This paper focuses on code switching (CS) done by bilingual speakers of Amharic and English, focusing exclusively on switching codes from Amharic to English. Amharic is the national language of Ethiopia, however, English is the language of instruction in high schools and post-secondary institutions in Ethiopia with English classes being part of the curriculum in elementary schools. This creates a bilingualism that makes CS an inevitable part of the discourse of speakers of Amharic and English. There is, however, little research on the linguistic phenomena of CS as it relates to speakers of English and Amharic. This paper explores the practice and raises questions of the nature of its grammaticality. This paper will be mainly exploring if any grammatical rules are violated in either of the languages in code switched sentences or phrases, or if any information is lost in the process, given that the codes have very different morphological systems. It was observed that Amharic (having much richer morphology than English) often lends affixes to English words being code switched, resulting in no information being lost in the CS process. An idea of the working definition of CS for this paper is established and followed by an analysis of the relevant aspects of English and Amharic grammar. Examples of occurrences of CS done by bilinguals on Amharic radio stations, news broadcasts, and political speeches are used to determine if there are specific environments in which CS can or cannot be grammatically done. This empirical study demonstrates that a vast majority of code switched items are single words (mostly nouns or verbs). I also conduct a study, using sample sentences from different studies references in this paper, testing the grammaticality of code switched sentences (using native speaker judgments) with English words, with various grammatical functions, placed in different environments.

Theoretical Analyses of Code Switching

Code is defined by Wardhaugh (1986) as simply being a language or dialect that a person chooses to speak in. By this definition, CS is simply alternating between languages within a sentence, phrase, or conversation. Wardhaugh (1986) and Fasold (1984) define CS as using elements of one language while speaking in another language. Hymes (1974) claims that CS is not restricted between languages but can be between multiple dialects of the same language. Gumperz (1975) defines CS similarly, adding that it is intrasentential. It can, however also be intersentential. Bokamba describes this a little differently, claiming that CS is exclusively intersentential and code mixing as intrasentential. This paper assumes CS as an umbrella term covering both the inter- and intrasentential forms. Following Gumperz’ definition, this paper will consider CS in terms of morphology and syntax.

CS can be done by anyone with extensive or limited knowledge of 2 or more codes. This raises many questions of what goes on in the mind of the speaker during CS (in regards to the phonetic, phonological and syntactic inventory of the multiple languages), who code switches, in what situation do they do it and why. As stated above a speaker must have some knowledge of more than one code in order to code-switch. There is considerable debate as to requirements that are to be met to qualify an individual as a bilingual. Bloomfield (1933) describes bilingualism as the “native-like command of two languages.” On the other end of the spectrum, Edwards (2004) claims that “everyone is bilingual.” This is because everyone has the ability to use at least one word or greeting in another language with some sort of control, and Edwards considers this
ability bilingualism. Macnamara (1967) described people with equal bilingual ability as being “balanced.” The methodology used by Macnamara and others to assess the level of bilingual proficiency will not be used in this review. The assumption is that many of the examples used of Amharic speakers CS English are not “balanced” though they are native speakers of Amharic and have sufficient knowledge of English in that they use it at the academic level. They are considered, in this review, to be bilingual.

CS can be done by a bilingual speaker for various reasons or with various intents in mind. Gumperz (1975) notes that CS is scarcely done because of a lack of knowledge in one or the other of the languages being used. Taking this into consideration, it must then be a stylistic choice. Speakers of a language can code switch depending on the context; situational CS, or to express more specific meaning; metaphorical CS (Blom and Gumperz, 1972). Situational CS involves factors such as social environments. Relating to Hymes’ (1974) definition of CS, being between two languages or two dialects of the same language, Young (2013) discusses the reasons for CS between “Standard English” and slang in African American youth. He observes that the youth took to using “Standard English” at home or at church and slang among their peers. Metaphorical CS may be used to better express a meaning or emotion (Young 2013). The situational and metaphorical categorizations of CS explore the reasons for CS. This is separate from the intersentential and intrasentential categorizations of CS. Intersentential and intrasentential CS can be done in both situational and metaphorical code switching.

In continuation with the idea of CS being a stylistic choice, Ferguson (1964) introduced the theory of “diglossia” which centers on the idea of having two registers of speech, formal and informal. Fishman (1967) refers to this idea by categorizing these languages into being high or low. The division here, however, focuses on formal or informal speech. In a study of conversational CS, Gumperz (1977) discusses the nature of CS as depending on the setting. He discusses what he has found to be a direct correlation between one’s choice of the language they use and the social context in which they are making that choice. He notes the frequent use of CS by minority language speakers into the majority language of a metropolis when conversing in informal speech in the workplace. Given this analysis the people being spoken to, the subject and the setting of the conversation (such as the professional or academic environment) would influence CS to English from Amharic.

Giles (1977) established a system of language categorization for application in multilingual environments. He categorizes them according to the following elements; demographic strength, institutional support, and social status. This framework is set in place to navigate through possible productive motives for code choice in multilingual societies where multiple options exist. Gumperz (1975) believes CS to be a stylistic choice through observations of minority language users CS into the majority language in professional environments. If CS is indeed a stylistic choice, it can then be assumed that there would exist many possible motives and intentions to drive bilingual speakers to this choice. The categorizations discussed above from Giles (1977) are all sufficient reasons to cause any bilingual speaker to CS into a code with demographic strength, institutional support, and high social status depending on their motivations. Gross (2000) discusses the use of CS by bilinguals or multilinguals as a conversational strategy to achieve certain ‘social ends.’ He discusses it as means to reap desired benefits in environments with obvious social hierarchies. It has already been established by Myers-Scotton (1993) that people in positions of power or prestige use CS (most likely into a language with high standing in the categorizations listed above by Giles (1977)) to assert their power. Gross (2000) discusses the use of CS by persons of lesser power or prestige (perhaps in
the professional or academic environments) using CS in an attempt to prove their ‘interactional power.’ Myers-Scotton (1988) describes speakers as using this strategy with various intentions in mind. She describes ‘social consequences’ as the driving factor in the ‘code choices’ made by bilingual and multilingual speakers.

Though CS can be defined as using elements of one code while speaking in another, this does not include the practice of loan words. A loan word is a word from one code adopted into another by the speakers of the adopting code. The words are widely understood and used by speakers of the adopting code as if it is a part of that language. Such occurrences will not be acknowledged as cases of CS in this study, they are considered a part of the vocabulary of the code that they are borrowed into.

As every language has a structure that must be followed in order to produce grammatical utterances, the question of the structure of CS is raised in relation to its syntax and morphology: what grammatical structures are speakers following when using CS? MacSwan (1999, 2000) proposes that it is only the grammars of the participant languages that restrict the structure of CS. For example, if neither of the codes being used by a speaker are pro-drop languages, then CS would not change this. The speaker would not in any case drop a pronoun. Myers-Scotton’s (2002) theory for CS centers around the idea of a matrix language and an embedded language. Similar to Ferguson (1964) and Gumperz’ (1967) idea of “diglossia” and having two registers of speech. Myers-Scotton (2002) views the Matrix language as the code mostly spoken in and the embedded language is the code that the code switched item is extracted from. According to this theory, the structure and grammar of the matrix language is preserved and adhered to in the CS sentence or phrase. She claims the embedded language provides nothing structurally except content material (ie. Lexical items). This now raises questions of the actual structure of sentences involving CS, such as: when the grammars or morphological inventory of the component languages do not have a one-to-one correspondence, what, if anything, is lost or modified in the CS process?

Analysis of the Relevant Aspects of English and Amharic Grammar

Amharic is the national and official language of Ethiopia and is classified as a Semitic language. Amharic is largely spoken throughout Ethiopia, Eritrea (where the official language is Tigrinya) and Djibouti (where the official languages are French and Arabic). Though Amharic is both the national and official language of Ethiopia, English is the language of instruction in High Schools and Post-Secondary Institutions, according to the Education and Training Policy as outlined in the constitution of Ethiopia. Children are also taught English as a course at the elementary level. The constitution also states that the language of instruction at the elementary level shall be the majority language of the region in question, as there are over 85 ethnic groups in Ethiopia, many of which have their own distinct vocabulary. Language policies are the regulations regarding the use of certain languages in certain domains as set by the governing body (Schiffman 2005). These domains include government, business, education, administration and more. The government, under Prime Minister Meles Zenawi who was Prime Minister from 1995 until 2012, promoted the use of regional dialects in the educational system until such time that English takes over (Getachew and Derib 2008). This not only encourages an equal bilingualism but also further promotes Ferguson’s (1964) theory of “diglossia.” There becomes a sharp divide between higher and lower registers of speech (Gumperz, 1967).

Due to incorporating English into Ethiopian society, much of the population can be considered bilingual, although the degree of bilingualism may vary greatly. As mentioned above,
Gumperz (1975) notes that CS is done most frequently by speakers of minority languages in informal speech when conversing with speakers of the majority language and/or in the workplace. He goes on to refer to this behavior as the beginning of a process in which a language or dialect is displaced by another. However, this is a long process in which bilingualism delays the displacement for many generations. He predicts that the use of code switching will increase partly due to changes occurring in metropolitans.

Amharic has a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) word order, unlike English, which has Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order. Due to this difference in word order and the large imbalance in the morphological inventory of these languages, it is inconceivable to analyze Amharic and English sentences on a word-to-word basis. English and Amharic can have an approximately 2:1 ratio in terms of their morphology. An analysis of the first sentence of the Bible in English and Amharic is provided below:

1. በመጀመሪያ ይግራፍ ያስማይንና ምድርን ወጤ ይወጣ ምክንያት

   In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth

Amsalu (2006) found a ratio of approximately 1 Amharic word for every 1.7 English word in the experimental sample that was used in the paper. Because of the rich morphology of Amharic, this is often true in many words or phrases. An example of this is the Amharic uses of the verb “go” in various forms. The glosses used in this paper will be hyphenated in the Amharic translation to indicate morpheme boundaries.

2. Heed En-heed Hed-en Hed-u
   Go! 1pl go left 1pl left 3MP
   “Go!” “Lets go” “We left” “They left”

Here, the morphological unit ‘en’ can either act as a prefix or a suffix in Amharic. While it is first person plural it takes on slightly different functions and meanings in the translation. As a prefix it translates to a verb in English while it is a pronoun in the Amharic. As a suffix it is a pronoun in the English translation and a bound morphological unit in the Amharic denoting number. “Heed,” the present tense of “go” can stand on it’s own as an infinitive verb while “hed-,” the past tense of “go” is bound and must appear with a pronoun indicating number. This ratio indicating the rich morphology of Amharic can also be seen in phrases.

3. An-te at-felig-im An-chee at-felig-m
   “You do not want.” Ms “You do not want.” Fm

4. E-wed-e-shall-o E-wed-e-hall-o
   “I love you.” Fm “I love you.” Ms

In (2), it is the masculine and feminine forms of “you” that stand on their own. While “atfeligim” is composed of three bound units, two being affixes, and one a bound verb. Unlike English, verbs in Amharic carry inflection such as number, gender, and person. “At-“ indicates the negative, “felig” meaning “want” and “-im” acts similarly to anaphors in English, it agrees with the pronoun in the sentence. (3) goes on the express the rich morphology of Amharic using bound verbs. “Wed”, meaning love, is always bound. “-Shall-” in the feminine or “-hall-” in the masculine indicates something being done to a person, and “e-“ and “-o” work together to represent “I” and “you” in “I love you.” Examples (2)-(4) show the 1:1.7 word ratio between Amharic and English introduced by Amsalu (2006). This ratio and the examples given represent
the rich morphology of Amharic. There are, however, many examples of a 1:1 relationship between Amharic and English words that continues to display the ample use of morphology in Amharic. Example (4) demonstrates the 1:1 relationship between English and Amharic words that is possible. The example includes a verb, noun and determiner to demonstrate that it is possible in a variety of types of words.

5. Sim-u meh-kohtaht I-dell-em

“Listen” “to be - anger” “it-IS-NEG”

Suffixes such as –m and –ss are examples of affixes which denote meaning in Amharic. –M attaches to most Nouns, Pronouns, and Adjectives, on Quantifiers, Indefinites and conditional clause verbs. –ss attaches to most Nouns, Pronouns, Adjectives and conditional clause verbs. Gasser (1984) argues –m to be used in clauses involving new information, where –m represents ‘continuity’ and –ss represents ‘discontinuity.’ For example, Indaw-m “in fact”, indihu-m “similarly”, yiliq-iss “rather”, ingidiya-ss “in that case.” Such affixes are used in relation to new information, English does not have a specific morpheme that seems to parallel with these affix meanings.

Further, Amharic takes use of person and gender affixes in many cases. I will use the example used in Yimam (2006) of ‘sabr-‘ meaning ‘break’ in the imperfective stem.

6. 1 sg. säbr-kut ‘I break’ pl. ?i-n-säbr- ‘we break’
2 m tī-säbr- ‘you break’ tī-säbr-u ‘you break’
1 f tī-säbr-i ‘you break’ tī-säbr-u ‘you break’
3 m yī-säbr ‘he breaks’ yī-säbr-u ‘they break’
1 f tī-säbr- ‘she breaks’ yī-säbr-u ‘they break’

As seen in Example (6), Amharic uses both prefixes and suffixes that cannot stand on their own to indicate plurality, gender and person. In the same scenarios, English uses pronouns that stand on their own to indicate gender, person and number (to some extent) and the present tense marker –s to denote the third person. Amharic is also a Pro-drop language. Therefore while it can drop independent pronouns when there is no emphasized element as shown in the example below.

7. Ene-awkwalow Ackwalow

“I know” “I know”

Dropping the pronoun meaning “I” left the sentence with the same meaning in Amharic, which it would not have done in English.

Bender (1972) discusses the presence of English in Amharic vocabulary and its rising dominance as the largest source of borrowed words for Amharic. These loan words, adopted by Amharic, are considered a part of Amharic vocabulary.

**Code Switching from Amharic to English**

CS from Amharic to English seems to occur in a variety of syntactic settings mostly involving insertion of uninflected English lexical items. These can occur in academic based conversations, in professional settings or in casual conversation.
Leyew (1998) records CS occurrences between two Ethiopians on a radio station. The data showed that the English words being inserted into the Amharic sentences were not exclusive to one or certain lexical categories; the majority being nouns, adjectives and verbs. Also, the structure of the code-switched sentences followed the SOV structure of Amharic and not the SVO structure of English.

8. Kinat DEDICATION ti-fallig-all-acc
   Art dedication 3FS-require-AUX-3FS
   “Art requires dedication”

However, when English phrases are inserted into Amharic speech, the structure and grammar of the English phrase is identical to the English grammar, as seen in the below example.

9. Anta dagmo YOU ARE THE MAN FROM THE EAST
   “You oh! You are the man from the east”

Amsalu (2006) observed a roughly 2:1 ratio of morphology between Amharic and English in some data. This difference in the inventory of morphology can be observed in CS. Though a majority of English words inserted into Amharic utterances do not contain morphology when being code-switched, it is possible.

10. ine HISTORICAL NOVELS, POETRY, 1-wadd-all-ahu
    1PS HISTORICAL NOVELS, POETRY, 1PS-love-1PS-TO DO
    “I like historical novels, poetry”

Example (10) shows that inflected forms (plural marker –s in this case) can be code-switched. Therefore it is not just the bare form of a verb or other lexical category that is code switched. The above example demonstrated an English word being code switched into an Amharic sentence carrying its own English inflection. English words, however, can also be code switched into Amharic and be given Amharic affixes in the process.

11. AWARD-occ RIGHT-ih-in
    AWARD 3MP RIGHT-3MS-TO BE
    Awards You are right

The above examples demonstrate an English word carrying an Amharic marker representing number. English words being code-switched into Amharic can, and often do, take on Amharic prefixes and suffixes. The two affixes used in the latter example represent possession and masculine possession respectively.

Leyew (1998) observed what might be considered a grammatical mistake in his analysis of the conversation between two bilingual Ethiopians on the Ethiopian radio station.

12. …CERTAINABLE ya-hon-a timihirt la-masafat
    certainable that-be-3MS education for-spreading

In this example, a bilingual speaker of English and Amharic, while CS, created a new adjective that is not a word in English. “-Able” is a suffix in English that attaches to verbs to create the meaning “capable of, or worthy of.” In this case, the speaker created a word that is not an actual
word in English. In addition, the speaker did not follow the grammatical rules of English in creating this word, as they added “-able” suffix to an adjective.

It is demonstrated in these examples that English words can be inserted in any form into Amharic speech while following Amharic SOV order. It can also carry Amharic morphology.

**Empirical Data**

In an analysis of the speech of Amharic and English bilinguals in a completely controlled setting; an Ethiopian television show, it was observed that the Amharic-speaking actors code-switched into English a total of nine times in a 26 minute episode. For every word that was code switched there is an Amharic equivalent to that word, with one exception. The word text was used in the context of sending a text message via a cell phone. This word was likely used because of a lack of Amharic equivalent with the same meaning that applies to cell phone messaging. In the history of Amharic, texting is a new phenomenon in which the word for it was simply borrowed from English. This episode is simply an example of the 20 episodes of this television program that data was collected from. It was observed that there was an average of 8 CS occurrences over these episodes (loan words not included). A majority of code switched words observed in this study were either nouns or verbs, no function words were observed to be code switched. In no cases were English words code switched into Amharic containing English morphology. In every case where a morphologically altered word was code switched the morphology incorporated was that of the Amharic morphological system. Considering that this sample is from a controlled setting and not an observation of spontaneous speech, the data is observed according to a written work by a writer/author. Gross (2000) discusses the practice of writers to tailor their work to emulate real-life scenarios and situation. Further, they make any dialogue in their work sound as natural as possible. It can be thought of as a representation of the speech patterns of real speech communities. This data can therefore be regarded as a dim mirror of the speech of native speakers of Amharic and their patterns of CS into English. A fact worth noting here is that no words or phrases from any language was code switched into Amharic other than English in this sample. This is odd given that there are very many distinct dialects spoken in Ethiopia, and Tigrinya and Arabic are close neighbors of the nation and it’s language. This speaks to the immense promotion and incorporation of English into the Amharic speech community.

The concept of loan words extends throughout much of Amharic vocabulary and is therefore instilled in the lexicon of speakers. In an analysis of various speeches by political figures in Ethiopia, it was observed that English words and phrases were evidently integrated into their speech. Many of these words, however, do not have an Amharic equivalent and therefore become adopted into the Amharic lexicon in the English form. An example of this is the word economy, which is used in all the political surveys analyzed. The word democracy is another example of this. This can usually be accounted for nouns involving Western items or ideas. These would be categorized by Abraham (1963) as being under the umbrella of governmental or political loan words. There are however, some examples of words in English, that also have an Amharic equivalent, but speakers still opt to code switch into English. An example of this is seen below in a speech given by the current Prime Minister of Ethiopia, Hailemariam Desalegn, during his acceptance speech:
Example (13) shows the Prime Minister using the English word *diplomat* in his sentence, adding the Amharic plural suffix –*och*. There is, however, an Amharic word for diplomat, *balesletane*. This raises questions of any possible intentions behind this CS occurrence. Another example of this is another speech, called a ‘discussion with Ethiopian Diaspora,’ by Desalegn.

14. **sow** immediately malkowm nebereben  
    people immediately TO-stop must-PST-PL  
    “People should have immediately stopped”

In Ethiopia, English is part of the curriculum in elementary schools and is the language of instruction in both high schools and post secondary institutions, and so it has a close relation with not only education but also higher education. Furthermore, many large businesses and corporations in Ethiopia conduct business in English. This, perhaps, puts the ability to speak English and English in general in a higher esteem. Therefore using it in contexts like the ones above may be a tactic of the speaker to sound more intelligent. In accordance with Giles (1977), factors such as demographic strength, institutional support and high social status are motivating factors influencing CS. English seems to have high standing in each of these mentioned categories and would therefore be a code of choice scenarios involving some sort of power hierarchy (Myers-Scotton 1988). Myers-Scotton (1988) theorizes that CS is a strategy of the speaker to achieve certain conversational goals or benefits. In Example (14) of CS done by Prime Minister Hailemariam Desalegn in which he code switched the word *immediately*, it can be assumed that this adverb was code switched to create urgency in the Ethiopian Diaspora (whom he was speaking to in an effort to gain support). Also, it can be assumed to emphasize the urgency by coupling it with the sense of power, education and prestige and, consequently, dominance that comes with not only CS an English word into Amharic but also by CS a word like *immediately*. This occurrence of CS is said to be motivated by the hope of achieving a certain ‘social end’ (Gross 2002).

**Sample Study Testing Grammaticality of Various Code Switched Sentences**

Given the data represented above, many questions can now be raised such as whether or not there are differences in code switching in nominative or accusative case. Another question can be raised: what English words, if any, cannot be code switched into Amharic, or possibly what lexical categories or positions are off limits? Do complications or ungrammaticalities exist in CS involving derivational affixes or inflectional morphemes? This section will begin the exploration of such questions with syntax. MacSwann (1999, 2000) says that CS is limited to the grammars of the codes being switched to. In the case of the syntactic structure of code switched sentences from Amharic to English, the syntactic structure of Amharic is adhered to while English words or phrases are switched into that structure. In observing the syntactic structure of code switching, English has a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order while Amharic has a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) word order. The following example from Leslau (1995) (15) displays this difference in structure.
(16) is an example of an expletive construction in the English translation. This sentence is considered an expletive construction because of the function of the word *there* in the subject position. *There*, in this context, can be referred to as the subject of the sentence (Long 1968). It is a “dummy” word inserted into the sentence to fill the subject position. It acts as a subject in order to make the English sentence adhere to its proper SVO structure and therefore be grammatical. The Amharic sentence, being Pro-drop and having the SOV word order, does not need an expletive to stand in. It has the subject, or the object being spoken about, the location, and the verb to be. Perhaps due to its rich morphology, Amharic sentences seem to lack expletives. Expletives are filler words used in English and other languages and do not have a particular meaning in a sentence. A common expletive is ‘*it*’ like in a sentence about the weather:

17. Zenab ale
   Rain IS
   There is rain

In an experiment in which multiple middle aged bilingual speakers of English and Amharic were asked whether the following code mixed sentences were grammatical, 100% of them said they were not.

18a. Zenab THERE IS
     Rain THERE IS
     There is rain (or It’s/it is raining)

18b. THERE IS zenab
     THERE IS rain
     There is rain (or it’s/it is raining)

19. Skitbitow OVER THERE ale
    Pen OVER THERE IS
    There is a pen over there

20a. Mas’haf-u tarappeza UNDER naw
     Book-DET table-DEF UNDER IS
     The book is under the table

20b. Mas’haf-u tarappeza sir IS
     Book-DET table-DEF under IS
     The book is under the table

20c. BOOK tarappeza sir ale
     Book table-DEF under IS
     The book is under the table

The following sample sentences, Examples (21) to (23b) were made by me using the last 3 example sentences, Examples (18a) to (20c) in this paper. Using the same sentences, only code switching different words, 100% of the bilingual speakers of Amharic and English said the following sentences do indeed make sense and are therefore grammatical.

21. RAIN ale
    Rain IS
    There is rain (or it’s/ it is raining)

22. PEN izaga ale
    Pen OVER THERE IS
    There is a pen over there
It seems here that bilingual speakers of English and Amharic are more likely to grammatically code switch subjects than expletives or parts of a Prepositional Phrase (PP). These bilingual speakers deemed it grammatical to code switch an entire PP, but not a part of it. This suggests that there may be a rule requiring CS to be only with entire constituents. This theory is however disproved by the grammaticality of 23a and the ungrammaticality of 20c. In this example the Noun Phrase (NP) includes a noun and determiner (as a suffix to the noun). As seen in multiple examples above, English words being code switched into Amharic require the Amharic suffix where applicable. In this case, the –u determiner suffix is required for the sentence to be grammatical (20c shows that the sentence is ungrammatical when the determiner suffix is missing). Therefore, part of the NP is code switched and the utterance is still grammatical.

The above data sample raises questions of the uses of the uses of the Amharic ale and naw. Both are forms of is while ale is a noun and naw is a verb. In the contexts listed above from (18a-23b), all participants in the study claimed that it is grammatical to replace ale where it is used in the above sentences with naw, but the reverse is not grammatical. I predict this is because the contexts in which naw is used it is a verb, a noun therefore cannot replace it. Perhaps a noun cannot replace it because it would slightly alters the meaning of the sentence, but it is still considered ungrammatical in this context because the participants are the contextual judges of grammaticality. The reverse, however, can be true because in a sentence like (20) the noun form of is is sufficient to give the sentence meaning, while the verb form adds the same meaning.

Conclusion:

This literature review explored the nature of CS in regards to Amharic and English. Definitions of CS were considered in order to create a basis for the analysis of the context and nature of CS from Amharic to English. I conducted a study given the information discussed in the review regarding the grammaticality of sentences considering a variety of different words or functions being code switched into English. The participants were unanimous in all answers to questions regarding grammaticality of code switched sentences. It was observed that the grammatical structure of Amharic and not English is adhered to when CS from Amharic to English. Parts of phrases can be code switched in some places and not others (Ex. It is ungrammatical to code switch part of a PP but is only grammatical to code switch part of an NP if there is any inflection in the English). Questions still linger as to whether or not there is a certain type of phrase that can never be code switched into English from Amharic. One question is: what is the CS structure when it comes to phrases that bilingual speakers of Amharic and English adhere to when CS? Also, a question was raised in the introduction as to whether any information is lost in CS because English and Amharic only have a 1:1 correspondence of words in certain contexts, and a 1:7 English to Amharic word to word ratio was found in others. It has been observed that information is not lost in the CS process because Amharic uses it’s rich morphology to include any meaning (example, number, gender) and attaches it to English words being code switched. So while fewer English words may be used, the morphology makes up for the meaning.
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