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Abstract

This Study: Engaging Appropriate Affixation System for English and Anaang: Amorpho-Syntactic Study at Distributional Equivalence for Education and Development in Nigeria Beyond 2020 which is the first in the area, takes a look at all the morphological processes which are involved in affixation; as well as the application of these processes on syntax-related rank scales in order to account appropriately for affixation as a very important aspect of morphology. It also aims at revealing the possible universals of the two languages in the field of word-formation. The theoretical frameworks used in this study are the three-in-one tool: contrastive analysis (CA), error analysis (EA) and needs analysis (NA) which are identifiable by the researchers to be effectively operational in revealing the linguistic universals between the two languages. The general assumption here, is that the aspect of similarities will facilitate learning the second language, especially if a rule in L1 is identical to a rule in L2 and applied to propagate Educational sensitization that will usher in Development in Nigeria in 2020 and beyond.
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Anaang is a name which marks dual identification: it identifies a people – the Anaang and their language. As a people, the Anaang are claimed to be the second largest ethnic group after the Ibibio in the present day Akwa Ibom State of Nigeria. They number 1.4 million following the 1991 census result. They occupy the North-Western part of Akwa Ibom State with a total of 2.73 sq. kilometres. They are bounded by Abia State in the North, Rivers State in the West, the Ibibio people in the South, East and North-East.

According to Greenberg (1963), the Anaang people are semi-Bantu speakers who originated from the Central Benue valley in Nigeria. They are said to have moved through the Northern flank of the Cross River to the Enyong Creek and eventually through the present day Eastern Ibibio (Ikono) land to settle at the location of the present day Abak. Greenberg (1963:84) further claims that the Anaang people were the first wave of the Ibibio speaking people to settle in the present day Ibibio land.

Morphological difficulties arise from different processes which an individual undergoes in its word formation. Generally, quite a number of linguists have observed this controversy in the study of Morphology. For instance, Bauer, (1987:1) asserts that “there is at the moment no single ‘theory of word formation’, nor even agreement on the kind of data that is relevant for the conclusion of such a theory (Udom,1999:3). Consequently, affixation, an aspect of word formation, is unique and peculiar to the individual language.

Even, in England itself, English was long neglected mainly because it did not have any ‘grammar’. Writers such as Dryden of the latter half of 17th century was said to have complained of the ‘barbarity’ of the English tongue, by which they meant the absence of ‘grammar’ in the form of set rules, on the model of the Latin grammar of the day. The eighteenth century saw a movement towards what was called ‘ascertainment’ of English- the term being used not in the sense of
ascertaining the facts by enquiry, but rather in that of formatting ‘a settled rule; an established standard (Boadi, 1981:16).

Today, English is used by more speakers than its native speakers. This development has called for a reassessment of the status of English. The rate at which English spreads has brought a number of consequences upon it. Its status has changed so considerably that it can no longer conveniently be referred to as the language of England. Therefore, the morphology of a language, which deals with various processes of word-formation should be underestimated because without a proper involvement of the morphological processes; a means of changing a stem to adjust its meaning to fit syntactic and communicational context, morphological requirements and functionalities will fall below language usages and communicative expectations that will make education and development in Nigeria a reality beyond 2020 (Enang, Nyarks, Utin, Udoka and Udom, 2013:1).

Language is the chief source of communication of ideas. There are some other ways also, such as dance, music, physical gestures and symbols through which we can communicate ideas. But language is a very common and easy source of communication. It is the basis of human civilization, which would have been impossible without it (Ojukwu, 2011:1).

On Education and Development in Nigeria Beyond 2020
Since the end of the 1990s, Education and development have become a growing area of interest once more within the states and wider society of Nigeria. In England, language education had since been named within the school curriculum and in the curriculum for children aged 3–5. There are numerous government and other initiatives to foster individual and collective development, some of this through partnership activity bringing together the arts, technology, science and the social sciences.

As far as education and development are concerned, this growth in emphasis and value placed on encouraging education and development can be seen as being in stark contrast with the government policy prevalent from the late 1980s onward. One of the underpinning themes and justifications for this re-kindling of interest in fostering education and development is that the individual and collective empowerment which is fostered by the development of education and technological skill is seen to be a good thing at the social and economic levels in particular. For instance, Close-up, Mc-Clean and Pepsodent (toothpastes), Mc-Intorch (Water-proof)' etc, all of which are commercial products that have gained international pass-port into the repertoire of English. In the same vein, Government and Non-governmental organizations, private sectors and or commercial institutions should develop angry drives towards the employment of language experts who will be able to source for appropriate affixations that will in turn touch the economy of Nigeria positively. Both sectors of our economy have the duty of pulling their sources together in order to experience a hitch-free educational growth and development in Nigeria beyond 2020.

On Related Literature on Affixation
Every language has different ways of forming new words that make it unique. One of these processes of word formation is called affixation. Affixation is under the concept of morphology, and morpheme. Morphology is a branch of linguistics that deals with the internal structure and formation of words. Yule (1996:75) defines morphology as ‘the study of forms’. These forms are what we have as morphemes. Morphemes are the smallest units of grammar.

There are two kinds of morphemes: free and bound morphemes. A free morpheme can stand alone and is understandable in isolation. For example, ‘toy’. A bound morpheme on the other hand, cannot occur alone; example, ‘-er’ in ‘reminder’, ‘former’, ‘trickster’. Affixation is thus, the process of addition of affixes (bound morphemes) to the existing stem, root, or base morphemes in order to form new words or change the meaning of the existing one (Ojukwu 2011) It is one of the productive ways of word building in both English and Anaang languages.
According to Babarinde (2009:58), affixation comprises of prefixation, suffixation, interfixation, infixation, interfixation. Anagbgu, Mba and Eme (2001:102), added an aspect called “circumfixation”. The list provided by scholars above, are all morphological processes; a means of changing a stem to adjust its meaning to fit a particular communication situation.

On the Aspect of Related Literature

English is such a dynamic phenomenon which enlarges the repertoire of its new words as these new words keep forcing their ways into the language from time to time. According to Katamba (1993:8)

“Speakers of a language do not just commit to memory all the words they know, their competence includes the ability to manipulate rules in order to create new words and scramble the meaning of or unfamiliar words they encounter”

The term morphology is generally attributed to the German poet, novelist, playwright and philosopher, Johann Wolfang Von Goetha 1749-1783, who coined it early in the 19th century in biological context. Its etymology is Greek. ‘Morph’ means ‘Shape’ or ‘Form’ and morphology is the study of form or forms. In biology, morphology refers to the study of the form and structure of organisms; and in Geology, it refers to the study of the configuration and evolution of land forms. In linguistics, morphology refers to the mental system involved in word formation or to the branch of linguistics that deals with the words, their internal structure and how they are formed.

Morphology has become a subcomponent in generative grammar like the other three – syntax, phonology and semantics. Anagbogu (1990:20) writing on The Grammar of Igbo Nominalization, says that “there are two branches of morphology: inflectional and derivational morphology also referred to as lexical morphology by Matthews (1991:37)”. Each of these broad areas investigates different aspects of word structure. Inflection on one hand, is a pattern of change in form undergone by words to express grammatical and syntactic relations e.g. case, number, gender, person, tense, etc. Anderson (1992) posits that inflection is just the morphology that is accessible to and or manipulated by the rules of the syntax. Derivation, on the other hand, is a process by which lexical items are formed in the lexicon by adding affixes to roots, stems or words, or by uninflected words which are regarded as lexemes (Eze, 2013:11).

This study which generally handles noun-formation (a sub-field of word-formation) is going to dwell more on derivational morphology rather than Bloomfield’s (1934:222) who observes in Anagbogu (1990:21) “that derivational morphology occurs as “inner layers” while inflectional morphology displays as “outer layers” of words (Gleason, 1996, Nida, 1999). For instance:

A. (i) Kill (Verb)  
   (ii) Kill + er (Noun) Derivational Morpheme  
   (iii) Killer + s (Noun) Inflectional

B. A look at the instances above, would further explicate that while inflected words cannot form the base or root of a new word, derived word or stems productively form bases of new lexical items. This explication further shows that derivational morphemes are greater in number in any natural language than the inflectional morphemes. By this foregoing therefore, Nida (1949:99) agrees with Bloomfield (1934:218) that derivational morphemes change the lexical category of words whereas inflectional morphemes do not. Therefore, is possible for derivational morphemes to turn adjectives into verbs (verbalizing adjectives), turn verbs into nouns (nominalize verbs) and or turn nouns into adjectives (adjectivalize nouns) as in the following examples:

Nominalising Verbs: Dance (v) > Dancer (n), Inherit (v) > Inheritance (n).
Adjectivalising Nouns: Truth (n) > Truthful (Adj), Reality (n) > Real (Adj).
On the other hand, inflectional morphemes do not alter or change the category of words, for instance: Child (N) > Children (N), Man (N) > Men (N), Ox (N) > Oxen (N), etc. Takes (V) > Taken (V), Carry (V) > Carried (V), Speak (V), Spoke (V), Spoken (V).

It is the concluded observations by Structuralists that: (i) Derivational Morphology has to do with change of lexical category while Inflectional Morphology does not change the lexical category of words. (ii) Derivational morphemes occur nearer the root while Inflectional morphemes tend to occur farther from the root. (iii) In spite of the fact that Derivational are many in number, it is an established fact that Inflectional morphemes are more productive.

According to Matthews (1974:37), unlike compounding, “word-formation deals with the relationship existing between a complex lexeme and two or more simple(r) lexemes”. He posits that in word-formation, a complex lexeme is directly related to at most one simple(r) lexeme, whereas in compounding, the larger unit is related directly to at most two simple(r) lexemes.

Morphology, as one of the levels of linguistics deals with the study of the internal structure of words and how the words are created from the existing ones through the use of various morphological processes namely affixation, compounding, conversion, blending, clipping, reduplication, etc. (O’Grandy and Guzman, 1996:132-180). Lexical morphology deals with the lexicon; which is a collection of lexemes in a language. Therefore, it concerns itself mostly with word-formations: derivation and compounding. Lexicon is an outstanding element in language processing. This is because without adequate knowledge of the words, no language can make any intelligibility since a morpho-syntactic analysis of words tends to show that many words appear to have internal structure.

**On Morphology of Anaang**

Anaang, like other languages has morphemes which according to Udom (1999:8) can be classified in relation to two structures. First, they can be represented by segments and supra segments. Secondly, there are cases where a particular function of meaning is not always represented by the phenomenon. These assertions can clearly be illustrated in the way Anaang marks present tenses: “Mme fon” (I am good). The present tense marker ‘mme’, is appropriately represented by the segment [m] and supra-segmental element [the rising tone But in the sentence: Mmfonno or Ami mfonno (I am not good) the present tense is not in any way represented.

Other forms of morphemes that are not always represented as a sequence of segments and supra-segmentals are the process morphemes.

**Contrastive Analysis as a Theoretical Consideration**

The theoretical framework of this study is a Contrastive Analysis, a structure that can hold or support any research work that focuses attention on the juxtaposition of two languages for survey of differences and similarities. Udegbunam (2004) avers that contrastive analysis is a tool in Applied Linguistics of the solution it proffers to the problems encountered in the teaching and learning of a target language.

The goal of CA is to predict linguistic difficulties experienced during the acquisition of a second language as formulated by Lado (1957). Lado establishes that the difficulties in acquiring a new (second) language are from the differences between the new language and the native (first) language of the learner. It is a consensus amongst linguists that errors potentially made by learners of a second language are predicted from interference by the native language and that such a phenomenon is known as Negative Transfer.

Traditionally, CA is said to be a method which helps the analyst to ascertain in which aspects the two languages are alike and in which they differ (Filipovi, 1975:13). According to Chesterman (1998:52), CA involves two major processes; Description and Comparison broken down into four
basic steps as follows: (a) assembling of data, (b) formulating the description, (c) supplementing the data as required, and (d) formulating the contrasts.

Applied linguists use information from other areas of knowledge for their analysis. It is their belief that the language one learns first affects the second language the person is striving to learn. Every definition advanced in respect of CA revolves around the common premise: the similarities and differences at the different levels of linguistic analysis. In his assertion, Ayo Banjo (1972:20) says that:

The comparison of two relevant scientific grammars yield another kind of grammar, namely a contrastive grammar. The aim of a contrastive grammar as the name implies is to find out in systematic way-points of similarities and differences between the two languages to be brought into contact.

According to Crystal (1980:112) contrastive analysis is a general approach to the investigation of language (contrastive linguistics), particularly as carried out in certain areas of applied linguistics, such as foreign language learning. Contrastive analysis plays two major roles, viz: linguistic role and psychological role. The linguistic role involves qualifying the degree of differences between the structures of two languages, while the psychological role is concerned with establishing the relationship between the degree of linguistic differences and degree of learning difficulties.

It is in realization of the emphasis registered by linguists above that Fries (1945:9) submits that “The most efficient materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description with the languages of the learner”.

Therefore, the preoccupation of this study is on the linguistic role of CA, since the study is a contrastive assessment of noun formation (a morphological process) of two languages: English and Anaang.

**On Word Formation in English**

It is on record that morphological analysis dates back to the ancient Indian linguist, Panini who formulated 3,959 rules of Sanskrit morphology in the text Astadhyayi by using a constituent Grammar. The term morphology was coined by August Schleiecher in 1858. Zwicky Arnold and Spencer Andrew (1993:xvii) posit that morphology is at the conceptual centre of linguistics because it is concerned with the study of word structure and words are the interface between phonology, semantics and syntax. They further state that words contract relationships with each other by reason of their forms; that is, they form paradigms and lexical groupings. For this reason, every linguist should be well versed in morphology (Eze, 2013:17).

Linguists like Selkirk and Lieber have claimed that a morpheme-based model would have the advantage which would adequately streamline the theory of language in such a way that no separate morphological component is required. Plag (2002:241) establishes that “both syntactic rules and morphological rules would be essentially the same kinds of rule”.

Noun derivation as a morphological process has attracted the interest of linguists across languages and dialects. Chomsky (1972) cited in Iloene (2007:48). Derivational suffixation in English is a morphological process which results in the formation of new lexemes, Lyons (1977:525). Besides production of new lexemes, Bauer (1973:29) says that derivation can involve many variables in an open system; can be characterised by low computability within the word formed and is typically and semantically irregular in nature.
As mentioned earlier on, affixation on nouns in English may be derived from verbs, adjectives or nouns. This process involves the affixation of the morpheme to the base/stem. Nouns formed from verbs are outputs of adding the suffixes: {-tion, -age, -er,} to the verbs as in

i. - Inform [verb] + tion >> Information (N)
ii. - Break [verb] + age >> Breakage (N)
iii. - Talk [verb] + er >> Talker (N)

Nouns by themselves can serve as bas/stem for the formation of other nouns. These suffixing derivational morphemes like [-dom, -ship, -hood, -er] as in

i. - King [Noun] + dom >> Kingdom [N]
ii. - Relation [Noun] + ship >> Relationship [N]
iii. - Father [Noun] + hood >> Fatherhood [N]
iv. - Dream [Noun] + er >> Dreamer [N]

There are also other subclass of English words within the class of nouns which serve to show diminutiveness. Usually, these group of nouns are formed by suffixing bound morphemes to the root nouns. The morphemes: [-ette, -let, ling], etc can be used to form diminutives as in

i. - Cigar + ette >> Cigarette
ii. - Pig + let >> Piglet
iii. - Nest + ling >> Nestling

On Word Formation in Anaang

Words in Anaang are formed through affix of four major processes, viz: derivational, inflectional, compounding and reduplication. Derivational and inflectional processes are further divided into four new subgroups: derivational prefixation, derivational suffixation, inflectional prefixation and inflectional suffixation.

In Anaang, three categories of derivational morphemes can be identified: verbal (extension), adverbial and noun-forming morphemes. For the purpose of maintenance of focus, this study will only account for noun-formation in Anaang.

Noun-Forming Derivatives in Anaang

In Anaang, there are affixes which derive lexical elements or lexemes that are assignable to the nominal form or class when added to verb roots or stem. Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English/AAnaang Verb</th>
<th>English/AAnaang Noun Derived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold</td>
<td>Mum (kama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy</td>
<td>Dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream</td>
<td>Daba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>Gwed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Ima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder</td>
<td>Andimum or Andikama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>Andidep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreamer</td>
<td>Adaba-ndab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Agwed-ngwed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noun-Forming Inflectional Prefixation in Anaang

This is a major type of affixation in Anaang. Prefixes are morphemes added at the beginning of roots. Most inflectional morphemes are prefixes and according to Essien (1990:73), “they are those morphemes that mark grammatical categories such as number, person, gender, tense, aspect and mood”. These classes of morphemes are capable of producing different forms of the same word. For examples:
Noun-Forming Inflectional Suffixation

This is a morphological process whereby a morpheme, (usually referred to as suffix), is added after a root or base. An inflectional suffix is usually the final element added after a root or base. By the rules of word formation in English, it is not possible to have more than one inflectional suffix at a time, (Eka 1994:61). Suffixes are regularly attached to the appropriate adverb, adjective, verb or noun bases, to indicate number (plurality) and possessive Katamba (1993:46). For examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English/Angaang</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>English/Angaang</th>
<th>Inflectional Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry</td>
<td>Biom</td>
<td>u+</td>
<td>Shelf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Akparawa</td>
<td>m+</td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Kpe</td>
<td>i+</td>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempt</td>
<td>Domo</td>
<td>i+</td>
<td>Temptation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noun-Forming by Compounding in Anaang

Compounding has a peculiar characteristic in its noun formation approach. Its process involves the composition of two or more word classes (free morphemes) to constitute a compound or associate construction (cf Udom, 1999:69). Compounding in Anaang involves an extensive use of adjectival elements to qualify the item instead of naming it directly. For examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adjectival compound</th>
<th>Eng/A ngaang Noun-formed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoe/ Urok</td>
<td>akpoko/handle</td>
<td>Handle of the hoe/Akpokourok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest/Irok</td>
<td>Eto/ Stick</td>
<td>Harvesting stick/ Etoirok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand/Ntan</td>
<td>Irim/Stream</td>
<td>Stream Sand/Ntan Irim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason/Ntak</td>
<td>Ndo/Marital</td>
<td>Marital reason/Ntak ndo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noun-Formation by Reduplicatives in Anaang

According to Udom (1999:70), in Anaang, adverbs are derived through the process of reduplication. Adjectives and nouns are the word classes that must be doubled to derive nouns. By explication, nouns are formed by doubling, sometimes bringing to play two nouns or adjectives in order to derive a full fledged noun as in the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective as a Base</th>
<th>Reduplicated Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imuk ete ‘Short’ (adj) man</td>
<td>Imuk-imuk ete &gt; Short man (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukwanŋ usunŋ ‘Crooked’ (adj) way</td>
<td>Ukwanŋ-ukwanaŋ usunŋ &gt; Crooked way (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuto ‘Diverse’ (adj) colours</td>
<td>Kuto-kuto koro &gt; Diverse colours (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enyonŋ iban ‘Tall’ (adj) woman</td>
<td>Enyon-enyonŋ iban &gt; Tall woman (n̂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afia Aboikpa ‘Fair’ (adj) girl</td>
<td>Afia-afia aboîkpa &gt; Fair (complexion) girl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the foregoing, it is observed that compounding and reduplication seem to be the most familiar word formation processes which operate at a simple and functional distributional equivalence in English and Anaang languages. This is made possible because the two languages share certain grammatical features like verbal, adverbial, adjectival and nominal compounds in the compounding and reduplication processes.

Summary/Conclusion

The aim of this study was to explore the possibilities of Engaging Appropriate Affixation System for English and Anaang: Amorpho-Syntactic Study at Distributional Equivalence...
for Education and Development in Nigeria Beyond 2020 Anaang with a view to highlighting the similarities and differences between the two languages. This is because when two languages are juxtaposed, the aim is to identify the differences and similarities in their linguistic features.

To achieve this purpose, the researchers applied broad method of contrastive analysis. In using broad method of contrastive analysis, noun formation processes and rules in both English and Anaang were fully accounted for. The results show, among others, that the polymorphic nature of Anaang words by analysis shows each morpheme as having a single lexical meaning or grammatical function. This, in fact, is true of agglutinatng languages (Anaang being one); because each of the glued morphemes can be separated and they will make meaning just like its English counterpart.

The case in English is different since it is analytical in nature. But the polymorphemic words in Anaang are sometimes compounded in order to bring out meaning. These differences have tended to affect the performance of Anaang learner/users of English.

One of the major differences observed in the study is that Anaang inflects and derives new words mostly through the process of prefixation. This process greatly contrasts with English word formation processes which indicate grammatical classes through suffixation. Similarly, in spite of the differences existing between the two languages, English and Anaang share some linguistic features in reduplicative and compounding processes of word formation. Consequently, an adequate exposure of Anaang learners of English through competent linguistics specialist teachers and good learning facilities would surely enhance the learning of English morphological processes and systems.
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