

Research Article

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijamr.2017.04.08.006>

## The use of conjunctions in English and Igala: A contrastive analysis

**Unubi, Sunday Abraham**

Department of Igala Language & Culture, School of Languages, Kogi State College of Education, PMB 1033, Ankpa, Nigeria

Corresponding Author: [unubi4u@gmail.com](mailto:unubi4u@gmail.com)

### Keywords

English,  
Igala,  
conjunctions,  
contrastive analysis

### Abstract

This research analyses the use of conjunctions in English and Igala, using the linguistic tool of contrastive analysis. Conjunctions are words that link or connect two words, phrases, clauses or sentences together, either in speech or in writing. Conjunctions which are one of the eight parts of speech of the English are also found in other languages, according to the traditional grammar. Over the years, this important area of language study has received less attention from language scholars, students and linguists in comparison with other parts of speech like nouns, verbs, adjectives and prepositions. In Igala, some scholars have pointed out that conjunctions are few in the language when compared with English, without suggesting reason(s) for their fewness. The resolve of the researcher to fill this gap necessitated the present study. This research, which is qualitative in nature, collected its data based on a text of twenty-two English conjunctions (that comprised coordinating, subordinating and correlative conjunctions) which was produced in copies and distributed to some selected Igala informants for translation from English into Igala. These respondents speak the Idah/Igala-mela dialect of the language. The researcher used the translated text of conjunctions to read two books of the Igala Bible: Jonah and James, and monitored the frequency of use of those conjunctions, as used in these books of the Igala Bible. The major findings of the study showed that: (i) the additive coordinating conjunction in Igala, **kpàí** and, unlike in English, does not perform a linking function when it begins a sentence, according to the Igala Bible (ii) conjunctions are actually many in Igala but it is just that few are used; (iii) there are more differences between the use of conjunctions in English and Igala than the similarities. The study's contributions to knowledge included its pedagogical/practical implications for the learners and teachers of the Igala language. The first task for teachers of Igala and Igala linguists in order to increase the use of more conjunctions in the language is to list all the conjunctions in English and translate them into Igala. After the translation exercise, the translated text should be carefully examined to ensure that it is devoid of any equivalent error. Then the new conjunctions should be added to the existing curriculum, and the teaching and learning of them can begin immediately in all the primary, secondary and tertiary institutions in Igala land where Igala language is taught as a subject or course. In addition, there have been few contrastive studies carried out on conjunctions either between English and one Nigerian language, or between two Nigerian languages generally over the years in Nigeria. Most language scholars believe that conjunctions are few, and as such, there is nothing much to say there. Therefore, the fact that the researcher has taken a bold step to research into this neglected area of language study makes this study important and insightful, thereby giving it credibility.

## Introduction/Background to the study

The use of conjunctions in English is obvious, perspicuous and well defined, as one of the core grammatical classes, popularly known as parts of speech in a language, according to traditional grammarians. However, this is not so in Igala. This indicates that there is a big difference or wide gap between the use of conjunctions in English and Igala. This, no doubt, has informed and propelled the need to carry out a contrastive analysis of the use of conjunctions in these two languages. According to James (151), a contrastive analysis (CA) specifies those features of language two (L2) which are different from the corresponding features of language one (L1), and by implication, those that are identical.

Moreover, it is worthy of note to indicate at this juncture that some language scholars or linguists have done some works already in this area. One of them, Omachonu comments:

It is true that Igala exhibits word classes ... but the taxonomic categorisation into parts of speech like noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, adjective, preposition, conjunction, and interjection, though it may work perfectly for English, may not be so with Igala language. This is because the division or classification of lexical items into word classes or parts of speech may not follow exactly the same pattern for English. For instance, there are only two open word classes or major parts of speech in Igala, namely, nouns and verbs. All others are either derived from these two or exist just as small groups in the language (Igala Language Studies: 26).

At another instance, he submits that conjunctions are few in Igala:

“Owing to the fewness of conjunctions,...the Igala language, at times resorts to serial verb constructions (SVC)” (Igala Lang. Studies & Dev.: Progress, Issues & challenges: 26).

Speaking in a similar fashion, Atadoga stresses that:

Parts of speech or word class in Igala are nouns and verbs only (being the major ones), whereas all others: adverbs, adjectives, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions and determiners are considered as belonging to the closed or minor parts of speech because most of them are seen to be largely derived from the major two and are few in number. Therefore,

conjunctions do not constitute major groups in the Igala lexicon (82-83).

Despite their fewness, however, he identifies the use of conjunctions – especially coordinating and subordinating conjunctions in the language, and provides some examples (96-7).

These scholars, who are also native speakers, have not only established the presence of conjunctions but also their use in the language. Nonetheless, left untouched is the disparity or difference between the use of conjunctions in English and Igala, as well as the reason(s) that could be advanced for their fewness in the Igala language.

Therefore, this present study investigates the disparity or difference between the use of conjunctions in English and Igala, as well as the circumstance(s) that led to the fewness of conjunctions in Igala. To achieve this purpose, the researcher uses Contrastive Analysis (CA) as a tool, including its principle, theory or hypothesis, and one of the Igala core texts: the Igala Bible. The Bible provides us adequate information about the use of conjunctions, as used by the translators in it. The reason why the researcher has chosen to do this is hard to find. It is to carry out a quality study that will stand the test of time in terms of validity.

## Brief History of English and Igala

❖ **English:** Historically, English was spoken first in England about 1,500 years ago. However, it was in existence before then. Geographically, the English language was confined to ‘the British Isles’, a group of Islands lying off the north-west coast of the continent of Europe in the northern temperate zone of the world. Furthermore, there are two main islands, namely Britain, the larger of the two, and Ireland, the smaller. Politically too, the British Isles today also comprises two main parts, namely the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, made up of England, Wales, Scotland (i.e. Britain), and Northern Ireland, with its capital at London; and the Republic of Ireland, with its capital at Dublin.

Associated with the British were the Celts, the Romans, the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes. The *Celts* were the first inhabitants of the British Isles about 500 and 100 BC. The age in which they existed is called ‘The Iron Age’. Having spread through central and western Europe, they arrived in south-eastern England. They did not speak English, but their languages

belonged to the Indo-European family of languages, to which English also belongs. The **Romans** were a succession of peoples of the Ancient World who invaded Britain from the Middle East around the Mediterranean in the period of 3000 BC – 500 AD (3,500 years). They developed a literate civilisation based on agriculture and slave labour, and through military prowess brought other peoples under their control. The Roman Empire with Latin as its language and its capital at Rome in Italy, was the most extensive of all, and with the conquest of Britain, it reached almost its fullest extent. By the end of the fifth century AD, the Roman Empire in Western Europe had disappeared and had been replaced by 'barbarian' kingdoms. The **Anglo-Saxon** invaders arrived in Britain in large numbers with the intention of settling, when with the Roman withdrawal, the native British were left to fend for themselves. The Anglo-Saxons were chiefly interested in the fertile eastern and southern parts of Britain, which were also closest to their homeland in Germany. They set up a number of kingdoms which included: Kent, Sussex, Essex, Wessex, Northumbria, East Anglia, and Mercia. The whole area occupied by the Anglo-Saxons later came to be referred to as 'Angla-land' ('the land of the Angles', the Angles being more in number than the Saxons), and from this word, 'England' is clearly derived. Finally, the **Danes** were warlike, heathen and Norwegian beings from Scandinavia, popularly known as Vikings, who attacked the British Isles or England around 800. They descended on the English coast and penetrated far inland, plundering and burning. Later in the ninth century the Danes finally came to England to settle, especially in the eastern parts of the country after the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms had virtually disappeared (Jowitt 1-10).

According to Wilton (1), the English language typologically belongs to the West Germanic branch of the Indo-European family of languages. This broad family includes most of the European languages spoken today. The Indo-European family includes several major branches, as follows:

- Latin and the modern Romance languages;
- The Germanic languages;
- The Indo-Iranian languages, including Hindi and Sanskrit;
- The Slavic languages;
- The Baltic languages of Latvian and Lithuanian;
- The Celtic languages; and
- Greek

The influence of the original Indo-European language, designated proto-Indo-European can be seen today, even though no written record of it exists. The word *father*, for example, is *vater* in German, *pater* in Latin, and *pitir* in Sanskrit. These words are all cognates, similar words in different languages that share the same root.

❖ **Igala:** Igala is a dominant language in Kogi State spoken by over two million natives in nine Local Government Areas (namely – Ankpa, Bassa, Ibaji, Idah, Igala-mela/Odolu, Ofu, Dekina, Olamaboro and Omala) of Kogi East Senatorial District, North Central Nigeria. Furthermore, the language is equally spoken in some communities outside Kogi State: Ebu in Delta State, Olohi and Ifeku in Edo State, Ogwurugwu, Ojo, Iga and Asaba in Enugu State, Odokpe, Njam, Inoma, Ala, Igbedo, Onugwa, Ode, Igbokeanyi and Ila in Anambra State, but certainly not outside Nigeria.

Geographically, Igala land is located within the triangle formed by the confluence of the Rivers Niger and Benue. The Igala people are found east of the confluence of these rivers. The land is bounded on the west by River Niger, on the east by Enugu State, the south by Anambra State and on the north by Benue/Nassarawa States. It is 120 kilometres wide and 160 kilometres long. It is located approximately between latitudes 6' 80° and 8' north and longitudes 6' 30° and 7' 40° east and covers an area of about 13, 665 square kilometres (Egbunu, 5).

Typologically, as one of the African languages, Negedu (116) states that Igala belongs to the Kwa subgroup of the Niger Congo language family. The Niger Congo languages constitute one of the world's major language families and Africa's largest in terms of geographical area and number of speakers. Igala is also a language of the Yoruboid branch of the Defoid. The Defoid languages constitute a branch of the present Benue Congo language family. It comprises the Yoruba, the Igala and the Itsekiri groups of south-western Nigeria.

The name (Yoruboid branch of the Defoid) derives from its most widely spoken number, Yoruba. It is therefore note-worthy, at first instance, that the Igala and the Yoruba almost share the same view in their notion of God. There is a very thin line in pronunciation of words that depict divinities with their qualities. Research has shown that the concept of the *Ata* may have relational connection with a Yoruba word used to refer to kings both in Ayede Ekiti and Oshogbo respectively. Armstrong, as cited by Negedu

(117) is emphatic in saying that “the most definite statement that can be made about the Igala is that they had a common origin with the Yoruba and that separation took place long enough ago to allow for their fairly considerable linguistic differences”. It is more preferable to say that there is a relational connection between cultures than to say that one emanates from the other since humility has not proven to be a virtue where cultures and civilisations contest for relevance.

Like any group of people, the Igalas are ruled by a figure called the ‘Ata’. The word Ata means ‘father’ and the full title of the ruler is ‘Ata Igala’, meaning, the Father of Igalas. The popular way of greeting the Ata is *Agaabaidu* or *Gaabaidu*, literally translated to mean ‘lion, the king of the forest/head of all animals’. The new **Ata Igala** is HRM Idakwo Michael Ameh Oboni II. He ascended the throne of his fore fathers in February, 2013, after the demise of Ata Aliyu Ocheje Obaje.

### Statement of the Research Problem

The problem that warranted this research lies in the fact that conjunctions have been adjudged to be few in Igala, with little or no reason(s) proffered for this fewness. Conjunctions, though few in English, are fewer in Igala. In his words, Omachonu asserts: “Owing to the fewness of conjunctions ..., the Igala language, at times, resorts to serial verb construction (SVC)” (26). This research fills this gap by exploiting the pedagogical application of Contrastive Analysis (CA) to compare the use of conjunctions in English and Igala.

In summary, there have been few studies carried out on conjunctions generally over the years in Nigeria. Most language scholars believe that conjunctions are few, and as such, there is nothing much to say there. However, the fact that the researcher has taken a bold step to research into this neglected area of language study makes this study impactful and insightful, thereby giving it credibility.

### Aim and Objectives of the Study

Since English is the lingua franca of Nigeria, being used both as official language as well as the language of education from primary to tertiary levels, it is true to say that it has come in contact with Igala language. Therefore, the broad aim of this study is to do a contrastive analysis (CA) of the use of conjunctions in

English and Igala for some pedagogical reasons. The specific objectives include the following:

- (1) To determine the factor(s) that led to the fewness of conjunctions in Igala as against English as claimed by some language scholars.
- (2) To determine the extent of differences in the use of conjunctions in the languages and the effect(s) of the difference.
- (3) To determine the extent to which the two languages share similarity in the use of conjunctions.

### Research Questions

This research answers the following questions:

- (1) Why are conjunctions fewer (in use) in Igala than in English?
- (2) Are there differences in the use of conjunctions between English and Igala? If there are differences, to what extent do they differ?
- (3) Are there similarities in the use of conjunctions between English and Igala? If there are similarities, to what extent are they similar?

### Scope of the Study

The study covers the contrastive analysis of the use of conjunctions in English and Igala languages only. This includes the three types of conjunctions which are: coordinating, subordinating and correlative as well as their uses in the two languages.

### Significance of the Study

This study is significant as it promises to offer a contrastive analysis of the use conjunctions in both Igala and English. It is a pioneer study as far as conjunctions in Igala are concerned. Before now, little has been said about conjunctions in Igala. Some Igala scholars have pointed out that the dominant parts of speech in Igala are nouns and verbs, and that conjunctions are few in the language, proffering little or no reason for the fewness. Consequently, this study waded into that to find out why conjunctions are few in Igala. Therefore, this research is of immense value as it serves as a future reference material for linguists in particular and students of English/Linguistics in general. Also, this study emphasises and makes use of the practical/pedagogical approach, value or application of contrastive analysis (CA). So, the research has practical/pedagogical implications for the learners and teachers of Igala as well as Igala scholars and linguists because one of its findings is that there



are more conjunctions in Igala but few are actually used. As a pace-setter then, this research uses a total number of twenty-two conjunctions in English which were translated by the Igala informants into Igala, and used as part of the data for this study. There are more than twenty-two conjunctions in English. The onus now rests on the teachers of Igala language to first of all, list out all the conjunctions in English and translate them into Igala, then add them to the existing curriculum, and begin to teach them immediately in all primary, secondary and tertiary institutions in Igala land where Igala is taught as a subject or course.

## Review of related literature

### ➤ Conceptual Review

**Definitions of Conjunctions:** Traditionally, the conjunction is one of the eight parts of speech in English. A conjunction, as reported by Malmkj r (478), is defined as an indeclinable part of speech that links other parts of speech, in company with which it has significance, by classifying their meaning or relations. According to Leung (11), conjunctions have been studied under various labels and have drawn much attention from various scholars in the field of English/Linguistics over time: Halliday and Hasan (13) treat them as “linguistic devices that create cohesion”, while Sanders and Maat describe them as a “semantic relation that is explicitly marked” (1-2). According to Er, as cited by Aidinlou and Reshadi (611), conjunctions are a “semantic connection between two clauses”. Furthermore, Leung (11) cites four scholars in this regard. These are: Schiffrin, who treats conjunctions as “discourse markers”, Fraser considers them as a “pragmatic class of lexical expressions”, or simply, “pragmatic markers”, while Rouchota states that conjunctions “encode different meanings, and that they can be a procedural device”, and lastly, Caron conceives conjunctions simply as being used “to express various kinds of relations between utterances”.

Aside from the scholars mentioned above, others most generally conceive conjunctions as linkers or connectors that join two words, phrases, clauses or sentences together, either in speech or in writing. To this end, Leech and Svartvik note, “Clauses or phrases may be linked together (coordinated) by conjunctions” (203-204). They further state that conjunction or coordination can also link two words of the same word class. Aarts says, “Conjunctions belong to a closed class of words that have a linking function” (45). (Closed class here means that we cannot derive

another word class from conjunctions the same way we do with others such as nouns, verbs and adjectives). According to Roberts (258), conjunctions perform the function of joining any two or more sentences together to form another coordinate sentence. Speaking from the same viewpoint, Lester (63) states that conjunctions join words or groups of words. In the words of Eckhard-Black, “A conjunction stands between two words, phrases or clauses and links them” (97). Similarly, Carnie says that “Coordinate structures are constituents linked by conjunctions like *and* or *or*” (90). In addition, Kirkpatrick states that “A conjunction is a linking word used to join words, word groups or clauses” (173). Again, a conjunction, in the words of Murthy, is “A word which joins together sentences or words and clauses” (212). Furthermore, Baskervill and Sewel say that “Unlike adverbs, conjunctions do not modify but they are just solely for the purpose of connecting” (1). As noted by Kirksten, “Conjunction is an indeclinable part of speech that links other parts of speech, in company with which it has significance, by classifying their meaning or relations” (478). In a similar fashion, Crystal says that conjunctions are “A term used in the GRAMMATICAL classification of words to refer to an ITEM or a process whose primary function is to connect words or other CONSTRUCTIONS in which the conjoined elements may be referred to as **conjunctions**” (73). Also, McArthur (235) says that a conjunction is a part of speech or word class used to connect words or constructions, adding that the linked units that result are said to be coordinated or coordinate.

All these scholars, as we have seen, are unanimous in echoing the fact that conjunctions are words that link, connect or join two words, phrases, clauses and sentences together. This is absolutely true because whenever the word conjunction, being a part of speech in a language, is mentioned, the first thing that comes to mind traditionally is that it is a linker, a connector or a joiner.

### Types of Conjunctions

Language scholars have divergent views on the types of conjunction. For instance, Baskervill and Sewell (1), Arthur (235), Lester (63) and Eckhard-Black (97) divide conjunctions into two classes: coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. These scholars (including others not mentioned here) leave out correlative conjunctions because, according to them (e.g. Lester (65)), correlative conjunctions are similar to coordinating conjunctions. However, there are traditionally three types of conjunctions basically. They include:

**Coordinating Conjunctions:** These are used to link words, phrases and clauses. Besides that, coordinating conjunctions are used to join the elements of sentences that have equal levels. In other words, they link two sentences that do not depend on each other for meaning.

**Subordinating Conjunction:** Subordinating conjunctions are words which are used to link subordinate clauses with the main clauses in a complex sentence. Main clauses can stand alone and do not depend on subordinate clauses while subordinate clauses cannot stand alone. Therefore, subordinate clauses depend on the main clauses for complete sense or meaning. According to Sahebkeir & Aidinlou (125), subordinating conjunctions are also known as *transitional conjunctions*.

**Correlative Conjunctions:** These link words that consist of two parts and are used to give emphasis to the combinations of two structures that are balanced (Sahebkeir & Aidinlou, 125).

### Theoretical Review

This research is purely analytical as it is basically hinged on the theory, principle or hypothesis of contrastive analysis (CA). This is reviewed here, being the framework of this research.

### Contrastive Analysis (CA)

Contrastive Analysis (CA) is a linguistic enterprise aimed at producing inverted (that is, contrastive, not comparative) two-valued typologies (a CA is always concerned with a pair of languages). It is not concerned with classification because the term *contrastive* implies, more interest in differences between languages than in their likenesses. CA is founded on the assumption that languages can be compared (James, 2 & 3). According to Filha (5), Contrastive Analysis (CA) is the comparison of the native language (NL) with the target language (TL), i.e. the language being learnt with the purpose of determining similarities and differences between the two. Furthermore, Johansson (9) defines Contrastive analysis as the systematic comparison of two or more languages, with the aim of describing their similarities and differences, and it has often been done for *practical/pedagogical* purposes. However, there is more to CA than this: when we compare two languages, we often see things more clearly. Speaking on the beauty of CA, Johansson quotes Firbas as saying that “The contrastive method proves to be a

useful heuristic tool capable of throwing valuable light on the characteristic features of the languages compared” (9). In other words, when we compare across languages, we can see the characteristics of each language more clearly, and the comparison can contribute to a better description of each individual language. Contrastive analysis (CA), over the years, has had various designations such as *comparative linguistics*, *contrastive grammar* and *differential description*. According to Hamp, as cited by Filha (5), no matter what terminology is used for CA, it is basically the juxtaposing of accounts of two languages and the extraction of certain observation of learning difficulty.

In the preface to his book as cited by James, Lado says:

The plan of the book rests on the assumption that we can predict and describe the patterns [of L2] that will cause difficulty in learning, and those that will not cause difficulty, by comparing systematically the language and culture to be learnt with the native language and culture of the student (7).

Furthermore, in support of his proposition, Lado quotes Fries, who points out that:

The most efficient materials are those based upon scientific description of the language to be learnt, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner (James, 143).

Speaking in a similar vein, Politzer and Strauback in Filha (7) say that:

By comparing the linguistic analysis of the native language of the learner ... with that of the language to be studied,...we highlight the major difficulty encountered by the learner. This comparison enables us to construct teaching and testing materials quite unsystematically and to give due emphasis to the points of real difficulty.

The basic practice of contrastive analysis therefore, is first to write a description of a particular aspect of each of the two languages to be compared. This could be in phonology, morphology and syntax. One then compares any of this with a view to noting areas of differences and similarities; this, being the technique for identifying and establishing inter-systemic correspondences.

## Hypothesis/Theory/Principle of Contrastive Analysis (CA)

Yang (134) reports that the hypothesis or theory of contrastive analysis (CA) was advanced when the structural linguistics and behavioural psychology were dominant in the sixties. It actually originated from Lado's *Linguistics across Cultures*. James (14) says that CA is founded on the assumption that L2 learners will tend to transfer to their L2 utterances and formal features of their L1. According to Lado, as quoted by Ibiwotisi, the contrastive analysis hypothesis entails:

That individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture, both productively when attempting to speak the language ... and receptively when attempting to grasp and understand the language ... as being practised by natives ... in the comparison between native and foreign languages lies the key to ease difficulty in foreign language learning (27).

This hypothesis is built on the premise that languages are different, and that because of these differences, the second language (L2) learner will encounter difficulties; that linguistic differences could be used to predict learning difficulty. It is this conviction that linguistic differences could be used to predict learning difficulty that produced the notion of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH): where two languages are similar, positive transfer would occur; and where they are different, negative transfer or interference would result. Bayraktaro lu (57) and James (184-85) report that Wardhaugh in a paper on the contrastive analysis hypothesis suggests that the CA Hypothesis exists in two versions: the *strong* and the *weak* version. The two versions are equally based on the assumption of L1 interference on L2 in language learning.

### The Strong Version of the (CA) Hypothesis/Theory/Principle

According to James (145 & 184), the strong version claims predictive power (i.e. ability to predict difficulties in second language learning). There seems to be three things a CA can predict: it can predict (pre-identify) what aspect will *cause problems*; or it can predict *difficulty*; or it can predict *errors*. He suggests the fourth possibility: of a CA predicting the *tenacity* of certain errors, that is, their strong resistance to extinction through time and teaching. As Filha (6) puts it, the strong version maintains that it is possible to compare the system of the native language (NL)

grammar, phonology and syntax with the system of the target language (TL) in order to predict the difficulties the learner will encounter and thus enable the textbook writers and teachers to construct more efficient teaching materials.

In a similar fashion, Behfrouz and Joghataee (1871) assert that four fundamental issues were claimed in the strong version. These are: (i) Interference from the learner's native language is the most important factor in second language learning. (ii) The more the differences of the two languages, the greater the learning difficulty will be (i.e. the degree of difficulty depends on the degrees of differences). (iii) A systematic and scientific analysis of the two language systems can help predict the difficulties. (iv) The results of CA can be used as a reliable source in providing some teaching materials, course planning and improvement of classroom techniques. Filha (8) also reports that Rivers expresses her opinion in favour of the use of the strong version of CA hypothesis in the preparation of language teaching materials. She says that the student's attention should be drawn to the differences so that he ". . . may practise with awareness and concentration and monitor his own production with watchfulness until he finds himself producing the target language (TL) forms with ease and accuracy". The strong version of the CA hypothesis presented here emphasizes that difficulties and facilities can be predicted if comparison of two languages is made. According to Bayraktaro lu (61), it is this strong version of the CA hypothesis that has been the approach underlying much of the work done in contrastive analysis.

### The Weak Version of the (CA) Hypothesis/Theory/Principle

James (184-85) says the weak version, less ambitiously, claims merely to have the power to diagnose errors that have been committed. He quotes Wardhaugh as saying that using the weak version of CA means that reference must be made to the two systems only in order to explain actually observed interference phenomena. In other words, CA has innate application for teachers and linguists who can successfully draw the best linguistic knowledge therein in order to explain the difficulty in second language learning. Here, the emphasis shifts from the predictive power of the relative difficulty to the explanatory power of observable errors. In addition, according to Yang (136), Brown suggests that the weak version of CA focuses not on the *a priori* (known or assumed without reference to experience)

prediction of linguistic difficulties, but on the *a posteriori* (deriving knowledge from experience) of explanation of sources of errors in language learning. In this version, errors are examined and explained after they have been produced by second language learners. Although the weak version has more realistic and practical strength than the strong version, it is restricted to the interference concept and those errors which are produced due to language transfer. It is hypothesized that the main source of errors in the weak version comes from lack of adequate knowledge in the second language (Behfrouz and Joghataee, 1871). Speaking in the same vein, Bayraktaro lu (61) says that although the weak hypothesis of contrastive analysis is a more useful tool than the strong hypothesis in accounting for the errors arising only from the interference of the first language. Schumann and Stenson, also cited by Bayraktaro lu, state that “No theory of contrastive analysis, strong or weak, should be expected to account for all errors of language learning” (61).

According to Bayraktaro lu (61), the weak version of the CA hypothesis requires of the linguist only that he uses the best linguistic knowledge available to him in order to account for observed difficulties in second language learning. It also leads to an approach which makes fewer demands of contrastive theory than the strong version does. It starts with the evidence provided by linguistic interference and uses such evidence towards relationships between systems rather than directly between systems. While recognising that some errors are the result of L1 interference, Richards, as cited by James (185), lays emphasis on those which cannot be so accounted for. He identifies common errors and categorises them by cause into four types. These include: overgeneralisation, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of rules, and building of false systems or concepts.

### **The Moderate Version of the (CA) Hypothesis/Theory/Principle**

According to Yang (136), Oller and Ziahosseiny proposed the third version of CA hypothesis: a moderate version based on their study of spelling errors on the dictation section of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) placement test in English as a second language. They found that the strong version was too strong, while the weak version was too weak. Here they focused on the nature of human learning and proposed the moderate version, which is summarised as: The study reveals that the categorization of abstract and concrete patterns

according to their perceived similarities and differences is the basis for learning; therefore, wherever patterns are minimally distinct in form or meaning in one or more systems, confusion may result. Also, Brown, as reported by Yang, explains the “technical” idea applying it to human learning: “interference can actually be greater when items to be learned are more similar to existing items than when items are entirely new and unrelated to existing items” (136).

Furthermore, Ziahosseiny in a separate study cited by Behfrouz and Joghataee (1872), claims that one of the most important advantages of the moderate version is that it can explain both interlingual errors which are related to the native language and intralingual errors that are related to the target language. Moreover, some errors which are due to overgeneralization can be interpreted and predicted on the basis of the moderate version.

### **The Pedagogical Value/Application of Contrastive Analysis (CA)**

The pedagogical value of contrastive analysis is clearly visible in all the sections discussed so far under contrastive analysis. Lado, who is widely regarded as the father of Contrastive Analysis established the foundation of the pedagogical application of CA in his work *Linguistics across Cultures* through his theory of transfer in respect to second language learning. James (11) says that the observation that prior learning affects subsequent learning leads to the theory or hypothesis of transfer. He cites Ellis, who refers to this as “perhaps the single most important concept in the theory and practice of education”.

While discussing pedagogical exploitation of CA, James (141) reports that Wilkins considers in general the relevance of linguistics for language teaching, raising the whole question of what is meant by ‘applied linguistics’. He suggests that while most teachers look for direct *applications* of linguistics, that is, “. . . cases where notions and information drawn from linguistics act directly upon the process of language teaching”. It must be borne in mind that besides these, linguistics provides *insights* and carries *implications* for teaching. These are less direct: by ‘insights’ Wilkins means “linguistic notions that increase one’s understanding of the notion and consequently of the nature of language learning”, while ‘implications’ are guidelines for materials production based on general observations of how language is learned.



Furthermore, in her paper entitled *Some Pedagogical and Practical Applications of Contrastive Studies in English Language Teaching (ELT)*, Garcés (31-32) states that it should not be forgotten that the development of any foreign language teaching (FLT) programme involves dealing with 'real teachers', 'real students', 'real data', and coping with 'real circumstances'. In other words, the more closely a second language teaching programme is based on the specific needs of the students, the more successful and effective the course will be. Emphasising the invaluable importance of L1 in L2 teaching, she provides a summary as follows:

To ignore L1 in the foreign language (FL) classroom means almost certainly to teach with less than maximum efficiency since, in the learning of a foreign language, there is an inevitable association in the mind between the new language and the one already known (34).

### **Distinction between Contrastive and Comparative Linguistics**

Over the years, both contrastive and comparative linguistics are two important dominant terms that have been used in the fields of English and Linguistics respectively. Therefore, we deem it necessary to distinguish between the two in this study. On one hand, the term 'contrastive linguistics', according to Gast (1), is sometimes used for comparative studies of (small) groups (rather than just pairs) of languages, and does not require a socio-cultural link between the languages investigated. It is also a practice-oriented linguistic approach that seeks to describe the differences and similarities between a pair of languages. Thus, contrastive linguistics aims to arrive at results that carry the potential of being used for practical purposes, e.g. in foreign language teaching and translation. On this view, contrastive linguistics is a special case of linguistic typology and is distinguished from other types of typological approaches by a small sample size and a high degree of granularity. Accordingly, any pair or group of languages that are not socio-culturally linked (e.g. English and Igala) can be subject to a contrastive analysis. Historically, the programme of contrastive linguistics was instigated by Charles Carpenter Fries from the University of Michigan in the 1940s. Some years later, this project was put into practice by Fries' colleague, Robert Lado.

On the other hand, comparative linguistics, according to Matasovi (2), is the scientific study of language

from a comparative point of view, which means that it is involved in comparing and classifying languages that are socio-culturally linked, in order to discover the features they share in terms of differences and similarities. As confirmed by Vikner (1-2), comparative linguistics tries to discover differences (or similarities) between various languages. Comparative linguistics goes a step further in finding out both which kinds of variation exist between languages and also which kinds do not exist. Furthermore, comparative linguistics seeks to account theoretically for as many actual differences and similarities as possible, by deriving them from as few general differences as possible. In this way, it may be established which aspects of a given language are also found in another language and which aspects are specific to it. By comparing two languages, we can begin to map the ways in which languages differ and the ways in which they do not. Such a typological perspective makes it possible not only to establish typological connections and predictions (e.g. of the kind: "only languages which have X also have Y"), but also to explain and justify these theoretically.

### **➤ Empirical Review**

Over the years, several contrastive studies of this sort - either on conjunctions or other aspects of English as well as other languages have been conducted by some researchers in the field of English/Linguistics, which could be found as articles in journals, projects, dissertations, or books. The main objective of those researches was to identify the differences and similarities between the languages compared, and to bring out the pedagogical value or application of contrastive analysis (CA).

Thus, **Odiase Faith Eniyemamwen** conducted a study titled *A Contrastive Analysis of the Verbal Systems of Bini and English Languages: Implications for Curriculum Development*. The major focus or purpose of this research was to identify the difficulty the native speakers of Bini encounter in second language learning, that is, the effect of L1 on L2 as far as the verbal systems of Bini and English are concerned. The methodology included the selection of twenty students who are of Bini extraction from the remedial section of the College of Education, Ekiadolo, Binin City, Edo State. Data was collected through the use of a questionnaire containing 100 test items principally meant to test the linguistic ability of the students in the use of primary tenses, aspects and modalities of the English verbal system. The findings of this research

show the following learning difficulties faced by the students, as summarised below:

1. Difficulty in applying directly the varieties of verb inflection allomorphs - /d/, /id/ or /t/ (-d, -ed or t) or the / /, and vowel/consonant placement in transforming verbs from the past to the past participle form.
2. Overgeneralisation of the -s morpheme allomorphs /z/ and /iz/ (-s, -es and -ies).
3. Difficulty in applying correctly the oppositional future verbs *will/shall* in concord with subject/verb in transforming statements into future tense, including their aspects and modalities.
4. Difficulty in understanding the morphological inflection of the lexical verbs in English with the -ing suffix in transforming statements into the progressive aspect.

**Margje Post** conducted a study entitled *A Contrastive Analysis of Russian and Norwegian Utterance-Initial Coordinating Conjunctions*. The concern of this study was the comparison of the basic additive and contrastive coordinating conjunctions *and* and *but* in Russian and Norwegian. Thus, the three Russian basic additive and contrastive coordinating conjunctions *i*, *a* and *no* were compared with their two Norwegian counterparts *og* and *men* when used in utterance-initial position. A core meaning was then formulated for each of these five conjunctions. The study indicates that the Russian conjunction *a* connects in a way fundamentally different from *i* and *no*. Metaphorically, *i* and *no* can be said to connect on a horizontal, or syntagmatic line, whereas *a* connects elements on a vertical, or paradigmatic axis. Unlike *i* and *no*, the conjunction *a* is implicationally unmarked for linear, logical connections. In Norwegian, *og* simply has an additive meaning, whereas *men* signals the existence of an element of conflict.

**Lida Liu & Xiukun Qi** researched on a topic *A Contrastive Study of Textual Cohesion and Coherence Errors in Chinese EFL Abstract Writing in Engineering Discourse*. The study compared the data obtained from thirty abstracts written by Chinese advanced EFL (English as a Foreign Language) writers and another thirty abstracts written by English as Mother Language (EML) writers in terms of structural cohesion and non-structural cohesion. The principal focus of this study is to promote EFL teaching for both the researchers and the learners in terms of the abstract writing process and production through the exploration of general existing problems related to textual cohesion and coherence.

The methodology for the research includes: Halliday and Hasan's cohesion theory, Hoey's lexical cohesion theory, and Zhu and Yan's thematic theory. The first tool used for measurements of non-structural cohesion includes grammatical cohesion of reference, ellipsis, substitution, and conjunctions proposed by Halliday and Hassan, and lexical cohesion of reiteration by Hoey in terms of simple repetition and complex repetition. The other tool which was used for structural cohesion is concerned mainly with thematic progression proposed by Zhu and Yan. The results of the study show that there are great differences concerning the structural cohesion, non-structural cohesion, lexical cohesion, and coherence between the Chinese and English languages, and that four major differences stemming from language, pragmatics, cognition and culture destroy textual property, ruin the expectation of readers, and reduce effective communication.

**Firas Ali Suleiman Zawahreh** in a paper entitled *A Linguistic Contrastive Analysis Case Study: Out of Context Translation of Arabic Adjectives into English in EFL Classroom* also conducted a contrastive study. The overall aim of this study is to shed light on the probable problematic differences between some Arabic adjectives and their possible equivalents in English, using the strong version of CA to clear and explain the differences in meanings when students translate Arabic adjectives to English ones without considering the general context. The methodology for this research was the presentation of a textbook of fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh grade containing new Arabic adjective vocabulary, called 'word box' to selected students to translate into English. During this exercise, unfortunately, the students used dictionaries or let the others help them to translate the new vocabulary but it was out of context. The result of the research shows that the process of finding and choosing the correct equivalents of Arabic adjectives in English when EFL students translate them out of context is difficult and misleading in most cases. This is because of the probable problematic differences between some Arabic adjectives and their possible equivalents in English. Students therefore need to pay close attention to: (i) context (ii) parts of speech and (iii) collocations.

**Nguyen Thi Hoa** conducted a research titled *A Contrastive Study of Grammatical Cohesive Devices in English and Vietnamese*. From his abstract, the main objective of the study is to point out similarities and differences in grammatical cohesive devices in English and Vietnamese. The methodology includes:

(i) presenting what grammatical cohesive devices in English and Vietnamese are; (ii) contrasting them to see whether there are corresponding grammatical cohesive devices in Vietnamese to those in English and how these grammatical cohesive devices differ from each other, as well as pointing out how this knowledge can be applied to the task of teaching and learning. The result shows that there are differences in using cohesive devices which seem to be the same like *though* and *despite*. It is common that students tend to transfer their mother tongue into the target language, which may lead to misunderstanding due to differences between the two languages. Consequently, in order to make students avoid mistakes, teachers should bear in mind that they have to show their students the differences clearly. By showing some typical errors students commit, teachers will draw their attention to them when teaching grammatical cohesive devices. Furthermore, teachers can make contrasts between the learners' L1 and L2. This is because contrasting students' mother tongue and the target language grammatical cohesive devices help them develop linguistic skills in both languages.

*Ibrahim Al Faki* embarked on a study entitled *A Contrastive Study in Sentence Construction between English and Nubian Languages*. The general objectives of the research include: (i) to identify the points of similarities and dissimilarities between the Nubian and English sentence level (ii) to find out the potential productivities of this process (CA) for pedagogical purpose, which may prove to be useful for Nubian natives and help Nubian English teachers to benefit from it in teaching English, and (iii) to add to the existing knowledge about Nubian sentence construction as a contribution to relevant studies. The data for this study was collected from Nubian informants in meetings and interviews whose age ranged from 40 to 80. The researcher gave the informants questions to answer and sentences to translate into the Nubian language, and tape-recorded their utterances. Published materials in the Nubian language such as books, newspaper articles, were also utilised. In the methodology, the researcher uses the method of contrastive analysis (CA) as a model for comparing two grammatical sentences in the two languages, concentrating deeply on their similarities and differences. The data required for the sentence construction in the two languages was classified into two main categories as follows:

1. Sentence types according to function which consist of the following:
  - (a) Declarative sentence
  - (b) Exclamatory sentence
  - (c) Interrogative sentence and
  - (d) Imperative sentence.
2. Sentence types according to structure which contain the following:
  - (a) Simple sentence
  - (b) Compound sentence
  - (c) Complex sentence and
  - (d) Compound complex.

The result of this study, according to the analysis, shows that the two languages, Nubian and English have some aspects of similarities and differences between them as far as sentence construction is concerned.

Major findings of his study are as follows:

- The points of similarities can be summarised as follows:
  1. The two languages have similar elements to construct a sentence.
  2. Both languages use coordination to construct compound and complex sentences, and both languages have equivalent conjunctions.
  3. Both languages have equivalent pronouns to construct (WH) questions.
  4. Ellipsis exists in the two languages.
- The points of differences between the two languages are as follows:
  1. The two languages have different order of elements in sentence construction.
  2. Coordinators in English convey shades of meaning, whereas they do not in Nubian.
  3. Ellipsis in Nubian language does not result in an ambiguous sentence.
  4. The coordinator appears in the middle of the sentence in English.

The presence of more than one sentence may result in an ambiguous sentence. In Nubian, the coordinator appears after the nominal in each clause and may not result in sentence ambiguity.

From the review of related research based on contrastive analysis so far, it is clear that very little contrastive study has been conducted comparing conjunctions either in English and in any other language or between two languages of the world other than English. The researcher, in the course of this study has come across a reasonable amount of literature on contrastive study conducted on other aspects of English/Linguistics, but little or none on conjunctions.

## **Methodology**

### **Area of Study**

The study revolves or centres on conjunctions, which are traditionally regarded as one of the parts of speech in a language, and they belong to the aspect or level of syntax. These conjunctions and their uses in English and Igala are compared in this study. In dealing with conjunctions in this study, the three types: coordinating, subordinating and correlative conjunctions are analysed exhaustively as obtainable or applicable to the two languages under study. In addition, contrastive analysis (CA), which is used as a tool to analyse and compare conjunctions and their use in English and Igala forms part of the area of this study. Through contrastive analysis, the researcher is in a better position to establish the differences and similarities in the use of conjunctions in the two languages under study.

### **Research Design**

The nature of the present study places it in the domain of qualitative research. Qualitative research can be defined as a form of systematic empirical enquiry into meaning. According to Amenorvi (63), Fraenkel and Norman point out the major characteristics of qualitative research to include: “qualitative data, flexible design, naturalistic enquiry, personal contact and insight, inductive analysis and holistic perspective”. In the light of this, this study has qualitative data, e.g. written texts in both English and Igala. It is also naturalistic in its enquiry as it investigates a natural phenomenon – the use of conjunctions in the two languages. Furthermore, this research involves a personal contact between the researcher and the informants or respondents, and it is analytical as it makes use of contrastive analysis (CA) to compare conjunctions in English and Igala. Besides, qualitative research is characterised by unstructured data which includes literature reviews, interviews, audio recordings and so on.

Thus, this study uses focused samples of the three types of conjunctions – coordinating, subordinating and correlative which are analysed and compared in the two languages under study using the tool of contrastive analysis (CA), being a qualitative method of analysis. The researcher listed these three types of conjunctions in English and handed the list to some Igala informants for translation which was duly recorded.

### **Instrumentation and Sources of Data**

The instruments used for collecting the data for this research were as follows: (i) Copies of a text prepared by the researcher containing a total number of twenty-two conjunctions that consist of coordinating, subordinating and correlative, were distributed to respondents (ii) The Igala informants who served as respondents to the text were charged with the responsibility for translating the conjunctions from English into Igala (iii) The dialect of Igala that served as the data source for this study is that of Idah/Igala-mela dialect, and (iv) Some selected texts in English and Igala: those in English included texts written in English by other scholars (outside Igala). This actually made up our English data. From here, the researcher was equipped with insight to be able to provide a plethora of sentential examples of conjunctions. We deliberately chose not to collect data formally for English as we did for Igala because much of literature on the use of conjunctions in English already exists. Therefore, we decided to do something new. Those in Igala included the Igala Bible as well as texts written in English by Igala scholars. From here, especially the Bible, the researcher was able to investigate not only the use of conjunctions but also the frequency of their use. The researcher chose to do this with a view to ensuring the validity, viability and reliability of this research. These are the sources of data for this research.

### **Methods of Data Collection**

In this section of the study, the researcher explains the way through which the data for this work was collected. The subjects for this study were deliberately selected. The researcher had selected some Igala informants who speak the Idah/Igala-mela dialect of Igala, and whose age ranged from 20-60, as subjects for the study. The researcher decided to select this category of people as informants for this study based on the fact that they were born and bred at home (Igala land). Some of them are still at home, and some of them settle here in Jos. Therefore, they are expected to



have a great repertoire or storage and command of the native language. They comprised males and females. The data was collected from these informants in meetings and interactions. The researcher prepared a text containing a total number of twenty-two conjunctions, which comprise coordinating, subordinating and correlative conjunctions in English, and administered it to the informants. Their responsibility was to translate those conjunctions from English into Igala. The translation of each of the conjunctions by these informants as well as conjunctions from English texts formed the major data for this study. While the translation of the conjunctions from English into Igala by the informants and the English texts provided the data, the Igala Bible provided the use of conjunctions.

### Methods of Data Analysis

The data collected for this research was analysed based on the principle of contrastive analysis (CA). Also, the data was analysed with due cognizance and recourse to the research questions formulated for the study. The text of conjunctions – coordinating, subordinating and correlative, prepared by the researcher that was translated from English into Igala by Igala informants formed the raw and core data analysed in this study. Furthermore, the Igala Bible was read using this translated text of conjunctions to investigate the frequency of use of those conjunctions. Those conjunctions were tabulated or listed vertically, and their frequency of use was indicated in percentage. Through this, the researcher was able to do the following: establish or draw a conclusion on how frequent or otherwise conjunctions are used generally in Igala, itemise the differences and similarities between the use of conjunctions in English and Igala, and state the pedagogical value or application of this study as well as suggest why conjunctions are smaller in Igala than in English. These, among other things, made or formed the results or findings of this research. Again, for purposes of specificity, the Idah/Igala-mela dialect of Igala was used to analyse the data collected for this study.

## Data presentation, Analysis and Discussion of findings

### Presentation of Data

This chapter discusses the data collected for this study. Here, the first task by the researcher was to identify conjunctions in both languages under study. This means that the data was in two corpora – one in

English, that is, conjunctions in English, and the other in Igala, that is, conjunctions in Igala. To ensure a neat presentation, the researcher then sorted the English corpus separately or distinctively from the Igala corpus. Moreover, in the English data, conjunctions were sequenced and italicised while their sentential examples were presented chronologically and vertically in accordance with the ordered appearance of each of the conjunctions. In the Igala data on the other hand, conjunctions were in bold letters and in vertical order with their English equivalents placed side by side as a gloss. Sentential examples using each of the conjunctions were presented sequentially and vertically, but conjunctions in the English equivalents were italicised.

### Conjunctions in English and Igala

#### ► Conjunctions in English and Types

Halliday and Hasan (242-267) propose four types of conjunction that ensure cohesion in English generally: (1) *Additive Conjunctions* act to structurally coordinate or link by adding to proposed item and are signalled by *and, also, furthermore, in addition*, etc. Additive conjunctions may also act to negate the proposed item and are signalled by *nor, and ... no, neither*. Kinds of additive include: **alternative**, e.g. *or, or else, alternatively*; **after-thought (or conjunct)**, e.g. *incidentally, by the way*; **expository**, e.g. *that is, I mean, in other words*; **exemplificatory**, e.g. *for instance, thus*; **comparing similarity**, e.g. *likewise, similarly, in the same way (or in the same vein)*; and **comparing dissimilarity**, e.g. *on the other hand, by contrast, on the contrary*. (ii) *Adversative Conjunctions* are used to express comparison or contrast between sentences and they include *but, on the other hand, however, yet, though, only*. Kinds of adversative include: **emphatic**, e.g. *nevertheless, despite this*; **contrastive avowal**, e.g. *in fact, actually, as a matter of fact*; **correction of meaning**, e.g. *instead, rather, at least*; **closed dismissal**, e.g. *in any case, in eithercase, whichever way it is*; and **open-ended dismissal**, e.g. *any how, at any rate, however it is*. (iii) *Causal Conjunctions* express the cause or reason of what is being stated. They include: *then, so, hence, therefore*. Kinds of clausal conjunction include: **specific causal**. It is divided into three – (a) **reason**, e.g. *for this reason, on account of this, on this basis, it follows*; (b) **result**, e.g. *as a result, in consequence, arising out of this* and (c) **purpose**, e.g. *for this purpose, with this in mind, to this end*; **simple emphatic**, e.g. *in that case, in such an event, that being so*; **direct respective**, e.g. *in this respect, in this*

regard, with reference to this; **reversed polarity**, e.g. *otherwise, under other circumstances, in other respects, aside from this*. (iv) *Temporal conjunctions* represent sequence relationships between clauses and they include: *next, secondly, then, in the end*. Kinds of temporal conjunction include: **simultaneous**, e.g. *just then, at the same time*; **preceding**, e.g. *previously, formerly, before that*; **conclusive**, e.g. *finally, at last, in conclusion*; **immediate**, e.g. *at once, thereupon, forthwith*; **repetitive**, e.g. *next time, on another occasion, later*; **specific**, e.g. *next day, an hour later*; **durative**, e.g. *meanwhile, in the interim, for the time being*; **here and now**. This is divided into three – (a) **past**, e.g. *up to now, last time*; (b) **present**, e.g. *at this point, here, now* and (c) **future**, e.g. *from now on, henceforth (or henceforward)*; **summarizing**, e.g. *to sum up, in short, briefly*; **resumptive**, e.g. *to resume, to return to the point*. Moreover, Halliday, as cited by Saya and Fatemi (135), further classifies conjunction into three more abstract types: **elaboration, extension and enhancement**. **Elaboration** includes apposition like *in other words* and clarification like *rather*. **Extension** includes addition and variation like *alternatively*. **Enhancement** includes spatial-temporal like *there, previously* and causal-conditional like *consequently* and *in that case*. We deem it necessary to comment here that the above taxonomy by Halliday and their examples are more of adverbs than conjunctions. Murthy (212) outlines four types of conjunctions which are: coordinating, subordinating, correlative and compound conjunctions. We will consider them one after the other.

### Coordinating Conjunctions

These are conjunctions which are used to link together clauses of equal rank. In other words, they generally connect sentence elements of the same grammatical class such as nouns with nouns, adverbs with adverbs, phrases with phrases and clauses with clauses. They are simply referred to as coordinators, and the art of joining two words, phrases, clauses or sentences using coordinators is known as *coordination*. Huddleston (194) divides coordination into two - **basic coordination**, which can be described directly, e.g.

(15) Her daughter is a dentist *and* her son is studying law; and **non-basic coordination**, which can be described indirectly, in terms of its relation to the more elementary type.

(16) Okosun says he is innocent *and* she is a disinterested witness.

According to Aarts (45-6), we treat coordination as an instance of *parataxis*, a term derived from Greek, meaning ‘syntactic side-by-side arrangement’. Furthermore, all cases of coordination that involve an overt coordinator are referred to as *syndetic coordination*. Where there is no overt coordinator, it is referred to as *asyndetic coordination*. Asyndetic coordination is exemplified as follows:

(17) (a) She is honest, hard working, intelligent.  
 (b) We need bananas, apples, oranges, pears.  
 (c) Abu laughed, Jummai chuckled, Ojo grinned.  
 Coordinating conjunctions include: *and, nor, but, and or*. Sentential examples:

(20) (a) I bought a computer *and* a keyboard.  
 (b) When his wife left him, he did not bother *nor* went to plead for her return.  
 (c) She is poor *but* she is happy.  
 (d) The books are on the table *or* in the cupboard.

According to Murthy (215), coordinating conjunctions are divided into three kinds. They are:

- Cumulative or Copulative Conjunctions
  - Adversative Conjunctions and
  - Disjunctive or Alternative Conjunctions
- Also, we will consider them one after the other:

### (i) Cumulative or Copulative Conjunctions

These are used to join statements, or they add one statement to another. They include: *and, so, both ... and, as well as, not only ... but also, no less than*, etc. Sentential examples:

(21) (a) He looked *and* smiled at me.  
 (b) He is my father *so* I respect him.  
 (c) They *both* gave me money *and* stood by me in my trouble.  
 (d) *As well as* writing the letter for me, he posted it.  
 (e) She, *no less than* her friend, tried to cheat me.

### (ii) Adversative Conjunctions

According to Halliday and Hasan (250), the meaning of the adversative relation is ‘contrary to expectation’. The expectation may be derived from the content of what is being said, or from the communication process, in a speaker-hearer situation. They include: *but, still, only*, etc. Sentential examples:

(22) (a) She is beautiful *but* poor.  
 (b) You are intelligent *still* you have to work hard.  
 (c) He is a good servant *only* he has greed for food.

### (iii) Disjunctive or Alternative Conjunctions

These are used to express a choice between two alternatives. They include: *or*, *nor*, *either...or*, *neither...nor*, *else*, *whether...or*, *otherwise*, etc. Sentential examples:

- (23) (a) You must tell me the truth *or* I cannot help you.  
(b) She is not a teacher *nor* a typist.  
(c) You must *either* return my money *or* sell your house to me.  
(d) She *neither* loved him *nor* liked to marry him.  
(e) You must do the work sincerely *else* you will lose the job.

### Subordinating Conjunctions

These are conjunctions used to join clauses of unequal rank. In other words, they are used to join an independent or main clause with a dependent one that relies on the main clause for meaning and relevance. As Aarts (46) notes, "another way of putting this is to say that subordination is a type of *hypotaxis*, a Greek term that means originally 'syntactic underneath arrangement'. This means that a subordinating conjunction causes the clause it appears in to become dependent, and that it will only be a sentence fragment unless it is joined to an independent clause. Simply, subordinating conjunctions are called subordinators and the art of using a subordinator to join two clauses together is referred to as *subordination*. According to Quirk and Greenbaum (309), subordination is a non-symmetrical relation, holding between two clauses in such a way that one is a constituent or part of the other. Also according to Huddleston (194), subordination in contrast with coordination, involves inequality, that is, a relation between a dependent (the subordinate element) and a head (the superordinate one). A subordinating conjunction can appear at the beginning or in the middle of a sentence. They include: *after*, *because*, *if*, *that*, *though*, *although*, *till*, *before*, *unless*, *as*, *when*, *where*, *while*, *than*, *whether*, *in order that*, *nevertheless*, etc. Sentential examples:

- (24) (a) He came *after* I had finished my work.  
(b) He was sacked from office *because* of his stance against corruption.  
(c) I wonder *if* he will ever change.  
(d) He thinks *that* we will agree.  
(e) *Though* he is your brother, you should not trouble him like that.  
(f) We waited *till* the President arrived.

- (g) The plane was hijacked *before* it arrived at the airport.  
(h) *Unless* I marry Mary, I will never be happy in life.  
(i) Do *as* I said and nothing more!  
(j) John came *when* I was writing my dissertation, etc.

According to Baskerville and Sewell (3), subordinating conjunctions are divided into eight classes. They include: time, cause or reason, purpose, result or consequence, condition, circumstance, concession and comparison. We will consider them one after another:

### (i) Time

These are subordinators that express consequence in time or succession in time between clauses. Examples include: *before*, *after*, *till*, *since*, *when*, *while*, etc. Sentential examples:

- (25) (a) Mary had left *before* my arrival.  
(b) I began my work *after* they had gone.  
(c) I have not seen Mercy *since* she was married.  
(d) She will be happy *when* her mother returns from the market.  
(e) He was speaking with his friends *while* I was trying to sleep.

### (ii) Cause or Reason

These are subordinators that express causal relations in the simplest form that mean 'as a result of this' or 'because of this'. Examples include: *because*, *since*, *as*, and *for*. Sentential examples:

- (26) (a) He travelled home *because* of the death of his mother.  
(b) *Since* it is dark, take the torch with you.  
(c) *As* she is my sister, I like her.

### (iii) Result or Consequence

Result/consequence and cause/reason are closely related but the main subordinator here is *so* and *that*. These have the relation that is expressed to mean 'for this reason' which leads to something else. Sentential examples:

- (27) (a) He talked *so* fast that I could not understand him.  
(b) I was so tired *that* I could not eat after cooking.

### (iv) Purpose

Purpose and cause/reason are closely related and the subordinators involved have the sense of 'for this

reason' or 'for this purpose'. They include: *that, so that, in order that, lest*, etc. Sentential examples:

- (28) (a) We eat *that* we may live.  
 (b) I will help him now *so that* he can help me tomorrow.  
 (c) Emeka travelled to Abuja *in order that* he could see his brother.  
 (d) He walked quietly *lest* he should wake the child.

### (v) Condition

According to Quirk and Greenbaum (323), conditional subordinators state the dependence of one circumstance or set of circumstances on another. The main subordinators in English are *if* and *unless*. The *if*-clause could either be a positive or a negative condition while the *unless*-clause is a negative one. For example:

- (29) (a) *If* you do the job well, I will pay you.  
 (b) *If* you do not do the job well, I will not pay you.  
 (c) *Unless* the strike is called off, there will be no lecture tomorrow.

The latter (c) roughly means 'If the strike has not been called off ...'. But there is a slight difference between an *unless*-clause and a negative *if*-clause in that *unless* has the more exclusive meaning of 'only if ... not' or 'except on condition that ...'. It is thus the opposite of the compound conjunction *provided (that)* or *providing (that)*, which means 'if and only if':

- (30) *Provided that* no objection is raised, we will hold the retreat there.

Other compound conditional conjunctions approximately synonymous with *provided (that)* are *as long as, so long as, and on condition that*. Also, *if* and *unless* clauses often introduce non-finite and verbless clauses, e.g.: *if ready...*, *unless expressly forbidden*, etc. In addition, clauses beginning with *unless* lay stress on the excluded positive option, and so normally contain assertive forms. For example:

- (31) I will not phone you, *unless* something unforeseen happens.

(The meaning of this is: 'I will phone you when something unforeseen happens' but we can exclude this as unlikely).

According to Silva (1), there are three types of *if*-clauses. These are as follows:

- **Type 1:** The type 1 of the *if*-clause refers to the condition possible to fulfil. The *if*-clause appears in the simple present tense, and the main clause has the pattern: will-future (or modal + infinitive). For example:

- (32) *If* I study, I will pass the exam.

- **Type 2:** This refers to the condition in theory possible to fulfil. Here, the *if*-clause appears in the simple past tense. The pattern of the main clause is as follows: would + infinitive; e.g.:

- (33) *If* I studied, I would pass the exam.

- **Type 3:** The type 3 of the *if*-clause refers to the condition not possible to fulfil. In other words, the condition is too late to fulfil. The *if*-clause here appears in the past perfect tense, and the main clause has the pattern: would + have + past participle. For example:

- (34) *If* I had studied, I would have passed the exam.

**Real and unreal conditions:** Similar to type 1-3 of the *if*-clause is what Quirk and Greenbaum (324-25) call real and unreal conditions. According to them, a 'real' condition leaves unresolved the question of the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of the condition, and hence also, the truth of the proposition expressed by the main clause. For example:

- (35) (a) *If* he comes, I will see him.

(b) *If* she was awake, she certainly heard the noise. In an 'unreal' condition, on the other hand, it is clearly expected that the condition will not be fulfilled. For example:

- (36) (a) *If* he came, I would see him.

(b) *If* she had been awake, she would have heard the noise.

### (vi) Circumstance

These subordinators express a fulfilled condition, or to put differently, a relation between a premise in the subordinate clause and the conclusion drawn from it in the main clause. An example of this is a special circumstantial compound conjunction: *seeing that*. Sentential example:

- (37) *Seeing that* the weather has improved, we shall enjoy our game.



### (vii) Concession

These are subordinators that express the sense of 'reluctant yielding'. They are usually introduced by *though* and its more formal variant *although*, *even if* and occasionally *if*. Others include *however*, *whereas*, etc. Sentential examples:

- (38) (a) No goals were scored, *though* it was an exciting game.  
(b) *Although* I enjoyed myself, I was glad to come here  
(c) *However* hard he tried, he failed the exam  
(d) *Whereas* Sule seems rather stupid, his brother is clever.  
(e) *Even if* you dislike music, you would enjoy this concert.

### (viii) Comparison

These are subordinators that express comparison between dependent and independent clauses. They are introduced by *than*, *as-as*, *as*, etc. Sentential examples:

- (39) (a) She respected me more *than* I thought.  
(b) Uchendu walks *as* beautifully *as* a film star.  
(c) *As* sugar attracts ants, John is attracted by Mary.

### Correlative Conjunctions

Correlative conjunctions are regarded as team conjunctions because they are used in pairs. They get their name from the fact that they work together (co-) and relate one sentence element to another. Correlative conjunctions are more similar to coordinating conjunctions in that the sentence fragments they connect are fairly equal. Lester (65) notes that correlative conjunctions are very similar to coordinating conjunctions except that they are two-part conjunctions.

They include: *either...or*, *neither...nor*, *both...and*, *as many...as*, *whether...or*, *not only...but also*, *such...that*, *so...that*, *hardly...when*, *scarcely...when*, *no sooner...than*, *not...but*, etc. Sentential examples:

- (40) (a) I want *either* eba *or* amala.  
(b) *Neither* a borrower *nor* a lender be.  
(c) I have *both* eba *and* amala.  
(d) There are *as many* curtains *as* there are windows.  
(e) He was not sure *whether* he was losing *or* winning.  
(f) She was *not only* mean *but also* rude.  
(g) *Such* was the nature of their relationship *that* they never would have made it even if they wanted to.

(h) I had *scarcely* walked in the door *when* I got the call and had to run back.

(i) I had *no sooner* finished my studies *than* I got a job.

### Compound Conjunctions

These are groups of words that are used as conjunctions. Quirk and Greenbaum (313) regard such groups of words as compound subordinators. They are compound items which act, to various degrees, like a single conjunction. Such groups of words end with obligatory 'that', e.g. *in order that*, *in that*, *except that*, *on condition that*, *so that*, *such that*, etc. while some others have optional 'that', e.g. *now (that)*, *provided (that)*, *supposing (that)*, *seeing (that)*, *considering (that)*, etc. Furthermore, Omosowone and Akindolire (36) regard compound conjunctions as semi-coordinating conjunctions because they link elements together. More examples are: *as well as*, *as much as*, *rather than*, etc. Other examples include: *as though*, *in as much as*, *as soon as*, etc. Sentential examples:

- (41) (a) He applied for the job *in order that* he might help his father.  
(b) I can lend you the money *on condition that* you repay me next month.  
(c) I shall give you the job *provided that* you know how to type.  
(d) The pastor *as well as* his members received the gift of the Holy Spirit.  
(e) He buries himself in the things of this world *as though* he will not die.  
(f) *In as much as* he remains President, things will never work in that country.  
(g) Please, appear *as soon as* he calls you.

### ➤ Conjunctions In Igala and Types

In Igala, conjunctions connect, join or link words, phrases, clauses or sentences and have the same function as in English. However, they are not recognised or regarded as a distinct part of speech or word class as they are in English. It is strikingly interesting to state and emphasize here that Igala has only two parts of speech, which are nouns and verbs, according to some Igala scholars. For instance, Omachonu says that:

It is true that Igala exhibits word classes ... but the taxonomic categorisation into parts of speech like noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, adjective, preposition, conjunction, and interjection, though it may work perfectly for English, may not be so with Igala

language. This is because the division or classification of lexical items into word classes or parts of speech may not follow exactly the same pattern for English. For instance, there are only two open word classes or major parts of speech in Igala, namely, nouns and verbs. All others are either derived from these two or exist just as small groups in the language. He also adds: notice that conjunction as a word class belongs to a 'closed system' which gives no room for expansion or addition (Igala Language Studies: 26-27 & Lang. Studies & Dev.: Progress, Issues & challenges: 25-26).

Speaking in a similar fashion, Atadoga stresses that:

Parts of speech or word class in Igala are nouns and verbs only (being the major ones), whereas all others: adverbs, adjectives, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions and determiners are considered as belonging to the closed or minor parts of speech because most of them are seen to be largely derived from the major two and are few in number. Therefore, conjunctions do not constitute major groups in the Igala lexicon (82-83).

Judging from the foregoing, this is revealing and a unique characteristic of the Igala language.

To make up for this deficiency, Omachonu further comments:

Igala language, at times, resorts to serial verb constructions (CVC). Serial verb constructions or verb serialisation refers to a string of verbs or verb phrases within a single clause that express simultaneous or immediately consecutive actions, having a grammatical subject, have no overt connective markers, and are understood as having the same grammatical categories.

An example of this includes: (42)

Ì mú ókó gba (du) j  
S V N(obj) V V V

He catch/carry money receive carry eat

'He collected and embezzled the money' (27).

However, according to Dzameshie (77), there are several perspectives on verb serialisation as well as unresolved issues on the subject. While citing Larson's review of various viewpoints on the underlying form of serial structures, three different

proposals were distinguished: the *first* view is that all the sequenced verbs in verb serialisation might constitute a coordinate structure. This assumes that all the verbal elements occupy a coordinate status in that none of them is subordinate to the other. The *second* perspective is that the VPs in a serial structure might represent a nested sequence of adjunctions to a main verb. This suggests that all the other verbs perform a series of secondary predications and, thus, are subordinate to the first (i.e. principal or main) verb in status. The *third* proposal is that the relation among the sequenced verbs might be neither coordinate nor subordinate. In this view, the VPs might constitute a series of verbal complements. The first proposal seems to be true for Igala as the above example is a reflection of it. In that example, the third serialised verb (second to the last) *du* occupies a coordinate status. This is because it stands for the coordinator *and* in the English equivalent of the above sentence. Be that as it may, the serial structure exemplified above poses a problem to an analysis that assumes that all serial constructions comprise VPs in coordination. This is because normal coordination involves joining or linking constituents that represent discrete entities, actions, etc.

Since verb serialisation is inadequate in handling normal coordination, it is true that conjunctions still operate in the Igala language. It is in the light of this that Atadoga (96-97) makes reference to coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, with some examples. However, in this study the researcher, through the translation of English conjunctions by the informants, has identified more conjunctions in the language, which formed the second corpus of data for this study. These are presented here as well as their sentential examples for better knowledge of conjunctions in the Igala language.

### Coordinating Conjunctions

Coordinating conjunctions are used to link or join together words, phrases, clauses or sentences of equal grammatical status and class, in the same way as they do in English. Coordinating conjunctions in Igala primarily link nouns versus nouns, and verbs versus verbs together. They include:

#### IGALA

#### ENGLISH

- |     |              |       |
|-----|--------------|-------|
| (1) | <b>kpàí</b>  | 'and' |
| (2) | <b>àmáá</b>  | 'but' |
| (3) | <b>àb kí</b> | 'or'  |

Sentential examples:

- (43) (a) Àtá **kpàí** òmá. ‘The father *and* the child’.  
 (b) Ì ch n àlé **àmáá** d nwu ch b . ‘He is poor *but* he is happy’.  
 (c) j **àb ki** ón ? ‘God *or* man?’

Furthermore, syndetic and asyndetic coordination exist in the language. All the examples given above are instances of syndetic or overt coordination. Examples of asyndetic or covert coordination include:

- (44) (a) ùn ténè? Náténè úk ch , pià, ùjá.  
 ‘What do you want? I want a hoe, a cutlass, a file’.  
 (b) ùn n wá? Ùn’úchù, gwà, pá, ápí. ‘What did you bring? I brought yam, beans, groundnut, melon.’

### Subordinating Conjunctions

Basically, subordinating conjunctions are used to join clauses of unequal rank. They operate in Igala exactly the same way they do in English. They include:

#### IGALA

#### ENGLISH

- |      |                              |                   |
|------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| (4)  | <b>ùbì (ùbìl )</b>           | ‘after’           |
| (5)  | <b>tòdú</b>                  | ‘for’             |
| (6)  | <b>tábál (tábál -tàbàl )</b> | ‘yet’             |
| (7)  | <b>tòdú, tòdúl (àb l )</b>   | ‘so’              |
| (8)  | <b>todú</b>                  | ‘because’         |
| (9)  | <b>ích un</b>                | ‘if’              |
| (10) | <b>kàkíní (kákí)</b>         | ‘that’            |
| (11) | <b>ìkò ( gbà)</b>            | ‘when’            |
| (12) | <b>chái</b>                  | ‘unless’          |
| (13) | <b>tákù, gwá</b>             | ‘before’          |
| (14) | <b>tùlè</b>                  | ‘than’            |
| (15) | <b>áludúúkid</b>             | ‘however’         |
| (16) | <b>tábál -tàbàl</b>          | ‘nevertheless’    |
| (17) | <b>íí</b>                    | ‘though/although’ |
| (18) | <b>úgbó</b>                  | ‘where’           |

Sentential examples:

- (45) (a) Ì liá **ùbì** kòmi lè. ‘H came *after* I left’.  
 (b) Í neke k’unyi ñ **todu** ì ch n àlé. ‘He cannot build a house *for* he is poor’.  
 (c) Ì al’uch **tábál -tàbàl** ébì ákp . ‘He farms *yet* he is hungry’.  
 (d) Atámi ìche **tòdúle** náðòjímá nwú. ‘He is my father *so* I respect him’.  
 (e) Ì k chábùn mi **todú** kùmá d k nwu ñ. ‘He refused to help me *because* I did not give him money’.  
 (e) Lia **ích un** kì dúw d . ‘Come *if* you are willing’.

- (f) Á jù j un **kákí** d ju. ‘We eat *that* we may live’.  
 (g) Ù liá **ìkò/ gbà** k déjéfù. ‘I came *when* you were inside’.  
 (h) j un ñíni ñ **chái** gbà k fúk l chékpá. ‘You will not eat today *unless* you finish the work’.  
 (i) Òmì wá **gwá** w . ‘I came *before* you’.  
 (j) j n m **tú mí le**. ‘Ojone is better *than* me’.

(Note: to compare two entities in Igala, one is inserted in-between **tùlè**, making it to have the form **tù...le**, with the particle **le** occupying the final position of the sentence, as in above. But where comparison does not involve two entities, this is not required. E.g. Oun/éí/él ny **tùle**. ‘It/this/that is better’).

- (k) Fejúgbiti k’ wa **áludúúkid** ‘Try and come *however* it may be’.

- (l) Ì ch’èluch **tábál -tàbàl** ébì ákp . ‘He is a farmer *nevertheless* he is hungry’.

- (m) **Íí** icheéja, ìmúda che etú. ‘*Though/although* he tried hard, he failed’. (Note that while *though/although* has the sense of ‘reluctant yielding’, *íí* has the sense of ‘yes we know’ in Igala).

- (n) Únyí **úgbó** kùlólú nál d . ‘That is the house *where* I slept yesterday’.

### Correlative Conjunctions

These are conjunctions used in pairs. Though not common in the language, evidence of it still exists. They include:

- | IGALA                                     | ENGLISH         |
|---|-----------------|
| (19) <b>tù...kpàí</b>                     | ‘both...and’    |
| (20) <b>tu...tu</b>                       | ‘neither...nor’ |
| (21) <b>dágba...àb ki (dágba...dágba)</b> | ‘whether...or’  |
| (22) <b>íí... tábál -tàbàl</b>            | ‘though...yet’  |

Sentential examples:

- (46) (a) **Tú** j mà **kpàí** íyeun áwáì. ‘*Both* Ojoma *and* her mother are coming’.  
 (b) **Tu** àtá **tu** ma d m ñ. ‘*Neither* the father *nor* the child is around’. (Note that the particle *ñ* negates this sentence the same way English *nor* does).  
 (c) **Dágba** íj **àb kí** ík , nà ágwíllì la l . ‘*Whether* he likes it *or* not, I will investigate the matter’.  
 (d) **Í-í** icheéja gbalí, **tábál -tàbàl** íché ètu. ‘*Though* he tried hard, *yet* he failed’.

As we have seen in the above data, it is worthy of note to point out here that some of the conjunctions in Igala (belonging to the subordinating and correlative types) have more than one lexeme. This is because they can be used interchangeably in the language.

### Analysing the Data

In this section, the researcher used the translated text of twenty-two conjunctions by the Igala informants, and then read two books (the books of Jonah and

James – representing both the Old and New Testaments) of the Igala Bible painstakingly taking note of the frequency of occurrences of use of those conjunctions. In this analysis, the twenty-two conjunctions which belong to the three main types (coordinating, subordinating and correlative) of conjunctions were further divided and rearranged into subtypes for clarity. The analysis of this is here below recorded vertically in a tabular form, indicating the frequency and the percentage of occurrences of each of the conjunctions.

Table 1: *The frequencies and percentages of occurrences of coordinating, subordinating and correlative conjunctions in the book of Jonah in the Igala Bible.*

COORDINATING				
<i>Sub-types</i>	<i>Conjunctions</i>		<i>Frequency of Occurrences</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<b>Additive</b>	kpàí	and	7	63.64
<b>Alternative</b>	àb ki	or	1	9.09
<b>Adversative</b>	àmáá	but	3	27.27
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>
SUBORDINATING				
<b>Temporal</b>	ùbì (ùbìl )	after	0	0
	tákù ( gwá)	before	0	0
<b>Causal</b>	todú,	for	11	39.29
	todú	because	1	3.57
	todú, todúle (àb l )	so	6	21.43
	kàkíní (kákí)	that	3	10.71
<b>Adversative</b>	tábál -tábàl	yet	0	0
	áludúúkid	however	0	0
	tábál -tábàl	nevertheless	1	3.57
	í-í	though/although	1	3.57
<b>Condition</b>	ích un	if	0	0
	chái	unless	0	0
<b>Comparison</b>	tùlè	than	2	7.14
<b>Time</b>	ìkò ( gbà)	when	2	7.14
<b>Place</b>	ùgbò	where	1	3.57
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>100</b>
CORRELATIVE				
<b>Cumulative</b>	tù...kpàí	both ... and	0	0
<b>Alternative</b>	tù...tù	neither ... nor	2	100
	dágba...àb ki (dágba...dágba)	whether...or	0	0
	í-í ... tábál -tábàl	though ... yet	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>



Table 2: The frequencies and percentages of occurrences of coordinating, subordinating and correlative conjunctions in the book of James in the Igala Bible.

COORDINATING			
Sub-types	Conjunctions	Frequency of Occurrences	Percentage (%)
Additive	kpàí <i>and</i>	19	86.36
Alternative	àb ki <i>or</i>	2	9.09
Adversative	àmáá <i>but</i>	1	4.55
TOTAL		22	100
SUBORDINATING			
Temporal	ùbì, ùbìl <i>after</i>	0	0
	tákù, ( gwá) <i>before</i>	0	0
Causal	todú <i>for</i>	16	36.36
	todú <i>because</i>	2	4.55
	todú, todúle (àb 1 ) <i>so</i>	6	13.64
	kàkíní (kákí) <i>that</i>	6	13.64
Adversative	tábál -tábàl <i>yet</i>	0	0
	áludúúkid <i>however</i>	0	0
	tábál -tábàl <i>nevertheless</i>	0	0
	í-í <i>though/although</i>	0	0
Conditional	ích un <i>if</i>	10	22.73
	cháí, <i>unless</i>	0	0
Comparison	tùlè <i>than</i>	0	0
Time	ìkò ( gbà) <i>when</i>	2	4.55
Place	ùgbò <i>where</i>	2	4.55
TOTAL		44	100
CORRELATIVE			
Cumulative	tù...kpàí <i>both ... and</i>		
Alternative	tù...tù <i>neither ... nor</i>	0	0
	dágba...àb ki (dágba...dágba) <i>whether...or</i>	0	0
	í-í ... tábál -tábàl <i>though ... yet</i>	0	0
TOTAL		0	0

The two tables above provide a panoramic view of the use of conjunctions in Igala. Table 1 contains information on the use of conjunctions in the book of Jonah of the Igala Bible which represents the Old Testament, as carefully surveyed by the researcher. The same is also applicable to Table 2, that is, the book of James which represents the New Testament. Both tables display the number of possible outcomes of the conjunctions used in the two books of the Bible, giving us their frequencies of occurrences and percentages. In table 1 which is the book of Jonah, the total number of the coordinating conjunctions used is 11, the total number of the subordinating conjunctions used is 28, and the total number of the correlative conjunctions used is 2. On the other hand, the total number of the coordinating conjunctions used in Table 2 is 22, then the total number of the subordinating

conjunctions used is 44, and the total number of correlative conjunctions used is 0; in other words, correlative conjunctions were not used in the book of James. Moreover, it is worth pointing out from the tables that the additive coordinating conjunction **kpàí** *and* has more use in Table 2 because its frequency of occurrences is 19 as against 7 in Table 1. Similarly, the causal **todú**, *for* has more use in Table 2, having frequency of occurrences of 16 as against 11 in table 1. Also, the conditional **ích un** *if* is used more in table 2 as its frequency of occurrences is 10 in contrast with 0 in Table 1, and another causal **kàkíní (kákí)** *that* has more use in Table 2 because it has the frequency of occurrences of 6 as against 2 in Table 1. It is then obvious that there is a wide gap in the use of conjunctions between the two books. Why? The reason that could be advanced for this is the style

of writing by the authors of the books. This is true because the two writers lived in different dispensations or generations that spanned a period of hundreds of years.

## Discussion of the Findings

Consequent upon the tables provided above for our analysis, some important and salient discoveries or findings have been made. It has been observed in this study that the additive coordinating conjunction **kpàí** *and* is solely and exclusively used in linking or coordinating two nouns in the language. Table 1 which has fewer use of it (7) as compared to Table 2 (19), is an obvious indication of the direct consequence of the fact that there were more nouns to be coordinated in James than in Jonah. However, when **kpàí** *and* begins a sentence, it loses its coordinating force. In such instances, **kpàí** was never used, but instead other forms like **oún** and **táki** or **táku** were used. Some of the examples of this from the Bible are here cited as follows: (47) **Tak'** la Jihofa ñ wugbo Jona onukeji, kakini, 'And the word of the Lord came unto Jonah the second time, saying', (Jonah 3:1), and (48) **Owñ** takada la j ch kpa ki kakini Ebrahim la k d n' j , **owñ** ma f'e-ele lor' kpakpa ñw owñ. **Taku** ma d' k onuku j . 'And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, *and* it was imputed unto him for righteousness: *and* he was called the Friend of God' (James 2:23). In addition, in both tables, the temporal conjunctions **ùbì** (**ùbìl**) *after* and **tákù**, (**gwá**) *before*, the adversatives **tábál -tábàl** *yet* and **áludúúkid** *however*, the conditional **cháí** *unless*, the cumulative **tù...kpàí** *both ... and*, as well as the alternatives **dágba...àb ki** (**dágba...dágba**) *whether ... or* and **íí ... tábál -tábàl** *though ... yet*, all have zero frequency of occurrences.

After dividing the three main classes of conjunctions (coordinating, subordinating and correlative) into subclasses, it was strikingly but interestingly discovered that some of them that belong to the same class bear the same name in the Igala language. These include the causatives **todú** *for*, **todú** *because* and **todú**, **todúl** (**áb 1**) *so*, and the adversatives **tábál -tábàl** *yet* and **tábál -tábàl** *nevertheless*. Their subsumption into the same class also gives them the advantage of being used interchangeably in the language. Consequently, the **tábál -tábàl** of *yet* is as similar as the **tábál -tábàl** of *nevertheless*, and as such, the two can be considered as one. For example: (49) Ì ch'èluch **tábál -tábàl** ébi ákp . 'He is a farmer *yet/nevertheless* he is hungry'. Similarly, the **todú** of

*for* can also be interchanged with the **todú** of *because*, and can be exemplified thus: (50) Í neke k'unyi ñ **todu** ì ch n àlé. 'He cannot build a house *for/because* he is poor'. However, the **todú**, **todúl** (**áb 1**) of *so* cannot be interchanged with that of *for* and *because* when the speaker actually means *so*. Thus: (51) Àtámi ìche **todúl** nádòjímá nwú. 'He is my father *so* I respect him'. Note that **todú** **todúl** (**áb 1**) *so* can have the sense of 'therefore', 'it is like that' or 'like that' or 'it is true', and 'in order that' or 'in order to'. However, when it has the sense of 'in order that' or 'in order to', it can be interchanged with the **todú** of *because* but not the **todú** of *for*, as in (50) Á jù j un **todú** kád jú. 'We eat *so* (that) we may live' or 'we eat *because* we want to live'. But when it conveys the sense of 'it is true' or 'it is like that', **áb 1** is exclusively used and not **todú**. Furthermore, the two tables have shown clearly that correlative conjunctions are rarely used in Igala. It is only in Table 1 that we recorded the use of one, and that is, **tù...tù** *neither ... nor*, which has the frequency of occurrences of 2. As students of language, we have observed over time that even users or speakers of English in Nigeria rarely use correlative conjunctions both in speech and writing. So, the rarity in the use of correlative conjunctions, one could argue, is not restricted to Igala alone but is perhaps applicable to other Nigerian languages.

## Why Few Conjunctions are Used in Igala

In consonance with our first research question formulated for this study, we want to suggest, at this juncture, the factor responsible for the fewness of conjunctions in Igala, especially in terms of use, as identified by this work. As seen so far from both tables, it is generally obvious that many conjunctions exist in Igala but few are actually used. Some conjunctions belonging to two of the main three types (subordinating and correlatives) were not even used at all in the Igala Bible, or are rarely used in the Igala language. This, of course is true, judging from the evidence provided by our analysis of some conjunctions that had zero frequency of occurrences according to the tables. Why is this so? Lado, as cited by James (188), has this to say concerning an L2 learner: "Those elements that are similar to his native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different will be difficult". James (183) also reports that Levenston, while talking of selective avoidance of difficulty uses the term 'underrepresentation' to explain the fact that learners underrepresent L2 items that are difficult by virtue of being exotic to their L1 and, conversely 'over-indulge' patterns that are similar. In the light of the above, it is

no wonder then that we saw in both tables that the cumulative conjunction (**tù...kpàí** *both ... and*) as well as the alternatives (**tù...tù** *neither ... nor*, **dágba...àb ki** (**dágba...dágba**) *whether ... or* and **í-í ... tábál -tábàl** *though ... yet*) of the correlative are rarely used in the language. In addition, the temporal conjunctions **ùbì** (**ùbìl**) *after* and **tákù** (**gwá**) *before*, the adversatives **tábál -tábàl** *yet* and **áludúúkid** *however*, the conditional **chái** *unless*, are similarly rarely used, according to the tables. This is because these L2 forms or patterns are in a way dissimilar or different in L1, and as such, difficult and selectively avoided.

On the other hand, this study has shown also that those patterns of L2 that are similar in L1 are simple, and therefore 'over-indulged' or overused, thereby making conjunctions few in Igala in terms of use. Thus, the additive, alternative and the adversative of the coordinating conjunctions: **kpàí** *and*, **àb ki** *or* and **àmáá** *but* are frequently used in Igala, as none of them recorded zero frequency of occurrences in the two tables. In the same vein, the causal conjunctions: **todú** *for*, **todúl** *because*, **todú (áb l)** *so*, **kàkíní (kákí)** *that*, the conditional: **ích un** *if*, and the time and place conjunctions: **ìkò** (**gbà**) *when* and **ùgbò** *where*, are frequently used because they all had frequency of occurrences according to both tables. Again, in view of this, James (170) quotes Haugen as saying that "Interlingual identification occurs when speakers equate items in one language with items in another because of their similarities in shape, distribution, or both".

## Points of Differences and Similarities

### ➤ *Points of Differences*

In harmony with our second research question formulated for this research, we now outline some differences in the use of conjunctions between English and Igala that have been identified or discovered by this research. These include the following:

1. As mentioned earlier on, it was observed that when the additive conjunction **kpàí** *and* begins a sentence, it loses its coordinating force, and as such, other forms like **oún** and **táki** or **táku**, which obviously have nothing to do with coordination were used. Conversely, this is not the case in English. According to Leung (14), when the additive coordinator *and* is used at the beginning of a sentence in writing, it introduces something else that the writer wants to add to what he has just said. This means that when *and*

begins a sentence in English, it is still a coordinator and it retains its coordinating force by linking or joining the preceding or former sentence with the present or latter sentence in which it appears.

2. The comparative subordinating conjunction **tùlè** *than*, which has 2 as its frequency of occurrences in Table 1 is not used in Igala the same way it is in English. To compare two entities in Igala, one is inserted in-between **tùlè**, making it to have the form **tù...le**, with the particle **le** occupying the final position of the sentence. This is exemplified thus: (52) **j gban m tú mí le**. 'Ojogbane is better *than* me'. But where comparison does not involve two entities, this is not required, as in (53) **Oùn/éí/él ny tùlè**. 'It/this/that is better'. When *than* is used to compare two entities in English, one is placed before it and the other after it. For example, (54) Abu is more intelligent *than* Femi.

3. The causal subordinating conjunctions: **todú** *for*, **todú** *because* and **todú, todúl (áb l)** *so*, as seen from both tables have the same name in Igala. Perhaps this could be attributable to the fact that they belong to the same category, and perform similar functions semantically and syntactically. In English, even though they belong to the same category as causal conjunctions, and may perform similar functions semantically and syntactically, they have a distinct name: *for*, *because* and *so*.

4. In the alternative correlative conjunction **tù...tù** *neither ... nor*, the particle **ñ** (**ng**) is the negation marker just like the English *nor* but it must be placed at the end of the sentence after each of the alternatives has been mentioned. It is exemplified as follows: (55) **Tù àtá tu ma d m ñ** (**ng**). 'Neither the father *nor* the child is around'. Sometimes, the negation marker **ñ** (**ng**), may be placed at the end of each of the clauses containing the alternatives. Thus: (56) **Tù àtá d m ñ** (**ng**), **tu ma d m ñ** (**ng**). When this is done, the sentence is interpreted as 'The father is not around, the child is not around'. On the other hand, English functions differently. In any alternative correlative sentence in English, one of the alternatives is placed after *neither* and the other after the negation marker *nor*, which never appears at the final position of a sentence. Thus: (57) *Neither* the President *nor* the vice-President was in the meeting.

### ➤ *Points of Similarities*

Once and again, in line with our third research question formulated for this study, we now point out a few similarities which we have hitherto been able to find as a result of this research.

1. As generally observed, conjunctions in Igala perform a linking function in the same way as they do in English. Take, for instance, all the conjunctions used for this study: the additive (**kpàí** *and*), the alternative (**àb kí** *or*) and the adversative (**àmáá** *but*) of the coordinative, the temporal (**ùbì, ùbìl** *after* and **tákù** (**gwá**) *before*), the causal (**todú** *for*, **todú** *because*, **todú, todúl** (**áb l**) *so* and **kàkíní** (**kákí**) *that*), the adversative (**tábál -tàbàl** *yet*, **áludúúkid** *however*, **tábál -tàbàl** *nevertheless* and **í-í** *though/although*), the conditional (**ích un** *if* and **cháí** *unless*), the comparison (**tùlè** *than*), the time (**ìkò** (**gbà**) *when*) and the place (**ùgbò** *where*) of the subordinative, as well as the cumulative (**tù...kpáí** *both ... and*), the alternative (**tù...tù** *neither ... nor*, **dágba...àb ki** (**dágba...dágba**) *whether ... or* and **í-í ... tábál -tàbàl** *though ... yet*) of the correlative, all perform a linking function between two or more entities, phrases, clauses and sentences, except when the additive **kpáí** *and* begins a sentence, as already pointed out.

2. In Igala, the time and place conjunctions **ìkò** (**gbà**) *when* and **ùgbò** *where* can be used as interrogative pronouns (i.e. when they are used to ask questions) and as relative pronouns (i.e. when they are used to make statements), the same way they do in English.

After pointing out the differences and similarities in the use of conjunctions between English and Igala which our study has identified, it was discovered that the differences are more in number than the similarities. This, indeed, has supported our earlier claim that contrastive analysis (CA) is not concerned with classification because the term *contrastive* implies more interest in differences between languages than in their likenesses or similarities.

### Practical and Pedagogical Implication of this Research

From the analysis of the text of twenty-two conjunctions used for this study, as translated by the informants, through which it was found that there are many conjunctions in Igala but few are actually used, has invaluable implications for Igala (language) learners and teachers as well as Igala scholars and linguists. The total number of conjunctions used for this research was only twenty-two, but there are far more than twenty-two conjunctions in English. Therefore, the first task for teachers of Igala and Igala linguists in order to increase the use of more conjunctions in the language is to list all the conjunctions in English and translate them into Igala.

Speaking on translation as a valuable tool in contrastive analysis (CA), James says that “In translation for CA, we ought to equate L1 and L2 forms, no matter how far they diverge superficially, are semantically and pragmatically equivalent” (178). After the translation exercise, the translated text should be carefully examined to ensure that it is devoid of any equivalent error. Then the new conjunctions should be added to the existing curriculum, and the teaching and learning of them should begin immediately in all the primary, secondary and tertiary institutions in Igala land where Igala language is taught as a subject or course. By this, the fewness of conjunctions recorded over the years will be a thing of the past, and this is the dynamic nature of language.

## Summary, conclusion and Recommendations

### Summary of Findings

This research has been based on a contrastive analysis of the use of conjunctions in English and Igala. Its conceptual framework is conjunction(s) while its theoretical framework is contrastive analysis. These were widely reviewed in this study. The conjunction, which is the core concept of the conceptual framework for the study, was effectively and exhaustively treated. It has been asserted that conjunction(s), as a grammatical resource for indicating links within texts, is one of the most important parts of a sentence. In this regard, it acts as glue, drawing attention to and making explicit the logical relationship between propositions. A good understanding of various conjunctions enables us to maintain both ways of communication, i.e. oral and written. In oral discourse, conjunctions aid us to speak in a confident manner by making us to produce coherent sentences if we use them appropriately. In writing on the other hand, a conjunction is very important as improper use of it leads to an incoherent and a disjointed sentence, and can make the readership misunderstand and misinterpret the proposition it connects as either totally unrelated, or relate it in ways unintended by the writer. Conversely, writers who fail to make judicious use of conjunctions leave their readers guessing about the connections between ideas they have presented. In addition, types, structure and functions of conjunctions, the use of conjunctions in logic and in other African languages, and the semantic and pragmatic use of conjunctions, were fully discussed.



Furthermore, contrastive analysis which is the theoretical framework for this study was effectively and exhaustively dealt with. When any aspect (e.g. phonology, grammar or syntax) of any two systems or languages are compared using the tool of contrastive analysis, we see things more clearly ranging from differences and similarities, as well as practical or pedagogical implications that may arise from such study because more light is shed on the two languages compared. We also devoted time to discuss the hypothesis of contrastive analysis. In fact, before this research, a lot of literature on contrastive analysis, most often, makes reference to two versions of the hypothesis of contrastive analysis which are the strong and the weak versions, saying little or nothing about the third which is the moderate version. But this study, through its wide consultation of materials, has been able to at least say something about the moderate version of the hypothesis of CA. Also, previous related empirical studies on contrastive analysis were comprehensively reviewed, and contrastive and comparative analyses were clearly distinguished.

For the methodology, the instrument used for data collection was a text of twenty-two conjunctions in English prepared by the researcher and distributed to the Igala informants who speak the Idah/Igala-mela dialect of the language. Their task was to translate the twenty-two conjunctions from English into Igala. After that, the researcher read two books of the Igala Bible (Jonah and James) and took note of the frequency of appearances of the twenty-two conjunctions as used in the books. This formed our main data which was presented and analysed. Data for English was collected informally from textbooks, articles and journals written by different scholars on conjunctions. Following the data analysis, several findings were made such as differences and similarities between the use of conjunctions in English and Igala, and suggestions were offered as to why conjunctions are small in Igala, among others.

## Conclusion

In this research, attempts have been directed at studying the use of conjunctions in English and Igala through contrastive analysis. Based on the findings as a result of this study, we now make our conclusions.

Firstly, our study established that when an additive coordinating conjunction **kpàí** *and* begins a sentence, it does not perform a linking function between the former and the latter sentence in which it appears. In actual sense, it loses its linking or coordinating force.

Owing to this, the additive conjunction itself is not even mentioned in such a sentence. Rather, we saw that other forms like **oún** and **táki** or **táku** were used in the Igala Bible instead of the additive **kpàí** *and*. Therefore, we conclude that when the additive conjunction **kpàí** *and* begins a sentence in Igala, it loses its coordinating force.

Secondly, our study has established that there is a wide gap between the use of conjunctions in English and Igala at present. From this research, it has been discovered from the two books of the Igala Bible that a good number of some conjunctions had zero frequency of occurrences which implies that they are not used. They include: **ùbì** (**ùbìl**) *after*, **tákù** (**gwá**) *before*, **tábál -tábàl** *yet*, **áludúúkid** *however*, **chái** *unless*, **tù...kpàí** *both ... and*, **dágba...àb ki** (**dágba...dágba**) *whether ... or*, and so on.

## Contribution to Knowledge

This research has proved that there are more conjunctions in Igala but few are actually used. A text of twenty-two conjunctions used for this study as translated by the informants has established this point, and it has valuable practical/pedagogical implications for Igala learners and teachers as well as Igala scholars and linguists. The few conjunctions we have at present are products of L2 forms that are similar in L1, and as such they are simple. These include the coordinating (e.g. the additive **kpàí** *and*, the alternative **àb kí** *or* and the adversative **àmáá** *but*) and few subordinating conjunctions which are frequently used in Igala. The total number of conjunctions used for this research was only twenty-two, but there are far more than twenty-two conjunctions in English.

The first task for teachers of Igala and Igala linguists in order to increase the use of more conjunctions in the language is to list all the conjunctions in English and translate them into Igala. After the translation exercise, the translated text should be carefully examined to ensure that it is devoid of any equivalent error. Then the new conjunctions should be added to the existing curriculum, and the teaching and learning of them can begin immediately in all the primary, secondary and tertiary institutions in Igala land where Igala language is taught as a subject or course.

Furthermore, there have been few contrastive studies carried out on conjunctions either between English and one Nigerian language or between two Nigerian languages generally over the years in Nigeria. Most language scholars believe that conjunctions are few, and as such, there is nothing much to say there.

Therefore, the fact that the researcher has taken a bold step to research into this neglected area of language study makes this study important and insightful, thereby giving it credibility.

### Recommendations for Further Studies

As established by this research, studies on conjunctions have attracted less attention among language scholars in Nigeria in English/Linguistics over the years. This study having taken the lead, the door is now open for further studies on conjunctions. In fact, both graduate and post graduate students in English and Linguistics can use this research as a guide to conduct contrastive studies on the use of conjunctions in English and their own native languages, or in English and any language of their choice or in one Nigerian language and another. Moreover, apart from contrastive studies on the use of conjunctions between one language and another, further studies on conjunctions may include: the use of conjunctions by Nigerian speakers of English, the influence of mother-tongue on the use of conjunctions by Nigerian speakers of English, the use of conjunctions as cohesive devices among Nigerian TV and Radio newscasters, the pragmatic or semantic use of conjunctions among Nigerian sports commentators, the use of conjunctions among the Nigerian football fans, and so forth. Indeed, we can see that studies on conjunctions have been a fertile ground waiting to be tilled by language students and scholars who want to do something new.

### Works cited

Aarts, Bars. *English Syntax and Argumentation*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Palgrave, 2001. Print.

Ahanger, Abbas Ali, Taki, Giti and Rahimi Maryam. "The Use of Conjunctions as Cohesive Devices in Iranian Sport Live Radio and TV Talks" in *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*. Vol. 9, No. 2, 2012. Print.

Aidinlou, Nader Assadi and Reshadi, Elnaz. "A Comparative Study of the Use of Conjunctions and References in Electronic Mails vs. Paper-based Letters" in *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 611-615, 2014. Print.

Akinkugbe, Femi. *An Internal Classification of the Yoruboid Group (Yoruba, I kiri, Igala)*. J.W. A. L.XI, 1-2, 1976. Print.

Al Faki, Ibrahim. "A Contrastive Study in Sentence Construction between English and Nubian Languages in American International Journal of Contemporary Research". Vol. 4, No. 5, May 2014

Amenorvi, Cosmas Rai. "A Comparative Study of Cohesion in English and Ewe: A Case Study of Some Written Texts". M.A Dissertation, University of Cape Coast, 2011. <https://ucc.edu.gh/> accessed on 30<sup>th</sup> August, 2014.

Arokoyo, Bolanle Elizabeth. *A Comparative Phonology of the Olùkùmi, Igala, Owe and Yoruba Languages*. University of Ilorin, 2012. Print.

Arthur, Tom Mc. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language (Cambridge Edition)*. Oxford University Press. 1996. Print.

Atadoga, Francis Tijani. "Igala Morphology" In Omachonu, GS (eds) *Igala Language Studies*. 76-102, LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, Berlin. 2011. Print.

Baskervill, W. M. and Sewell, J. W. "An English Grammar". 1896. <http://classclit.about.com/library> accessed on 1st August, 2015.

Bayraktaro lu, Sinan. *Trends in Applied Linguistics and Language Learning: Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Interlanguage*. Be eri Bilimler, Vol. 6, 1978. Print.

Behfrouz, Behnam and Joghataee, Ameneh. "A Critical Survey of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis in a Multilingual (Persian, Turkish and English Context) Community" in *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*. Vol. 8 (11): 1870-1873, 2014. Print.

Burton- Roberts, Noel. *Analysing Sentences: An Introduction to English Syntax, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*. London: Pearson Education Limited, 2011. Print.

Carnie, Andrew. *Syntax: A Generative Introduction, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 2007. Print.

Close, R. A. *A Reference Grammar for Students of English*. Longman Group Ltd. 1975. Print.

Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008. Print.

Dzameshie, Alex K. "Structures of Coordination in Ewe" in *Journal of of Africal Languages*. University of Ghana, Legon.

Eckhard-Black, Christine. *Cassel Language Guides (German): A Handbook of Grammar, Current Usage and Words*, British Library Cataloguing-in-publication Data. 1992. Print.

Eniyemamwen, Odiase Faith. "A Contrastive Analysis of the Verbal Systems of Bini and English Languages: Implications for Curriculum Development" Unpublished M.A Dissertation, Faculty of Education, University of Jos. 2006. Print.

- Filha, Maria Carmelia Machado. *A Study in Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis: Article Usage in English and Portuguese*. University of Santa Catarina. 1997. Print.
- Finch, Geoffrey. *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. Palgrave Macmillan. 2000. Print.
- Garcés, Carmen Valero. *Some Pedagogical and Practical Implications of Contrastive Studies in ELT*. RESLA, 13 (1998-99), 27-36. Print.
- Haliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, Ruqaiya. *Cohesion in English*. Longman Group Limited. 1976. Print.
- Hoa, Nguyen Thi. *A Contrastive Study of Grammatical Cohesive Devices in English and Vietnamese*. Ho Chi Minh City University of Education. 2011. Print.
- Huddleston, Rodney. *English Grammar: An Outline*. Cambridge University Press. 1988. Print.
- Ibiowotisi, Raphael Idowu. "An Error Analysis of Written Composition of Igbo Students in Secondary Schools". M.A Dissertation, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. 2010. [http://naulibrary.org/dglibrary/admin/book\\_directory/Thesis/9937](http://naulibrary.org/dglibrary/admin/book_directory/Thesis/9937) accessed on 23rd May, 2015.
- James, Carl. *Contrastive Analysis*. London: Longman, 1980. Print
- Johansson, Stig. *Contrastive Analysis and Learner Language: A Corpus-based Approach*. University of Oslo, 2008. Print
- Jowitt, David. *English Language and Literature in Historical Context*. Spectrum Books Limited. 2009. Print.
- Ketabi, Saeed "A Corpus-based Study of Conjunction Devices in English International Law Texts and its Farsi Translation" in *International Journal of Linguistics*. Vol. 4, No. 4. 2012. Print.
- Kirkpatrick, Betty. *Better English*. Polskabook. 2007. Print.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Svartvik, Jan. *A Communicative Grammar of English* 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. London: Longman. 1994. Print.
- Lester, Mark. *Grammar in the Classroom*. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York. 1990. Print.
- Leung, Carrie. *A Comparison of the Use of Major English Conjunctions by American and Hong Kong University Students*. LUNDS Universitet. 2005. Print.
- Liu, Lida and Qi, Xiukun "A Contrastive Study of Textual Cohesion and Coherence Errors in Chinese EFL Abstract Writing in Engineering Discourse" in *Intercultural Communication Studies XIX*. 2010. Print.
- Malmkj r, Kirksten. *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. Routledge, London and New York. 1991. Print.
- McClure, Erica and Steffenson, Margaret S. *A Study of the Use of Conjunctions across Grades and Ethnic Groups*. University of Illinois. 1980. Print.
- Murthy, J. D. *Contemporary Grammar of English*. Book MASTER. 2007. Print.
- Negedu, Isaiah Adujo. "The Igala Traditional Religious Belief Systems: Between Monotheism and Polytheism" in *Ogirisi: a new journal of African Studies*. Vol. 10, 2003. Print.
- Omachonu, Gideon Sunday. "Igala Language Studies and Development: Progress, Issues and Challenges" *Being the text of a paper presented at the 12<sup>th</sup> Igala Education Summit held at Kogi State University Anyigba – Kogi State, Nigeria*. 28<sup>th</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> December, 2012. Print.
- Omachonu, Gideon Sunday. "Igala Language Studies: Progress, Issues and Challenges" In Omachonu, Gideon Sunday (eds) *Igala Language Studies*. 15-45, LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, Berlin. 2011. Print.
- Omosowe, Juba and Akindolire, Nelson. *Comprehensive English Language*. Johnson Publishers Limited. 1997. Print.
- takada la j* The Bible in Igala. The Bible Society of Nigeria, United Bible Societies. 1970. Print.
- Post, Margje. "A Contrastive Analysis of Russian and Norwegian Utterance-initial Coordinating Conjunctions" in *Oslo Studies in Language*. 2(2), 210. 412-432, University of Bergen. 2010. Print.
- Quirk, Randolph and Sidney Greenbaum. *A University Grammar of English*. London: Pearson Education Limited, 2004. Print.
- Sanders, T. and Maat, Pander H. "Cohesion and Coherence: Linguistic Approach". Utrecht University, Netherlands. Elsevier Limited. 2006. [http://www.hum.uu.nl/.../h.l.w.pandermaat/coherence\\_doc/](http://www.hum.uu.nl/.../h.l.w.pandermaat/coherence_doc/) accessed on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2014.
- Sahebkhair, Farnaz and Aidinlou, Nader Asadi. "The Role of Explicit Instruction on Using Conjunctions in Iranian EFL Learners' Written Performance" in *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. 2(2), pp.121-126. 2014. Print.
- Sayah, Leila and Fatemi, Asar Hosseini. "The Role of Conjunctions in EFL Learners' Narrative Development" in *International Journal of Education*. Vol. 1, No. 11. November, 2013. Print.
- Schleppe rell, Mary J. "Conjunctions in Spoken English and ESL Writing" in *Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 17, No. 3. Oxford University Press. 1996. Print.

- Siddiqui, Fareed. "Importance of Conjunctions in Business English Communication". 2014. <http://fareedsiddiqui.expertscolumn.com/> accessed on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2014.
- Silva, Lúcia de Freitas. *Grammar Study – Conditional Sentences/If Clauses*. REDE VALORIZAR
- Wilton, Dave. "A (Very) Brief History of the English Language". January 15, 2001. <http://www.wordorigins.org/index.php/> accessed on 1<sup>st</sup> June, 2015.
- Yang, Byung-gon. *A Review of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis*. Vol. 2, pp. 133-149. 1992. Print.
- Zawahreh, Firas Ali Suleiman. "A Linguistic Contrastive Analysis Case Study: Out of Context Translation of Arabic Adjectives into English in EFL Classroom" in *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. Vol. 3, No. 2. 2013. Print.

## APPENDIX I

### TRANSLATION EXERCISE: FROM ENGLISH INTO IGALA

- | English                 | Igala |
|-------------------------|-------|
| <b>1. Coordinating</b>  |       |
| 1. and                  |       |
| 2. but                  |       |
| 3. or                   |       |
| <b>2. Subordinating</b> |       |
| 4. after                |       |
| 5. for                  |       |
| 6. yet                  |       |
| 7. so                   |       |
| 8. because              |       |
| 9. if                   |       |
| 10. that                |       |
| 11. when                |       |
| 12. unless              |       |
| 13. before              |       |
| 14. than                |       |
| 15. however             |       |
| 16. nevertheless        |       |
| 17. though/although     |       |
| 18. where               |       |
| <b>3. Correlative</b>   |       |
| 19. both ... and        |       |
| 20. neither ... nor     |       |
| 21. whether ... or      |       |
| 22. though ... yet      |       |



**APPENDIX II**

**THE TRANSLATED TEXT OF CONJUNCTIONS FROM ENGLISH TO IGALA BY THE IGALA INFORMANTS**

<b>English</b>	<b>Igala</b>
<b>1. Coordinating</b>	
2. and	kpàí
3. but	àmáá
4. or	àb kí
<b>3. Subordinating</b>	
4. after	ùbì (ùbil )
5. for	tòdú
6. yet	tábál (tábál -tàbàl )
7. so	tòdú (tòdúl ) àb 1
8. because	todú
9. if	ích un
10. that	kàkíní kàkí
11. when	ìkò ( gbà)
12. unless	chái
13. before	tákù ( gwá)
14. than	tùlè
15. however	áludúúkìd
16. nevertheless	tábál -tàbàl
17. though/although	íí
18. where	úgbó
<b>4. Correlative</b>	
5. both ... and	tù...kpàí
6. neither ... nor	tu...tu
7. whether ... or	dágba...àb ki (dágba...dágba)
8. though ... yet	íí... tábál -tàbàl

<b>Access this Article in Online</b>	
	Website: <a href="http://www.ijarm.com" style="color: blue;">www.ijarm.com</a>
<b>Quick Response Code</b>	Subject: <a href="http://www.ijarm.com" style="color: blue;">Education</a>
DOI: <a href="https://doi.org/10.22192/ijamr.2017.04.08.006" style="color: blue;">10.22192/ijamr.2017.04.08.006</a>	

How to cite this article:

Unubi, Sunday Abraham. (2017). The use of conjunctions in English and Igala: A contrastive analysis. Int. J. Adv. Multidiscip. Res. 4(8): 34-62.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijamr.2017.04.08.006>