

## **The Contrastive Analysis of English and Igbo Deverbal Nouns**

**Umeodinka, Aloysius U.**

Department of Igbo, African & Asian Studies,  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

&

**Ugochukwu, Chinweude N.**

Department of Igbo, African & Asian Studies,  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

### **Abstract**

*The teaching of foreign languages has not been without obstacles. The books and other teaching materials in use by the teachers seem not to have been tailored to suit the exact problems of the learners. This is observed to be more pronounced in the area of nominalizations, the making or derivation of nouns, in the learning of English as a second language by the Igbo. It is against this backdrop that this paper embarks on the contrastive study of English and Igbo Deverbal Nouns. The objective of this study is to investigate English and Igbo nominalizations with the view to finding out their areas of similarities and differences so as to establish how best to facilitate the teaching and learning of the English language. The approach to be adopted is the theory of contrastive study by Lado (1957) which operates by the discovery of the interference areas between the mother tongue and the target language. The study is descriptive and has pedagogic intent. It will address issues of word formation related to nominalization, that is, how nominals are formed from Igbo verbs. Also, the work derives much strength from the analytical minds of the researchers, a team of informed native speaker insiders. The researchers find out that*

*the English derivational morphology is multi-directional, whereas that of the Igbo language is uni-directional and from the verb. The implication of these differences is that the findings will assist curriculum and syllabus designers in deciding the contents of the teaching materials for the teachers. The areas of differences will serve as the area of emphasis for the teachers as against where there are similarities. The study has also established some similarities in regular noun formation patterns in both languages. The irregular patterns and variation areas in noun formation from verbs have been discovered. It is now left for authors and curriculum planners to come up with the right materials to facilitate English-Igbo language pedagogy.*

## **Introduction**

Language is man's instrument for addressing many issues of life. It is called into mention when written or spoken, meaning-ridden words are used in expressing or conveying one's intention. The importance of language to man is better imagined than expressed. There is no facet of man's life that does not involve language. This explains why any problem area in language entails some disservice to the community owners of the specific language. Through the field of linguistics, the scientific study of language, and its applied linguistics branch, many problems affecting language can presently be addressed. This time, the port of call is the learning of English by the Igbo as a second language. There are some challenges traceable to nominalization being encountered by the Igbo learner of English as a second language. One of such weaknesses in language teaching is that teachers are not teaching with the intention of tackling language problems pertaining to specific linguistic communities in Nigeria. When papers or textbooks are

written, there is no particular focus on the problems of a specific community in terms of facilitation of pedagogy. The known attempts so far made in designing English primary textbooks have not been pragmatic and so not founded on contrastive studies of the mother tongue in relation to the target language. It is only when this is done that the influence of the mother tongue on the target language will be known. It is only when the two languages have been contrasted phonologically, morphologically, syntactically or lexically that textbooks will be produced bearing in mind the needs of the second language learners.

In keeping with the motivation for this study, the theory of interference by Robert Lado (1957) will guide the study. It is a contrastive study theory that operates by the discovery of the similarities and differences between the mother tongue and the target language. In addition to using the theory, the diagnostic drive will also involve the review of literature of experts in contrastive linguistics. The work organization is such that the first section is the introduction which deals with preparing the reader's mind about the subject matter of the study. The second section is about the review of the written works of experts on nominalization, morphology and the relevant areas to contrastive analysis. The third section is centred on the analysis of data collected about English and Igbo verbs, especially their derivational morphology. Here, the derivational patterns of verbs are classified and analysed, bringing out their areas of semblances and variations. The fourth section will be for the summary and conclusion.

### **Literature Review**

In the view of Agbedo (2015), one of the areas of applied linguistics that has improved pedagogy is contrastive analysis. Wilkins (1972) reveals that contrastive studies or analysis brings to

light the differences between the mother tongue and the target language the learner is learning. These differences help in foretelling the areas of difficulties to be encountered by the learner in the learning process. The possibility of the prediction brings out clearly what the learner has to learn, and from there, what the teacher has to teach. The consequences of the contrastive analysis are used in designing the syllabuses, creating tests and teaching materials for the learner.

From the point of view of Agbedo (2015), contrastive analysis is the systematic comparison of two or more languages, with the aim of describing their similarities and differences. The aim is to ensure that learners have better descriptions and teaching materials. It beams some valuable light on the characteristic features of the contrasted languages. Through it, knowledge of the universals of language is always exposed. This refers to those things common among the different languages in the world. The assumption of CA is that the native language of the learner plays a significant role in the learning of a second language. In it, the points of difference that might lead to interference are identified.

Wilkins (1972) posits that the importance of contrastive analysis is best appreciated in language teaching where Lado (1957) emphasizes the relevance of the theory. According to the theory, most errors and difficulties encountered in our language learning and use of a foreign language are traceable to the interference of the mother-tongue with the target language. It says that whenever there is a difference between the structure of the first language and the language being learned, it is enough sign to anticipate difficulty in learning and some performance errors in the language being learned. According to Lado (1957) as stated by Wilkins (1972), there is normally no expectation of difficulty in learning if the structures of the first and second language are the

same; otherwise difficulties would be anticipated if the structures are at variance. It is when the comparison is done that the sameness or variation would be known. The teaching of foreign languages is targeted at the differences so that the difficulties can be predicted. It is from the prediction that what will be taught and learnt will be made clear and materials designed for the teaching.

Umaru (2005:46) sees contrastive analysis alongside error analysis as some of the approaches adopted in the examination or study of errors and challenges involved in second language learning. Umaru (2005) asserts that contrastive analysis has four names that are used to refer to it, thus: “linguistic a priori”, “strong hypothesis”, “predictive linguistics” and “preventive linguistics”. She maintains that a contrastive analysis is made up of statements relating to the similarities and differences between two languages. Contrastive studies/analysis is a product of the audio-lingual theorists who normally get their foundation from the behaviourists theory.

Umaru (2005) is of the view that the reason for establishing the theory of contrastive analysis is to make a comparison of the source language (native language) with the target language in the bid to pick out their similarities and differences, make a prediction of where the difficulty or error is coming from and try to stop the development of such errors or difficulties. From Umaru (2005), the four-step practice of contrastive analysis as provided by Whiteman is disclosed. The first step is that primary and secondary languages are taken and a formal, written description of their structural system is made. The second step is that subsets of the same level like phonology, morphology and syntax are taken. The third step in the practice of contrastive analysis is that the comparison of the two subsets is carried out to show areas of similarities and

differences. The fourth and final step is to make a prediction of the likely encounterable similarities and differences.

Johanson (1975), following Umaru (2005), stresses that contrastive analysis has the weakness of being able to predict only part of the learning challenges and that some of the previous predictions of contrastive analysis are often ambiguous. The issues of differences which contrastive analysis has predicted are often found not to cause the same level of difficulty as contrastive analysis has claimed. Chidi-Onwuta and Oluikpe (2016) are of the view that CA insists on seeing how the structure of the first language influences the acquisition of L2 (Lado (1957), Fries (1945). In the view of Yang (1992), the theory of CA was founded by Lado (1957) and had its basis on Behavioural Psychology for which Skinner is popular.

Brown(2007), following Chidi-Onwuta and Oluikpe (2016), asserts that CA was founded on three assumptions: First, the blockade against the acquisition of the second language is the interference of the first language system with the second language system; it is only when the two are contrasted that the difference between them will be revealed. The difference will enable the prediction of areas of difficulties to occur. Second, there is a tendency for individuals to transfer the structures and semantics and the distribution of structures and semantics of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture. What this implies is that the learner errors made in L2 are a function of the learner's inability to cope with the predicted difficulties in L2. What they do in order to cope is to depend on their prior knowledge of L1. According to Brown (2007), this is called negative transfer. The third is that negative transfer of L1 is the cause of all the difficulties learners go through in learning the target language.

Following Chidi-Onwuta (2016), Yang (1992) claims that the greater the difference between the native and target language, the greater the difficulty will be; that a systematic and scientific analysis of the two languages will help in predicting the difficulties and that the result of CA can be made use of as a reliable source of in the getting ready of teaching materials, the planning and improvement of classroom techniques. This claim has the backing of Kufner (1962), Stockwell, Bowen and Martin (1965), Stockwell and Bowen (1965), Oluikpe (1978 ), Abu-Jarad (1986), Lucy (1992), Kharma and Haijaj (1985) and Nasir (1997).

Odlin (1994:27), as presented by Chidi-Onwuta and Oluikpe (2016), explains *negativetransfer* as “the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language (TL) and any other language that has been previously acquired”. Mitchell and Myles (2004) are of the view that what is known as negative transfer is the effect of speaker’s or writers’ first language in the use of his or her second language. They also call it “Cross linguistic influence”. According to Brown (2007), transfer is of two types—positive and negative. When prior knowledge benefits the learning duty, it is called positive transfer but when prior knowledge interferes with new knowledge, it is known as negative transfer. It is this phenomenon of negative influence that is called *interference*.

### **Nominalization and English Verbs**

According to Geoffrey Leech in his book, *A Glossary of English Grammar* (2006), nominalization is a method of word formation which allows a verb or adjective or other parts of speech to be transformed or turned into or used like a noun. It is also called “nouncing”. He explains that it also occurs in transformational

grammar where nominalization is regarded as derivation of a noun phrase from an underlying clause.

Jaggat (2001) defines Deverbal nouns as nouns that are formed from verbs or verb phrases but their grammatical function is that of nouns and not verbs. Deverbal nouns are not the same as verbal nouns, like gerunds and infinitives, which behave like verbs within their verb phrase. Deverbal nouns are one of the types of nominalization (noun formation). Examples of Deverbal nouns in English are organization which is formed or derived from the verb, organize; construction which is gotten from the verb construct. Jaggat (2001) maintains that verbal nouns are different in some ways from Deverbal nouns. A verbal noun is a word that has the features of a noun and which is used to form a noun phrase. But a Deverbal noun has no grammatical verbal features except that it is derived from verbs.

However, there are cases where authors use the term verbal nouns to refer to both cases. Examples of verbal nouns are gerunds and infinitives. The sentence, “Catching fish is fun” has “catching” as a gerund because it takes the object “fish”. Again, in the sentence, “Shouting loudly is enjoyable” has “shouting” as a gerund because “shouting” is modified by the adverb, loudly, like the verb, shout. But in the sentence “Loud shouting makes me angry”, “shouting” is a Deverbal noun. Just like a noun is modified by an adjective, “shouting” is modified by an adjective, loud. Jaggat (2001) outlines some examples of semantic categorization of Deverbal nouns thus: nouns denoting an activity—running and relaxation; nouns denoting a particular action—murder and discovery; agent nouns—invader and singer; patient nouns, denoting the party to whom or for whom something is done—draftee and employee; nouns denoting manner—walk, talk; nouns denoting an ability—her speech; nouns denoting a result—dent and



scratch; nouns denoting an object or system of objects—building, fencing and piping. There is also initial-stress-derived noun (like increase).

Kolin(1990) postulates that English has two types of nominalization. The first is by the addition of derivational suffix to generate a noun. The second is by using the same word as a noun without any extra morphology. This second process is known as zero derivation. Some of the examples are: fail to failure, nominalize to nominalization, investigate to investigation, move to movement, refuse to refusal, etc. Kolin (1998) gives the linguistics notion of nominalization as the employment of a non-nominal lexical item, like a verb, an adjective or an adverb, to play the role of a noun or to serve as the head of a noun phrase, with or without morphological changes. Nominalization can also be used to refer to the process of producing a noun from another lexical category through the use or attachment of derivational affixes. There are languages which use verbs as nouns by conversion or zero derivation. What this means is that such languages use verbs as nouns just like that, without inflectional variation. In spite of this, there are languages like English where morphological changes must occur prior to the use of the word as a noun. In fact, English has both zero and derivational process of nominalization.

Otagburu, Okwor, Ngonebu, Orabueze and Ogenyi (2012) posit that nouns in English are formed by the addition of suffixes like “-ment”, “-tion”, and “-ance” to verbs like “manage”, “combine” and “persevere” to arrive at the nouns “management”, “combination” and “perseverance”. From all these, they conclude that the following suffixes denote words as nouns: “-ness” for kindness and usefulness”, “-ity” for nationality and sensitivity; “-ment” for achievement and treatment; “-tion/ion” for resignation and election”; “-ance/ence” for tolerance and allowance, etc. It is

these suffixes that are added to words in order to generate nouns . We can also say that any word that has these suffixes is a noun.

### **Nominalization and Igbo Verbs**

Uba-Mgbemena (2011) treats the addition of noun and verb as one of the forms of deriving nouns through verbs in Igbo. The two syntactic categories are combined to give a name to an idea/concept. The noun and the verb are written as one word. For example: aka (hand) + mere (did)=akamere (hand-made), ike (strength) + agwu (never exhausted) = ikeagwu (scythe). Another form of derivation of nouns in Igbo with the involvement of verbs occurs when, to form a compound word, a noun is combined with a verbal noun. For example, afo (stomach) + oruru (churning) = afooruru (stomach ache); ike (strength) + ogwugwu (exhausting) = ikeogwugwu (tiredness); isi (head) + owuwa (breaking) = isiowuwa (headache).

Anagbogu (1990) postulates that Igbo Deverbal nouns are formed by prefixing a vowel or a syllabic nasal to the verb stem, thus: -lu (violate) to alu (abomination); -che (think) to uche (thought/mind); -pe (be small) to mpe (smallness). Another form occurs with the prefixation the harmonizing vowel to the verb, as in: -ji (hold) to oji (staff); -nu (rejoice) to onu (joy); li (bury) to ili (grave). Others are: -to (grow) to uto (growth); -cha (be white) to ocha (whiteness); -gba (wrestle) to mgba (wrestling); -bu (carry) to ibu (load); -mu (laugh) to amu (laughter) and -kpe (judge) to ikpe (judgement).

### **Empirical studies**

Anagbogu's (1990) study touches the subject of Deverbal nouns in Igbo, but is not objectively and specifically devoted to Deverbal

nouns, as it also treats Denominal nouns together with it. The work treats mainly theoretical issues concerning word formation relevant to nominalization. His work's major concentration is to marry universal, theoretical issues with language-specific ones. In his passing treatment of Deverbal nouns, he focuses attention on Igbo Deverbal nouns generated by prefixing a vowel or a syllabic nasal to the verb stem (VS), like "mpe" (smallness) formed from the VS "-pe" (be small) and "uche" (thought/mind) formed from the VS "-che" (think).

The study treats also Deverbal nouns of words of high tone (HT) prefixes with low tone (LT) verb stem, such as "oji" (staff) formed from the VS "-ji" (hold). The work extends also to Deverbal nouns of LT prefixes with HT verb stem, such as "uto" (growth) generated from the VS "-to" (grow). The main reason Anagbogu's (1990) work is different from ours is not only that it is not devoted to Deverbal nouns, as is our work, but also it is not done with a contrastive analytical bias as our work. Furthermore, the work does not use Lado's (1957) Contrastive Analysis Theory as ours, to serve as his theoretical framework. His findings are also different from ours.

Emenanjo's (2015) study of Wordhood and Morphological Processes has the objective of identifying, analysing and classifying morphemes and words. The objective, unlike ours, is not to contrast the Deverbal nouns of English and Igbo to solve pedagogic problems. He treats nominalization generally as a morphological process that involves sentential nominalization in Igbo (e.g. "-guakwukwo" (read/study) to "agumakwukwo" (studies)); ("-zuike" (rest) to "ezumike" (leave)). His treatment of morphological processes also touches on partial duplication and full duplication in Igbo (e.g. "-ta" (chew) to "otita" (chewing) and "-zu" (train) to "ozuzu" (training)).

There is no clear theoretical framework for the study except to explore the Igbo morphological processes. For this lack of a theoretical framework and the variation in his objective and ours, the study is different from ours and so our study is justified.

The Uba-Mgbemena's (2011) work's objective is to treat the combination patterns of Igbo compound words and not to do a contrastive study as ours. It is only in passing that his work touches on noun-verb collocation (e.g. "aka" (hand) + "mere" (did) = "akamere" (hand-made). It also embraces noun-verbal noun combination (e.g. "isi" (head) + "owuwa" (breaking) = "isiowuwa" (headache). Having a different objective and not concentrating on Deverbal nouns or contrastive analysis are sufficient points of departure of his work from our work which is otherwise.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework on which this work is based is the Contrastive Analysis theory founded by Robert Lado in (1957). The theory is hinged on second language learning/ teaching.

The claim of the theory is that the errors and difficulties that are encountered in our language learning and use of a foreign language are from the interference of our mother-tongue (L1). The claim further states that in the event of the structure of the target language (L2) being at variance with that of L1, it implies that some difficulties in learning and error in performance should be expected. The theory states that a foreign language is mainly based on learning to conquer these problems. The theory's claim further states that where the structures of L1 are similar, no difficulty should be anticipated in teaching/learning. Teaching is normally concentrated on where there are variations between the two languages.

What the theory implies is that the problems of people learning English as a second language will vary in accordance with the mother-tongue of those learning it and the nature of the similarities and differences between the two languages. Once a contrastive study of the two languages is carried out, the possible areas of differences will be identified, leading to the prediction of the difficulties the learners will encounter. Based on the result of the contrastive analysis, teaching materials, syllabuses, curricula, tests and research will be done to facilitate the teaching/learning of the second language. Different textbooks will then be produced for the different groups of learners.

In summary, what the theory of contrastive analysis does is to help predict the anticipated or likely errors of a given group of learners and thereby supply the teaching materials required to teach the language (L2).

### **Data Presentation and Analysis**

The various examples of Deverbal nouns in English and Igbo languages will be listed hereunder to form the bases of the subsequent analysis.

### **Categories of English Deverbal Nouns**

<b>Group 1</b>		<b>Group 2</b>		<b>Group 3</b>	
Close	Closure	Base	basement	Apply	applicant
Enclose	Enclosure	Astonish	astonishment	Attend	attendant
Forfeit	Forfeiture	Govern	government	Participate	participant
Expend	Expenditure	Encourage	encouragement	Account	accountant
Fail	failure	Excite	excitement	Lubricate	lubricant
Sign	signature	Develop	development	Inform	informant
Compose	composure	Agree	agreement	Depend	dependant

<b>Group 4</b>		<b>Group 5</b>		<b>Group 6</b>	
Assume	assumption	Avoid	avoidance	Widen	width
Classify	classification	Rely	reliance	Breathe	breath
Collect	collection	Annoy	annoyance	Weigh	weight
Corrupt	corruption	Disturb	disturbance	Heighten	height
Admire	admiration	Dominate	dominance	Deepen	depth
Educate	education	Signify	significance	Lengthen	length
Affect	affection	Deliver	deliverance	Broaden	breadth

<b>Group 7</b>		<b>Group 8</b>		<b>Group 9</b>	
Confuse	confusion	Arrive	arrival	Activate	activity
Divide	division	Approve	approval	Realize	reality
Admit	admission	Remove	removal	Apply	applicability
Confess	confession	Avow	avowal	Produce	productivity
Conclude	conclusion	Criminalize	criminal	Divide	divisibility
Seclude	seclusion	Dispose	disposal	Create	creativity

<b>Group 10</b>		<b>Group 11</b>		<b>Group 12</b>	
Dispossess	dispossession	Believe	belief	Lie	lie
Dissociate	dissociation	Relieve	relief	Love	love
Dissipate	dissipation	Grieve	grief	Doubt	doubt
Disqualify	disqualification	Disbelieve	disbelief	Convert	convert
Disintegrate	disintegration	Prove	proof	Stress	stress
Disinfect	disinfection	Reprove	reproof	Play	play
Dissimulate	dissimulation			Sail	sail

## Categories of Igbo Deverbal Nouns

Group A(U-prefixation group)	Group (U- prefixation group)
Gbu (being painful)	mgbu (pain)
Tó(grow)	uto (growth)
Kọ (being scarce)	ụkọ (scarcity)
Kwé(sing)	ukwe (song)
Bá (being rich)	ụbá (wealth)
Fé(fly)	ufe (flight)
To(be sweet)	uto(sweet taste)
Dé (sound)	ude (sound)
Ká (serving God)	ụkà (God worship)
Bé make sound)	ube(cry)
Tá(accuse)	utā (blame)

**Note:** Deverbal nouns are nouns formed from verbs; as nouns, they behave grammatically purely as nouns, not as verbs any more. “Ufe” is formed from “fe” and can no longer behave as a verb, but noun. Being a “cognate noun “means having similar parentage. And this does not cancel the fact of “ufe” being a noun that is derived from a verb.

Group C		Group D	
Gwú (play)	égwùrégwù (play)	Zụ (buy)	àzụmázu (act of buying)
Sè (draw)	èsèrèsè (something drawn)	Dé (write)	édémédé (act of writing)
Go(buy)	ègorégó (something bought)	Gu (reading)	águmágu (literature)
Su (pound)	àsùràsu (something pounded)	Ko(narrate)	àkomáko (narrative)
Gbu (killing)	ègbùrègbù(something killed)	Kpé (pray)	ékpémékpé

Si (cook)	èsirèsí (something cooked)	(religion)
Hụ (roast)	àhụràhụ (something roasted)	Ká (being great) àkámáká (superiority)
Ke (tying)	èkèrèké (something tied)	Bà (entry) àbàmàbà (initiation)
		Rí (eat) ériméí (enjoyment)

**Group E  
(Reduplication of verb root)  
duplication)**

**Group F  
(Nasal prefixation & verb root**

Nwà (try)	Mé (do)	onwụnwà (temptation) mmèmmé (celebration)
Dà (fall)	Jé (go)	oḍìdà (falling) njènjè (traveling)
Kwé (believe)		òkwùkwé (belief) mkpọkpọ (calling about)
Kpọ (call)		òsìsè (drawing) mkpọmkpọ (obstacles)
Sè (draw)		òkìkè (creation)
Kpọ (striking on)		the foot
Kè (create)		òjǐjé (going)
Jé (go)	Tá (chew)	ntántá (meat)
Gwá (tell)		Ké oḡwụgwá (informing) nkénké (short)
Kọ (cultivate)	Tí (hit with weight)	ọkụkọ (cultivation) ntíntí (huge/fat)

**Group G (Harmonising nasal fixation) Group H**

Kwá (cough)	Kpé (judge)	ụkwára ( phlegm)	
Tì (stretching)	Gbé (crawl)	ìkpé (judgement)	utiri
	Ké (be strong)	(selfstretch)	ìgbé
Bá (scold)	Kà (serve God)	(crawl)	
Zé (sneeze)		oneself)	



Tá (blame)		íké (strength)
Gbọ (vomit)	Má (be excess)	mbá (scolding)
Nyé (give)	Sá (begging)	ụkà (church/service) úzéré ( the sneezing act)
Jé (emulate)		utā (blame)
Ká (get old)		ágbo (vomit)
		umá (excess)
		ònyínyé (gift)
		usà (begging much) éjijé (drama)
		nkā (aged)

### Group H

Gwé (grind)	ngweri (ground to pieces)
Mé (do)	mméjọ (done to spoilage)
Gbú (cut)	mgbúri (cut to pieces)
Sí (cook)	nsíjọ (cooked tospoilage)
Tá (chew)	ntári (chewed to pieces mgbájọ (the misshot)
Gbá (shoot)	nzọri (matched to pieces)
Zọ (match)	nkwújọ (talked to an insulting point)
Kwú (talk)	

### The Analysis

What is to be done here is to do a detailed study of the way and manner the verbs of English (displayed above) undergo some changes of structure in order to generate deverbal nouns.

### English Deverbal Nouns

In the formation of English nouns from verbs, the processes of derivation by suffixation and conversion are used. In group 1, the process is that of suffixing “-ture” or “-ure” to the verb stem (VS),

whereas in group 2, it takes the process of suffixing of “-ment” to the VS. In group 3, impersonal physical agents are denoted by adding the suffix “-tant” or “-ant” to the VS as the case may be. The morphological process in group 4 is by putting the suffix “-ation” to the VS, just as group 5 derives nouns from verbs by suffixing the morpheme “-ance” to the VS. Group 6 undergoes the process of changing the VS form and the suffix of “-dth” or “-ght” to the VS.

In group 7, the suffix “-sion” is added to the VS, though at times there is a change of the VS form. The nominalization method in group 8 is by adding the suffix “-val” or “-al” to the VS. Then, in group 9, the process follows the form of either adding a suffix “-lity” or “-vity” to the VS to derive the Deverbal noun. Group 11 adds “-ief” to the verb stem which changes the ending from “-ve” to “-ief”, the noun form. The last but not the least is group 12, where there is zero derivation, but mere conversion.

### **Igbo Deverbal Nouns**

In group A of the Igbo deverbal nouns, the process adhered to is the prefixing of *m-* and *u-* to the harmonizing heavy vowels to form the deverbal nouns. In group B, the process of making the deverbal nouns is by prefixing *m-* and *u-* to the harmonizing light vowels. Group C takes the process of duplication of the VS alongside the interfixation of *-r-* morpheme. The same goes for group D, except for the simple reason that while the latter is about harmonizing with the heavy vowels and the interfixation of “-m-” to the heavy vowels, the former is about the light vowels. In group E, the morphological process is that of partial duplication of the VS alongside the prefixation of the harmonizing heavy or light vowels, as the case may be. Contrary to group E, group F is about full

duplication of the VS alongside the prefixation of the phonologically matching “m-“ and “n-“ consonants.

In group G, through prefixation, the VS generates a nominal product while still adhering to the vowel harmony spelling principles of the Igbo language. It is the same prefixation and harmonization that occur in group H. Group H exhibits prefixation of the phonologically corresponding *m-* or *n-* to the VS, combined with the suffixation of another type of VS, *-r-* denoting the action of *pieces* or breaking into bits and pieces. The same prefixation of the corresponding *m-* or *n-* occurs in group H combined with the suffixation of another brand of VS denoting spoilage or damage. This shows that in Igbo, suffixation is only involved when a different type of VS is being combined with an already-existing verb stem.

### **Summary of Findings**

The examination of the English formation of deverbal nouns shows that English deverbal nouns are formed majorly by the process of suffixation of different forms of morphemes like *-ment*, *-ant*, *-ance*, *-lity* or *-ity*, *-val* or *-al*, *-dth* or *-ght*. The process of suffixation is not used in the making of deverbal nouns in Igbo. Another nominalization process characteristic of the English language that is not in Igbo is that of zero derivation or conversion. In this case, there is no structural change in the verb stem, but the same word is used for both verb and noun in English.

On the other hand, in the Igbo language, prefixation is the main form of deverbal noun formation. Other methods of creating nouns from verbs in Igbo language unlike in the English language, are through interfixation, partial duplication and full duplication. In the prefixation process, it is the vowels and syllabic nasals that are involved in accordance with the rule of vowel harmony in Igbo. In

the interfixation, *-r-* and *-m-* morphemes could be involved. There is no vowel harmony principle in the English language at all.

It is based on this bad state of language pedagogy for the Igbo learners of English as a foreign language that this paper sets out to carry out a contrastive study of English-Igbo Deverbal Nouns. It is a diagnostic study that will pinpoint the actual nature of interference in language teaching, so that the right syllabus, curriculum and books will be produced for the learners. The result of the study is expected to assist the teacher skilled craftsman to be able to order his materials wisely and lay emphasis in the right places for the learners. Not only teachers but also curriculum planners and authors will benefit from the findings of this study.

Based on the operational modalities of the theory of contrastive analysis, the teaching/learning of the deverbal nouns in English will be facilitated by not allowing the prefixation, interfixation and duplication processes characteristic of the Igbo language deverbal noun formation to interfere with the suffixation and zero derivation that are the hallmarks of the English formation of deverbal nouns. It is this understanding that will be incorporated into the syllabus and teaching materials to make the learning/teaching of English deverbal noun formation easy.

## **Conclusion**

The study set out to do a contrastive study of English and Igbo deverbal nouns using the theory of contrastive analysis by Robert Lado. The various forms of English and Igbo deverbal nouns formation have been displayed and examined. The findings have shown that prefixation, interfixation and duplication that are the features of Igbo deverbal noun formation unlike English constitute the difference between the two languages in this mode of

nominalization and is possible to be the source of interference in the pedagogy. English uses suffixation as the findings show. This discovery has made the prediction of the difficult area of learning/teaching English language deverbal nouns possible. The prediction will in turn help in designing the teaching materials and syllabus that will facilitate the pedagogy of English deverbal nouns to the Igbo learners of the English language.

### **References**

- Abu-Jarad, H. (1986). English interlanguage of Palestinian university students in Gaza strip: An analysis of relative clause and verb tense. Unpublished PhD thesis, Ball State University, Muncie, India.
- Agbedo, C. U. (2015). *General linguistics: Historical and contemporary perspectives*. Nsukka: Kumcee-Ntaeshe Press Inc.
- Anagbogu, P. N. (1990). *The grammar of Igbo nominalization*. Onitsha: Varsity Press.
- Anagbogu, P. N., Mbah, B. M. and Eme, C. A. (2010). *Introduction to linguistics*. Awka: Amaka Dreams.
- Brown, H. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Chidi-Onwuta, G.A and Oluikpe, B. O. A. (2016). *Contrastive linguistics: Concept and practice*. Owerri: Barloz Publishers, Inc.
- Crystal, D. (1985). *The Cambridge encyclopaedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Emenanjo, E. N. (2015). *A grammar of contemporary Igbo (student's edition)*. Port Harcourt: M & J Grand Orbit Communications Ltd.

- Finch, G. (2000). *Linguistic terms and concepts*. Basingstoke, Hamisphire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fries, C. C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a second language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Jaggar, P. (2001). *Verbal nouns, deverbal nouns and infinitives*. (no place of publication). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Johanson, S. (1975). "The use of error analysis and contrastive analysis". *Papers in contrastive analysis and language testing*. Lundi: Broderna Ekstrands Tryckeri A. B.
- Kharma, N. & Haijaj, A. (1985). *Errors in English among Arabic speakers: Analysis and remedy*. London: Longman.
- Kolin, M. (1990). *Understanding English grammar*. Macmillan, p. 179.
- Kolin, M. (1998). *Rhetorica grammar: Grammatical choices, rhetorical effects*, p.63.
- Kufner, H. (1962). *The grammatical structures of English and German*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- Lehmann, W. P. (1972). *Descriptive linguistics: An introduction*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Lucy, J. (1992). *Grammatical categories and cognition: A case study of the linguistic relativity Hypothesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mekiliuwa, O. (2008). *An introduction to applied English linguistics*. Shomolu: Fordson part & Sons.
- Mitchell, R. & Myles, S. (2004). *Second language learning theories*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Nasri, A. (1997). *Contrastive analysis and error analysis*. Retrieved from Eric database. ED 495903.
- Odlin, T. (1994). *Language transfer: Cross linguistic influence in learning language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oluikpe, B. (1978). *English in Igboland*. Onitsha: Africana.'

- Okolo, B. A. & Ezikeojiaku, P.A. (2012). *Introduction to language and linguistics*. Port Harcourt: Sunray Publications Ltd.
- Otagburu, E. J. ,Okwor, E. O., Ngonebu, C.L., Orabueze, F.O., Ogenyi, L.C. (2012). *Basic grammar& composition course for university students*. Enugu: Snaap Press Nigeria Ltd.
- Pei, M. (1965). *The story of language*. Mentor Book.
- Prasad, T. (2012). *A course in linguistics*. Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Stockwell, R. & Bowen, J. (1965). *The sounds of English and Spanish*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stockwell, R. Bowen, J. & Martin, J. (1965). *The grammatical structure of English and Spanish*. Chicago: University of Chicago.