Covenant Journal of Language Studies (CJLS) Vol. 9 No. 2, December, 2021
ISSN: p. 2354-3582 e. 2354-3523

An Open Access Journal Available Online

A Micro-Parametric Variation of English and Khana Adjectives

Nwizug, Sumenenua Suzi & Nwala, Michael A.
University of Port Harcourt, Choba
Port Harcourt

Received August 3, 2021; Accepted December 1, 2021
Date of Publication: December 2021

Abstract

Significant parametric variations are discovered in different languages whenever their structures are dissected and laid bare. The English and Khana languages are two distinct languages; the former spoken as a second language as well as the language of instruction in schools in Nigeria while the latter is the indigenous language of a selected Ogoni group and also included in the languages grouped as minority languages in Nigeria. This paper which examined the structural variations of adjectives in both languages anchored its strength on two theoretical frameworks: Chomsky's Minimalist Program and Lado's Contrastive Analysis. The methodology is completely descriptive. Secondary data were predominantly collected from grammar texts and interpreted by native speakers of Khana. Findings revealed a sharp departure in the adjectival structures of both languages, for instance, the adjectives in English manifest an overt morphological pattern of grading while those of Khana retain their forms at the comparative and superlative levels. The paper therefore recommends that teachers of Khana/English bilinguals should adopt teaching strategies that will assist learners surmount the challenges that emanate from the structural variations of adjectives in both languages. **Key words:** parametric variation, contrastive, adjectives, second language, inflection, bilinguals.

Introduction

Language is purely a human endowed property through which communication and socialisation are achieved. Despite this fact, humans do not just string sounds or elements together in order to form sentences, rather, certain rules apply. For example, in the formation of words, morphological rules are strictly followed. The word 'table' cannot be spelt in the reverse form as 'elbat,' even though all the letters in 'elbat' are conspicuous in 'table,' it cannot represent the object acceptably. Same idea applies when it has to do with the arrangement of words to form larger syntactic structures, specified rules must be obeyed. Whenever a rule is flouted, the construction is termed ill-formed. Hence, syntactic constructions must follow laid down rules.

Interestingly, syntactic constructions can be equated with building in architecture. Every finished well-constructed architectural design is as a result of the proper placement of the blocks. These blocks are laid properly on one another in order to achieve a complete structure. In the English language also, words are considered to be building blocks in sentence formation (Plag, Braun, Lappe, & Schramm 2007). The same way every block is important in a building construction, that is how important words are. Words are invaluable bricks in sentence formation; every word has a role to play in every given construction and the placement of words is linguistically important in constructions, thus, the importance of word classes. Words in sentences are not arranged arbitrarily, they are syntagmatically arranged in line with the rules of grammaticality and acceptability governing a particular grammar of the language. Little wonder, Deng and Lin (2016) defined grammar as a rule-governed system which deals with the conventional concatenation and relationship of linguistic units.

Linguistic units are not entirely novel to a second language learner who learns the language formally (i.e., within the four walls of a school). As the language of instruction in schools, the English language is taught from the first day children step into a school until they graduate, yet, the incompetence of its users is glaringly conspicuous especially as it relates to aspects of grammar which exist in the English language but absent in the indigenous languages of learners. This is the driving force behind the linguistic inquiry of studying the structure of the adjectival class - an aspect of syntax that poses a problem to second language users of the English language from the Khana origin.

The English language in Nigeria, specifically to the people of Khana is one of the languages learned not acquired. Although it is learned, English as Nigeria's official language has dominated the use of Khana among the Khana native speakers. As a result, it has assumed the status of a lingua franca, thus, used as the major language for instruction in schools. As a result of the fact that English serves as a second language among the Khana native speakers, it has been unarguably *nativized*. In Nigeria generally, the *nativization* of the English language has produced another variety of the language known as the Nigerian English. This paper is not concerned with the holistic issue that affects the English language;

rather, it studies a micro parametric distinction that occurs in infinitesimal but relevant ways that affect the Khana L_2 users of English. It is on this note that Okoh (2006, p.46) asserted that the English language 'has left some imprints on the indigenous languages and has itself been influenced … such exertion and transmission of influences by domestic tongues has since become a global phenomenon.' That is to say that English has been 'influenced' by our indigenous languages and vice versa. This impact is noticeable at the phonological, morphological and syntactic and even at the semantic levels.

Grammatically, words are classified using a dual dichotomy; the lexical category and the functional category. The lexical category is also known as the open class category. This is because of its ability to accommodate new forms into its group. Compared to the functional category, the lexical category is quite a large class and is marked by semantic interpretations. Radford (1997) observed that words which belong to the lexical category are numerous and their features interconnect with other word classes. For example, words such as 'given,' and 'drunk' appear like verbs because of their morphological features but can function as adjectives, functionally and syntactically. This study centres on one of the members of the lexical category; adjectives. Adjectives like other members of the lexical category undergo morphological changes by adopting specific morphological markings known as inflections. Nwala (2016) further viewed the morphological features of adjectives where he enumerated the gradable nature of adjectives. In line with adjectival gradability, Nwala (2016) observed that adjectives behave like adverbs. They can be graded using the parameters of regularity and irregularity. Regular gradable adjectives utilise a particular pattern to express intensity.

The Khana Language

The Khana language pronounced and spelt as /kana/ by natives is one of the languages spoken by the Ogoni people of the South-South geopolitical zone of Nigeria, numbering over two hundred thousand (200,000) speakers (Ethnologue 2018). There are six districts in Ogoniland namely; Nyo-Khana, Ken-Khana, Gokana, Babbe, Tai and Eleme. Ngulube (2013) outlined five languages spoken in this area. They are, Baan, Gokana, Tai, Eleme and Kana. These languages are mutually unintelligible. Blench (2008) stated that the Ogoni languages are regarded as part of the Cross-River collection of Benue Congo languages.

There are two dialects of Khana language namely, Kekhana and Nyokhana. These dialects are mutually intelligible. Nevertheless, the basic difference in both is mainly in minimal pairs. Nyokhana will predominantly use the phoneme /i/ in a word like *ikpo* which implies 'power' whereas Kekhana speakers will use /é/ realizing *ekpo*. Thus, there is no overt difference in the phonology of both dialects.

Theoretical Framework

The Minimalist Program

The Minimalist Program is the language description model introduced by Chomsky in 1995. Its purpose is to economise linguistic representations which had been elaborated in Chomsky's earlier works. It however, shares some core principles with his earlier works. It believes that a part of the human brain is dedicated to language. This aspect of the brain which Chomsky refers to as the language faculty contains two systems: the cognitive system as well as the performance system. In the Minimalist Program, Chomsky's four levels of grammatical interpretation proposed in his earlier model of Government and Binding, the D-Structure, the S-Structure, the logical form (LF) and phonetic form (PF) are collapsed into just two concepts namely: the LF (meaning) and the PF (sounds) (Nwala 2016). The LF and PF simply imply that constructions are representations of sound and meaning.

Chomsky (1995) believed that every human possesses a lexicon, a mental storehouse which contains the total items of a particular language. This can also be defined as the content of a person's knowledge of a language. Jakendoff (1997) enumerated certain information that constitute the lexical entries of a language. They are the phonological component, the morphological component which contains (inflections, derivation etc.); the semantic component and the syntactic component. Radford (2004) also observed that during word formation, relevant words are extracted from the lexicon. In line with this, Chomsky (1995) presented language as a computational system that picks linguistic elements from the lexicon and arranges them in meaningful patterns by using specific operations which Chomsky (1995) referred to as operation select, merge and move. This eventually forms a syntactic structure of that language. Linguistic items are selected from the lexicon and used to create structures by a computational combining system which is called 'merge.' In this case, the selected items are said to converge and reach full interpretation if the combination is legitimate but crash should the items be illegitimate.

Contrastive Analysis

Contrastive analysis is a theory which compares two distinct languages, usually a target language and a native language. Introduced by Lado in 1957, contrastive analysis aims at revealing the points of departure as well as the meeting point of two languages. Lado (1951) cited in Carrasquillo (1994) stated that the points of departure in a native and a target language is likely going to pose a linguistic challenge to the L_2 learner, while the similarities in both languages may be harmless.

The proponents of this theory believe that language learning is a process of habit formation. As a result of this, the habits formed while acquiring the first language significantly affect second language learning. In line with this, Yang and Xu (2001) blamed the errors committed in L_2learning on the learner's native language transfer. Transfer in contrastive analysis could either be positive or negative (Ringbom, 2007). Positive transfer refers to the transfer of elements that are similar in both languages while negative transfer refers

to the transfer of items that are dissimilar. Proponents of the contrastive analysis theory assert that the transfer of the features of the L_1 may affect the learning of the L_2 and eventually produce errors.

The choice of the Minimalist Program and the Contrastive Analysis is justifiable for the fact that errors abound in the language of second language learners. These errors originate from the parameters present in the two languages understudy. First, the Minimalist Program believes that items are automatically selected from the already existing lexicon of a speaker's first language. This lexicon contains all the words in a particular language including adjectives. On the other hand, contrastive analysis will blame learners' errors on the differences in the structures of both English and Khana languages. The underlying tenets of both theories are not quite distinct. However, contrastive analysis compares languages with the aim of establishing the causes of errors in the language of L_2 learners. These two theories are relevant to this study because they serve as tools for explaining the problems Khana/English bilinguals may encounter while learning the English language.

Conceptual Review

Every word in a language belongs to a particular grammatical category. Radford (1997) identified two major grammatical categories in language, they are the lexical category and the functional category. Words are grouped into these categories based on their syntactic and morphological features. In line with this, Gelderen (2002) recognised five linguistic units that constitute the lexical categories such as nouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions and adjective. Gelderen (2002) stated that words in the lexical categories are meaningful and syntactically serve as the heads of phrasal constructions. It should be noted however that the adjectival class which is the concern and interest of this work is a member of the lexical category.

Adjectives are specifying words. They are referred to as the quality group by Tucker (1998). Also, Schmitz and Meb (2008) viewed adjectives as describing, identifying and quantifying words. This implies that adjectives co-occur with nouns in different constructions. They attribute additional meaning to nouns. In addition, Huddleston and Pullum (2005) and Nwala (2016) extensively outlined the types of adjectives with respect to their syntactic and morphological behaviours as follows: Attributive, predicative and post-positive adjectives. All the listed items signify the syntactic positioning of adjectives. In the same way, Nwala (2016) further viewed the morphological and the gradable nature of adjectives and noted that adjectives behave like adverbs. They can be graded using the parameters of regularity and irregularity. Regular gradable adjectives utilize a particular pattern to express intensity.

The regular gradable adjectives have two basic patterns of expression. First, it attaches the morpheme '-er' at the comparative level and the morpheme '-est' at the superlative level. Some examples of words are:

Base	*Comparative Degree*	*Superlative Degree*
Hard	harder	hardest
Small	smaller	smallest
Young	younger	youngest
Big	bigger	biggest
Tall	taller	tallest
Long	longer	longest

Similarly, some adjectives in this group attach the word 'more' at the comparative level and most at the superlative level. Some examples are courageous, beautiful, desperate etc. There are however, adjectives which express gradability in an irregular manner. Some are good, ill, bad, many etc.

Importantly, there are yet other adjectives that are not graded. Some of them outlined by Huddleston and Pullum (2005) are public, medical, chief, open, phonetic etc. Adjectives in this category do not accept modifiers of intensity such as 'too' and 'very.' In a similar way, Penston (2005) added some more non-gradable adjectives such as, incredible, fascinating, terrifying etc.

Quirk et al (1985) cited in Gonzalez-Diaz (2008) keenly observed that the inflectional structure which adjectives adopt are dependent on the length of the word. Thus, monosyllabic adjectives such as long, short, tall accept the morpheme '-er' and '-est' inflectional makers, while disyllabic and polysyllabic adjectives adopt the periphrastic grade markers, 'more' and 'most' distinction.

Morphologically, adjectives display diverse inflectional endings. Adjectives are sometimes identified based on their morphological properties. Givon (1993) revealed two basic types of morphological features that characterise adjectives. These two features are grouped as grammatical morphology and derivational morphology. Concerning grammatical morphology, the author stated that few grammatical morphemes characterise the English adjectives of the comparative and superlative classes. The popular '-er' and -est' word endings are the basic inflectional markers that mark adjectives out. However, not every word that possess the inflectional '-er' belongs to the adjectival class, words such as 'waiter, hair dresser, preacher etc. Givon (1993) further observed that adjectives are formed from other word classes using derivational morphemes. Adjectives formed from nouns adopt word endings such as '-al, -ar, -an, -ous, -ful, and -less.' Hence, one can realise the following:

Base	*Affix*	*Derived Adjective*
Faith	-ful	faithful
Courage	-ous	courageous
Home	-less	homeless
Fate	-al	fatal

Givon (1993) also noted that adjectives formed out of verbs adopt inflectional endings such as; 'ive,' 'en,' 't,' 'ed,' 'ing,' 'able,' etc. Some examples are listed below:

Base	*Affix*	*Derived Adjective*
Spend	-t	spent
Twist	-ed	twisted
Break	-en	broken
Win	-ing	winning

Negative adjectives are derived from their positive forms via the attachment of negative prefixes such as; 'un-, mal-, dis- and mis-.'Examples are unbreakable, unreliable, misguided, misinformed, malnourished, displeased, disorderly, disorganised etc.

In light of this conceptual review, it has become clear that the adjectival class is quite a large class constituted of a massive number of adjectives which could either be used attributively or predicatively. Also, there is no specific rule to determine the particular adjective which should or should not be graded. The inflectional representations of adjectives also do not follow a particular pattern. Therefore, as a result of the heterogeneous structure of adjectival representations, the second language learner is bound to encounter difficulties if there is any form of departure from his L_1 structural pattern.

Methodology

As highlighted above, the methodology adopted for this research is descriptive. Primary and secondary data were used. The English data were collected from selected expressions from grammar textbooks while the Khana data were sourced from native speakers' introspection and intuition as well as the Khana Online Dictionary (Williamson, Williamson & Blench 2007). The data were eventually analysed by comparing the adjectival structures in both languages.

Analysis

In this section, the Khana and English adjectival structures are contrastively displayed and analysed. This section considered some aspects of adjectival differentiation which include the inflectional behaviour of adjectives with respect to grading, adjective/noun agreement rule and adjectival position in sentences.

Data 1

Table 1: English adjectives

	Positive Form	Comparative Form	Superlative Form
1.	Tall	Taller	Tallest
2.	Happy	Happier	Happiest
3.	Beautiful	More beautiful	Most beautiful
4.	expensive	More expensive	Most expensive
5.	Bad	Worse	Worst
6.	Good	Better	Best
7.	Ill	Worse	Worst
8.	Little	Less	Least

(Eyisi, 2008)

Table 2: Khana Equivalent of the English Adjectives in Data 1

1.	Nyo	Nyo éa	Nyo éa
2.	ee (bu)	Ee éa	Ee éa
3.	Leé	Leé éa	lee éa
4.	sidu	Sidu éa	Sidu éa
5.	Pia	Pia éa	Pia éa
6.	Lee	lee éa	lee éa
7.	Pia	Pia éa	Pia éa
8.	nwiyigiri	Nwiyigiri éa	Nwiyigiri éa

Table 1 and 2 above show some selected adjectives in English and Khana. It has been established as displayed in data 1 that English adjectives such as 'tall and happy' undergo morphological inflections to illustrate the comparative and superlative forms. While their Khana equivalents do not inflect, rather, the word 'éa' which simply means 'more' is used to grade the adjectives in order to indicate their comparative and superlative forms. We explain this better using the adjectives 'tall' and 'expensive' in sentential examples:

A. Tall

1. ENG: James is tall.
   KHA: James a nyo.

   [*James is tall.*]

2. ENG: James is taller than Mary.

KHA: James nyoéa Mary.

[*James tall more than Mary.*]

3. ENG: James is the tallest in his class.
   KHA: James nyoéadedenenee a le ye class.

   [*James tall more than everyone in his class.*]

In the sentences above, the English adjectives display morphological alteration to express appropriate grading. Hence, the adjective 'tall' has inflected forms such as 'taller' and 'tallest.' In contrast, the Khana equivalent which is 'nyo' does not inflect. Thus, the word 'nyo' maintains sameness at the comparative and superlative levels. What is obtainable in this case is that the Khana 'ea' which serves as a quantifier in this situation, post modifies the adjective 'nyo' at the comparative level. The only similarity between the English and Khana adjectives at the comparative level is the presence of two nouns to illustrate comparison. Therefore, the following expressions are acceptable comparative expressions in Khana:

i. KHA: James nyo éa Florence.
   [*James tall more (than) Florence.*]
   GLOSS: James is taller that Florence.

ii. James kpuria éa Florence.
   [*James short more (than) Florence.*]
   GLOSS: James is shorter than Florence.

iii. James suɑ̃nu éa Florence.
   [*James wiser more (than) Florence.*]
   GLOSS: James is wiser than Florence.

It is also observed in the above data that Khana adjectives are capable of performing a dual role. They function as both adjectives and verbs in numerous expressions. This is because the use of verbs in the Khana expressions is optional and fundamentally the prerogative of the speaker. The speaker's brain unconsciously selects the verb 'a' which means 'is' and merges with other items in the construction or automatically eliminates the verb. This is a practical example of Chomsky's (1995) assertion concerning the computational feature of the brain which automatically selects items from the lexicon and merges with other elements in a construction. Therefore, an expression such as, '*This orange is better than mine'* could be expressed as follows in Khana:

Menende ama le ea nda.
GLOSS: Orange this good than mine.

Menende ama a le ea nda.
GLOSS: Orange this is good than mine.

In addition, some English adjectives form their comparative and superlative forms by using a preceding determiner 'more' and 'most' respectively. Nwala (2016) observed that these adjectives express grading using a periphrastic method as exemplified in point 3-4 of Table 1 (beautiful and expensive). In contrast, the Khana 'éa' which means 'more' functions as a quantifier and post-modifies the head while the word 'more' and 'most' function attributively in the English language. See the expressions below:

Expensive
ENG: That wristwatch is expensive.

KHA: Elèkèli si du

[Wristwatch that expensive.]

ENG: This wristwatch is more expensive than that one.

KHA: lokaèlèkèamasi du éaloka li.

[*This wristwatch (particular) expensive more (than) that one.]*

ENG: This is the most expensive wristwatch in the shop.

KHA: loka èlèkè ama si du éa dedene eè.

[*This wristwatch (particular) expensive more (than) all.*]

The illustrations above show that adjectives in the Khana language adopt the degree marker 'éa' (more) which post-modifies the head while 'more' and 'most' in English periphrastic adjectives function as pre-modifiers. In Khana also, there is no morphological distinction between adjectives in their positive forms and adjectives in their comparative and superlative forms.

The last part of the adjectives on Table 1 and 2 illustrate the pattern of irregular adjectival presentation. In the English language, some adjectives express degree in irregular ways. Adjectives in this category as outlined on Table 1 are 'bad, good, ill and little.' The English adjectives have morphological irregularity due to the nature of the words. However, same cannot be said of their Khana equivalents as the Khana forms of these irregular adjectives display resemblance with their base forms despite their comparative and superlative levels of grading.

Data 2: Structural Variation of English/Khana Demonstrative Adjectives

Table 3

Singular		**Plural**	
English	**Khana**	**English**	**Khana**
This	Loama	These	Lo ama
That	Loka li	Those	Loka li

Both Khana and English show a distinction in the use of demonstrative adjectives. Swinson (2011) observed that demonstrative adjectives describe nouns by revealing an idea of the location of the noun. The demonstrative adjectives further describe if a noun is close or at a distance. Both Khana and English language contain possessive adjectives but their usage differs. There are four demonstrative adjectives in English, 'this, that, these and those.' On the other hand, there are two patterns of demonstrative adjectives in Khana. The singular and plural demonstrative adjectives that illustrate proximity are represented with 'lo ama.' On the contrary, the singular and plural ones which describe nouns that are at a distance are represented with 'loka li' as shown below:

1. Kasiama

   [Chair this]

This chair

2. Gbo kasi ama

   [Many chair this]

   These chairs

3. Loka kasi li

   [That chair there]

   That chair

4. Gbo kasi li

   [Many chair those]

   Those chairs

From the above, we reiterate that 'lo ama' is interpreted as 'this one' while 'lo ka li' is translated as 'that one there.' The expressions in Khana are different from the demonstrative adjectives in English in significant ways. Whereas the

demonstrative adjectives in English utilises one word to point the location of the noun, the demonstrative pronouns in Khana describe the process.

In usage, the Khana demonstrative adjective, 'lo ama' which instantiates singular and plural nouns that denote proximity consists of two morphemes 'lo+ama.' Nevertheless, in usage the first morpheme 'lo' is automatically dropped, meaning it is covert while the second morpheme 'ama' is overt. Therefore, the noun heads in Khana. Determiner Phrases (DPs) do not merge with lo ama rather they merge with 'ama' alone. That is why we could have expressions such as:

5. Belo ama

   [Cloth this]

   This cloth

6. Phone ama

[Phone this]

This phone

7. Kpa ama

[Book this]
This book

The following would be regarded as illicit;

8. *Phone loama
9. *Kpa loama
10. *Belo loama

In addition, the demonstrative adjectives which indicate plurality behave in a similar manner as that which instantiates singularity. The only observable difference is that in usage, the plural form of 'lo ama' attaches a plural quantifier 'gbo.' The word 'gbo' is translated as 'many, several, a lot of, much' etc. The word 'gbo' always premodifies the noun while the demonstrative 'ama' post modifies the noun. Thus, expressions such as the following are possible:

11. gbo kasi ama
    [many chair this]
    These chairs

12. gbo fa ama
[many car this]
These cars

13. gbo te ama
[many tree this]
These trees

A close look at the English translations above reveals a parametric variation in both languages. In line with the concept of headedness, the demonstrative adjectives in the English language are head-final whereas their Khana equivalents are head-initial. Similarly, there is an observable morphological inclusion of the –s inflectional marker to the English noun heads to reflect plurality. In contrast, there is zero-inflection of the noun heads in Khana. This disparity is capable of creating learning problems for the Khana/English bilinguals. This is in line with Lado's contrastive analysis theory, which postulates that the difference in the target and native languages generates problems for the second language learner.

Further, the Khana demonstrative adjective 'loka li' that denotes items that are at a distance possesses somewhat same feature as 'lo ama.' To merge with singular distant nouns, the demonstrative adjective [that] either eliminates or retains the word 'loka' which denotes 'that' and adopts a constant 'li' which means 'over there.' In a situation where loka is overt, the noun head is inserted between 'loka' and 'li.' View the examples below:

14a. Lo ka tor li

[that house there]

That house

14b. Tor li

[house that]

That house

15a. Lokakaibo li

[that umbrella there]

That umbrella

15b. Kaibo li

[umbrella that]

That umbrella

In addition, the Khana demonstrative adjective 'loka li' that denote plurality and points at nouns that are at a distance also possess the same feature as their singular forms. However, the noun-heads in English display a morphological pattern of attaching the '-s' inflectional marker for plurality while the Khana noun-heads appear like their singular forms. Despite the zero morphological alteration process in Khana, the Khana nouns as well as the demonstrative adjectives adopt a preceding plural quantifier while the noun-heads maintain singularity. Also, the demonstrative adjectives in this case post modify their noun heads. This will be better understood in the phrases below:

16. Gbo gbara li

[many man that]

Those men

17. Gbo kõn li

[many chicken that]

Those chickens

Implications for the Khana/English bilinguals

So far, findings have revealed clear-cut structural differences in the adjectival class in both languages. As observed in the data, there is a difference in the morphological structure of gradable adjectives in both languages. While the English language displays an overt morphological pattern as grading occurs using comparative and superlative parameters, the Khana language does not display any morphological change in adjectival grading. These issues therefore become potential problems for the Khana learner of the English language as emphasized by the proponents of contrastive analysis that the differences prevalent in two languages are bases for errors that occur in L_2 learning. In addition to this, the L_2 learner already has the mental grammar of his L_1 which is contained in his lexicon. The brain which utilises a computational system (Chomsky, 1995) therefore applies certain minimalist operations (select, merge and move) on the L_2. The brain does this by selecting items from an already existing lexicon. This automatic selection consequently yields errors as the adjectival representation of the native language differs from the adjectival structure of the English language. For example, a Khana learner of the English language may render the comparative form of 'faster' as its bare form, 'fast.' Also, the comparative form of 'greater' may be realised as 'great' by a Khana learner of the English language.

Further, in sentential expressions, the findings in this study revealed that the adjectives in the Khana lexicon are capable of playing the role of verbs, thus, either retaining or eliminating verbs wherever they appear. In contrast, the English adjectives strictly allow an overt representation of

verbs in sentences. The implication is that the verb is an obligatory part of the English sentence. This means that the adjectives in English work together with verbs in English sentences. This divergence is also another potential problem a Khana English bilingual will experience in learning the L_2.

Another important finding revealed in this work is the head directionality in English/Khana demonstrative adjectives. While the English language adopts the head-final structure, the Khana language adopts the head-initial pattern. The implication is that the demonstrative adjectives in the English language pre-modify their noun-heads whereas the demonstrative adjectives in Khana post-modify their heads. Also, the demonstrative adjectives in Khana do not reflect singularity or plural as is the case with the English language. It only specifies proximity and distance using a dual pattern without signalling numerical variations.

Conclusion

This study has succeeded in its aim by bringing to limelight aspects of both the morphological and the structural differences in English and Khana adjectives. It therefore, asserts that the structural divergence in the adjectival representations in both languages make learners susceptible to errors. For example, since the merging of demonstrative adjectives and nouns in Khana is a covert construct, a Khana learner of the English language may express 'those chickens' as 'those chicken,' eliminating the –s inflectional bound morpheme in overt syntax. This discourse has aided to advance the assumptions of both the Contrastive Analysis and those of the Principles and Parameters Grammar.

References

Bhat, D. N. S. (2000). Word classes and sentential functions. In Vogel, P. M. & Comrie, B. (Eds.). *Approaches to the typology of word classes.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Blench, R. (2008). The Ogoni languages: Comparative word list and historical reconstructions. August 5, 2021 from www.rogerblench.info.com.

Brinton, L. J. (2000). *The structure of modern English: A linguistic introduction.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Carrasquillo, A. (1994). *Teaching English as a second language: A resource guide.* Garland Publishing.

Chomsky N. (1995). *The minimalist program.* MIT.

Deng, F. & Lin, Y. (2016). A comparative study on beliefs of grammar teaching between high school teachers and students in China. *English Language Teaching Journal.* 9 (8),1-12. DOI:10.5539/eltv9n8p1.

Ethnologue (2018). Languages of the world. January 7,2021 from https://www.ethnologue.com

Gelderen, E. (2002). *An introduction to the grammar of English.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Givon, T. (1993). *English grammar: A function-based introduction.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gonzalez-Diaz, V. (2008). English adjective comparison a historical perspective. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. (2005). *A student's introduction to English grammar.* Cambridge University Press.

Jackendoff, R. (1997). *The architecture of the language faculty.*MIT.

Ngulube, I. E. (2013). *Eleme phonology*. M & J Grand Orbit Communications Ltd.

Nwala, M. A. (2016). *Introduction to syntax: The students' guide*. Wisdom Publishers Limited.

Okoh, N. (2006). *The challenge of Englishes in Nigeria*. Pearl Publishers.

Penston, T. (2005). *A concise grammar of English Language teachers.* TP Publications.

Plag, I. Braun, M. Lappe, S. & Schramm, M. (2007). *Introduction to English Linguistics.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Radford, A. (1997). *Syntax: A minimalist introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Radford, A. (2004). *English syntax: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Ringbom, H. (2007). *Cross linguistic similarity in foreign language learning.* Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Schmitz, P. & Meb, S. (2008). Adjectives in advertising. Retrieved November 28, 2020 from books.google.com.ng.

Swinson, G. (2011). *Skill builders'grammar.* Carson-Dellosa Publishing.

Tucker, G. H. (1998). *The lexicogrammar of adjectives: A systemic functional approach to lexis.* : Bookcraft Ltd.

Williamson, N., Williamson, K. & Blench, R. (2007). *A dictionary of Kana: An Ogoni language of the Niger Delta.* Retrieved August 15, 2021 from www.rogerblench.info.com.

Yang, X. &Xu, H. (2001). *Errors of creativity: An analysis of lexical errors committed by Chinese ESL students.* University Press of America Inc.

About the Authors

Sumenenua Nwizug is a doctoral student in the Department of English Studies
University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Email: sumenenwizug@gmail.com

Michael A. Nwala (PhD) is a lecturer in the Department of English
University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Port Harcourt
Email: mikeson100@yahoo.com