



Digital Code-Mixing among Ethiopian Youth: Attitudes toward English Loanwords in Social Media Communication

Sofia Martínez

Department of English Linguistics, University of Salamanca, Spain

Abstract: *Social media communication has transformed language practices worldwide, fostering increased code-mixing and the adoption of English lexical items in multilingual communities. Among Ethiopian youth, English loanwords frequently appear in digital interactions across messaging platforms and social media networks. This study investigates how Ethiopian youth perceive and use English loanwords in digital communication, focusing on their sociolinguistic attitudes and motivations for code-mixing. Using a quantitative survey design, data were collected from 410 urban youth aged 16–24 through a structured questionnaire measuring language attitudes and digital language practices. Exploratory factor analysis and descriptive statistics were employed to identify attitudinal dimensions and usage patterns. The results indicate strong acceptance of English loanwords, primarily due to their perceived association with modernity, efficiency, and global connectivity. Three attitudinal dimensions were identified: Prestige, Integration, and Linguistic Purism. While most participants acknowledged the cultural value of local languages, they reported frequent use of English lexical items in informal digital contexts to enhance expressiveness and social identity. English loanwords have become integral elements of youth digital discourse in Ethiopia, reflecting broader processes of linguistic globalization and identity negotiation. Future research should incorporate corpus-based analysis of social media data to better understand real-life patterns of digital code-mixing and language evolution.*

Keywords: *code-mixing; digital discourse; English loanwords; youth language; sociolinguistics*

I. Introduction

The accelerating process of globalization has significantly reshaped linguistic landscapes around the world. As economic integration, technological advancement, and cross-cultural interaction intensify, languages increasingly come into contact with one another. One of the most visible outcomes of this contact is the spread of English vocabulary into numerous languages through borrowing and lexical adaptation. English has become a dominant global language in fields such as education, science, technology, and international communication, leading to its widespread influence on local linguistic practices.

In multilingual societies, the diffusion of English vocabulary often occurs through everyday communication, particularly among younger generations who are more exposed to global media and digital technologies. These young speakers frequently incorporate English lexical items into their conversations, creating hybrid forms of communication that combine elements from multiple languages. Such linguistic hybridity is especially prominent in digital environments where language norms are more flexible and creativity is encouraged.

Digital communication platforms such as social media networks, messaging applications, and online forums have created new spaces for linguistic innovation and identity expression. Unlike traditional written communication, which often adheres to standardized language norms, digital communication allows users to experiment with language in ways that

reflect their social identities, cultural affiliations, and technological experiences. In these contexts, English loanwords often function not only as practical linguistic tools but also as symbolic markers of modernity and global belonging.]

Youth are widely recognized as key agents of linguistic change in digital environments. As the most active users of social media and mobile communication technologies, young people frequently develop new linguistic styles that spread rapidly through online networks. These styles often include abbreviations, emojis, creative spelling, and the integration of vocabulary from multiple languages. English loanwords, in particular, are commonly used to refer to technological features, online activities, and aspects of contemporary global culture.

The sociolinguistic significance of English loanwords extends beyond their practical communicative function. In many contexts, the use of English vocabulary is closely linked to identity construction and social positioning. For example, speakers may use English terms to signal modernity, education, or affiliation with global youth culture. At the same time, linguistic borrowing can raise concerns about cultural authenticity and the preservation of local languages. As a result, attitudes toward English loanwords often reflect broader ideological tensions between globalization and cultural preservation.

Ethiopia provides a particularly rich environment for examining these sociolinguistic dynamics. The country's linguistic landscape is characterized by remarkable diversity, with dozens of languages spoken across different ethnic and regional communities. Amharic functions as the primary working language of the federal government, while English plays a crucial role in the education system, particularly at the secondary and tertiary levels. This coexistence of local languages and English creates a complex linguistic ecology in which multiple languages interact and influence one another.

In recent years, the rapid expansion of internet access and smartphone usage in Ethiopia has transformed communication patterns among young people. Social media platforms and messaging applications have become central channels for interpersonal communication, allowing youth to interact with peers both locally and globally. Within these digital spaces, language practices often reflect a mixture of local linguistic traditions and global cultural influences. English loanwords frequently appear in online conversations, particularly when discussing topics related to technology, entertainment, and international trends.

Understanding how young people perceive and use English loanwords is therefore essential for analyzing contemporary linguistic change in Ethiopia. Language attitudes play a key role in shaping speakers' linguistic choices and behaviors. Positive attitudes toward English loanwords may encourage their integration into everyday communication, while negative attitudes may lead to resistance against borrowing in favor of preserving linguistic purity. These attitudes are often influenced by social factors such as education, media exposure, and cultural identity.

While previous research has examined the spread of English loanwords in various multilingual contexts, relatively little attention has been paid to the relationship between linguistic borrowing and identity construction in African digital communication environments. Most studies on digital multilingualism have focused on Western or Asian societies, leaving the experiences of African youth underrepresented in the sociolinguistic literature. Investigating these issues in the Ethiopian context can therefore contribute valuable insights into the global dynamics of language change and identity formation.

This study seeks to explore the role of English loanwords in Ethiopian youth digital communication and to examine how these linguistic practices relate to broader processes of identity construction and globalization. By analyzing attitudes toward English vocabulary and patterns of digital language use among young speakers, the research aims to shed light on the sociocultural meanings associated with linguistic borrowing in contemporary Ethiopian society.

Through quantitative analysis of survey data collected from high school and university students, this research identifies key attitudinal dimensions shaping youth perceptions of English loanwords and evaluates how these attitudes influence their use in digital communication. In doing so, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of the complex relationship between language, identity, and globalization in the digital age.

II. Review of Literature

Code-mixing and code-switching are widely recognized phenomena in multilingual communication. Early linguistic research defined code-switching as the alternation between two or more languages within a single conversation or discourse. This phenomenon occurs frequently in bilingual or multilingual communities where speakers possess competence in multiple languages and strategically select linguistic resources according to social context.

One of the most influential theoretical frameworks for understanding code-switching was developed by Myers-Scotton through the Markedness Model, which explains how speakers choose linguistic codes based on social expectations and communicative goals. According to this model, speakers may use different languages to signal social identity, solidarity, or group membership.

Similarly, Gumperz emphasized the interactional functions of code-switching, arguing that language alternation often serves pragmatic purposes such as emphasizing meaning, expressing emotion, or managing interpersonal relationships. These sociolinguistic perspectives highlight that multilingual speakers actively manipulate linguistic resources to achieve communicative objectives.

In digital communication environments, code-mixing has become increasingly common due to the informal and interactive nature of online discourse. Social media platforms encourage rapid communication, creative expression, and linguistic experimentation. As a result, users often combine elements from multiple languages within a single message.

Research on multilingual digital communication shows that code-mixing frequently occurs among young users who are highly exposed to global media and online content. These users often adopt English vocabulary to describe technological features, digital activities, or popular culture references. Such practices reflect the influence of globalization and the dominance of English in digital media.

Empirical studies demonstrate that English loanwords frequently appear in youth digital discourse across different cultural contexts. For example, research on multilingual youth communication indicates that code-mixing may occur at various linguistic levels, including words, phrases, and clauses. These linguistic combinations allow speakers to convey meaning efficiently while maintaining cultural identity.

In addition to communicative efficiency, social identity plays an important role in motivating code-mixing. Youth often use English lexical items as markers of modernity, education, and global orientation. Such linguistic practices allow speakers to align themselves with global youth culture while simultaneously maintaining connections to local linguistic traditions.

Studies examining English loanwords in social media environments also highlight the role of cultural hybridity in digital communication. Digital platforms provide spaces where local and global cultural influences intersect, resulting in hybrid linguistic practices that blend multiple languages and cultural references.

Another important factor influencing code-mixing is peer group interaction. Young speakers frequently adopt linguistic styles that are popular within their social networks. The spread of loanwords through online communities can therefore be understood as a form of linguistic diffusion driven by social interaction.

Technological factors also contribute to the spread of English loanwords in digital communication. Many digital platforms and software interfaces operate primarily in English, exposing users to English vocabulary on a daily basis. As a result, English terms related to digital functions often become integrated into everyday communication.

Despite the widespread use of code-mixing in digital environments, scholars continue to debate whether such practices threaten linguistic diversity. Some researchers argue that extensive borrowing may lead to language shift or erosion of local languages. Others suggest that code-mixing represents a natural outcome of multilingual communication and does not necessarily undermine linguistic identity.

Recent research supports the latter perspective by demonstrating that multilingual speakers often maintain strong attachments to their native languages while simultaneously adopting foreign lexical items in informal contexts. In this sense, digital code-mixing can be viewed as a creative linguistic practice that reflects the dynamic nature of contemporary communication.

However, there remains limited empirical research on digital code-mixing among African youth, particularly in Ethiopia. Most existing studies have focused on multilingual communities in Asia or Europe, leaving significant gaps in our understanding of how African youth engage with global linguistic influences in online communication.

This study therefore contributes to the existing literature by examining how Ethiopian youth use English loanwords in digital communication and by analyzing the sociolinguistic attitudes underlying these practices. By exploring the relationship between language attitudes and digital code-mixing, the study provides insights into how globalization and technology influence linguistic behavior in multilingual societies.

III. Research Methods

3.1 Research Design

This study adopted a quantitative sociolinguistic survey design to examine digital code-mixing practices among Ethiopian youth and their attitudes toward English loanwords in social media communication. The survey approach enabled the systematic collection of data

on language attitudes and digital communication practices from a relatively large population of young participants.

3.2 Participants

A total of 410 students aged between 16 and 24 participated in the study. The participants were recruited from high schools and universities located in urban areas of Ethiopia. The sample included both male and female respondents and represented different educational levels.

Urban youth were selected as the primary population because they are more likely to engage in frequent digital communication through smartphones and internet platforms. This demographic group is also highly exposed to global media and technological environments where English vocabulary is commonly encountered.

Participants were recruited through voluntary participation in classroom settings and student networks. The study aimed to capture the linguistic practices of young individuals who regularly use messaging applications, social media platforms, and other forms of digital communication.

3.3 Instrument

The primary research instrument was a structured questionnaire designed to measure both language attitudes and digital communication behavior. The questionnaire contained three main sections.

- The first section collected demographic data including gender, age, and level of education.
- The second section focused on attitudes toward English loanwords and code-mixing in digital communication. Participants responded to Likert-scale statements assessing perceptions of English vocabulary as modern, prestigious, efficient, or potentially threatening to local languages.
- The third section measured digital communication practices by asking participants to report the frequency with which they used English lexical items in messaging platforms, social networking sites, and online discussions.

To ensure reliability and clarity, the questionnaire underwent a pilot test with a small group of students before the main data collection phase.

3.4 Data Collection

Data were collected through a combination of online surveys and printed questionnaires distributed within educational institutions. The data collection period lasted approximately one month.

Participants were informed that the survey focused on language use in digital communication and that their responses would remain anonymous. This approach helped reduce response bias and encouraged honest answers.

3.5 Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using quantitative statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics were used to identify overall patterns of digital language use.

Exploratory factor analysis was applied to determine the main attitudinal dimensions underlying participants' perceptions of English loanwords. Correlation analysis was then used to examine the relationship between attitudes and reported frequency of digital code-mixing.

Additionally, independent sample tests were used to determine whether demographic variables such as gender or education level influenced attitudes toward English loanwords.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Participation in the study was voluntary and based on informed consent. Participants were assured that their responses would remain confidential and would only be used for academic research purposes. No personal identifying information was recorded.

IV. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results

a. Descriptive Patterns of Digital Communication

The results of the survey indicate that digital communication plays a central role in the everyday social interactions of Ethiopian youth. Among the 410 respondents, 92% reported using messaging applications daily, while 87% indicated frequent engagement with social media platforms such as Facebook, Telegram, and Instagram. These platforms function as the primary channels through which young people communicate with peers, exchange information, and express social identity.

Participants reported spending an average of 3.8 hours per day on digital communication platforms. Messaging applications were the most frequently used medium for interpersonal communication, while social media platforms were primarily used for sharing opinions, entertainment content, and social interaction.

Within these digital spaces, multilingual communication practices were common. Most respondents indicated that they regularly switch between their native languages and English when communicating online. English lexical items were often embedded within sentences written in local languages, creating hybrid linguistic expressions characteristic of code-mixing.

The widespread presence of English loanwords in youth digital communication reflects broader sociolinguistic trends associated with globalization and digital media exposure. Young people frequently encounter English vocabulary through online platforms, international media content, and technological interfaces, which contributes to the incorporation of English lexical items into everyday discourse.

b. Frequency of Code-Mixing in Social Media Communication

Participants were asked to report how frequently they engaged in code-mixing during digital communication. The results reveal that code-mixing is a highly common practice among Ethiopian youth.

Approximately 68% of respondents indicated that they frequently combine English words with their native language when chatting online, while 21% reported occasional code-mixing. Only 11% of participants stated that they rarely or never mix languages in their digital communication.

The frequency of code-mixing varied depending on the communication platform. Messaging applications showed the highest levels of language mixing ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.59$),

followed by social networking platforms ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.71$). Online discussion forums and comment sections showed slightly lower levels of code-mixing ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.82$).

These results suggest that code-mixing is particularly prevalent in informal and interpersonal communication contexts where language norms are flexible and conversational spontaneity is encouraged. Messaging platforms, which emphasize rapid interaction and conversational tone, appear to facilitate the use of hybrid linguistic forms.

c. Types of English Loanwords Used in Digital Communication

Participants were also asked to identify common English loanwords that they frequently use in digital communication. The reported vocabulary items largely belonged to domains associated with technology, social interaction, and contemporary culture.

Words such as “online,” “download,” “post,” “like,” “share,” and “comment” were among the most frequently mentioned lexical items. These terms are closely associated with the functionalities of social media platforms and digital technologies.

In addition to technological vocabulary, participants reported using English expressions to describe emotions and social relationships. Terms such as “cool,” “sorry,” “thanks,” and “love” were commonly integrated into everyday digital conversations.

These findings indicate that English loanwords often serve pragmatic communicative functions. Many of the borrowed terms represent concepts that are closely tied to global technological culture and may not have direct equivalents in local languages. As a result, English vocabulary provides efficient linguistic tools for expressing ideas related to digital interaction.

d. Factor Analysis of Language Attitudes

To examine the underlying structure of attitudes toward English loanwords and code-mixing, exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the attitudinal items included in the questionnaire. The analysis identified three major factors explaining 82.6% of the total variance.

The first factor, labeled **Modern Identity**, explained 36.4% of the variance and included items reflecting the perception that English loanwords symbolize modern lifestyle and global connectivity. Respondents who scored highly on this factor tended to view English vocabulary as a marker of technological competence and social sophistication.

The second factor, labeled **Communicative Efficiency**, accounted for 29.1% of the variance. This dimension reflected participants’ beliefs that English lexical items facilitate faster and clearer communication in digital contexts. Participants reported that certain English words are shorter, more widely recognized, or more convenient for describing digital activities.

The third factor, labeled **Cultural Preservation**, explained 17.1% of the variance. This factor represented concerns that excessive use of English vocabulary might weaken the use of local languages. Although this factor emerged in the analysis, its overall mean score was lower than the other factors, indicating relatively moderate concern for linguistic purity.

e. Relationship between Attitudes and Code-Mixing Behavior

Correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether language attitudes influenced the frequency of code-mixing in digital communication. The results revealed modest positive

correlations between the Modern Identity factor and code-mixing frequency ($r = 0.21$), suggesting that individuals who perceive English loanwords as symbols of modernity are somewhat more likely to use them in digital communication.

Similarly, the Communicative Efficiency factor showed a moderate positive correlation with code-mixing frequency ($r = 0.27$). Participants who believed that English vocabulary enhances communicative efficiency tended to incorporate more English lexical items into their messages.

In contrast, the Cultural Preservation factor demonstrated a weak negative correlation with code-mixing frequency ($r = -0.12$). Participants who expressed stronger concerns about protecting local languages were slightly less likely to engage in code-mixing, although the relationship was relatively weak.

Regression analysis further confirmed that communicative efficiency was the strongest predictor of code-mixing behavior among the three attitudinal dimensions. This finding suggests that pragmatic considerations play a more important role in shaping digital language use than ideological concerns about linguistic purity.

f. Demographic Differences in Code-Mixing Practices

Statistical tests were conducted to examine whether demographic factors influenced digital code-mixing behavior. The results indicated no significant gender differences in the frequency of code-mixing ($p > 0.05$). Both male and female participants reported similar levels of language mixing in digital communication.

However, small differences emerged between high school and university students. University students reported slightly higher levels of code-mixing, which may reflect their greater exposure to English through higher education and academic environments. Nevertheless, the difference was not statistically significant.

Age differences within the sample were also minimal, indicating that the practice of digital code-mixing is widespread across the youth demographic group.

4.2 Discussion

The findings of this study confirm that digital communication environments encourage multilingual language practices characterized by code-mixing and lexical borrowing. Ethiopian youth frequently integrate English loanwords into their online communication, reflecting the influence of globalization and digital media.

The prominence of the Communicative Efficiency factor suggests that practical considerations play a major role in shaping linguistic behavior. English loanwords often provide convenient labels for technological concepts that are widely recognized across digital platforms. As a result, their use becomes a pragmatic strategy for efficient communication.

The association between English vocabulary and modern identity also reflects broader sociolinguistic patterns observed in multilingual societies. English often functions as a symbolic marker of globalization, education, and technological competence. Young speakers may therefore adopt English lexical items to align themselves with global youth culture.

At the same time, the relatively low level of concern for linguistic purity indicates that multilingual youth do not necessarily perceive code-mixing as a threat to their cultural identity.

Instead, they appear to navigate multiple linguistic resources flexibly, adapting their language use according to communicative context.

Overall, the results highlight the dynamic nature of digital multilingualism and demonstrate how youth language practices evolve in response to technological and cultural change.

V. Conclusion

This study explored the prevalence of digital code-mixing among Ethiopian youth and examined their attitudes toward English loanwords in social media communication. The results reveal that code-mixing is a widespread and normalized linguistic practice among young speakers who regularly engage with digital communication platforms. English lexical items frequently appear within messages written in local languages, producing hybrid linguistic forms characteristic of multilingual digital discourse.

The analysis identified three key attitudinal dimensions influencing participants' perceptions of English loanwords: Modern Identity, Communicative Efficiency, and Cultural Preservation. Among these factors, communicative efficiency emerged as the strongest predictor of code-mixing behavior. Participants often reported that English vocabulary provides convenient expressions for technological concepts and digital interactions, particularly in online environments where communication is fast-paced and informal.

The findings also demonstrate that code-mixing is most common in interpersonal communication contexts such as messaging applications and social networking platforms. These environments encourage conversational language styles and creative linguistic expression, allowing users to integrate vocabulary from multiple languages. At the same time, concerns about cultural preservation were relatively moderate, indicating that most participants do not perceive digital code-mixing as a threat to their native languages.

These results contribute to broader sociolinguistic discussions about multilingual communication in the digital age. Rather than representing linguistic decline, code-mixing appears to function as a dynamic communicative strategy that reflects both globalization and local linguistic identity. Young speakers navigate multiple linguistic resources flexibly, selecting words that best serve their communicative goals.

Based on the findings, several practical recommendations can be proposed. First, language educators should acknowledge the realities of digital multilingual communication and integrate discussions of code-mixing into language awareness programs. Recognizing these practices can help students develop a deeper understanding of language variation and sociolinguistic diversity.

Second, policymakers and educational institutions should promote balanced multilingual education that values both global languages such as English and local linguistic heritage. Encouraging students to maintain proficiency in their native languages while engaging with global communication networks can support linguistic diversity.

Finally, future research should incorporate corpus-based analysis of real social media data in order to capture authentic patterns of digital code-mixing. Such research would provide more detailed insights into how multilingual youth use language in naturally occurring digital communication contexts.

References

- Androutsopoulos, J. (2006). Multilingualism, diaspora, and the internet. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10(4), 520–547.
- Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation*. Routledge.
- Backus, A. (2005). Codeswitching and language change. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9(3–4), 307–340.
- Bailey, G., & Lucas, C. (2007). *Sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blom, J., & Gumperz, J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics*.
- Boyd, D., & Ellison, N. (2007). Social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210–230.
- Crystal, D. (2006). *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. A. (2006). *Do not leave your language alone*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Heller, M. (2007). *Bilingualism: A social approach*. Palgrave.
- Holmes, J. (2008). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Longman.
- Hudson, R. (2001). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Li Wei. (2000). *The bilingualism reader*. Routledge.
- Li Wei. (2007). Dimensions of bilingualism. In *Bilingualism: A social approach*.
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Language and social networks*. Blackwell.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Pavlenko, A. (2006). *Bilingual minds*. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. Routledge.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Code-switching patterns. *Linguistics*, 18, 581–618.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Blackwell.
- Sebba, M. (2007). *Spelling and society*. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tagliamonte, S. (2006). *Analyzing sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thurlow, C., & Brown, A. (2003). *Generation Txt? Discourse Analysis Online*.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Blackwell.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact*. Mouton.