A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LEXICAL TERMS IN SANGH-GAMI AND SANGH GHSHI DIALECTS OF (ZAAR) SAYAWA COMMUNITIES OF BAUCHI STATE

BY

SIMON TIMOTHY
BA English Language, UNIMAID, 2004
MA/ARTS/22239/2012-2013

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUTE STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES
FACULTY OF ARTS
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA, NIGERIA

MAY, 2018

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation entitled **"A Comparative Study of Lexical Terms in Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi Dialects of (Zaar) Sayawa Communities of Bauchi State"** has been carried out by me. The information derived from relevant literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this dissertation was previously presented for another degree or diploma at this or any other institution.

_____ _____

Simon Timothy Date & Signature

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled: **"A Comparative Study of Lexical Terms in Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi Dialects of (Zaar) Sayawa Communities of Bauchi State"** by Simon Timothy, meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Master of Arts in English Language, from the Department of English and Literary Studies of the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

_____	_____
Dr. Jonah E. Amodu (Chairman, Supervisory Committee)	**Date**
_____	_____
Dr. Isyaku Saminu (Member, Supervisory Committee)	**Date**
_____	_____
Prof. T. Y. Surakat (Head of Department)	**Date**
_____	_____
Prof. Sadiq Zubairu Abubakar (Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies)	**Date**

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my beloved wife and children for their prayers and courage and support despite all odds and challenges, you all ensured I never gave up.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my immense gratitude to God Almighty for his benevolence and care for, the gift of Salvation, wisdom and Knowledge and the courage to start this academic journey; God, I will ever remain grateful to you.

I am grateful to my major supervisor, Dr. Jonah E. Amodu for their wealth of experience, invaluable help, guide, advice and thoughtful suggestions, without which this research work wouldn't have been complete. I am also grateful to my second reader, Dr. Saminu Isyaku, I cannot forget your words of encouragement; "to always keep writing".

Prof. T. Y. Surakat, Prof. Sadiq G., Dr. Ahmed, Dr. A. Mansur, Dr. Hauwa M. Sani; these are icons that cannot be forgotten for the marks they have created in my lives and indeed the academia. What can one say about Prof. Gani-Ikilama (Mama), the valuable word to use effectively is to say thank you.

My dear wife, I sincerely appreciate your courage, patience and moral support despite all odds. To my children, I love you all for being there to welcome me back from Zaria, I say thank you. To the rest of my family, most especially Haruna and Nehemiah, you have always been there for me, I cannot thank you enough.

I am also grateful to my friends and well-wishers, May God almighty bless you richly.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Babangida Yarima, Mr. Dauda I. Atang, Alhaji Dahiru, Mal. Adamu Abbas, Mr. Babangida Danladi just to mention but a few. I thank the government of Bauchi State through Abubakar Tatari Ali Polytechnic for using TETFUND allocation to support me during this programme.

To my Pastors too numerous to mention your names, your prayers elderly advices are well appreciated.

To the entire Zaar (Sayawa) community especially those who were patient enough to listen to me as I engaged them in discussions that brought this research work to the limelight, thank you all and may this research work benefit the entire Zaar land and be useful to humanity in general.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.5.6.2.1a: Zaar (Sayawa) Language Consonant Chart (Bernard Caron 2005) …….64

Table 2.5.6.2.1b: Examples of Zaar (Sayawa) words are given for each sound…. ……64

Table 2.5.6.2.2a: Zaar (Sayawa Vowel Chart) Bernard Caron 2005…. …. ……65

Table 2.5.6.2.2b: Sample of Words for the Vowel Sounds in Zaar (Bernard Caron 2005).65

Table 4.3.1: Respondents' reply on the dialect they speak…. …. …. ……92

Table 4.3.2 Lexico-Statistical Wordlist in the two Dialects…. …. …. ……93

Table 4.5.1: Lexical Items Differences Autography, Pronunciation but same Meaning..94

Table 4.5.2 Demonstrative Pronounce in Zaar (Sayawa) Language…. …. ……97

Table 4.5.3 Lexical Expansion and Narrowing…. …. …. …. ……99

Table 4.6.1 Formation of Plural Nouns in Sangh-Gami and Sangh-Ghshi Dialects ….100

Table 4.6.2 Plural Formation in both Dialects where (a) is Substituted with (ə) ……101

Table 4.6.3 Plural Formation in General Zaar Language for Plural Nouns…. ….…102

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page … … … … … … … … … … ….....ii

Declaration … … … … … … … … … … ….....iii

Certification … … … … … … … … … …….iv

Dedication … … … … … … … … … …….v

Acknowledgements … … … … … … … … …….vi

List of Tables … … … … … … … …. … ……viii

Table of Contents … … … … … … … … ……....ix

Abstract … … … … … … … … … ….....xiii

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1: Background to the Study… … … … … … … … 1

1.2: Zaar (Sayawa) People and Language… … … … … … … 2

1.3: Statement of the Problem… … … … … … … … 4

1.4: Research Questions… … … … … … … … 5

1.5: Aim and Objectives…… … … … … … … …. 6

1.6: Justification for the Study… … … … … … … … 6

1.7: Scope and Delimitation… … … … … … … … 7

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEWAND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0: Preamble… … … … … … … … …. …. 9

2.1: Conceptual Review… … … … … … … … …. 9

2.2: Concept of Language… … … … … … … … 9

2.2.1: Language and Society… … … … … … … …. 17

2.2.2: Language and Ethnic Group… … … … … … … 18

2.2.3: Distinction between a Language and a Dialect… … … … … 19

2.3: Varieties of Language… … … … … … … … 21

2.3.1: Sociolect… … … … … … … … …. …. 21

2.3.2: Regiolect… … … … … … … … …. …. 23

2.3.3: Idiolect… … … … … … … … …. …. 25

2.4: The Concept of Sociolinguistics… … … … … … … 26

2.4.1: Speech Communities… … … … … … … … 31

2.4.2: The Sociolinguistic Concept of Standardization… … … … … 35

2.5: The Sociolinguistic Concept of Dialect… … … … … … 35

2.5.1: Standard and Non-Standard Dialect… … … … … … 38

2.5.2: Historical Survey of Dialect… … … … … … … 38

2.5.3: Types of Dialects… … … … … … … … …. 40

2.5.3.1: Ethnic/Rural Dialects… … … … … … … … 40

2.5.4: Factors Responsible for the Development of Dialects… … … … 42

2.5.4.1: Migration… … … … … … … … …. …. 42

2.5.4.2: Physical or Geographical Factor… … … … … … … 42

2.5.4.3: Social Factor… … … … … … … … …. 43

2.5.4.4: Culture… … … … … … … … …. …. 44

2.5.4.5: Sex Differentiation…… … … … … … … …. 44

2.5.4.6: Age Differentiation… … … … … … … … 45

2.5.4.7: Convergences and Divergences… … … … … … … 45

2.5.4.8: Mutual Intelligibility… … … … … … … … 46

2.5.5: Dialectology… … … … … … … … …. 49

2.5.5.1: Diglossia… … … … … … … … …. …. 50

2.5.5.2: Isoglosses and Dialect Boundaries… … … … … … 54

2.5.5.3: Dialect Continuum…… … … … … … … … …. 56

2.5.6: Variations of Dialectology… … … … … … … … 57

2.5.6.1: Lexis and Lexical Variations… … … … … … … 57

2.5.6.2: Phonology and the Phonological Variations… … … … … 60

2.5.6.2: The Phonology of Zaar (Sayawa) … … … … … … … 64

2.5.6.3: Grammatical Variations… … … … … … … … 66

2.6: Review of Previous Studies… … … … … … … 66

2.7: Theoretical Framework… … … … … … … … 82

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0: Preamble… … … … … … … … …. …. 85

3.1: Research Design… … … … … … … … …. 85

3.2: Source of Data… … … … … … … … …. 85

3.3: Questionnaire/Interview… … … … … … … … 86

3.4: Secondary Sources of Data… … … … … … … … 86

3.5: Data Collection Instrument/Tools… … … … … … … 86

3.5.1: Face to face Interviews… … … … … … … … 87

3.5.2: Questionnaire Administration… … … … … … … 88

3.6: Sampling Population and Sampling Techniques… … … … … 88

3.6.1: Respondents Sampling and Selecting Procedure… … … … … 89

3.7: Validity and Reliability of Research Instrument… … … … … 89

3.8: Pilot Testing… … … … … … … … …. 90

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1: Introduction…… … … … … … … …. …. 91

4.2: Data Presentation and Analysis… … … … … … … 92

4.3: Language Spoken… … … … … … … … …. 92

4.5: Lexical Items with Complete Different Forms… … … … … 94

4.6: Plural Nouns formation in Zaar… … … … … … … 99

4.7: Findings… … … … … … … … …. …. 102

4.8: Discussion of Findings… … … … … … … … 104

4.9: The Implications of the Findings… … … … … … … 107

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1: Preamble… … … … … … … … …. …. 109

5.2: Summary… … … … … … … … …. …. 109

5.3: Conclusion… … … … … … … … …. …. 110

5.4: Suggestions for Further Research… … … … … … … 110

REFERENCES… … … … … … … … …. …. 112

APPENDICES… … … … … … … … …. …. 119

Appendix I… … … … … … … … …. …. …. 119

Appendix II…… … … … … … … …. …. …. 120

Appendix III… … … … … … … … …. …. 124

Appendix IV… … … … … … … … …. …. 125

ABSTRACT

Language is a living entity that is always in constant change. It develops changes, undergoes modernisation and vanishes. In every language, there are items that die out and others develop by using different strategies or devices of word formation, such as derivation, to express the modern needs of a particular language community (Handhal 1998). The purpose of this research is to comparatively examine the lexical variations in Sang-ghshi and Sang-gami dialects of the Zaar (Sayawa) language with a view of analysing the areas of convergences and divergences between the two dialects. The study analyses those differences which are prominent in the dialects and also examines if these differences are capable of hindering communication among the speakers of these dialects. The study adopts an eclectic approach by combining the generative dialectology approach to the study of dialects and a comparative analysis to the study of lexical items. One hundred questionnaires were administered to native speakers of the two dialects in which one hundred lexical items were written and two columns were provided, one for each dialect. Other methods such as interview and observations were employed in data collection. The result from the study reveals some lexical and phonological differences found in the dialects. It also reveals some reasons for the variations such as geographical features like rivers, mountains, migration and general distance. The findings further reveal that Sangh-ghshi dialect is frequently used in organised gathering such as religious or political, as a result of its larger population as well as the fact that it is more acceptable by the people and their neighbouring ethnic groups given it is also simplified and easy to learn by non speakers of Zaar than the Sangh-gami dialect. Most traditional songs and Radio programmes or presentations are conveniently presented in Sangh-ghshi dialect. Prominent literature like the Bible, Zaar (Sayawa) dictionary are written in Sangh-ghshi dialect because of the reasons given above. In the mids all this, the dialects of the study are still mutually intelligible among the speakers', despite the differences in the lexis and phonology of the language, these dialects can be identified and are distinct from other Zarr (Sayawa) dialects. The research concludes that the two speech forms are mutually intelligible and the dialects are of the same language and cannot be passed as separate languages.

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Every language that is spoken over significant area is spoken in somewhat different forms in different places; these are its regional dialects. Besides, even in a single community, a language may be spoken written differently by members of different social groups. This is to say that, no human language is fixed, uniform, or unvarying; all languages show internal variation. The actual usage varies from group to group and from speaker to speaker, in terms of pronunciation, choice of words, meanings or semantics, and syntactic constructions. The differences found within a language can be mutually intelligible among the speakers of the language. If they are mutually intelligible, the speakers consider themselves speaking different dialects of the same language but when the differences are not mutually intelligible among the speakers, it is obvious that they are speaking different languages.

A language, whether spoken or written, plays the role of communicating of ideas, knowledge, experience s and thoughts of individuals. Scholars such as Dittmar (1976:9) define language as "that variety of a speech community that is legitimized and institutionalised as a superior regional method of communication as a result of socio political process." Similarly, Gumpers (1962) is of the view that Language is a body of verbal signs abstracted from the totality of communicative behaviour on the basis of certain structural or genetic consideration.

A dialect is a distinct form of a language which is either regional or social in origin and differentiated from other forms of the language by specific linguistic features. Variations

which are found in a language and are peculiar to particular speech form of people living in a speech community are known as dialects. In this research, efforts are made to examine the speech forms of a particular language with regards to Zaar (Sayawa) which is spoken among the Zaar (Sayawa) people. The research is based on the fact that certain variations are found in the speech forms of the language because; the speakers live in different environments. They also interact and socialise in different contexts for different purposes. The work sets out to study the Sangh-ghshi and Sangh-gami speech forms of Zaar (Sayawa) language spoken in Southern part of Bauchi State, Nigeria.

1.2 Zaar (Sayawa) People and Language

The Sangh (Sayawa) ethnic group inhabits Bogoro Local Government Area and a major part of Lere District of Tafawa Balewa Local Government in Bauchi State of Nigeria. In 1990 Bernard Caron in his book: *The /Za:r/ Dictionary and Grammar* asserts that:

> in the north of Nigeria on the trail of Zaar, a language that was numerically the most important of the group of Chadic languages about which previously little was known. Though this group of people are said to have migrated from Lake Chad area, they have lived in their present location for centuries. It is speculated that their migration from the East to the present location was in search of security and farmland. This is because they were and are still known for their farming and hunting activities (Caron, 1990).

The people call themselves Sangh. However, the Hausas call them Sayawa. The name Sangh is said to have come from the word "saghad" meaning "wise". It is the name Sangh that was corrupted by the Hausas when they came in contact with them. It was first corrupted to "Saghawa" which later metamorphosed to "Sayawa". And since then, it has become the official name by which the Sangh people are called and identified as a tribe.

Geographically, those Sangh (Sayawa) from the western part of Tafawa Balewa and Bogoro Local Government areas are referred to as Sangh-Gami whereas those from the eastern part of Bogoro are referred to as Sangh-Ghshi. Some sections of the Sayawa people refer to Zaar' as the tribe's name as against Sangh, their claim is based on the assertion that the Sayawa people are known for hospitality, kindness and goodwill. The claim of hospitality, good gesture and kindness is not historical. The terms are relative and not absolute, therefore, cannot be said to be an exclusive distinguishing characteristics of a particular group of people or tribes. 'Zaar' in Sangh (Sayawa) language refers to 'human beings' or 'universal human race'. It therefore means that Ngas, Jhar, Hausa, Fulani, Pyem and so on are also 'Zaar' i.e. human beings. If the original name of the Saghn (Sayawa) people were 'Zaar', the Hausas were likely to have referred to them as 'Zarawa'. This is because the word Zaar is not difficult to pronounce or write.

The Zaar (Sayawa) people are an ethno linguistic group that primarily inhabits southern part of Bauchi State: kindred groups can be found in Kaduna, Adamawa and Taraba States respectively. The Zaar (Sayawa) speakers are the second largest ethnic group in Bauchi State and the native speakers occupy two Local Government Areas in the Southern part. The population of Zaar (Sayaw) people (National Population Census, 2006) is 1,242,357. They occupy area of land which lies to the extreme south of Bauchi and West towards lower plateau.

So, this study focuses on variations in Nigerian languages with respect to Zaar (Sayawa), which is mainly spoken in the North East of Nigeria and in the Southern part of Bauchi State specifically. Other States where the language is spoken in pockets are; Kubau and Lere local governments in Kaduna State, Taraba and Adamawa States.

The two dialects under study are the major dialects of (Zaar- Sayawa) language. One is Sangh-ghshi and the other is Sangh-gami dialects. These dialects are spoken widely other than other dialects such as Sara, Num, Zakshi, Gambar, Tungri, Sigdi and Kal respectively; hence the study centred on the two above because of their popularity even among none Zaar (Sayawa) speakers within the neighbouring ethnic groups. Furthermore, Sangh-ghshi has some pockets of written materials and has more spoken population followed by Sangh-gami dialect.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

A comparative study into dialects of either same or different language plays a great role in the development of other languages. A comparative study of the dialects of Sayawa Language which are Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi conflict at the regional base and also have some neighbouring communities between them, where other dialects of Zaar (Sayawa) are spoken. In the dialects under study, notable linguistic differences are observed in both the words and phonology. The codification of Sangh-ghshi dialect contributed immensely to the variation found in the two dialects. The Sangh-ghshi dialect is mostly used in the media, politics and social gathering of the community, and neglecting the other dialects, which is not widely understood by populates of the neighbouring communities. As a result of this, the native speakers of this dialect are focused to learn or acquire the major dialect in order to relate and be informed. It is against this backdrop that the study intends to justify the facts on the lexical and phonological variations between the dialects of Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi and to indicate how it helps speakers of both dialects understand themselves, with also the possibility of developing one of the minority dialects.

However, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, very few studies have been carried out on how the resemblances or differences of the two dialects manifest in their daily activities. Therefore, this research identifies those differences and difficulties faced by Sangh-ghshi conversing with Sangh-gami daily with these differences in lexis and phonology of these speech forms which have also affected the younger generation (especially born and brought up outside Zaar (Sayawa) community); most of such youth find it difficult to identify which variety is being spoken at any particular time. These difficulties call for an examination of the two speech forms with a view to ascertaining whether they are dialects of the same language or whether they are distinct languages.

1.4 Research Questions

The study therefore hopes to investigate the interplay in the use of Sangh-gami and Sangh-gshi dialects of Sayawa language in Bauchi State illuminating Sociolinguistic situation in this multilingual setting. Therefore, this study seeks to respond to this problem by stimulating and deepening further studies and analysis into development of these dialects for overall growth of Zaar (Sayawa) speech community by asking the following questions:

i. What is the level of mutual intelligibility among the speakers of the two dialects?
ii. How are the speech forms different in lexis and phonology?
iii. What are the factors responsible for the diversity?
iv. To what extend can the two dialects be proved that they originate from same or different languages?

1.5 Aim and Objectives

The research is generally aimed at identifying the areas of differences that exist between Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi in Zaar language. Specifically, the following objectives of this research to:

i. examine the level of mutual intelligibility in the two dialect varieties;
ii. analyse the lexical and phonological variation in the two speech forms;
iii. ascertain the reasons for the variation in the speech forms; and
iv. show whether or not the speech forms are dialects of the same language.

1.6 Justification for the Study

The scientific importance to this study is to gain an understanding of the linguistic processes in relation to other relevant factors responsible for language variety (dialects) and mode of behaviours. This is in order to improve on both linguistic and sociolinguistic theories to further have detail knowledge of the sociolinguistic situation in (Zaar) Sayawa language community which would help in social and pedagogical; decision-making.

Secondly, the general need is to offer critical comments as well as have an insight in furtherance of the continuing theoretical discourse on linguistic differentiation in Nigeria. Furthermore, the specific need is to investigate and subsequently report on various aspect of existing dialect differentiation within ethno-linguistic communities of Bauchi State.

The choice of Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi are because, to a large extent, no study has being carried out on comparing their phonology. Again, lexis and phonology are strong signifies of forms that is why the investigation focuses on them. Variations can also hinder oraid

understanding and a number of these variations can be found in the two speech forms selected for this study.

Furthermore, this research is justified by the need to appraise the degree to which people within the selected communities use different dialectal varieties in relation to other prevalent languages of wider communication. It has been widely accepted that such languages of wider communication, wherever they occur often serve as valuable communication bridges. Hence, there is the need to include such languages of wider communication within the scope of the study language used within the communities in question.

1.7 Scope and Delimitation

This research is restricted to the issue of dialect inter-comprehension and intelligibility in two selected ethno-linguistic communities in Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi of Zaar (Sayawa) in Bauchi State, bringing out the similarities and differences that exist between them. The research is focused on the lexical aspect not minding the grammatical aspect of it. The two regions covered for the research are:

- Marti community (Sangh gami) in Tafawa Balewa local government area.
- Mwari community (Sangh ghshi) in Bogoro Local Government Area, with concentration on the sociolinguistic aspect.

The choice of these communities in preference to other ones is based on the following basic considerations; first the dialect variety spoken within each community has some peculiarities, the first has no written identity in any of the very few available literatures in Zaar (Sayawa) language. The second dialect has some pockets of written materials and this makes it have an

edge over Sangh-gami, therefore, it is said to be near standard because of its acceptability and wide coverage. However, the two dialects share many formal linguistic and socio-linguistic features in common. Secondly, speakers in each community lay claim of common tradition, common origin and pattern of population dispersal from a common ancestral home. Finally, each of them exhibit intra-cultural similarities, especially with respect to songs, folk tales, food, and politics, social and religious affiliation.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEWAND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Preamble

This chapter reviews other works that are related to this research. The chapter is divided into three parts; the first presents a review of related literature conceptually, the second focuses on the previous studies done in the area while the third centres on the theoretical framework, followed by a chapter summary.

2.1 Conceptual Review

This part reviews various related topics that range from Sociolinguistics, the concept of Language and society, Dialectology, Sociolinguistic concept of Dialect, Regiolect, Idiolect, Isoglossses, Mutual intelligibility, Standardization, and Speech communities and few other areas worthy of consideration.

2.2 Concept of Language

Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols. Sapir (1921) There are two terms in this definition that calls for discussion: human and non-instinctive. Language, as Sapir rightly pointed out, is human. Only human's posses' language and all normal human being uniformly possess it. Animals do have a communicative system but it is not a developed system. That is why language is said to be species-specific and species uniform. Also,

language does not pass from a parent to a child. In this sense, it is non-instinctive. A child has to learn the language of the society he/she is placed in.

Syal and Jindal (2008: 3) states that "everybody knows the answer to this question but nobody has so far been able to come out with any standard definition that fully explain the term language". Syal and Jindal (ibid) language is a very important form of communication between human that is difficult to think of a society without language. Firdaus (2014) opines that the existence of language cannot be separated from human life, even though it is obvious that all activities related to interaction among people necessitate a language. According to him, language is the most valuable asset of any society and members of a community understand each other through the use of language. For O'Grady and Dobrosvolky (1989: 1) "language is many things; it can be a system of communication, a medium for expression, a matter for political disagreement and a catalyst for nation building". According to Brooks and Warren (1972), language is the most important means of communication in the human society, and man is regarded as the animal with language, the symbol-making animal.

Hall (1969) opines that "language is the institution whereby humans communicate and interact with each other by means of habitually used oral-auditory arbitrary symbols". This definition rightly gives more prominence to the fact that language is primarily speech produced by oral-auditory symbols. A speaker produces some string of oral sounds that get conveyed through the air to the listener who through his hearing organs, receives the sound wave conveys these to the brain that interprets these symbols to arrive at a meaning. Furthermore, Hall In (1978) sees language as "the institution whereby human communicate and interact with each other by means of habitually used oral auditory arbitrary symbols."

Implied in Hall's definition is the fact that language is a conglomeration of different social groups' needs or desires using conventional and arbitrary sounds to communicate.

Matthews (2007), define language as "a phenomenon of vocal and written communication among human beings generally." According to Bloch and Trager (1942) "a language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperate" communication".

Gimson (1980:4-5) describes language as:

> a system of conventional symbols used for communication by a community, the pattern of conventions covers a system of significant sound units, the inflection and the arrangement of words and the association of meaning with words.

The Zaar language used a conventional sound system for communication in its community, but most of its sounds and lexical terms can have more than one meaning which can be differentiated by the context of discussion. The lexical term 'mirr' is a good example; it means 'pomade' or 'thief', therefore, the arrangement of words does not affect Zaar (Sayawa) language. Similarly, to this the definition of language by Osisanwo (2008:1):

> Language is a human vocal noise or the arbitrary graphic representation of this noise, used systematically and conventionally by members of a speech community for the purpose of communication.

Both definitions above prominently point out that language is a system. Sounds join together to form words according to a system. These definitions are therefore preferred in the light of the topic considered for this research for the simple fact that it covers the aspect of language as a system comprising Lexicon, Syntax, Semantics as well as the role of language use by individuals in speech community, therefore the above definition is considered as a working

definition for this research. Language exist in every society of the world, however language use is controlled by situations and circumstances surrounding the event of discussion which make individuals to speak either in a formal or informal way based on the situation at hand. It gives man the ability to express himself properly in his society or community in which he belongs. Language is flexible in nature and it changes… as the needs of users change in order to adequately meet the various needs of users.

There are a number of properties of human language that differentiate it from other forms of language e.g. animals and birds of the air. These properties are displacement, arbitrariness, productivity, cultural transmission, discreteness and quality (Lyons, J, 1981). Human beings are quite unique and different from other creatures that communicate one to another; there has not been any change or development of speech since creation in birds and animal's communities or societies. These creatures too have their system of communication but their communication is limited to a very small number of messages, e.g. hunger, and thirst, fear and anger (Darwin, C., & Prodger, P., 1998). Zaar (Sayawa) language being one of the human languages is creative and accepts changes in time and space, new words are created because of the new inventions scientifically and the general human development.

The social structures that determine linguistics is the choice of words and even rules for conversations are in fact determined by certain social requirements. Alternatively, linguistic structures or behaviours may either influence or determine social structure which leads to language variety. If one thinks of 'language' as a phenomenon including all the languages of the world, the term "variety of language" can be used to refer to different manifestation of it, what makes one variety of language different from another is the linguistic items that it

includes in its lexicon and so on. Hudson (2001:27) defines variety of language as "a set of linguistic items with similar social distribution". This definition gives a general notion that a variety of language could refer to other languages and dialect style, which is also a general term for variety or varieties of language.

According to Akindele and Adegbite (1999), Nigerian speech community is made up of 250 ethnic groups with a conservative estimate of over 400 languages, yet a recent figure from Ethnologue (2011) puts the figure of individual languages spoken in Nigeria to be above Five Hundred (500), which of those languages, Five Hundred and Fourteen (514) are living languages. The Nigerian speech community therefore, is a multi-lingual and multi – cultural speech community where diverse languages and cultures compete. The multiple nature of the languages shows that some are dialects of the same language which are mutually intelligible. The term dialect especially in the Nigerian Socio –Cultural setting is routinely used in a pejorative sense, suggesting that it is merely a local variant of a central language. Linguistically, dialect could be regional, social or occupational variant of another speech form with no presupposition as to its importance or otherwise. It is also a speech community whereby apart from the indigenous languages; foreign languages also compete favourably with other languages and cultures of the local language where there exists an exo-language. English Language performs official and national functions while the various indigenous languages are used for international communication in their respective domains of operation. In addition to this, the multilingual nature of culture necessitates the assignment of function to both exo - language and indigenous languages. From the above assertions, one thing is needful, that is considering Nigeria as a multi lingual and multi-cultural nation, the number of

languages identified above gives a picture of having thousands and hundreds of dialects. Most scholars so far have not been able to identify the number of dialects especially in Nigeria not to talk of West African sub region. However, this research is an attempt to study dialects in the immediate environment which are quite unintelligible in most of their lexical and phonological features.

Languages all over the world are noted for variation pervasiveness. English for example, has so many variations which include British English, American English, Australian English, South- African English, and Nigerian English etc. For instance, American English (*AME*) is noticeably different from that of the British, and the speeches of these two groups in turn are distinct from Australian English. When speakers of a particular language speak different versions of the language, they are said to be speaking different dialects of the language. The term 'register' first came into general currency in 1960s, Halliday. Mclutosh & Strevens, (1964:77) describe register as a variety according to use in the sense that each speaker has a range varieties which he chooses from, at different times. The term is distinct from dialect, which is a variety according to user, in the sense that each speaker uses one variety and uses it all the time.

A dialect is "any distinct variety of language especially one spoken in a specific part of a country or other geographical area" (Matthews 2007). Furthermore, he adds that the criterion for distinguishing a dialect from a language is to take into consideration of mutual intelligibility of both dialects. Halliday (1964), cited in Farinde and Ojo (2005) defines dialect as a variety of languages distinguished according to users; Gregory (1978) further amplified

this definition as He opines that dialectal varieties are linguistic reflections of reasonable permanent characteristics of the user of the language in situation.

According to Holmes (2008), "Dialects are simply linguistic varieties which are distinguishable by their vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. In common usage, a dialect is a sub – standard, low status often rustic form of language generally associated with peasantry or other groups lacking in prestige. In its traditional sense, a dialect is a term which is often applied to all forms of languages, particularly those spoken in more isolated parts of the globe, which have no written form. Some also regard dialect as a kind of erroneous deviation from the norms, an aberration of a corrector standard form of language. Modern dialectologies however are of the opinion that contrary to the above stated definitions of dialectology, all speakers of language speak at least one dialect of the same language. For instance Standard English has many dialects which are spoken in different parts of the world.

According to Trudgil (2007):

> It is often useful to regard dialects as dialects of a language; dialect can be regarded as subdivision of a particular language. In this way, we may talk of the Parisian dialect of French, dialect the Lancashire dialect of English, the Bavaries dialect of German and so on.

Of course, the above assertion might be correct with major languages of the world, but certainly not with some minor languages. Since dialects are developed as a result of distance and geographical barriers that forced up gap between the settlements of such speech communities. On the other hand, Petyt (1980) opines that "a dialect is an abstraction based on some set of features chosen in a way which is essentially arbitrary. Petyt (ibid) further explains that when a speech community simply decided that they are going to take note of

some features and ignore others, when calling something (object) a 'different form of a language emerge' the challenge with the above definition of dialect as different form of the same language is that of deciding how different languages rather than dialects". When people are dealing with related languages (such as English and German) they are unrelated while (English and Malay) are said to be reasonably related and can maintain that the distinction between dialect and language is a quantitative matter. Language enables people to talk with others at the same time, it enables them to talk about things that are abstract and out of reach. It provides us with not only just a mode of interaction, but also with capacity of representation. According to Green and Petty (1978:22)

> Through language; Man obtained social responses from individuals and groups through language he acquires understanding, attitudes and ideals; with language he thinks and solves problems; from language he finds inspiration and secures emotional release. Language makes possible the operation of business and government; it holds the key to achievement, security and international understanding.

In most African societies, language is fundamentally natural even as most of our societal programmes are basically by such phenomenon, originally every human is born with language he/she only learn to use it for self-satisfaction daily. Sapir (1921) opines that "Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols". The above definition clearly attributes language to human species. This is supported by Liles (1972) who says "it is language that has put man over and above every other species that inhabit the earth. Different human communities in the world today use language as a means of contact interaction and achievement. Man's achievement on earth has been very spectacular in the field of science and technology,

politics, education etc. This achievement would not have been successful without a proper use of language

2.2.1 Language and Society

Without mincing words, language and culture are interwoven and bound together with a strong cord that cannot be separated. In any group or society, language cannot exist alone without its culture; it is this culture that makes it unique and distinctive from other groups. When one talk about the culture of people, such person must mention first the kind of language they speak. The culture of people reflects in the language since language does not exist in a vacuum; it is always contextualized. It must be stressed that no study on culture can be complete without a cursory look at Sapir-Worf Hypothesis. The Hypothesis claims that since language determines our perceptions of reality and since languages are structured differently, different language communities have different views of what is objectively the same reality. Furthermore, the hypothesis asserts that people are constrained in all aspects, feel and aspire to be molded, shaped and contours of a particular grammar, and are forced thereby to recognize and interpret reality only and always in accord with those patterns that the particular grammar recognizes and imposes on every thought and on every formulation.

In essence, language can affect a society by influencing or even controlling the world view of its speakers. This hypothesis is also concerned with the possibility that man's views of his environment may be conditioned by the language. Example of the physical environment being

reflective of language lies normal in the structure of the lexicon, that is, the way in which distinctions are made by means of simple words. For instance, while English has a single name for Yam, Zaar (Sayawa) has varied lexical items to describe the various types of the same lexeme.

Lyons (1968) further corroborates this in his book Introductions to Language;

> The language of a particular society is an integral part of its culture. And that the Lexical distinction drawn by each language will tend to reflect the culturally important features of objectives, institutions and activities in the society in which the language operates.

In a nut shell, according to Lyons, Culture determines language and language determines our view of reality. Greenberg (1971) in Farinde and Ojo (2005), summarized that "language is the prerequisite for the accumulation and transmission of other cultural traits; such as fundamental aspect of culture as organized political life, legal system, religion and science". This can be exemplified in the degree of respect for elders in the Zaar (Sayawa) speaking community where a child kneels down when greeting his/her parent or any elderly person. But in the English speaking countries the reverse is the case, where the child engages in a hand shake when greeting the parents. This greeting can even be extended to kissing or even pecking on the cheeks. By and large, since the people within a cultural environment own and use the language, it is expected that language cannot function meaningfully outside the context of that culture that produces it.

2.2.2 Language and Ethnic Group

In many communities, different ethnic groups speak different languages. What is more interesting for our purposes; however, are cases where different ethnic groups speak the same

language but differ quantitatively or qualitatively in their use of particular variables especially in lexical items. It is the focus of this study, the above assertion points it out that it is a different ethnic groups speaking different languages, but in this research it is proved that it is the same ethnic group that are speaking with noticeable variations in most of their lexical items and phonology.

Ethnic group differences in language can be considered to be a particular example of the role of social networks in affecting linguistic behaviour. It appears that people are influenced linguistically, as might be expected, much more by close friends, family members, work-mates, and members of other social networks to which they belong than by anybody else. Moreover, people who are well integrated into a particular social group may have linguistic characteristics rather different from those who are more peripheral in the group, because the influence of the group will be less strong and less consistent on the peripheral members. Similarly, even if the entire youths in the community are of the same sex and approximately the same age and social class, there is going to be a clear demarcation that will be clearly seen, the differences in the usage of copula deletion that may be due to their different positions in the social network.

2.2.3 Distinction between a Language and a Dialect

The controversy as to what a dialect is and what a language is, is a very old one, and according to Hammastrom and Nordhoff (2011), there are no agreed criteria on how to resolve this problem. Haugen (1966), points out that language and dialect are ambiguous terms. As Haugen writes, the term ‘Dialect’ was borrowed from Greek during the Renaissance. There was the existence of a number of clearly distinct written varieties in use in

classical Greece, each associated with a different area and used for a different kind of literature. Haugen further points out that the Greek situation has provided the model for all later usages of the two terms with the resulting ambiguity. Language can be used to refer either to one of the norms. In the words of Wardhaugh (2006:28), 'the situation is further confused by the distinction the French makes between *un dialecte* and *un patois'*. The former is a regional variety of a language that has an associated literary tradition, whereas the latter is a regional variety of a language that lacks such a literary tradition. Therefore, patois tends to be used pejoratively; it is regarded as something less than a dialect because of its lack of an associated literature.

To study dialects therefore, it is important to first decide how to determine when two similar forms of a language are merely dialects of the same language and when they are separate languages. In line with this study the researcher agrees with the fact that the two dialects are of the same language because of the mutual intelligibility of the dialects. When the language of one group of people shows regular variations from that used by other groups of speakers of that language, we speak of a dialect (Fronkin and Rodman 2011). Ferguson (1971:30) says a dialect is:

> anybody of human speech patterns which is sufficiently homogeneous to be analysed by available techniques of synchronic description and which has a sufficiently large repertory of elements and their arrangements or process with broad enough semantic scope to function in all formal context of communication.

Fronkin and Rodman (2011) state that dialects are mutually intelligible form of a language that varies in systematic ways. Based on this definition, it means that every speaker, whether rich or poor, regardless of region or origin, speaks at least one dialect, just as each individual speaks an idiolect. Dialects as Chamber and Trudgill, (1998:3) opine "are also often regarded

as some kind of (often erroneous) deviation from a norm- as aberration of a correct or standard form of a language". A dialect however, is not inferior or degraded from a language, and logically could not be so because a language is a collection of several dialects. With reference to this study therefore, Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi are dialects of Sangh (Sayawa) language, with variations in some lexical terms.

2.3 Varieties of Language

2.3.1 Sociolect

"A social dialect or class dialect used by the member of a particular group of a speech community is called sociolect" Syal and Jindal (2013) for instance slangs which is commonly used by youths today. As the name implies, it is social class bound, it is a dialect that belongs to a social class. The Received Pronunciation (R.P) as the Sociolinguistics unlike the other dialect of English is devoid of a regional accent or influence which confers a considerable prestige on it. That is why it is not unusual for people to associate this Sociolinguistics with the ruling class. Farinde and Ojo (2005) assert that apart from being the pronunciation note with the ruling class, the R.P is the variety on the B.B.C news broad cast and in the Royal House.

According to Hudson (1996), there are two main sources of extra complicity of Sociolinguistics. First, there is geographical mobility. People move from one place to another, discussing their dialects with them even if they modify them in the course of time to fit their new surroundings. The second source of complexity is the fact that geography is only of the relevant factors, others being social class, sex and age.

When dialectologist speak of social dialect or socialist, it refers to non-regional differences rather geographical pronunciation seems in general to be more sensitive to regional and social difference than grammar and vocabulary, between accent and dialect, accent refers to nothing but the pronunciation while dialect refers directly to every aspect of language such as grammar syntax and vocabulary. The research in question is specifically on the lexical term of Sayawa dialect of two communities. With the above, therefore, it gives us opportunity to distinguish between standard dialect and nonstandard dialects.

Thus, the British may say that many people use a regional accent rather than a standard dialect; a selected few used R.P, (Received Pronunciation) accent with the same standard dialect while others use slangs which referred to as the nonstandard dialect.

Holmes (2008) opines that "the stereotypical 'dialect' speaker of an elderly rural person who is old but unintelligible to modern city dwellers. But dialects are simple linguistic, varieties which are distinguishable by their vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation, the speech of people from different social, as well as regional groups may differ in these ways. Just as R.P is a social class accent, so standard. English is a social dialect. It is the dialect used by well-educated English speakers throughout the world. It is the variety used for national news broadcast and in print, it is the variety generally taught in English-medium school. Labov (1923) also describes social dialects in these words "We are programmed to learn to speak, in ways that fit the general patterns of communities." Therefore, the basic concept of a socialect is that a person speaks in accordance with his or her social group as regards one's ethnicity, age, gender, religion, economic class, class of resident, etc. in Nigeria for instance Standard English is to aggregate extent a social dialect.

Whereas the traditional study of regional dialects tended to concentrate on the speech of people in rural areas, the study of social dialects has been mainly concerned with speakers in towns and cities. In the social study of dialect, it is social class that is mainly used to define groups of speakers as having something in common. The two main groups are generally identified as "middle class," those who have more years of education and perform non-manual work, and "working class," those who have fewer years of education and perform manual work of some kind. So, when we refer to "working-class speech," we are talking about a social dialect. The terms "upper" and "lower" are used to further subdivide the groups, mainly on an economic basis, making "upper-middle-class speech" another type of social dialect or sociolect Yule (2000).

2.3.2 Regiolect

These are dialects of a language which arise as a result of differences in speakers or user's geographical location or the region of origin. Quirk and Greenbum (1973) cited in Faimer (2005) have submitted that geographical dispersion is a classic basis for linguistic variation. So, differences in user's geographical setting will bring about a dialectal variation. This brings about the concept of Isoglosis which is a means by which the distinction of a particular feature is delineated. Isogloss is a live drawn on a dialectal map showing the boundary within which a particular feature can be found.

Wardhaugh (2006:43) asserts that "regional variation in the way a language is spoken is likely to provide one the easiest ways of observing variety in language". Wardhaugh (ibid) goes to explain that as one travels throughout a wide geographical area in which a language is spoken and particularly if that language has been spoken in that area for many hundreds of years, you

are almost certain to notice differences in pronunciations, in the choices and forms of words and in syntax. Regional dialect may differ not only in their pronunciation but also in their lexical choices and grammatical rules.

Pronunciation, syntax and vocabulary/lexical differences could be seen in regional dialects. In Nigeria for instance, such regional varieties of English are Yoruba English, Igbo English, Hausa English etc that cuts across our languages, the Yoruba will form a regional entity within the Yoruba language such as Oyo, kabba, Ijasha, Ekiti, Igbomina dialects etc. While in Hausa, we have different dialects such as Zaria dialect, Sokoto dialect, Kano and Bauchi dialects. The English word white in the dialect of Zaria is *Pari*, Sokoto- is *hwari* while in Bauchi and Kano dialect it is called *fari*. Similarly, the focus of this study is Zaar (Sayawa) language which has different dialects based on the geographical boundaries. The Zaar (Sayawa) language has about seven major dialects which are mutually intelligible with one another, while about two are not mutually intelligible with others; these are Num, Zagshi and Zari dialects.

Syal and Jindal (2013) opine that it is possible to draw an imaginary boundary separating the geographical areas using divergent linguistic items. The boundary line that separates the users of one area using a particular linguistic item from the area using the other linguistic item is called an isogloss. A large number of such isoglosses may overlap and from a sort of bundle. The phenomenon is called bundling. A bundle of isoglosses is considered a dialect boundary. Since the nineteenth century dialectologist like Chambers and Trudgill 1990, Charles Hocket 1958 and others both in Europe and United State have given their time to the study of geographical distribution of linguistic items such as pairs of synonymous words e.g pail

versus bucket or different pronunciations of the same word such as term with or without /r/ Hudson (1996) the result of the research was able to show which village has the items with or without the /r/ and so on. The study of regiolect or dialect geography tends to concentrate on the rural areas to avoid the complexities of towns. The result gotten will help the dialect geographer to draw a line between the area where one item was found and areas where others were found, showing a boundary for each area called an isogloss (from Greek Iso mean 'Same' and gloss means 'tongue'.

2.3.3 Idiolect

Though a dialect is the speech of a community or a group, it is noted that people do not speak in the same way because of certain reasons which border on people's experience of language being different from one individual to another, and the way an individual uses a potential meaning available in the language. Farinde and Ojo (2005) see 'idiolects as the personal idiosyncrasy of an individual speaker". Syal and Jidal (2013) posit that, "idiolect referred to the idiosyncrasy of an individual speaker" within a given speech community. Idiolect may be different speech between individuals. Furthermore, no two speakers speak exactly alike no matter how close they are.

These variations can be those of lexicon (vocabulary) phonology (pronunciation), grammar (morphology and syntax). Idiolect is the individual personal variety of the community language system' (Crystal) language variations are present in individuals as much as in societies and they can become regular and systematic in terms of the individual's own use of the linguistic code. When an individual uses language differently, there are some factors that account for these differences in language use. This range can be determined by the individual

education. A person's idiolect can be recognized by means of certain linguistic structures of a language which he intends to use. In relation to this is the fact that the way people pronounce certain words vary according to individuals, most often than not, you listen to individuals with different pronunciations of the same word which wouldn't have learnt them, rather such individuals have problem of affectation which is as a result of their deliberate attempt to acquire the pronunciation that does not come naturally to them. Yule (1996) suggests that the term idiolect "is used for personal dialect of each individual speaker of a language". There are other factors, such as voice quality and physical state, which contribute to the identifying features in an individual's speech, but many of the social factors identified and described determine each person's idiolect.

The most significant variations or differences within languages occur at the level of the lexicon (vocabulary), phonology (pronunciation), grammar (morphology and syntax) in usage. Moreover, they are not just qualitative, in the sense that dialect A uses one feature and dialect B another, but they may also be quantitative, in the sense that dialect A uses one feature more often than dialect B does. (This is particularly true of phonological and grammatical features which have social or stylistic significance.) Finally, variation may be regional, social or stylistic in its origins, and the methods that linguists have used to study each type differ slightly. For the purpose of better comprehension, the researcher will elaborate on these important concepts and provide examples on topic under consideration.

2.4 The Concept of Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics that is used in the study of intricate relationship between language and society (Labov, 1972:97120). It can be seen as representing an attempt

to relate language to the society. Sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between language use and the structure of society (Trudgill, P., 2000). It takes into account such factors as the social backgrounds of both the speaker and the addressee (i.e. their age, sex, social class, ethnic background, degree of integration into their neighbourhood, etc.), the relationship between speaker and addressee (good friends, employer–employee, teacher–pupil, grandmother–grandchild, etc.) and the context and manner of the interaction (in bed, in the supermarket, in a TV studio, in church, loudly, whispering, over the phone, by fax, etc.), maintaining that they are crucial to an understanding of both the structure and function of the language used in a situation (Gumperz, 1977). Because of the emphasis placed on language use, a Sociolinguistic analysis of language is typically based on (sound or video) recordings of everyday interactions (e.g. dinner-time conversations with friends, doctor–patient consultations, TV discussion programmes, etc.). From the forgoing, Ferguson's idea of language and the society is captured in the study area, and need to be deliberately discussed for the fact that the study focuses on language use in Zaar (Sayawa) community where the language is used in everyday life by its speakers. By and large the language grows by developing more vocabulary into the language.

Trudgill (1983) cited in Farinde and Ojo (2005) sees language as a social and cultural phenomenon. The importance of this is that any study of language therefore must take cognizance of its social as well as cultural context. Sociolinguistics as a discipline assigns functions to various languages which exist in a given community. It is not unusual to find a language being used as a mother tongue, another as a second language and yet another as an official language. No community or society that needs to grow will neglect the desire to

develop its means of communication. Language cannot be separated from culture, the Zaar language is used as the major means of communication as well as official language in Zaar speaking community. Despite variations between the dialects of Sayawa Language,it is used as social and cultural identification; this study therefore serves as a means of identifying Sangh-gami from Sangh-ghshi through communication.

Besides that, Akindele and Adegbite (1999) also see Sociolinguistics as a discipline which does not only provide an answer to the question of what accounts for differential changes in the social organization of language use and behaviour towards language, but also describes monolingual or multilingual speech community alternation between one variety and another among individuals who share a repertoire of varieties.

Hudson (1980) defines Sociolinguistics as the study of language in relation to the society, while Hymes (1972) defines it as the relationship between systems of communication especially linguistic systems and the social situation in which they are used. On the other hand, Fishman (1970) defines Sociolinguistics as the study of the characteristics of language varieties, the characteristics of language functions and characteristics of their speakers. The three constantly interact, change and change one another within a speech community. The two definitions above lay more emphasis on the community instead of culture. The Sangh (Sayawa) culture plays a greater role in determining the growth and strength of the people and language in the speech community. Furthermore, changes in language occur because of change in social conditions, for example natural disaster, migration or relocation in search of suitable climate. A particular social group may speak a different variety of a language from the rest of the community. Such group becomes a speech community. Variation in language

also may occur as a result of distance that is when speakers belong to a different geographical region.

Furthermore, Wardhaugh (1987), attempts to find a correlation between a social structure and the linguistic system in order to observe any of the changes that occur in both areas. This could be substantiated with Trudgill's (1974) statement that "Sociolinguistics is a part of Linguistics which is concerned with language as a social and cultural phenomenon" (p: 32).

Sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between language and social culture. That is, it seeks to unravel how age, sex, social status or background correlate with language, it answers questions such as: Do men speak differently from women? Is there a relationship between what one says and one's sex? Do the educated speak differently from the uneducated? These and other questions are dealt with in Sociolinguistics. Sociolinguistics looks at how a society influences language. This is confirmed by Osisanwo (2012) who opines that Sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between language and society. It is the study of patterns and variation in language within a society or community. Mainly, Sociolinguistics is interested in the study of language in its social and cultural context. The study of linguistics has opened up new grounds for indebt research in the field of language, which is the basis for this study.

Sociolinguistics is also concerned with the sociology of language, which is defined as the study of who speaks what language and to whom and where and for what purpose. The sociology of language looks at how language influences society. It looks at society as being broader than language and therefore as providing the context in which all language behaviour must be viewed. Akindele and Adegbite (1999) examine such issues as language planning and standardization, multilingualism and national development etc. Thus from the forgoing,

Linguists have unanimously agreed on one point; no one language is intrinsically better than any other language. Focusing only on structural features of a language leads the linguists to have a technical and neutral definition of the term dialect. Haugen (1997), in his paramount consideration is the genetic or historic relationship, in this sense; the word can be used to describe all speech forms originating from a common language ancestor. Thus the present study is interested in establishing lexical variation of a group of people who have dialects that are mutually intelligible among the speakers. These speakers share the same history and culture where members of the community do not live in a class (division) society. De Camp (1971) laid interest on linguistic variation and not sociological variation.

Thus, Sociolinguistics is divided into two branches micro-sociolinguistics: - This aspect handles language components, paralinguistic speech styles, Linguistic Variation, Stylistics, Discourse Analysis etc. while macro Sociolinguistics talks about language planning and language standardization, language attitude, language distribution etc. hence this study is micro-sociolinguistics even as the major concern of this study is on the Sangh (Sayawa) language variations on Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects.

Mathews (2007) opines that Sociolinguistics studies language in relation to society. He further explains that Sociolinguistics involves the study of correlations between linguistic variable for instance the precise phonetic quality of a vowel, or the presence or absence of certain elements in a construction and non-linguistic variables such as the social class of speakers, their age, sex etc.

Whereas Syal and Jindal (2013) posit that “Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics that deals with the exploration of the relation between language and society”, they further explain

that it is based on the fact that language is not a single homogeneous entity, but has different forms in different situations. The changes in language occur because of the changes in social conditions, for example, social class, gender, regional and cultural groups. They further explain that Sociolinguistics is the study of language variation and change-how varieties of language are formed when the speakers belong to a geographical region, social class, social situation and occupation, etc. Varieties of a language that are formed in various geographical regions involve a change in the pronunciation as well as vocabulary. Such changes result in the formation of a distinctly different variety of the language called a dialect. In line with this study, a lot of geographical features contributed to the variations between Sangh gami and Sangh ghshi, mountains, rivers, others went on hiding because of family and community wars, thereby having different pronunciation and lexical variation emerge.

Yule (1997:239) defines Sociolinguistics in general terms. Sociolinguistics deals with the inter-relationships between language and society. It has strong connections to Anthropology, through the investigation of language and culture, and to sociology, through the crucial role that language plays in the organization of social groups and institutions. The two communities under consideration are the same languages in different societies.

The above scholars give a vivid explanation of the relationship of language and community. It is pertinent therefore to know that the study at hand is a language community which is bound by its culture that is unique to it. The Zaar (Sayawa) community has a culture and a language, the language has more than five dialects; these are Mwari dialect, Marti dialect, Num dialect, Sara dialect, Sigdi/ Zakshi dialects, these are all interrelated.

2.4.1 Speech Communities

The term speech community is widely used by sociolinguists to refer to a community based on language. But linguistic community is also used with the same meaning. If speech communities can be delimited, then they can be studied, and it may be possible to find interesting differences between communities which correlate with differences in their language.

"Linguistically, community is a social group which may be either monolingual or multilingual and held together by frequency of social interaction patterns and set off from the surrounding areas by weakness in lines of communication" Gumperz (1962). This implies the development of multiple speech communities as a result of the multiple languages and dialect living in the same area with a great number of social associations. Furthermore, Gumperz (1982) cited in Agbedo (2007) opines that "A system of organized diversity held together by common norms and aspirations. Members of such communities typically vary with respect to certain beliefs and other aspect of human behaviours. Such variation, which seems irregular when observed at the level of the individual, nonetheless shows systematic regularities at the statistical level of social facts.

Labov (1972) asserts that "a speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language element, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms. These norms may be observed in overt types of evaluation, which are invariant in respect to particular level of usage." Romaine (1994:22) cited also in Agbedo (2007:20) opines that "a speech community is a group of people who do not necessarily share the same language but share a set of norms and rules for the use of language". "The boundaries between speech communities are essentially social rather than linguistic…a speech community does not

necessarily co-extensive with a language community." This does not in any way suggest that these definitions are contradictory, rather what seems obvious is the fact that they are complimentary in so far as they help to define a set of people who have something in common linguistically, that is a language or dialect, interaction by means of speech, a given range of variation and rules for using them and a given range of attitude to varieties and items.

Lyons (1970) defines speech community as, "all the people who use a given language (or dialect). Labov's definition implies that, speech communities may overlap (where there are bilingual individuals) and need not have any social or cultural unity; clearly it is possible to delimit speech communities in this sense only to the extent that it is possible to delimit languages and dialects spoken by a people without referring to their community. A more complex definition is given by Charles Hocket (1958:8) cited in Hudson (2001:24) which says "each language defines a speech community; the whole set of people who communicate with each other, either directly or indirectly, via the common language". This definition opens up a criterion of communication within the community is added, so that if two communities both speaks the same language but have no contact with each other, they would be counted as different speech communities.

Furthermore, a speech community is made up of a group of people sharing the same values, attitudes, etc, on language in use (Olaoye, 2007). It describes social groups held together by frequency of social interaction patterns and set of languages from the surrounding areas by inhibitions in communication lines. Gumperz (1972) sees speech community as any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of language and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language usage. According Akindele and

Adegbite (1999: 17) opines that, a speech community is defined as by the following criteria: geographical (e.g. British English speech community), social (e.g. Education/Standard versus non Standard English) and sociolinguistic (English as mother tongue (L_1), monolingual/bilingual speech community). It is important to note that:

i. Speech community may not share a single language for instance, although Nigerian speakers of English form a speech community yet, members of such speech community speaks several other languages for different purposes.
ii. People speaking the same language may nevertheless not form a speech community (for example, Hausa speakers in Plateau state, Nigeria, do not form a speech community with Hausa speakers in Sokoto, Nigeria).
iii. A speech community may not be defined base on geographical terms alone; there are speakers of Yoruba language in Benin Republic which may not form a speech community with those in Nigeria.
iv. Members of a speech community may be long to several other speech communities. For instance, there are Igbo speakers who speak Yoruba fluently in addition to Igbo language.

The study under consideration looks at dialect of these two communities which are of the same bilingual speech community. The Sayawa (Zaar) community speaks Hausa, which is the language for socialization, religious gathering, political and for commercial activities, while Zaar language is majorly the accepted dialect in the area and used as a language of identification especially at home or family meetings.

2.4.2 The Sociolinguistic Concept of Standardization

Standardization is a necessary and vital process for any language. A natural standardization process occurs in healthy languages. Certain standard rules must be followed so that people can communicate effectively with one another. However, there are differences in speech that occur among all speakers of these dialects. Sometimes the differences are so pronounced that one can identify from which community a speaker originates. One can also tell when the speaker is a child, a beginner, or an Elder. Furthermore, one can identify when a speaker is giving a formal speech, such as an opening address, or simply having a friendly chat at the corner at the market square.

Standardization is particularly important when there are great differences between dialects. Dialects are not a big issue for the Zaar (Sayawa) languages. There are some other dialects in Zaar language that are mutually comprehensible. Standardization does not mean the elimination of dialects in favour of a new literary form. Dialects are preserved in the family and in the community of speakers. Revitalizing any language requires modernizing the vocabulary, publishing a standard writing system, and developing methods to incorporate new words into the language. The existence of modern dictionaries and grammar makes the work of standardization much easier.

2.5 The Sociolinguistic Concept of Dialect

Origin of the term ‘Dialect’ The Greek word *dialektos* was first applied in ancient Greece to each member of a group of languages, all originally derived from a common Greek language. Each represented the speech of a major city, and had a specialized literary function. In other words, ‘the language called Greek was therefore a group of distinct, but related written norms known as dialects … [which] were ultimately based on spoken dialects of the regions whose names they bore’ (Haugen 1966:98).

Much of the confusion over the language/dialect distinction today derives from the ambiguities inherent in that original situation (Haugen 1966, Hudson 1996). For instance, mutual intelligibility was not considered, and neither was there a consistent divide between the two concepts of dialect and language (Harris 1990) interestingly, two of the main difficulties we still have with the way the word ‘dialect’ is used with reference to Zaar language today. Over time and in translation between languages the meaning has changed further. In addition, it has acquired multiple meanings in English, being used in different senses by different groups of people; it is therefore necessary to start by defining what we mean by dialect.

Dialect can be defined as something different from language in the following ways: If two language variants are mutually intelligible and ascribe to the same literary standard, they are dialects of the same language rather than separate languages, provided of course, that there is no overriding political reason to think otherwise. But if two language variants are not mutually intelligible, they are different languages, unless there are some overriding political or cultural reasons to consider them the same language.

Halliday (1994) defines a dialect "as a variety of languages distinguished according to its users". Gregory (1978) further amplified this definition by saying that "dialectal varieties are linguistic reflection of reasonable permanent characteristics of the user of the language in situation. Cited by Farinde and Ojo (2005) chambers and Trudgill (1998) opine that "dialect is a substandard, low-status often rustic form of language, generally associated with the peasantry, the working class or other groups lacking in prestige. Dialect is also a term which is often applied to forms of language, particularly those spoken in more isolated parts of the world, which have no written form. And dialects are also often regarded as some kind of (often erroneous) deviation from a norm – as aberrations of a correct or standard form of language (Chambers and Trudgill, 1998).

In this research work therefore, it shall not be adopting any of these points of view. It will, on the contrary, accept the notion that all speakers are speakers of at least one dialect – that Standard English, for example, is just as much a dialect as any other form of English – and that it does not make any kind of sense to suppose that any one dialect is in any way linguistically superior to any other. Petyt K.M. (1980) opines that "the term dialect refers, strictly speaking two differences of lexeme (vocabulary), syntax (grammar), as well as phonology (pronunciation)". While Mathews (2007) is of the view that dialectology is the study of geographical dialects e.g. in the preparation of a dialect atlas or a dialect grammars or dialect dictionary of a specific variety". The first definition here is closest to the current research, in that, it is about a community that has to dialects of the same language with differ vocabulary, grammar and phonology. Petyt's definitions further agrees with scope of this

study, in that, the Sayawa language has many dialects used based on geographical features and other natural phenomenon that set apart one dialects from another as stated above.

Petyt (1980) further expatiates on the above definition that “dialects are different but mutually intelligible forms of speech. So if two speakers in spite of some observable differences in their speech can understand each other, they are held to be using different dialects; as in the case of Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghashi; if two speakers cannot understand each other, they are speaking different languages.

2.5.1 Standard and Non-Standard Dialect

A *standard dialect* also known as a **standardized dialect** or "standard language" is a dialect that is supported by institutions. Such institutional support may include government recognition or designation; presentation as being the "correct" form of a language in schools; published grammars, dictionaries, and textbooks that set forth a correct spoken and written form; and an extensive formal literature that employs that dialect (prose, poetry, non-fiction, etc.). There may be multiple standard dialects associated with a single language. For example, Standard American English, Standard British English, Standard Canadian English, Standard Indian English, Standard Australian English, and Standard Philippine English may all be said to be standard dialects of the English language.

While a Non-standard dialect, like a standard dialect, has a complete vocabulary, grammar, and syntax, but is usually not the beneficiary of institutional support. Examples of a nonstandard English dialect are Southern American English, Western Australian English,

Scouse and Tyke. The Dialect Test was designed by Joseph Wright to compare different English dialects with each other (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialect accessed 17-06-18).

2.5.2 Historical Survey of Dialect

The rise of the "Sociolinguistics" introduced the consideration for social and demographic factors of the description and analysis of languages and language varieties. This has made the study of dialects a significant area in the understanding of not only human behaviour, but also of the processes of language change. According to Bernard Caron (2005) and Bitkon Adamu (2009) there is no mention to separate dialects of Zaar. Their works centred on the most acceptable dialect which is commonly used in most official gathering, churches and it has more speakers.

The classical form of a dialect is the regional dialect, which is a distinct form of a language spoken in a certain geographical area. For instance, we have the Cockney-dialect, Yorkshire-dialect of English. Inhabitants of these regions have certain distinct linguistic features that differentiate them from speakers of other forms of English. Also, Tohomo O' odhan (formerly papago) and Akimel O' odhan (formerly pima) are two native American languages spoken by members of some tribal groups living in the states of Arizona and Northern Mexico. The languages are close phonologically and grammatically with only minor linguistic differences in pronunciation and syntax (dialect variation). So, the phenomenon of dialect arose from the kind of language or the distinct form of a language spoken by members of a specific socio-economic class like the working class dialects in England or the ghetto languages in the United States. (Katzner, 1977; Mesthrie, 2003)

Examples below are taken from Labov (1963).

Working Class (England)	**Ghetto (United State)**
• He is fast in everything he does	He fast in everything he does
• You are out of the game	You out the game
• They are not caught	They not caught
• He is going to try get up	He gon' try get up
• She is the first one that started us off	She the first one started us off.

2.5.3 Types of Dialects

2.5.3.1 Ethnic/Rural Dialects

Ethnic dialect can be described as the forms of English Language, sometimes referred to as 'Yiddish' English, historically associated with speakers of Eastern European Jewish ancestry. Language variation does not end with dialect, as we have differences among speakers, and can also be linked to a particular region of the country or to a particular social class or ethnic group even individuals. Each recognizable dialect of a language is still equally subject to considerable internal variation, no two speakers of a language, even, if they are speakers of the same dialect produce and use their language in exactly the same way. It is in this sense that researchers are able to recognize different individuals by their distinct speech and language patterns; indeed, a person's language pattern is one of the most fundamental features of self-identity. And the form of a language spoken by a single individual is referred to as Idiolect, and every speaker of a language has a distinct idiolect. Once linguist realize that

variation in language is pervasive, it becomes apparent that there is no such thing as a single language used as at all times by all speakers (Wardhaugh, 2010).

Ayeomoni, M. A (2017) indicates that, there is nothing like single English language, rather there are many English Languages (dialects and idiolects) depending on who is using the language and the context in which it is used, hence the terminology 'New Englishes' (McArthur, T., Lam-McArthur, J., & Fontaine, L., (Eds.) (2018). For instance, the vocabulary differences between American and British English are often amusing. Indeed, at a time, a pamphlet entitled, "Getting around the USA: Travel Tips for the British visitors", which contains a section labelled "How to say it" was printed and contains the following differences between British and American dialects of English:

British Dialect	**American Dialect**
Car park	Parking lot
Coach	Bus
Garage	Service Station
Lift	Elevator
Lorry	Truck
Petrol	Gasoline
Call box	Telephone Booth
Minerals	Soft-drinks
Vest	Undershirt
Lay by	Rest area.

These examples are typical of the sort of dialectal variations found in the vocabulary of British and American Englishes. Finally, there are two other kinds of variation of English

languages which the researcher would also touch briefly. They are *Pidgin and Creole* which developed during and after the slave Era of the 17th century. Now, under slavery, a large number of people were able neither to maintain their ancestral Languages nor to shift to the colonial language. Instead, they created new languages (Pidgins and Creoles) that were partly based on the languages around them.

2.5.4 Factors Responsible for the Development of Dialects

There are number of factors that are responsible for the development of a dialect. Some of these factors are explained below

2.5.4.1 Migration

Mass migration according to Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (2006) is a factor that can contribute to the formation of a dialect overbroad geographical areas. They explained that once settlements are established, dialect boundaries may reflect, migration forms those points and geographic features such as mountains, rivers and lakes are important in as much as they shape migration routes. Either the resulting dialect is that of regional homeland of a particular migrating population or it is a dialect mixture formed by leveling of differences among the migrants from more than a homeland. The degree of dialectal differences depends to a great extent the length of time a certain population has remained. As Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (ibid) further explain, migration pattern varies overtime and are unique to different cultural groups. They can involve geographical movement from rural to urban settings.

2.5.4.2 Physical or Geographical Factor

Geographical or physical features according to Wolfram and Schilling- Estes (ibid cited in Long, D., 2001) often play a role towards the development of dialect because rivers, lakes, mountains, forest, valleys and other features of the terrain determine migration routes that people take and where they settle. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes go on to say when we mention physical boundaries; we are actually talking about lines of communication, and the fact that discontinuities in communication have taken place between communities due to face to face, and when a group of speakers do not interact regularly with other speakers, the likelihood of dialect divergence is heightened. Being isolated from other speakers tends to allow a dialect to develop in its own way, through its innovations that are different from those of the other dialects. Hansford (1976) explain that as different changes occur in different parts of the total language area so dialects develop and give enough time, these dialects will diverge further and further apart. The influence of geography has however diminished with the advent of technology (phones, roads, automobiles). These same factors are also emerging in differences between rural and urban speakers (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, 2006).

2.5.4.3 Social Factor

Wolfram and Schilling Estes (ibid cited in Long, D., 2001) observe that, in urban areas, members of social groups such as employees in a particular job area bound to develop a peculiar variety of a language with time. Different economic setting brings about the development of special vocabulary items associated with different occupations; which also affects the direction and rate of language change in grammar and pronunciation. They further observe that, social economy also play a role in the development of a dialect. For example, in

America, social class is a fact and it influences almost every regional variety of English. Yule (2010) supports this fact by saying that the upper, middle and lower classes differentiate themselves from each other by a whole range of social behaviour such as occupation, dress, education and social activities including language. Hence, the lower dialect speakers of the language under study are seen as the minority and are given little or no attention when their dialect is used, thereby segregating their language use. This study stands to compare these variations and ascertain the need for the recognition of the forms of the language.

2.5.4.4 Culture

Another point in the development of a dialect is culture, and it takes into account the opinion of the speakers. In the point of view of Vajda (2013) do the speakers themselves think of their form of dialect/language as a variety of a more standard form of speech? Is there a neutral or more standardized form the language that speakers look to as a norm? According to Vajda, that is certainly true of the varieties of English spoken in the United States. Most the people who speak southern English or Booklynese would consider their language form to be local variants of American English; they would also recognize certain newscasters as speaking English 'without accent'.

On the contrary, most of the language forms that share a single literary standard are mutually intelligible but a few are not. This is the case with Chinese Language. Mandarin Chinese and Cantonese are best known examples. These two are more different from one another than German is from English, yet all of them use a single standard written form. As Wardhaugh (2006) observes, Mandarine, Chinese and Cantonese are mutually unintelligible Chinese

languages but called ‘dialects’ by the Chinese themselves because they are united through a common writing system and tradition.

2.5.4.5 Sex Differentiation

Another social feature with which linguistic differences have been found to correlate very closely is the sex of the speaker. It is perhaps natural to think that men speak differently from women. As can be observed from everyday behaviour men tend to be abrasive, rough and domineering while women tend to be timid gently and more calculating. Sociolinguistics presents evidence from research which suggests that women speak differently from men. Trudgil (1975) observed that women produced linguistic forms which are more closely approximately standard language than men’s speech.

2.5.4.6 Age Differentiation

Elders tend to use more highly elevated language than young people. Their speeches are often marked by proverbs, riddles and anachronisms, perhaps to confirm their varied life experience and superior wisdom. Young people on the other hand, tend to be less considerable of tradition. Their speech is thus often more innovative than elderly people speech.

2.5.4.7 Convergences and Divergences

The concepts of dialect convergence (dc) and dialect divergence (dd) can be explained respectively, as the decrease and increase in similarity between dialects. While dialect convergence involves the linguistic unification, focusing dialect divergence as the amount of linguistic diversification, linguists define convergence as partial similarities increasing at the

expense of differences (so, from their perspective, divergence is the essential subject case of diachronic dialectology) and to be clear from these definitions, divergence and convergence are relational ideas, referring to either processes or the results of processes.

Dialect change has different appearances; convergence and divergence, which affects the relationship between related dialects or varieties, and they phenomena attachments to dialects have existed for a long time. Different historical developments, include the 'modernization' of society, which has have given less importance to the nature of dialects and have partly changed the strategy of dialect convergence and dialect divergence; moreover, they have lead them to dialect–standard language convergence. Trudgill (2002) Dialect convergence may lead to simplification, and to the reduction of intra-systemic, especially 'quantitative', variation. However, in most studies on dialect divergence or convergence, concentration is only paid to how processes of linguistic change influence on intersystem variation, for instance, dialectal differences, these differences are related to either quantitative variable features or categorical features.

2.5.4.8 Mutual Intelligibility

The rule-of-thumb that is most commonly applied to differentiate a language from a dialect is that of mutual intelligibility. When varieties of languages become mutually unintelligible, then they are classified as different languages. If they are mutually intelligible, they can be classified as dialects of the same language.

Vajda (2013) says that mutual intelligibility is a purely linguistic criterion in differentiating a language from a dialect. As Vajda explains, linguists generally use mutual intelligibility as

one of the primary factors in deciding between a language and a dialect. Akmajian, Demers, Farmer and Harnish (2001) define mutual intelligibility as a situation in which two or more speakers of a language or closely related languages can understand each other. Vajda (ibid) question that; can the speakers of two different languages forms readily understand one another? If they cannot, then the two forms would normally be considered separate languages. Such is the case with Dutch, German and English, which are not mutually intelligible. Vajda points out that there are at least Five Thousand (5000) forms of speech communities across the world that are different from another as German is from English. These would normally be considered separate languages. He goes on to say that if language differences cause only minimal problems in communication, there is a tendency to call the variants dialect of the same language. Such is the case with British, Australian, American English and the English of Indian, are all dialects of English.

It is very often useful to regard dialects as dialects of a language, and of course can be regarded as subdivisions of the language. Matthews (2007) opines that "(dialects, language) each of which can be understood, or understood sufficiently for ordinary purposes, by speakers of the other." In this way, we may talk of the Parisian dialect of French, the Lancashire dialect of English, the Bavarian dialect of German, and to narrow it to Africa and Nigeria, the Fulfulde spoken in Cameroun is not the same as that spoken in Togo, Nigeria and Senegal; both of them are dialects of Fulfulde. The Yoruba language in Nigeria and that of Benin Republic are mutually intelligible. Hausa language spoken in Bauchi, Kano, and Sokoto are mutually intelligible to each other and so they are regarded as dialects of Hausa language. Whereas the two dialects under study have about 85% intelligibility and 15% of

their lexical items are not mutually intelligible. Examples are damgi, twari,vwatsa and dzang all in Sangh-gami meaning rabbit, cry, broom and God. While in Sangh-ghshi, the above items are referred to as longa, ngwar, sorgha and chong.

This distinction, however, presents us with a number of difficulties. This research work is faced with the challenge of how to distinguish between a language and a dialect with particular reference to Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi and the related problem of how researchers can decide what a language is. One way of looking at this has often been to say that 'a language is a collection of mutually intelligible dialects'. This definition has the benefit of characterizing dialects as Sub parts of a language and of providing a criterion for distinguishing between one language and another.

There are also other difficulties with the criterion of mutual intelligibility. The main problem is that it is a criterion which admits the degrees of more or less. While it is true, for example, that many Swedes can very readily understand many Norwegians, it is also clear that they often do not understand them as well as they do other Swedes. For this reason, inter-Scandinavian mutual intelligibility can be less than perfect and allowances do have to be made: speakers may speak more slowly, and omit certain words and pronunciations that they suspect may cause difficulties.

Mutual intelligibility may also not be equal in both directions. It is often said, for instance, that Danes understand Norwegians better than Norwegians understand Danes. If this is true it may be because, as Scandinavians sometimes say, 'Norwegian is pronounced like Danish is spelt', while Danish pronunciation bears a rather more complex relationship to its own orthography. It may be due, alternatively or additionally, to more specifically linguistic

factors. When such is compared to Nigerian context for instance, the Yoruba speaker in Kaba in Kogi State understands Yoruba speakers in Ibadan than those in Ibadan State understanding Kaba speakers of the same language. Mutual intelligibility will also depend, on other factors such as listeners' degree of exposure to the other language, their degree of education and, interestingly enough, their willingness to understand. Hence, the two dialects of Zaar are also of similar cases, when put side by side, the Sangh-gami dialect speaker understands Sangh-ghshi better, whereas a Sangh-ghshi dialect speaker will hardly understand someone using Sangh-gami dialect, and this study hopes to compare these dialects and understand the differences as well as the similarities in order to make them some day mutually intelligible.

2.5.5 Dialectology

Britain (2015) refers to dialectology as the study of the way sounds, words and grammatical forms differ within a language. Britain further opines that, the term is usually used to describe the study of both accents and dialects and on the whole, dialectology has focused on the geographical distribution of different accents and dialects, and according to Chamber and Trudgill (1998), it has begun to investigate social factors such as age, gender and position in the society. Vajda (2013) sees Dialectology as a branch of Sociolinguistics that studies the systematic variant of a language.

Traditional Dialectologists study the variety of language use within a particular speech community, that is, a group of people who share a set of norms or convention for language use (O'Grady, Archibald Aronoff, and Rees-Miller, 2001). This research is a comparative

study of two speech forms of Sangh-ghshi and Sangh-gami varieties spoken in their individual speech communities that are several kilometres apart, but having the same parent language which is Zaar (Sayawa) Language.

According to Chambers and Trugill (1990) cited in Britain (2013) early dialectologies were particularly interested in lexical variation, that is different words used to refer to the same thing or item in different geographical locations. The above information collected by the traditional dialectologist approach has been a valuable resource even to present day Dialectologist especially to this study which is researching on the lexical terms of two Sayawa dialect communities. This is because it provides a valuable picture of the variety of different dialect structures used at a particular point in time. While Peter Trudgill (1994:2) refers to dialect as a combination of word pronunciations and grammatical forms that are shared by people of the same area and of the same social background. Each area has different combinations that are different from the other areas and backgrounds. Dialectologists are more interested in studying the differences rather than the similarities between dialects (Ibid.). The present research, however, attempts a comparative study of the similarities and differences between dialects as used in Zaar (Sayawa) language community. When one travels from one area to another, one would be able to notice regional and social variations, within the same language that include the differences in pronunciation, in the choices and forms of words, and in syntax (Wardhaugh 1993:40).

2.5.5.1 Diglossia

The term “diglossia” is a derivative of the French term “diglossia” and it was coined basically as a transliteration of the Greek word, “bilingualism” by the Greek linguist and demoticists

Joanis Psycharis. The Arabic William Marcais later used the term in 1930 to describe the linguistic situation in Arabic speaking countries. The term diglossia as it is used in modern sense was introduced into Indo-American sociolinguistic scholarship in 1959 by Charles A. Ferguson, (Hudson, 2002). The distribution of diglossia in language families in space and time, Diglossia is not limited to any geographical area or language family, and diglossia have existed for centuries or millennia in most countries of the world (Arabic, south Asia).

Ferguson (1972) defines diglossia "as a relatively stable language situation in which in addition to the primary dialects of the languages of a community, there is a divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superimposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of a written literature, either of an earlier period or in other speech community which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation, while Akindele and Adigbite (1999) criticize the above definition. They believe that it is too narrow for our situation of language use. Diglossia occurs where two or more codes exist side by side in a speech community and each has a defined role to play in communication. Codes existing side by side and playing different roles could be a language or dialect.

The definition by Akendele and Adigbite (ibid) is more relevant and useful to the study at hand. The two dialect communities under study speak the Sayawa language dialect, yet Hausa language is also used side by side with each of the dialect. However, the Hausa language in this community is designated as an official in some certain areas or context, such as during churches services, even in school and official gatherings are delivered in Hausa language, and reasons being that the Sayawa dialects have no written form.

Diglossia is a term used to classify situations in societies that make complementary use in daily exchange of two distinct codes which are either two language varieties or two distinct languages. Codes, language 'A', to the exclusion of the other language 'B', which can only be used in situations from which the first language is, excluded (Fishman 1967).

Romaine (1994) posits that the choice of codes made by individuals may become institutionalized at the societal level where bilingualism is wide dispread. Often each language or variety in a multilingual community serves a specialized function and is used for particular purposes. According to her, this kind of situation in any community is called "diglossia".

According to Wardhaugh (1998:68) a diaglossic situation exist where more than one code exists and where there are clear functional differences between the codes and these differences govern their use. In the above type of arrangement, one code is employed in one set of circumstance and the other in an entirely different set. It is sometimes a serious violation of social behaviour if the codes are used in an appropriate situation. This can cause certain codes to be associated with certain social groups or behaviours that generate into a sociolects and these codes inevitably divide themselves into high and low varieties. The study on Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects focuses on one form of language using a variety of codes in the same language family without assigning function to any of the varieties.

Syal and Jindal (2013) defined diaglosis as a speech community, that uses two dialects, but there is a strong tendency to use one of these for special prestigious or formal occasion. This prestigious dialect is called high (H) and the informal, commonly spoken dialects called Low (L). These two are not allowed to intermingle. Such a use of two dialects by a speech community is called diglossia e.g. 'high' and 'low' Tamil, 'high' and 'Low' Arabic.

The researcher disagrees with assertion by Syal and Jindal (ibid), which says a speech community is one that uses two dialects. The Sayawa speech community have more than five dialects, yet mutually intelligible. Similarly, the Jaar speech community in Dass Local Government has more than four dialects and they are mutually intelligible. High varieties (H) are typically used for delivering sermons, formal lectures, and legal and administrative transactions within the community (e.g. in court of law, parliament, for political speeches and for radio broadcasting, editorials, in newspapers and for literatures and so on). Low varieties (L) might be used for giving instructions to workers in low prestige occupations (for example in countries where there are servants) in casual conversations within family and social groups, on popular radio and television and so on, but of course, these are not the cases with the community under study. Usually the low varieties are represented in literature as embedded discourse and used to characterized particular socio-economic levels. Only occasionally is a low variety used to write an entire literary work. Low varieties, by not having a literary tradition will tend not to have established orthographies. Sometimes there are strong and long running debates which result from developing appropriate forms of writing low varieties. At present, the Sang-gahmi dialect (low variety) is yet to be fully developed and this situation is in sharp contrast with the position of Sang-ghshi (which is considered as the high variety) in the entire Sayawa (Zaar) community in Bauchi state.

High variety enjoys considerable prestige. They are the varieties which allow for social mobility. Low variety on the other hand is sometimes stigmatized and speakers of the high variety will not admit to use the low variety; the low variety is seen among the Sangh-gami, where youth and children learn and use among themselves within the same environment,

although, for only social context, while there is the demand for the use of high variety because of its prestige, affiliation and recognition.

Romaine (1994) agrees with this view when she observes that the high (H) and low (L) varieties differ not only in grammar, phonology, and vocabulary, but also with respect to a number of social characteristics, namely; function, prestige, literary heritage, standardization and stability. Low (L) is typical, uncivilized and associated with the few who not come out their remote villages. The patted of code variety choice in Eggenwil is one which has been described with the term diglossia. According to Hindues, the term has been used in narrow sense and in a much broader sense, the scholar above described both the narrow and original in the sense of the term diglossia which has three crucial features: Thus.

i. Two distinct varieties of the same language are used in the community, with one regarded as a high (H) variety and other a Law(L) variety
ii. Each variety as used for goiter dastard functions: H and L complement each other depending on the context.
iii. No one uses the high (H) variety in everyday conversation. The situation is Eggenwil fits these three criteria for narrow or 'classic' diglossia perfectly.

There are a number of other communities which fit the narrow definitions too. A form of diglossia exist in most Arabic speaking counties where the High or classical, is used in lauders elegies speeches and formal political talks, while the low variety is the local dialect of colloquial Arabic. Yule (2013) the Arabic speaking countries use classical Arabic as their high (H) variety and regional colloquial variety as low (L) variety, Katharevousa alongside a low (L) variety, Dhimtiki which is steadily displacing it alongside daughter languages such as

Italian, French and Spanish, which had developed from its more colloquial form Holmes (2008).

In this study therefore, the two dialects under consideration have some similarities where the (H) high is the Sangh-ghshi, the dialect that is use in most of Zaar functions (political or social) and in church programmes, while Sangh-gami is regarded as the (L) low variety. As it is not use in any gathering except where speakers constitute the majority.

2.5.5.2 Isoglosses and Dialect Boundaries

The term 'Isogloss' was first used by (J. G. A. Bielenstein), a Latvian Dialectologist in 1892, he apparently modelled his new word on the meteorological term *isotherm*, a line drawn between two locations with the same average temperature. Isogloss literally means 'equal language' (Greek *iso+gloss*). Presumably, the word is intended to convey the fact that a line drawn across a region will show two areas on either side which share some aspect of linguistic usage but which disagree with each other.

Chambers and Trudgill (1998:89) define isogloss as "a line marking the boundaries between two regions with respect to some linguistic feature (for instance a lexical item, or the pronunciation of a particular word)". Chambers and Trudgill further stated that "isogloss is intended to convey the fact that a line drawn across a region will show two areas on either side which share some aspect of linguistic usage but which disagree with each other". As Wardhaugh (2006) suggest, an isogloss serves as a marker of dialect variation, separating regions where people who speak the same language differ from one another. It distinguishes an area in which a certain feature is found in an area while in another it is absent.

Wardhaugh (ibid: 45) emphasises that "when several isoglosses coincide, the result is sometimes called a dialect boundary. Then we may be tempted to say that speakers on one side of that dialect boundary speak one dialect and speakers on the other side speak a different dialect". Yule (2010:243) lends support to the assertion above when he says that "a dialect boundary is a line representing a set of isoglosses, used to separate one dialect area from another". Yule (ibid) stresses that a dialect boundary has to do with regional differences in speech, and some linguistic items such as lexical items, or the phonology (pronunciation) of a particular word.

Dialectologists have used the term in two slightly different ways, with the result that the isogloss has been represented graphically in two different ways. Although it is always possible to transliterate one representation into the other, someone who is not aware of both is likely to be confused upon first encountering the unfamiliar one (Yule, ibid). In relation to this research, isoglosses between the two dialects, geographical features such as mountains and rivers demarcate Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi speakers of Zaar language whichlater developed into dialects.

2.5.5.3 Dialect Continuum

Yule (2010) posits that a dialect continuum is a gradual merging of one regional variety of a language into another. A dialect continuum is a network of dialect in which geographically adjacent dialects are mutually comprehensible, but with comprehensibility steadily decreasing as distance between the dialect increases. An example as given by Wardhaugh (2006) is the Dutch-German dialect continuum, a vast network of dialect with two recognized literary standards. Although mutual intelligibility between standard Dutch and standard German is

very limited, a chain of dialects connects them. Due to several centuries of influence by standard languages (especially in Northern Germany, where even today the original dialect struggles to survive) there are now many breaks in intelligibility between geographically adjacent dialects along the continuum, but in the past these breaks were virtually nonexistent.

Yule (ibid: 244) writes that:

> Another note of caution is required with regard to dialect boundaries. The drawing of isoglosses and dialect boundaries is quite useful in establishing a broad view of regional dialect, but it tends to obscure the fact that, at most dialect boundary areas, one dialect or language variety merges into another. Keeping this in mind, we can view regional variation as existing along a dialect continuum rather than as having sharp breaks from one region to the next.

Chamber and Trudgill (1998) assert that there are many parts of the world where, if particular attention is paid to dialects spoken by people in rural areas, it would be discovered that, as one travels from village, in a particular direction, one becomes aware of linguistic differences which differentiates one village from another. Sometimes, the differences are larger and sometimes smaller, but they will be collective. Chambers and Trudgill continued by stating that the further ones go from the starting point, the larger the differences will become. The effect of this is a dialect continuum. Chambers and Trudgill claim that if the distance involve is large enough, that if we arrange villages along our route in geographical order, while speakers from village 'A' understand people from village 'B' very well, and those from village 'F' quite well, they may understand village 'M' speech only with considerable difficulty, and that of village 'Z' not at all. Villagers from 'M', on the other hand, will probably understand village 'F' speech quite well, and villagers from A and 'Z' only with difficulty. In other words, dialects on the outer edges of the geographical area may not be mutually intelligible, but they will be chain of mutual intelligibility. According to Chambers

and Trudgill, at no point is there a complete break such that geographically adjacent dialect is not mutually intelligible, but the cumulative effect of the linguistic differences will be such that the greater the geographical separation, the greater the difficulty of comprehension.

2.5.6 Variations of Dialectology

2.5.6.1 Lexis and Lexical Variations

Sowa (2000) claims that grammar and words belong to the area of linguistics, but the concepts they express belong to the extra-linguistic knowledge about the world. In his explanation, Sowa further mentions that, for each language, the lexicon must provide the link that enables a language processor to carry message from one province to the other. Besides accommodating the idiosyncrasies of each language, the lexicon must support all the possible uses of language. Each set of lexis has a different purpose, which requires a different kind of information.

In the opinion of Akinpelu (2001: 173), lexis refers "to vocabulary or the entire stock of words in a language". Akinpelu goes on to say that lexis is the collection of words that every speaker of a language has. All lexical items have referents, that is, words are either written or spoken symbols of real life things. This does not mean however that all lexical items have referent to real life things that can either be seen or touched. It means therefore, that lexical items can refer to abstract things, for example words like delicious, scent, anger, happy, joy, cry etc.

In discussing lexis, the cultural background of the users of a particular language cannot be ignored. Ellise and Tomlison (1980) opine that each society has its own culture and the nature

of that society determine the meaning of the lexical items or uses. The word 'lexicon' is a term which is used by linguists to refer to those of language which relates to words otherwise known as its lexical aspect. Jowitt (1991: 126) states that:

> the lexicon of a language –including one word lexemes, phrasal lexemes, idioms etc contains hundreds of thousands of items, it is frequently augmented by fresh coinages and importation, and new meaning are constantly being added to existing meanings of the existing words, while the gains are only partially offset by obsolescence of some items or of certain meanings of some items.

According to Jowitt, this has being the large part of the story of most of the world's language in the present century and it has accompanied and signalled huge advances in empirical knowledge and the vast social changes which the country has witnessed. The lexicon of a language according to Sowa (2000) is the bridge between a language and the knowledge it expresses in that language. In Sowa's explanation, the lexicon as a bridge which is partly language dependent, partly language independent and partly domain, but it must contain the hooks that link the language-dependent words to language dependent grammar and to the language-independent, but domain-dependent conceptual structures. "every language has different vocabulary, but every language provides the grammatical mechanism for combining its stock of words to express an open-ended range of concepts". (Yusha'u 2015: 46).

Differences in vocabulary are one aspect of dialect diversity which people notice readily and comment on quite frequently. They are certainly common enough as markers of the differences between geographical areas or regions. For instance the fact that "a carbonated soft drink" might be called pop in the inland North and the West of the United States, soda in the Northeast, tonic in Eastern New England, and cold drink, drink or dope in various parts of the South (Carver 1987:268). Similarly, the word sickle is called **gaa**, pestle is called

rhipzing and a hoe is called **kagdi** all in the dialect of Sangh –ghashi, while in Sangh-gami these items are called **robji, taakund** and **kangchi** respectively. Accordingly, lexical differences play a significant role in regional dialectology (the study of regional dialects),

Lexical differences are not as salient in distinguishing the speech of different social or socioeconomic classes, and they have accordingly played a much smaller role in social dialectology (the study of social dialects), which has concentrated instead on differences in phonology and grammar. One area where social group differences are reflected strongly in the lexicon is in variation according to age group, particularly in the slangs of teenagers and young adults.

Accurate definitions of slang are elusive, in part because some words fall more decisively into this category than others, but the term is commonly understood to include the informal in-group vocabulary of young people or non-mainstream groups, and to include items which are relatively short-lived (Wolfram 1991:46-50). Slang is often particularly rich in evaluative terms; for instance, Smitherman's (1994:91-92) entry for def, a reduction of definitely, which means "great; superb; excellent." Although most of these terms have originated and are best known within the African American community, the popularity of African American music and culture has also made many of them familiar to teenagers from other ethnic groups, so much so that these and other slang terms might, in some areas, be considered symbols of youth culture rather than Black culture. However, African American teenagers often coin new in-group slang terms as fast as their former terms spread to other ethnic groups, and there remain significant differences between the slang of Whites and Blacks (T. Labov 1992). At the same time, some items which originate as slang become part of the informal vocabulary of

older age groups and eventually of the country as a whole, for instance buck "dollar". Hence, a Comparative study of the dialects of Sayawa community of Bauchi would also indicate these differences and similarities of the lexical and phonological forms of the Zaar language.

2.5.6.2 Phonology and the Phonological Variations

Daura (2012), states that in every language there are sounds which are peculiar to the language that may be different from those of other languages. For Lass (1984), Phonology is about patterns of sounds, especially different languages or within each language, different patterns of sounds in position in words. Comrie (2007) is of the view that phonology is concerned not with physical properties of sounds but rather with how they function in a particular language. Ekundare (1996) looks at Phonology as the study of the properties of the sound system of a language which speakers have mastered and internalized by the time they are competent users of it. The sound system involves the actual pronunciation of words, which can be broken up into the smallest units of pronunciation known as a phoneme, for example, words like 'eat', 'pat', 'fat', have different phonemes at the beginning and so the phonemes contrast with each other to produce different words. In the words of Yule (2010:42) "Phonology is essentially the description of the system and patterns of speech sounds in a language. It is in effect based on a theory of what every speaker of a language unconsciously knows about the sound patterns of that language. Because of this theoretical status, phonology is concerned with the abstract or mental aspect of the sounds in language rather than with the actual physical articulation of speech. Phonology can be looked at from two angles; either as the description of sounds of a particular language or as the rules that govern those sounds (Yusha'u, 2015). For example, we can talk of the phonology of the Zaar (Sayawa) language,

Phonology of Hausa or Yoruba or English or any other language. In discussing Phonology, it will be important to also briefly explain phonetics. This is because the two are interwoven. Ladefoged (1975) states that Phonetics is concerned with describing the speech sounds that occur in the language of the world. Comrie (2007) sees phonetics as a field of language study concerned with the physical properties of sounds. Yule (2010:26) describes Phonetics as "the general study of the characteristics of speech sounds".

The relationship between Phonetics and Phonology as pointed out by Osisanwo (2012) is that phonetics supplies raw material, while Phonology cooks them. In other words, Phonetics supplies the data for Phonology. While Phonology concentrates on how sounds are organized in individual language, Phonetics concentrates on the actual sound making. In order to do Phonology, therefore, you will necessarily need to know at least some of the Phonetics. Roach (1993) tries to show a connection between Phonetics and Phonology when he says both are concerned with speech with the ways in which humans produce and hear speech. To Yul-lfode (2001:20), phonetics describes and classifies speech sounds. Phonology studies the use, organization, patterning of these speech sounds in language.

From the explanations given above, it can be inferred that all languages have sounds and sound systems. These sound systems have to be internalized by the speakers of the language. The knowledge of the sound system is what helps a speaker to identify the combinations of sounds which are accepted in a language, and those which are not and also to recognized foreign accent the replacement of vowels in Afizare language in is either to conform to the new orthography or to show which sound is actually the basic sound in the language.

Phonological variation refers to differences in pronunciation within and across dialects, for instance the fact that people in New York and New England might pronounce "greasy" with an s, while people from Virginia and points further south might pronounce it with a z. Or the fact that working class people across the United States are more likely than are upper middle class speakers to pronounce the initial /th/ of they and similar words with a /d/. Similarly, within the same dialect of Sangh-gami, they have some variation in the pronunciation of some words; for instance, a hoe is kaanchi /tʃ/ in one part and kaandi /d/. While in the dialect of Sangh-ghashi the same hoe is called kagdi (McArthur, et al, 2018).

Phonological variants are fairly salient as markers of regional dialect. For instance, the stereotypical Bostonian pronunciation of "Park your car in Harvard yard" as Pahk yo' car in Hahvahd yahd includes not only the r-lessness of Pahk, yo', Hahvahd and yahd (the r in car is retained because the following word begins with a vowel)--a feature shared with many other American dialects, particularly in the South--but also the more distinctive use in these words of a long maximally low or open front vowel [a] where other dialects use a slightly fronter and less open vowel (Wells 1982:522). In order to represent the pronunciations with some precision, linguists often use a phonetic alphabet in which each distinguishably different sound is uniquely represented by a different symbol, rather than the relatively un phonetic spelling system of English, in which one sound is often represented by different spellings (e.g. the sound "sh" represented by sh in sheet but by ti in nation) and different sounds by one spelling (e.g. s represents an "s" sound in bets but a "z" sound in beds). Sounds and words represented in phonetic spelling are enclosed in square brackets; a key to the phonetic spellings used in this work is included from the beginning of the work.

Orthographically too, the two dialects of Zaar are similar in several respects, as they share the same orthographic form for most of the words or lexemes. They however, are different in the use of the letters ‘d’ and ‘ch’, ‘ə’ and ‘a’ while Sangh-ghshi often uses letter ‘d’, ‘ə’ for words that require it, Sangh-gami uses letter ‘ch’, ‘a’ as we have in words like, ‘kaagdi’ and ‘kaagchi’ and another of such words are galtsə for Sangh-ghshi and galtsa for Sangh-gami respectively. This high degree of similarity of the two dialects has implication for traditions and norms (culture) in these dialectal communities, since language too, is an element of culture.

2.5.6.2 The Phonology of Zaar (Sayawa)

According to Bernard Caron (2005) the Zaar (Sayawa) language has thirty-eight phonemes which is made up of thirty-one (31) consonants sounds and seven (7) vowels sounds. The differences found in the two dialects are all present in the sounds system of the language.

Table 2.5.6.2.1a: Zaar (Sayawa) Language Consonant Chart (Bernard Caron 2005)

	Bilabial	**Labiodentals**	**Alveolar**	**Alveolar palatal**	**Velar**	**Glottal**
Plosive	p b ɓ		t d ɗ dw		k g gh	
Fricatives		f v	S z	ʃ ʒ		h
Affricates	pw		tl dl	ts zh	dz	

Nasal	m		n	ŋ	
Roll			r		
Lateral			l		
Semi-vowel	w			j	y

The table above represents the Zaar (Sayawa) consonants sounds.

Table 2.5.6.2.1b: Examples of Zaar (Sayawa) words are given for each sound represented in the chart below

Sound	Zaar Word	Transcription	Meaning in English
/b/ as in	bang	**/baŋ/**	Bitter
/ɓ/ as in	ɓani	**/ɓani/**	Finish
/dz/ as in	dzang	**/dzaŋ/**	Sun
/y/ as in	yasəng	**/yasŋ**	Leg
/m/ as in	mani	**/mani/**	Come
/l/ as in	laar	**/laar/**	River
/n/ as in	ndas	**/ndas/**	Sour
/g/ as in	gaam	**/gaam/**	Head
/f/ as in	fyali	**/feəli/**	White
/t/ as in	taas	**/taas/**	Hand
/pw/as in	pwatla	**/pwatla/**	Pluck
/k/ as in	kuchi	**/kʊtʃi/**	Sleep
/n/ as in	naas	**/naas/**	Mother
/dw/ as in	dwatsa	**/dwatsa/**	Old
/ɗ/ as in	nɗai	**/nɗai/**	Enter

/v/ as in	vun	**/vun/**	Room
/tl/ as in	tla	**/tlaa/**	Cut
/dl/ as in	dlar	**/dlar/**	Dance
/j/as in	jid	**/jid/**	In-law
/ŋ/ as in	ngwar	**/ŋwar/**	Cry

The table above is the representation of the examples of Zaar (Sayawa) words indicating the transcription, the consonants sounds and the meaning the words.

Table 2.5.6.2.2a: Zaar (Sayawa Vowel Chart) Bernard Caron 2005

	Front	**Central**	**Back**
Close	I		O
half close	E		U
half open	ə		ɔ
Open		a	

The table above is the Zaar (Sayawa) language vowels, they represented as short vowels. Examples are given below in words and their transcription.

Table 2.5.6.2.2b: Sample of Words for the Vowel Sounds in Zaar (Bernard Caron 2005)

Vowel	**Example of Word**	**Transcription**	**Meaning in English**
/i/ as in	chim	/chim/	call
/e/ as in	geri	/geri/	fowl
/ə/ as in			
/a/ as in	maat	/maat/	goat

/ɔ/ as in	kwot	/kwɔt/	calabash
/o/ as in	mokshi	/mokʃi/	courtship
/u/ as in	luu	/luu/	shirt

2.5.6.3 Grammatical Variations

What this work has been referring to as grammatical variation really involves two sub-types: Morphology and Syntax. Morphology refers to the structure or forms of words, including the morphemes or minimal units of meaning which comprise words, for instance the morphemes {un}"not" and {happy} "happy" in unhappy, or the morphemes {cat}"cat" and {s} "plural" in cats. Syntax refers to the structure of larger units like phrases and sentences, including rules for combining and relating words in sentences, for instance the rule that in English yes/no questions, auxiliaries must occur at the beginning of sentences, before the subject noun phrase (e.g. Can John go? versus the statement John can go).

Grammatical variation is much more common as a marker of social dialects and formal/informal styles than it is of regional dialects, with non-standard or vernacular variants sometimes being strongly stigmatized for their associations with limited education or use by the lower working class, but simultaneously being strongly admired and adopted for their connotations of informality, masculinity or non-pretentiousness. Whether positive or negative, grammatical variables tend to have strong social marking. Hence, the comparative analysis of this study reveals these grammatical variables of the two dialects under study, in order to have a better knowledge of the language's dialect usage with the Sayawa community.

2.6 Review of Previous Studies

Different scholars have carried out different studies on language variation in English language. Most of the studies are based on social class, sex, age, style and network. Out of these studies social class is the most researched area. The most popular of these studies is that of American Sociolinguistic, William Labov.

Labov carried out a research in New York City in (1962). He studied the pronunciation of /r/ in the middle, and final position of words, for example 'car' and 'heard'. The New York accent as Thomas (2004) explain is a non-rhotic accent, unlike most American accents, meaning that the /t/ is not pronounced, just as in most British varieties of English. Yule (2010: 255) says that" Labov combine elements from places of occupation and socioeconomic status by looking at pronunciation differences among sales people in three New York city department stores". The department stores are saks Fifth Avenue (the highest social ranking), Macy's (middle social ranking) and Klein's (lower social ranking). Labov collected data through a variety of methods including, asking participants to read a word list and a passage: an informal interview was also conducted; this was an effort to collect natural speech in the interview (Thomas, 2004). That was another method of collecting data for a similar research, but this particular study had a lexico-statistical word list written in both Hausa and English Language with two columns provided for the two dialects, where the respondent filled in the correct interpretation of the given word. Furthermore, the researcher here employs the method of meeting with some respondents on the streets and market squires and engages them in discussion on subject of interest thereby observing the phonological aspect of the research.

Similar to the study carried out by Labov in the U. S. A., Trudgill (a British linguistic) in 1970 investigated the speech of residents of Norwich, England. Cruttenden (1979) notes that Trudgill was interested in the pronunciation of particular variables in different socioeconomic status groups and different speech styles. For example, 'walking' and 'talking' were regarded as the standard form while 'walkin' and 'talkin' as the nonstandard form peculiar to the local accent. As Cuttenden (ibid) observes, Trudgill also found out that class is more of a determiner of non-standard usage than gender, though women in all social classes are more likely to use the overt prestige or Received Pronunciation form. The result reflected those found by Labov in New York City: the higher the socioeconomic status of the speaker, the more frequently he or she was the standard variant. All socioeconomic group used more standard variants with increasing formality of the speech styles. Another social marker in Trudgill's study according to Yule (2010) "is called '[h]-dropping', which makes the words *at* and *hat* sounds the same. It occurs at the beginning of words and can result in utterances that sound like *I'm so 'ungry I could eat an orse".* In contemporary English, this feature is associated with lower class and less education.

The present study is interested in ascertaining lexical and phonological variation of a group of people who have speech forms that are mutually intelligible among the speakers. Members do not live in a class society like those of Trudgill's study. However, this study to some extent it aligns with Trudgill's work since pronunciation (phonology) is part of it.

Milroy (1970), carried out a research on language and social networks. Unlike Labov and Trudgill, Milroy was interested in social network of individuals rather than their economic class. Milroy investigated three working-class communities in Belfast: Ballymacarrett (a

Protestant area in East Belfast), Hammer (a Protestant area in West Belfast), and the Clonard (a Catholic area in West Belfast). Chambers (2003: 77) point out that:

> the subjects of Milroy's study are mainly under-educated working-class whites. The men are especially ghettoized. Those who are employed usually work in local factory and seldom venture outside the neighbourhood where sectarian factions come into conflict. The women are much less restricted in their movement, both for working and for recreation.

In her study of the three working-class communities in Belfast, Northern Ireland, Milroy found significant deviations from the classic class and gender pattern. Linguistic variation in these communities could be explained on the basis of differences in speakers' social network structures. According to Wardhaugh (2006), "people develop close and continuing relationships with each other, and they help one another, fist their kin and then their co-religionists". Cruttenden (1979) observes that in Milroy's study, there was a correlation between linguistic variation and a speaker's integration in a social network. Members of a speech community are connected to each other in social network which may be relatively 'closed' or 'open'. A person whose personal contacts all know each other belongs to a 'close network'. An individual whose contacts tend not to know each other belongs to an 'open network'. Cruttenden (ibid) further states that close networks are said to be high density: open class networks are said to be low density. Moreover, the links between people may be different kinds: people can relate to each other as relatives, as neighbours, as friends, as workmates. Where individuals are linked in several ways, for examples by joy, family and leisure activities, then the network ties are said to be multiple.

Spencer (1971) in his worked on English language in West Africa is based on his study on the types of English spoken in West Africa. Spencer, the English that is spoken in West Africa is

quite different from the English spoken in Britain, America and Australian. Even within West Africa, differences exist in their use of English. The way Nigerians use and speak English is different from Ghana and other West African countries speak English. Such variations arise as result of some geographical features such as Mountains, Rivers, distance between them etc. other factors could be natural and man- made disasters that force up distance between them. The work at have similar features that brought about the multiplication of the Zaar (Sayawa) dialect.

A comparative study by Agbala (1995) carried out a study of Owerri and Ezza dialects of Igbo language and the analysis is based on grammar, phonology and lexis. Agbala notes that differences and similarities among different languages and dialects of the same language can be observed in the lexical contents, grammar and phonology. The arrangement of morphemes in the Ezza and Owerri dialects are different in most cases. In Owerri dialect, the nominal phrase 'I am' is 'am I'. According to agbala, there is also the absence of conjunctive element in Owerri dialect while it is present in Ezza dialect. There is no concord relationship between the verb and the noun in the two dialects. In most cases, it is the pronouns and adjectives that carry out the job. Pronouns have no grammatical gender; they can be used for masculine and feminine. Agbala also examines the similarities and differences in lexical items between the two dialects:

Ezza	**Owerri**	**Englsh**
Ibo	Uzo	Door
Ujuru	Epe	Orange

Ododo	Uhie	Yellow
Aza	Asa	Answer
Ikpere	Ikpere	Knee
Onwu	Onwu	Dealth
Agba	Agba	Jaw

Agbala further mentions that the majority of Igbo speakers from different dialects understand one another during communication despite the differences. Hence, Agbala considerations of three areas in Igbo language (lexis, grammar and phonology), this current research concentrates on the lexical and Phonological variation within two dialects of Zaar language.

Ajoda (1995) did a research on dialect variation in Igala language. The work is based on three dialects of Igala language – Ogugu, Ibaji and Central dialect. Phonological, lexical and syntactic differences and similarities are investigated. Ajodo analyses vowels and consonant changes by comparing some lexical items collected from the three dialects. A prominent feature that distinguishes Ibaji dialect from Ogugu and the Central dialect as Ajodo explains is the use of the nasal sound at the end of sentences. The researcher here considers three dialects of Igala language, and it is centered on three grammatical concepts, thus phonological, lexical and Syntactic differences. However, this study is on two dialects of Zaar (Sayawa) language which are Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi with emphasis on lexical and phonological variations.

Yusha'u (2015) did a comparative study of the lexico – phonological variation in Kano and Sokoto dialects of **Hausa**. Her study examines the lexical and phonological variations found in Kano and Sokoto dialects of Hausa. According to Yusha'u, the Kano and Sokoto dialects,

which are known as eastern and western dialects conflict at the regional base. They have neighbouring states between them where other dialects of Hausa are spoken. Yusha'u says that in the Kano and Sokoto dialects, notable linguistic differences can be observed in their lexis and phonology. The Kano dialect is mostly used in the media, literature and also in higher institutions of learning. In the explanation, variations found in the dialects of te Hausa language are because of the speakers live in different environment. Yusha'u goes on to say that tone also plays a very important role in the variations between Kananci (Kano) and Bauchi (Bauchi). A word like "kanti" (shop) in Kananci is pronounced as "shago" in Bauchi, "pari" (white) in Kananci is "fari" in Bauchi. Yusha'u observes that there is also the deletion of vowels in some words, "Sha'awa" in Kananci is "Shawa" in Sakkwatanci. Phonological differences of consonant sounds are also given. The use of plosive /p/ in Kananci is /h/ or /hw/ in Sakkwatanci. There is also difference in the use of /p/ or /f/ variables between the two dialects. Some lexical differences examined include:

English	**Kananci**	**Sakkwatanci**
Soap	Sa abuluu	Tokaa
Mat	Taabarmaa	Wundii
Fly	Kudaa	Kujee

Yusha'u notes the dialects are mutually intelligible among the speakers despite the differences. The above research work is on a comparative study of Kano and Sokoto dialects. In line with the above, the present research dwells on the comparative study of two dialects of Zaar (Sayawa) language in reference to lexical and phonological aspect of grammar.

On the part of written literatures, the sayawa language is not known much because of the late development of Zaar autography. The first publish book using Zaar autography was in 2005, titled the Za:r Dictionary, Grammar and Texts by Prof. Bernard Caron assisted by Zaar youth volunteers who sacrificially give their time and energy to support the work. Subsequently Baba Adamu come up with more elaborate Zaar alphabets identifying about thirty-five (35) alphabets comprising of twenty- nine consonants and six vowels. Most of which are written in the same way as that of English orthography, a few consonants sounds are written joining two sounds, for example 'sh' as in 'shə̨mdi' in Sang-ghashi and 'shə̨mchi'in Sang-gami, meaning ice block. The two publications centered on the development of alphabets and writing of few lexical items in one of the dialects that is considered to be more acceptable to the majority. While the present research is on lexical terms of the two dialects which are a part yet they are mutually intelligible in most terms and apparently different in several other terms.

The work of Dadi (2013) *Zaar at a glance*, gives a vivid description of Zaar people, the history of their migration from the Far East to their present place called Tafawa Balewa and Bogoro. According to Bernard Caron in Dadi (2013) the Zaar language is a Chadic language family, he further explains how the various dialects came to be, it was as the result of clash for leadership, space for farming activities and epidemics. These and other reasons scattered the single family abroad which give birth to numerous dialects of Zaar due to distance and geographical features that stand as a hindrance from the root or mother language. His work centred on the historical background of the Zaar people and their activities, while this study is a study into two major dialects of Zaar language and their intelligibility from a lexical and phonological view point.

Omachonu, G. S. (2013) study undertakes a comparative analysis of the numeral systems of Igala, Yoruba, English and German. An essential part of data collation for the study comprises compilation of comparative wordlists of Ígálà, Yoruba, German and English numeral systems in addition to the writer's personal observation and knowledge of the systems. The investigation reveals that the complexity of deriving especially non-basic numerals in the languages involves three predominant arithmetic processes of addition, subtraction (Yoruba in particular) and multiplication in addition to certain grammatical processes, especially vowel elision, clipping, compounding and so on. In addition, the summary of the quasi constraints or derivational patterns for the languages reveals that whereas German and English maintain very similar patterns because of their very close affinity as sisters from the same parent, it is not so with Ígálà and Yoruba even though both belong to the same language family. Incorporating insights from optimality theory, the study argues that even though numeracy and the constraints that ensure well-formedness of numerals are somewhat universal, parametric variations abound. The actual patterning of the sequences of the derivational processes in individual languages may be very similar but definitely not the same, no matter how closely related the languages concerned may be. If not, they would cease to represent core grammars of different languages.

Arokoyo, Bolanle Elizabeth (2012) study presents a comparative analysis of the phonological systems of the Yorùbá, Owé, Igala and Olùkùmi languages with the objective of comparing and finding a reason for their similarities and differences and also proffering a proto form for the languages. These languages belong to the Defoid language family and by default a constituent of Niger Congo language family. Owé along with the other Okun dialects is

traditionally regarded as a dialect of Yorùbá. The study examines what constitutes their similarities and differences that make them to be regarded as different languages. A comparative approach is adopted for the study. Data were collected from native speakers of the languages using the *Ibadan Four Hundred Word List of Basic Items*. Using discovered common lexemes in the languages, the classification of the languages sound systems and syllable systems are carried out in order to determine the major patterns of differences and similarities. Some major sound changes were discovered in the lexical items of the languages. The systematic substitutions of sounds also constitute another major finding observed in the languages. We have been able to establish in this study that there exists a very strong relationship among these languages, with the discovery of some common lexemes. We, however, discovered that the languages are mutually unintelligible except for Owé that has a degree of mutual intelligibility with Yoruba. The major reason for divergence is language contact as each group has experiences, relationships and contacts with different peoples and languages.

Ayeomoni's (2012) lexico-syntactic analysis of selected dialects of Yoruba Language in Nigeria was on the comparative study of Ondo and Ikale dialects of the Yoruba language with a view to finding the areas of convergences and divergences between the two dialects. The study was based on 50 sentences from each of the dialects, but only 25 of the sentences were presented. They were analyzed from the perspective of Halliday Systemic Function Grammar (SFG) in order to identify the prominent lexemes and syntactic structures of the sentences. Simple statistics based on percentages was used to calculate the number of lexemes and

structures that are similar and different. It was discovered that the two dialects have basically the same lexemes at both subject and predicator levels.

The study reveals that the speakers of the two dialects often make use of the same nominal and verbal items in their speeches. Besides, the two dialects share basically the same syntactic components – Subjects, Predicator, Complement and Adjunct in all the sentences examined, but the Adjunct is rarely used in the dialects. The dialects are however, found to be mainly different in the area of auxiliary verbs usage. Most of the words or lexemes in the dialects are found in the standard Yoruba, hence the mutual intelligibility of the dialects to an average Yoruba language native speaker. It is thus envisaged that other dialects of Yoruba language that are geographically close may equally share similar linguistic features and cultural norms. It is envisaged that some of the dialects of Yoruba languages like the two examined in this paper, for reasons of proximity and historical factor, will equally share quite a lot of linguistic features. But quite a large number of them have vocabulary that are closely related to that of the standard Yoruba language as evident in Table I, hence the general mutual intelligibility of the dialects of Yoruba language to all the Yoruba speakers.

Stanford (2007) also reviewed Dialect Contact and Identity: A Case Study of Exogamous Sui Clans; investigates dialect contact and identity by examining the systematic patterns of clan contact and immigration found among the exogamous clans of the Sui people, an ethnic minority concentrated in rural parts of Guizhou, China. Sui women, men, and children maintain the dialect features of their home clans to a high degree throughout their lives, regardless of any later migration and long-term immersion in other clan dialects. In Sui clan exogamy, the wife moves permanently to the husband's village upon marriage. Since subtle

dialect differences can exist between clans, the wife often has dialect features that differ from the husband's clan. For example, a woman may use a different 1st Person Singular pronoun than her own husband and children, and subtle clan markers are observed in other words and phonetic features (tones and diphthongs). This study involves detailed analysis of dialect features of such immigrant married Sui women, nonimmigrant speakers in their original home clans, and children of immigrant women, as well as ethnographic interviews investigating community views on dialect and clan identity.

The results show that the immigrant women maintain their home clan dialects to a very high degree rather than acquiring features of the husband's clan. For the children of such women, a transition to the exclusive use of the dialect of the father's clan begins at a young age as they develop their linguistic identities through the metalinguistic influence of the community, and as they are directly exposed to the local clan dialect features in daily village interactions. Older children and teenagers adhere more closely to the father's clan dialect, fully acquiring that dialect as they reach adulthood. For all members of the community, ridicule is the consequence for use of dialect features that would identify the speaker as a member of any clan other than that person's father's clan. Further, children who use the mother's clan dialect features and women who use the husband's clan dialect features may also be admonished or criticized. The study concludes that all members of the community; women, men, and children perform linguistic acts of clan identity that continually reinforce their clan memberships. In the case of immigrant married women, such acts of clan identity operate in opposition to an otherwise typical human tendency for some amount of dialect acquisition in

situations of long-term immersion (as evidenced by a survey of prior dialect acquisition studies).

The study concludes that Sui speakers perform linguistic acts of clan identity that index and maintain their clan memberships. The study also introduces methodology for "socio-tonetic" research and provides progress in variationist sociolinguistic research of indigenous minority languages, Sui acoustic phonetics and dialectology, and dialect acquisition research.

Bekker (2008: iii-iv) study on the Vowels of South African English provides a comparative analysis of vowel quality in South African English (SAE) using the following data: firstly, the existing impressionistic literature on SAE and other relevant accents of English, the former of which is subject to a critical review; secondly, acoustic data from a similar range of accents, including new SAE data, collected and instrumentally analyzed specifically for the purposes of this research. These various data are used to position, on both a descriptive and theoretical level, the SAE vowel system. In addition, and in the service of providing a careful reconstruction of the linguistic history of this variety, it offers a three-stage koin´eization model which helps, in many respects, to illuminate the respective roles played by endogenous and exogenous factors in SAE's development.

More generally, the analysis is focused on rendering explicit the extent to which the synchronic status and diachronic development of SAE more generally, and SAE vowel quality more particularly, provides support for a number of descriptive and theoretical frameworks, including those provided in Labov (1994), Torgersen and Kerswill (2004), Trudgill (2004) and Schneider (2003; 2007). With respect to these frameworks, and based on the results of the

analysis, it proposes an extension to Schneider's (2007) Dynamic Model, shows Trudgill's (2004) model of new-dialect formation to be inadequate in accounting for some of the SAE data, provides evidence that SAE is a possibly imminent but 'conservative' member of Torgersen and Kerswill's (2004) SECS-Shift and uses SAE data to question the applicability of the SECS-Shift to FOOT-Fronting.

Furthermore, this research provides evidence that SAE has undergone an indexically-driven arrestment of the Diphthong and Southern Shifts and a subsequent and related diffusion of GenSAE values at the expense of BrSAE ones. Similarly, it shows that SAE's possible participation in the SECS-Shift constitutes an effective chain-shift reversal 'from above'. It stresses that, in order to understand such phenomena, recourse needs to be made to a theory of indexicality that takes into account the unique socio-historical development of SAE and its speakers. Lastly, the adoption of the three-stage koineization model mentioned above highlights the merits of considering both endogenous and exogenous factors in the historical reconstruction of new-dialect formation and, for research into SAE in particular, strengthens the case for further investigation into the possible effects of 19th-century Afrikaans/Dutch, Yiddish and north-of-English dialects on the formation of modern SAE.

Carden, Kelly's (2016) goal is to provide a detailed description and analysis of vowel consonant interaction in Mandarin. Vowel-consonant interactions in Mandarin have been described and analyzed in the literature, but there is little agreement on the exact nature of the interactions, and no acoustic studies have been done to confirm impressionistic transcriptions. The data and analysis in this thesis show that vowel-consonant interaction is extensive in both Northern and Southwestern Mandarin, but the nature and degree of the interactions varies

based on vowel, context (onset vs. coda), and dialect. Carden provide an acoustic analysis and a theoretical account of vowel-consonant interactions in two different dialects of Mandarin that vary in their degree of interaction: the Northern dialect of eastern Hebei (similar to the Beijing dialect) and the Southwestern dialect of northeast Sichuan. The data analyzed was collected from native speakers of both dialects at Sichuan Normal University in Chengdu, and the analysis focuses on comparisons of the F1 and F2 of vowels in various onset and coda contexts. The theoretical account attempts to determine whether vowel-consonant interaction in Mandarin is best classified as a phonological process (e.g. assimilation) or a phonetic process (e.g. co-articulation). I explore possible analyses of the data under multiple theoretical frameworks, including serial rule-based phonology and Optimality Theory (OT), and compare the effectiveness of these analyses to a co-articulation account.

Traditionally, sound change phenomena are assumed to be either phonological or phonetic in nature. However, a detailed examination of the data collected reveals an unexpectedly large variety of vowel-consonant interaction effects. The effects range from subtle co-articulatory adjustments that can only be detected instrumentally to large magnitude differences that can be represented by a change in phonological features. The results of this study show that vowel-consonant interaction in Mandarin is even more extensive than previously documented, and that the line between phonetic and phonological processes may be more arbitrary than we like to believe.

Mishra, D., & Bali, K. (2011, August) study of dialectal variations provides vital cues to both synchronic and diachronic changes in sounds of a language. There has been no comparative phonological study of the dialects of Hindi in the last several decades. They presented a

phonological description of seven of the major dialects of Hindi, namely, Awadhi, Bagheli, Bhojpuri, Bundeli, Haryanvi, Kanauji and Khari Boli, based on the observation and analysis of telephonic conversational data. We believe that these preliminary results will as a starting point for a more comprehensive and detailed comparison of the dialects and provide insights for language evolution as well as synchronic variations of Hindi.

This study presented a comparative study of the basic vowel and consonants of seven major dialects of Hindi based on the analysis of telephonic conversational speech. This is a preliminary report of an ongoing project with the aim of a more detailed analysis of the dialectal variations in Hindi, including acoustic studies of some of the prominent phenomena and the prosodic patterns. We hope that such a study will provide a more contemporary insight into both diachronic and synchronic variations in Hindi.

Udondata Joseph (2017) research of the problems facing an Annang speakers of English are many: he applies the rules of Annang in his use of English particularly in sound production; when he is confronted with vowel sounds that are non-existent in the Annang sound inventory, he reduces the English vowel to the nearest vowel in his inventory; he hardly discriminates between long and short vowels; he also has problems relating to non-segmental phonology particularly in the areas of stress and intonation. This study has provided the rationale for the comparative analysis model. Four null hypotheses were used for the study and were measured with the Chi-square test. One hundred and twenty final year Annang Secondary School students provided the sample and were drawn through stratified random sampling. Literature was reviewed on phonology and Annang language studies. At 0.01 confidence level and 1 degree of freedom (df), the calculated value of x2 (30.8) was greater

than the table value of X2 (6.63) and so. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were rejected. At 0.01 confidence level and 1 degree of freedom (df), the calculated value of X2 (22.8) was greater than the table value of X2 (6.63) and so Hypotheses 3 and 4 were rejected. It was discovered that Annang speakers of English encounter problems in sound articulation. There is need for English teachers in Annang land to diagnose these problems and help the learners overcome them.

All the above reviews are a comparative study of each of the languages' dialectal study on numeral systems, phonological systems, lexico-syntactic, dialect contact and identity, vowel quality, vowel consonant interaction, dialectal variations and problems facing by non-native speakers of English, yet little or no work had been done in the case of the Zaar language of the Sayawa people of Bauchi and their dialects in the aspects of their lexical variations and phonological difference, hence this current study stands to present this language's peculiarities in the dialects of the Sayawa community.

2.7 Theoretical Framework

Like any other study of dialect or speech, it is difficult for this particular study to be successful without choosing a theoretical framework. This study therefore observes the social variables of the speech community involved, the distinction and mutual intelligibilities. It must be stressed that no study on language and culture can be complete without a cursory look at Sapir-Worf Hypothesis. This hypothesis has been a particular source of stimulation for researchers in the field of language and it's varieties since the 1920's and 1930's. Therefore,

the study adopts an eclectic approach in the analysis of its data the study, by combining the *Generative Dialectology Approach* to the study of dialects and a *Comparative Analysis* to the study of lexical items. Davenport and Hannahs (2005) explain that the term generative in linguistics has a specific meaning, that is, it does not mean 'concerning production and creation'; rather adapting a usage from mathematics meaning that is specifying as allowable or not within a language. Chambers and Trudgill (1998) are of the view that generative dialectology involves the application of concepts and findings from generative phonology to the description and comparison of different dialects as in the case of the present study of Zaar (Sayawa) dialects of Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghashi. The study is set out to find the extent of the similarities and differences between the two dialects of the same language and the consequences of these on the traditions and norms of the affected people.

Another is that of Robert Lado (1957), who propounded the theory of Contrastive Analysis which focuses on finding the similarities and differences of the sub-systems of languages compared. Contrastive Analysis in a general term is an inductive investigative approach based on the distinctive elements looked upon in the language under study. The theoretical framework gains insights from Structural Grammar of Randolph Quirk, and Greenbaum, (2004) in the analysis of two dialects as considered in this research. It also found that the *Contrastive Analysis* of Lado (1957) is very helpful as it is basically concerned with how two languages can be compared and contrasted in terms of their similarities and differences. The two dialects that the research is concerned with are Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghashi of Zaar (Sayawa) language. The main concern, however, is to identify lexical items in the two Zaar dilects. (i.e. to compare their similarities) in such a way that their meaning and essence are not

lost. Also identify the structural differences of the lexical terms in the two dialects. This would be done by employing three models, the Wilson (2004) model of translation, Quirk (1988) Structural grammatical analysis and the Banathy (1968) model of contrastive analysis.

These models would be used to enable the research to have a thorough understanding of the two dialects of Zaar (Sayawa) with the lexical items and their meaning. Theoretical framework also involves the use of Banathy's (1968) model of contrastive model of analysis in order to explicate the sentential lexemes to arrive at their meaning, essence and usage in the Sayawa speech community.

Contrastive Analysis was first suggested by Whorf (1941) as Contrastive Linguistics, a comparative study which emphases linguistic differences. The work of Charles Fries (1945) is said to have firmly established Comparative Linguistic Analysis as an integral part of the methodology of Target Language Teaching. In Contrastive Analysis (CA), two or more languages are contrasted in order to highlight the similarities and differences in their structures. Lado (1957:2) posits that this would enable one to predict the areas in the second language (L2) that will be difficult for learners as well as the nature of difficulties with a certain amount of accuracy. CA is a way of comparing languages in order to determine potential errors for the purpose of isolating what needs to be learned and what does not need to be learned in a second language situation. According to Wardhaugh (1970:124) there are two positions developed – the strong version and the weak version. The strong version helps one to make predictions about learning, and thus the success of language teaching materials based on a comparison between two languages. On the other hand, the weak version starts

with an analysis of learners' errors and then attempts to account for those errors on the basis of native language-target language differences.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Preamble

The crux of this chapter, among other things is to describe the research design, sources and instrument for data collection, sampling techniques and sampling procedure, validity and reliability of research instrument. Others are, procedures of data collection, tools for analysis and reporting of results are given adequate attention.

3.1 Research Design

This study uses the descriptive design; which is considered as appropriate for the topic of the study. A Contrastive Study of Zaar (Sayawa) and any other language that desires to study the lexical and sound system of a language requires a careful description of lexical items in both dialects. Fries (1945) assert that, "the most efficient materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the languages to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner." Therefore, the research employed the use of descriptive models, such as the (Wilson model of word translation, Banathy's model of analysis and structural grammatical model).

3.2 Source of Data

There are two primary sources; the first is the researcher and some other speakers of the two dialects, the second is the use of a questionnaire/interview. The researcher, being a native speaker of Sangh-gami and also speaks Sangh-ghshi dialect, plays an important role in the data collection for the research. The researcher draws his personal knowledge, observation and experience of the two speech forms to come up with a list of words were administered to chosen respondents, first for identification of lexical items from the word list and secondly for the correct pronunciation of items presented.

Other speakers include elderly people who are native speakers of either of the two dialects and some youths. They provided available backing for the data as far as the actual lexical items and their pronunciations are concerned. The age of the elderly people are from 50 and 60 years while the youth are between the ages of 25 and 35 years.

3.3 Questionnaire/Interview

One hundred (100) words were designed for presentation to the respondents who supplied the Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi versions of the written words. In addition, the researcher conducted an oral interview with informants in the two dialect zones selected for this study to get information on the correct pronunciation of the wordlist presented.

3. 4 Secondary Sources of Data

The secondary source complements the primary sources, and it is archival, that is it comprises of earlier works, books and researches on the subject.

3.5 Data Collection Instrument/Tools

The tools used for data collection and analysis for this research work is mainly lexical items and the sound system. The core data utilized are from the actual dialects of Zaar (Sayawa) language. The following are the means through which primary data collection, processing and analytical tools deployed for determining and estimating the dialectal variation and its intelligibility for effective success of the research.

i. Lexicostatistical word list.
ii. Individual sociolinguistic questionnaire.

iii. Face to face Interview/Audio recording.

3.5.1 Face to face Interviews

This is an interview that involves direct contact between the researcher and the respondent. This contact arose through approaches made by the researcher which were on the street, the market or the researcher called some people collected some available materials on ground.

This type of approach is chosen for the simple fact that the response rate is high and better than other means of survey approaches. Part of the researcher's skill is to engage the potential respondent and quickly manoeuvre the person to get his or her co-operation. An arm lock is not called for at the point of face to face interview. The point is, though, the face to face interview allowed the researcher the opportunity to 'sell' the idea to the potential respondent in a way the use of questionnaire and telephones would not allow such privileges, in all these recording of sounds and correct pronunciation were covered intermittently.

Face to face contact also allowed the researcher to select carefully the potential respondents in order to get the responses of the people needed to fill necessary quotes. A required number of males and females as respondents were ensured. A suitable balance of age bands was guaranteed. Appropriate number for each dialect or ethnic groups and earnings categories were also incorporated with minimum prospect of redundant materials. There is an efficiency built into this form of data collection despite its expensive nature.

3.5.2 Questionnaire Administration

For the Questionnaire Administration, the list of words designed were presented to some selected people from Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi speakers from Bogoro District in Bogoro

Local Government and Lere district in Tafawa-Balewa Local Government both in Bauchi state. The respondents from the two zones will write the version of the wordlist given to them in their dialect that is either Sangh-gami or Sangh-ghshi. For those who neither can read nor write, a picture of the object is shown to them to pronounce, while some, the researcher himself wrote for such respondent. The questionnaire is divided into two sections, that is: A and B, Section A contains the respondent personal data by ticking into the appropriate box as provided. While Section B contains one hundred (100) wordlist in English and also two columns are provided one for each dialect.

3.6 Sampling Population and Sampling Techniques

For effective collection of data, the random sampling technique is adopted and three research instrument are used thus; participant, observation and questionnaires. Using the sampling method by Kolo (1992), this study made use of one hundred and twenty (120) subjects. The respondents make use of the questionnaire which was structured with possible answers and the verbal interview was also centred or drawn from the two dialect communities. Mwari and Marti communities represents the Sangh-ghshi and Sangh-gahmi respectively both in Bauchi State. The scales of age of the respondents were limited to Twenty Five (25) years old and above, in respect to their gender, the respondents' educational level, as well as residents of the respondents. The research further involved person-to-person verbal interview using a set of lexical items which are written in English and interpreted in the two study dialects.

3.6.1 Respondents Sampling and Selecting Procedure

With regards to respondent's selection for the interviews, people were call upon from the study communities of the two dialects in particular. Prior to this, the researcher had contacted the village heads who helped to give the researcher some fifteen people each who are knowledgeable in the vocabulary of their dialects that can serve as his respondents. With the help of the leaders viable and articulate respondents were sourced from the two communities who assisted in realizing the objective of this study.

Furthermore, for the purpose of conducting both RTT (Recorded Text Testing) and SQI (Sociolinguistic Questionnaire Interview) administration, attempts were made to choose a representative sample of the surveyed population across gender and age stratified with respect to location, gender. This was done according to the following pre-determined social categories:

- Various ages of both genders: the younger will be from the ages 25- 35. While the older will be from the ages 35-50 years and above.
- Subjects who are 100% speakers of a particular dialects (both parents speaks the same dialect) and having grown up and live most of their lives in the study area.

3.7 Validity and Reliability of Research Instrument

For any study to be acceptable as empirical study, the research instruments must exhibit an appreciable measure of validity and reliability. By validity it means the research instrument to measure as adequate as possible, the variables purported to measure. In this study, therefore, the major instruments are the subjects that the researcher used, those that have the right vocabulary of their dialects under study. The instruments were able to give the correct interpretation of the lexical items in either of the dialects, that is the Sangh-gahmi or Sangh-

ghshi. The validity of the subjects was also measured in face and content validity so as to make the research work viable.

The reliability of the research instrument was also taken into cognizance to be able to measure what are purported to measure consistently. The researcher proved the reliability of the instrument by visiting the subjects on different times and at different places to present the same lexical items to check how consistent and reliable the subjects might be, thereby ascertaining the fact that they are reliable and all the data gathered are correct.

3.8 Pilot Testing

This has to do with a tried version of the study which is meant to give an open door for the success of the research. This pilot test was conducted on two separate dialect communities of the same parent language; Sayawa, that is in *Sara* and *Num* dialects. The communities under consideration are not quite far apart, but they speak entirely different from each other. The instrument used for this pilot test are not the same as for this study but the same method and approach is used to determine the success and to discover the shortcoming, this enabled the researcher to arrest or avoid them during the current study's data collection.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

The data collected for this research work are presented, analysed and interpreted in this chapter. The patterns, instances and functions of the zaar (sayawa) language and how its numerous dialects are used for daily transaction in the community can be seen in their pronunciations and apparently different lexemes yet having the same meaning. The whole of this work is on dialect similarities (convergence), differences (divergence) and differences in pronunciations of lexical items.

This section of the research relies on Caron's Zaar Dictionary, Grammar and Text for correct spelling. The dictionary was compiled by Caron, who is a Senior Research Fellow in the National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) in France and Director of Llacan (Paris), an institute devoted to research on Sub-Saharan Languages. In 1990 Bernard Caron arrived in the northern part of Nigeria on the trail of Zaar, a language that was numerically one of the important languages in the group of Chadic languages about which is precious but little was known. He has written a story about this research which Le Gré des Langues published in (1995).

The analysis carried out in this research reveals that over 50 of the entries are shared within the two dialects. These entries shared constitute 25% of the total number contained in the dictionary. This large number of the shared items found in the varieties of both dialects is a good proof that the geographical location of a variety of a language is no longer the only factor that determines the linguistic features of any particular variety. Commercial relations between the two communities are also some major factors in molding the two dialects more intelligible as dialects of the same language.

4.2 Data Presentation and Analysis

This section presents and highlights data collected from the two dialects of Zaar (Sayawa) language which portray Pragmatics that lied in the use of language in communication. Lexical items are carefully selected and arrange in order on the basis of items that have the same pronunciation, spelling and meaning, followed by those with different spellings and pronunciation but the same meaning, others are those with partial similarities (if any exist) and those words that can be used as singular and plural in both dialects

4.3 Language Spoken

Table one (1) below reveals that all the respondents from Sangh-gami confirm that they speak and understand Sangh-gami and all the respondents from Sangh-ghshi too confirms that they speak and understands Sangh-ghshi. It means therefore that the study have a reliable data on the two speech forms from the respondents.

Table 4.3.1: Respondents' reply on the dialect they speak

Dialect	Dialect Spoken	Total
Sangh-gami	25 Respondents= 100%	25=100%
Sangh-ghshi	25 Respondents=100%	25=100%

Table 4.3.2 Lexico-Statistical Wordlist in the two Dialects

A word list of one hundred (100) words designed and given, Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi speakers in order to elicit from the respondents i.e Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi words were

collected and analysed. This is not to say that all the respondents are can speak English or educated, but the questionnaire were aided by the interview, helped to get the information supplied below.

	Sangh-gami Dialect	Sangh-ghshi Dialect	English
1	Mwan (n)	mwan (n)	servant
2	Kihr (n)	kihr (n)	tale
3	dzaŋ (n)	dzaŋ (n)	sun
4	Zhaghali(n)	zhaghali(n)	water
5	miir (n)	miir (n)	oil
6	Maanda(v)	maandh(v)	fighting
7	dzangi	dzangi	that day
8	lhm (n)	lhm (n)	moon
9	mokshi(v)	mokshi (v)	courtship
10	naar (v)	naar (n)	hunting
11	zha (n)	zha (n)	water
12	laar (n)	laar (n)	river
13	nduuri (n)	fworgh (n)	kitchen
14	nyatsa (n)	nyatsa (n)	sand
15	longa (n)	longa (n)	hare
16	gwami (v)	gwami (v)	raw
17	gyass (n)	gyass (n)	fish
18	shalaŋ (n)	shalaŋ (n)	bucket
19	mardu (n)	mardu (n)	trouser

20	biaŋ	(n)	biaŋ	(n)	goad
21	kutn	(n)	kutn	(n)	mortar
22	Lwu	(n)	Lwu	(n)	shirt

The role and use of lexical items in any language serve as ingredient of the spoken language even as they form phrases and then to sentence. Sangh-gami represents one of the major dialects while Sangh-ghshi is the dominant dialect also regarded as near standard in Zaar (Sayawa) language. The above lexical items are few among the terms that are shared by both dialects, the first item on the list is (mwan) it has the same pronunciation, spelling and meaning in both dialects, an example of twenty two (22) lexical items are given in the above table, they correspond in all shades of meaning. Other aspect of these dialects is that both lexical items correspond in terms of either number or word class. The subjects during oral interview pronounced some of these words with a slight difference which cannot be identified by a person who heard them speak the first time.

From the analysis of the lexical items gathered from the two dialects and examined above; it is discovered that the two dialects have basically the same lexemes at subject and predicator levels; (see the vocabulary table above), meaning that the speakers often use the same nominal and verbal words in most of their daily conversations. Having examined the above thirty-five (35) lexical items as selected from the two dialects under study, these vocabularies are having the same pronunciation, spelling and meaning.

4.5 Lexical Items with Complete Different Forms

The under listed lexical items are vocabularies of both Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects, these lexemes are different both in spellings and in pronunciations but having the same meaning.

Table 4.5.1: Lexical Items Differences Autography, Pronunciation but same Meaning

	Sangh-gami Dialect	Sangh-ghshi Dialect	English
1	əsubsu	tantan	eight
2	dzaŋ	choŋ	God
3	gyamda	mbishlr	ashes
4	chat	cim	call
5	ndugbogn	twaknanndam	nine
6	ɗyeɓad	mburuk	all
7	dwaam	wurɓa	money
8	gambur	wuur	mountain
9	fwaraŋ	falaŋ	thunder
10	kyasəŋ	shaŋndi	pot
11	lambh	puus	stone
12	suɓər	səɓər	knife
13.	nduri	fworghad	short
14.	nduwan	dan	stool
15.	ndwaba	dabwa	toad
16.	ndi	naghad	food
17.	mbogta	na-mbobtak	frog
18.	mbutsa	shirhŋ	stick

19.	madi/maji	mani	come
20.	mmam	kuur	throw
21.	tuu	vwa	stomach
22	.votsa	sorgah	broom
23.	vuri	gari	monkey
24.	tamji/tamdi	tamɗì	give me
25.	zhuur	phrshi	horse
27.	taakunt	rubzuŋ	pestle
26.	kanci/kandi	kaghɗì	small hoe
28.	robjhi	gaa	sickle
29.	vun	vin	room
30.	thlaa	ngər	to cut
31.	nduŋh	kavid	night
32.	wulɗah	ndi	to answer
33.	kusuŋ	mbab	rat
34.	nghnɗa	dedah	reason
35.	digsa	gəbzə	ladder

Source: Field survey; (2016)

The table above shows 35 lexical items with about 90% completely different from each other in spelling and pronunciation but have the same meaning, even though the percentage agreement has confirmed that the two are dialects of Zaar (Sayawa) language it is important to point out that 90% is enough to bring about confusion or misunderstanding between the speakers of the two dialects. Sometimes, when a person who speaks Sangh-gami dialect

communicates with someone who speaks Sangh-ghshi dialect, take a look at item number one in Sagh-gami the word "eight" is called **əsubsu** while Sangh-ghshi refer to the same eight as **tantan**, similarly item number three, Sangh-gami referred to "ashes" as **gyamdah** while with Sangh-ghshi is known as **mbishlr**. The item number six is in the table is not considered to have similar pronunciation and spelling. Sangh-gami referred to "all" as **ɗyeɓad** while in Sangh-ghshi is called **mburuk.** In the same vein, at the subject level (the nominal) out of 35 lexical items examined only five (5) of the lexemes in both dialects have some similarities. While in their orthography at either the beginning, the middle or at the end sound and the pronunciation is more or less tonal, that is high or low as seen in these lexemes; **tamji/tamdi** and **tamɗi** –"to give me" and also **madi/maji** and **mani** which means "come". Then item number nine and twelve have some similarities, in number nine the lexeme "thunder" in English is **fwaraŋ** in Sangh-gami and **fwalaŋ** in Sangh-ghshi. Similarly lexeme number twelve is "knife" in English and **suɓər** in Sangh-gami and **səɓər** in Sangh-ghshi respectively. The three examples above have only one sound different, as we can see in "madi/madi" for Sangh-gami and "mani" for Sangh-ghsh. Similarly, "fwaraŋ and fwalaŋ" for Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi which has "r" and "l" sounds respectively. This represents 5%.of the total lexical items that have different orthography, sounds but have same meaning.

Furthermore, some Zaar (Sayawa) youth speakers living in towns outside Zaar land may also find some of the lexical items confusing. When some of the lexical items that show variations are used in speech, these younger speakers may recognise that the speaker is speaking Zaar (Sayawa) language, but possibly may not be aware as to which dialect is being spoken. They may find it difficult to differentiate the dialect's particular lexical item. More to that most

youths tend to blend to the more popular dialect neglecting the less popular dialect, thereby regarding the less popular as inferior to the first dialect.

Table 4.5.2 Demonstrative Pronounce in Zaar (Sayawa) Language

	Sangh-gami Dialect	**Sangh-ghshi Dialect**	**English**
1	dən	dən	House
2	dənəni	dənən	this house
3	dənəgi	dəni	that house
4	gyaadənəni	dənsən	these houses
5	gyaadənəgi	dənsəi	those houses
6	gəɗ	gəɗ	woman
7	gəɗəni	gəɗìn	this woman
8	gəɗìgi	gəɗì	that woman
9	gyaaguɗəni	guɗìn	these women
10	gyaaguɗəgi	guɗì	those women

The above table shows demonstrative pronouns in Zaar (Sayawa) language using the two dialects under study, specifically using two lexical items; den (house) and gəɗ (woman). The nouns of both dialects have the same pronunciation and spelling, but when the demonstrative pronouns are used, the differences are identified in the allocation of these demonstrative pronouns to each dialect. In Sangh-gami dialects a suffix is added as **ni** while in Sangh-ghshi only **n** to represent "this" as seen in number two on the table above. The use of "that" in Zaar

(Sayawa) language considering the two dialects, Sangh-gami will add the prefix **əgi** whileSangh-ghshi will the suffix **i.** Similarly, the use of "these" and "those", in Sangh-gami both Demonstrative Pronouns will take prefixes and suffixes, **gyaa** and **gəni** while in Sangh-ghshi only the suffix is added as **ən** for these and **gyaa** and **əgi** for those in Sangh-gami and only **səi** in Sangh-ghshi respectively.

The lexical item "dən" are similar in pronunciation and spelling.

1. In the second item, the suffixes are different; they are "ni" and "ən" respectively
2. Sangh-gami has suffixes; "gi" while in Sangh-ghshi is "ni".
3. In the fourth item Sangh-gami has both prefix and suffix "gyaa" and "ni" while Sangh-ghshi has only a suffix "sən"
5. Similarly, the prefix and suffix in sangh-gami are "gyaa and gi" while in Sangh-ghshi is only a suffix "səi".
6. The lexical item "gəɗ" (woman) has the same pronunciation and spelling in both dialects.
7. Both sangh-gami and samgh-ghshi have suffix, they are "ni" and "n" respectively.
8. The two dialects have only the suffixes, they are "gi" for sangh-gami and "i" inform of a long sound.
9. Sangh-gami has both prefix and suffixe; "gyaa" and "ni" while sangh-ghshi has only a suffix which is "i" as a long sound.
10. In the same vain the prefix and suffix are "gyaa" and "gi" whiles it is only "in" in the suffix position for sangh-ghshi.

11. On the third person plural pronoun that has been observed and the researcher could not properly make use of, is the item “chaŋshi” for Sangh-gami and “yaŋshi” for Sangh-ghshi as the third person plural pronoun “they” in English language.

Table 4.5.3 Lexical Expansion and Narrowing

	Sangh-gami Dialect	Sangh-ghshi Dialect	English word
Lexical	**1.** Dzaŋ	Choŋ	God
	2. Tsoŋ	Choŋ	Heaven
	3. tsoŋ von	Kur-von	sky
	4. Gami	Choŋ	up
	5. Dzaŋ	Dzaŋ	sun

expansion refers to a word which is used more generally than it should be, while narrowing on the other hand refers to a word which receives more restricted meaning. In the course of this research, it is discovered that Sangh-gami dialect speakers use words in a more expanded way than Sangh-ghshi. That shows that they have more specific lexical items in their dialect than the other dialect. Sangh-ghshi dialect uses one lexeme to mean more than one item for the simple fact that the items are closely related (expanded). This is apparently due to its limited

storage of Zaar vocabulary in its linguistic repertoire. The abov listed words are used by both dialects in either expanded or narrowed situation.

4.6 Plural Nouns formation in Zaar

The term plural referred to more than one, in other words, is having a grammatical form that refers to more than one person or thing. The Zaar (Sayawa) language is not an exception and as well as most African languages. Changes from singular Nouns to plural Nouns formations are not always the same in all words as it is in English language. Most words in Zaar language that have vowels in the singular form have the corresponding short vowel in the plural form in the two dialects under consideration. In addition to that, most words that have the plural forms carry suffixes which are different from the other; such can be seen from the following examples;

Table 4.6.1 Formation of Plural Nouns in both Sangh-Gami and Sangh-Ghshi Dialects

English	Zaar	Plural Sangh-gami Dialect	Plural Sangh-ghshi Dialect	Plural English
Cow	Gaal	Galtsa	galtsə	Cows
Head	Gaam	Gamtsa	gamtsə	Heads
Masquerade	Muhm	Muhmtsa	muhmtsə	Masquerades
Old	Ndwatsa	Ndwatsa	ndwatsə	the Old
Old man	Ndwatsa	Ndwatsaŋsa	ndwatsəŋsə	Oldmen

The table above gives a vivid explanation on the use of singular and plural nouns in both dialects. The first lexeme under consideration is “Cow” in English; it is “Gaal” in Zaar

language and in both dialects, although, the plural form of Gaal in Sangh-gami dialect is galtsa and galtsə in the Sangh-ghshi dialect. Similarly, the second lexeme is "Head" in English, it is called Gaam in general Zaar (Sayawa) language, but plural form of Gaam in Sangh-gami dialect is gamtsa and gamtsə in Sangh-ghshi dialect. The "the Old" in English means ndwatsa in general Zaar language, the Sangh-gami called it ndwatsa for both singular and plural form while in Sangh-ghshi it is refers to as ndwatsə. The pronunciation of the above lexemes by the two dialects are clearly seen at the end of each lexical item and the distinct sound that shows their differences is (tsa) for sangh-gami and (tsə) for Sangh-ghshi respectively.

Table 4.6.2 Plural Formation in both Dialects where (a) is Substituted with (ə)

English	**Zaar singular**	**Plural in sangh-gami Dialect**	**Plural sangh-ghshi Dialect**	**English**
Human being	Zaar	Zarsa	zarsə	human beings
Thief	Meer	merəŋsa	mərəŋsə	thieves
Sheep	təəm	təmsa	təmsə	sheep
King	Guŋ	Guŋsa	guŋsə	Kings
Room	Vun/vin	Vunsa	vinsə	rooms
Youngman	tləbər	tləbərsa	tləbərsə	youths

Vulture	kwaɗak	kwaɗaŋsa	kwaɗaŋsə	vultures

Pronunciations are bound to be different when there is a change in one sound either a vowel or consonant even if the words have the same meaning. The table above shows a list of words that have the same meaning but are pronounced differently in their plural formations. For instance, the phrase "human being" in English, means "zaar" in Zaar (Sayawa) language, while the plural form of the same word in Sangh-gami dialect is spelt "Zaarsa" and "Zaarsə" in Sangh-ghshi dialect respectively. Other examples include "təəm" which means "sheep" in English and it has no plural form but in Zaar (Sayawa) language has it, in Sangh-gami it is "təəmsa" and "təəmsə" in Sangh-ghshi. Furthermore "King" in English is "Guŋ" (singular) in general Sayawa language, while the plural form is "Kings" in English and in Zaar (Sayawa) the plural form is guŋsa and guŋsə in Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi respectively. Furthermore, the lexeme vulture or vultures for singular and plural in English, while in Zaar (Sayawa) language the bird is called kwaɗak (Singular), while the plural form in Sangh-gami is kwaɗaŋsa, whereas in Sangh-ghshi is pronounced kwaɗaŋsə. The pronunciations of the above lexemes are similar in the singular form in both dialects and have differences in their plural forms especially at the end of each lexeme; they are "sa"for Sangh-gami and "sə" for Sangh-ghshi.

Table 4.6.3 Plural Formation in General Zaar Language where (i) for Singular and (shi) for Plural Nouns

English Singular	**Zaar Singular**	**English Plural**	**Zaar Plural**
Fowl	Geri	Fowls	Gershi

Courtship	Mokshi	Courtships	Moksaŋshi
Red colour	Zheli	Red colours	Zhelaŋshi
White colour	Fyali	White colours	Fyalaŋshi
Dog	Kadî	Dogs	Kaɗaŋshi

There is another form of plural formation in Zaar (Sayawa), the above are examples of words that end with the sound "i" dropped and the addition of "shi" to make the plural forms of the Zaar lexical terms, this also common in both Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects. The table above gives a clear illustration of such words; the word fowl in singular and the plural form of it is fowls in English, while the Zaar name for it is "geri" for singular and "gershi" for the plural form. In the same vein, lexical items such as red "zheli", white "fyali" and dog "kadî" those in English only take "s" to be in a plural form, while the Zaar (Sayawa) lexical items will have to replace the last sound "i" with "shi" to form their plurals.

4.7 Findings

The presentation, analysis and interpretation of data quantitatively and qualitatively based on the research questions forms the preoccupation of this section. The following content was analysed based on the pragmatic features of lexical items of the two dialects of Zaar language. The following findings were obtained:

i. Dialects generally play several Sociolinguistic roles in the overall development of a language. Based on the questions asked, there is a great difference in pronunciations and meanings in most of the lexical items identified.

ii. There is little challenge despite the differences in the existing dialects in the speech communities. The two dialects are mutually intelligible in most of their lexical items, whereas the phonological makes it unintelligible especially when Sangh-gami dialect speaks, a listener from Sangh-ghshi dialect hardly can comprehend the message.

iii. The use of particular dialect in each part of the Zaar (Sayawa) speech community has helped in building a strong relationship between the speakers of the same dialect, there by fostering unity and development among the people. Having the knowledge of the two dialects, it aids them to relate well with each other and people from another dialect.

iv. Lexical items are capable of performing an action; J. L. Austin's speech act theory suggests the use of words to perform an activity which is simply the locutionary aspect that concerns the activity we engage in when we say something e.g. "mani/maji" and "madi" in the two dialects meaning "to come" in English. The dialect that is popularly spoken is the Sangh-ghshi with about 60% users, while Sangh-gami is having rest of the 40% speakers within the community.

4.8 Discussion of Findings

The findings show on the various tables indicating dialect similarities and differences within the same language proves that most languages of the world have various degrees of variations in speech; it could be intonation where the pitch rises or falls, long vowels turn to short and

vice versa. Zaar (Sayawa) language is not an exception, and that in any speech community, there may be varieties depending on the geographical features that create in the distance between them, Fishman (1972) confirms this when he says diaglossia exist in all communities of the globe.

From the one hundred (100) lexical items sorted out, the researcher discovered that about 30% of lexical items have shared meaning within the two dialects under consideration while 30% also are completely different both in spelling, pronunciation and meaning and the remaining 40% are lexical items that vary either in their formation of plural that the differences occur or on the process of lexical expansion and narrowing. These are lexical items commonly used in the two dialects daily conversations either in official or unofficial gathering.

The first table identifies the alphabet of Zaar (Sayawa) language which are common to all the dialects of Zaar language, the consonants, vowels and the consonant cluster sounds as it is in **zh, dz, dl** and **gh** etc. The second table introduced to us common features in Zaar language, the issue of low and high intonation in pronunciation. The two dialects have some lexical items that are pronounced interchangeably, when Sangh-gami pronounced a lexical item with a low tone, Sangh-ghshi pronounce the same word with a high tone thereby giving it a different or same meaning vice - versa. The findings further revealed that the magnitude dialect is another area where social class, age group, gender and ethnicity are easily noticed from the use of dialects among other things.

Table 4.5.1 presented a list of thirty-five (35) lexical items that have the same form and content, both dialects pronounced it same, there is no low nor high tone in each lexical item. The same table present another list of thirty-five (35) lexical items that are apparently

different in form and pronunciation but same in meaning. When such words are used, there is no mutual intelligibility between the speakers of the two dialects, for instance the **"əsubsu"** and **"tantan"** meaning "eight" in Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi respectively, unless one is told.

The fifth table is on the use of demonstrative pronouns, there are a lot of variations in both dialects. The demonstrative pronouns **"this, that, these"** and **"those"** are used differently. In Sangh-gami **"this"** is **"ni"** while in Sangh-ghshi it is as **"ən"**. Similarly, the pronoun "that" has a suffix added to any lexical item in the dialect of Sangh-gami whereas Sangh-ghshi does not. Furthermore, demonstrative pronouns "these" and "those" take both prefixes and suffixes to point to the fact that they are used in plural forms in Sangh-gami. Words like "**gyaa"** at the prefix position and **"ni" "gi"** at the suffix positions are used respectively. For instance; the use of "these" as in

a) "These houses" can be written as "gyaadənini", the use of "those" as in
b) "Those houses" can be written as "gyaadənigi".

While in Sangh-ghshi, the prefix is missing but there is a change in the suffixes, for instance; these houses can be written as "dənən", while "those houses" can be written as "dənii" long sound.

The research reveals a number of things in sangh-gami and sangh-ghshi dialects.

1. That the lexical similarities that exist between the dialects are more than the differences, which explain why the two speech forms are dialects of the same language hence are mutually intelligible.

2. It was observed from the research wordlist that there are lexical items which have the same spelling and pronunciation in both the Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects, the word 'lizard', for instance, is '**ɓali**' in both Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects. Furthermore it is noticed that there are words which in both dialects have the same meaning but have slight different pronunciations. For instance, the word 'jan' (tomorrow) in Sangh-ghshi dialect is 'jayau' in Sangh-gami dialect.
3. In the research also it is discovered that, a word might have more than one way of spelling and pronunciation, particularly in Sangh-gami dialect. A word like 'sickle' can be spelt and pronounced as 'robji' or 'lobji'.
4. From the research it was found out that as a result of trade contact and the fact that the Sangh-gami dialect share boundaries with Hausa and Fulani, words have been borrowed into the dialect from the Hausa. For instance, a word like 'maize' Sangh-gami call it Masara as it is in Hausa whereas in Sangh-ghshi is 'ɓalwa'. For the Sangh-ghshi dialect, through the research it is discovered that their boundary with the Ngas from the south and the Jharr to the East does not have any influence or question of borrowing in the dialect.
5. The research also reveals that a word like '*tsong*' in Sangh-gami dialect means 'God', but in Sangh-ghshi dialect '*tsong*' means 'sky'. 'gaam' in Sangh-gami dialect means 'head', while in Sangh-ghshi dialect it means 'hawk'. This means that the same word can mean different things in the two dialects.
6. This research also shows that the Sangh-ghshi dialect is spoken widely in Zaar (Sayawa) land and they are higher in population than Sangh-gami dialect.

7. Furthermore, this study reveals that, at times there is a change of one consonant with another in words between the two dialects. The word ‘come’ for instance is ‘maji’ /mædʒi/ in Sangh-gami, while in Sangh-ghshi is ‘mani’ /mæni/. The /dʒ/ sound is replace with /n/ sound. There is also the addition or deletion of one or two sounds sometimes. For instance the word ’you’ (singular) is ‘kyani’ in Sangh-gami dialect; it is ‘kyan’ in Sangh-ghshi dialect.

At the lexical and phonological variations, the research has also discovered that:

1. Tones play a very important role in Zaar (Sayawa) language generally. It can have a semantic function, thereby bringing about change in the meaning of a word.
2. Some young speakers and respondents especially of Sangh-gami find it difficult to respond fully in their dialect, they flow easily with Sangh-ghshi dialect because Sangh-ghshi dialect is simplified and spoken in most places.
3. Variations occur as a result of distance between the communities which is caused by mountains and other geographical features, trade contacts and influence of neighbouring languages.

4.9 The Implications of the Findings

It is revealed from the findings that the two dialects examined in this work are closely related in some areas of lexical usage while the greater part of the lexical items is apparently divergent. The two dialects are virtually having different lexical items in both the subject and verbal (predicator) positions. In the area of plural formation and the use of pronouns they are similar in both dialects; there are a reasonable number of the lexemes that are the same in both dialects. This implies that the dialects have areas of convergence and divergence in lexicon.

By and large the research reveals that the Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi are dialects of the same language and are mutually intelligible: the differences pointed out, except for a few cases do not impede mutual intelligibility. The speakers consider themselves as speaking the same language- Zaar (Sayawa), though it is acknowledged that there are variations in the language.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Preamble

This chapter focuses on the summary and conclusions drawn from the major findings of the study. It reiterates the contents of all the previous chapters and recommendations that would help further researchers in this area of study are also made.

5.2 Summary

This research begins with a brief background to the study and what the researcher intends to look at as well as the importance of such a study. The aim of the study has being to find out some of the lexical and phonological differences in Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects, to determine the level of mutual intelligibility between the two dialects, and also to highlight the influence of surrounding languages on Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects. The scope of this study covers Marti which is used as the norm for Sangh-gami and Mwari which represents Sangh-ghshi dialect.

The researcher tries to identify various contributions of scholars that are related to this work. They include definitions and explanations of language, communication, dialects, phonology, and lexis. Earlier works on dialects of Zaar (Sayawa) language and dialects of other Nigerian languages related to the work are also reviewed. The theoretical framework the researcher adopts for the study is also explained. The researcher gives the explanations on the sources of data, methods of data collection used for the study. The analyses of the data are done using tables. Other topics such as tone, homonyms, homographs and elision are discussed. Findings Forms the analyses of the data collected were also explained using the variations both of lexical items and phonology. The summary and conclusion of the entire work, and recommendation for further studies related to this work are given.

5.3 Conclusion

The main concern of this study has been to examine the lexical items and phonological variations that are found in Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects of the Zaar (Sayawa) language. In the study, we said that the Sangh-gami and the Sangh-ghshi are the major dialects of the Zaar (Sayawa) language. Other varieties exist in the same Zaar (Sayawa) language but they are regarded as sub-dialects under these two major dialects. The study has established the fact that, both Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects, differences as well as similarities exist in their lexical items and phonology. Some of the differences brought about misunderstanding and total breakdown in communication at the course of conversation between speakers of the two dialects. Based on the finding above, the research concludes that the two speech forms are mutually intelligible, and the dialects are of the same language and cannot be passed as separate languages.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

The researcher admits that this research is not exhaustive or conclusive. It is, therefore, recommended that further research be carried out in the following areas:

1. The effect of age on language use among the Zaar people.
2. The influence of neigbouring languages on Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects of Zaar (Sayawa) language.
3. English-based loan words in Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects of Sayawa language.

REFERENCES

Agbala, C. H. (1995). A Comparative study of Owerri and Ezza dialects of Igbo language, Under graduate project, Department of English and Literary Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Agbedo, C. U. (2007). *Problem of Multilingual Nation*: *The Nigerian perspective Enugu*: Fidgina Global Books.

Ajoda, L. R. (1995). Dialect variations in Igala Language.Under graduate project, Department of English and Literary Studies, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria.

Akindele, F. & Adegbite,W. (2005). *The sociology and politics of language in Nigeri;* Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University press.

--------- (1999). *The Sociology and Politics of English in Nigeria*; *An Introduction.* Ile-Ife O. A. U. Press Ltd.

Akinpelu, E, O. (2001). "The Lexical Theory and Structure". In Ubahakwe, E. and Sogbesan, D. (eds). *An English Grammar for Tertiary Institution.* Ibadan: Stirling Horden publishers.

Akmajian, A., Demers, R., Farmer, A., & Harnish, R. (2001). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication.* New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

Arokoyo, B. E. (2012). A Comparative Phonology of the Olùkùmi, Igala, Owe and Yoruba Languages. *Towards Proto-Niger Congo: Comparison and Reconstruction, Paris*, 18-21.

Ayeomoni, M. A (2017) Lexico-syntactic Analysis of Selected Dialects of Yoruba Language in Nigeria.

--------- (2012). A Lexico-syntactic Comparative Analysis of Ondo and Ikale Dialects of the Yoruba Language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(9), 1802.

--------- (2011) "A Lexico-syntactic Exploration of Ondo and Ikale Dialects of Yoruba Language*" in Journal of Language and Culture*. Vol 2 (7), 124-132.

Bekker, I. (2008). *The vowels of South African English* (Doctoral dissertation, North-West University).

Bernard Caron (2005). *Za:r Dictionary, Grammar, Texts*; Institut Francais Recherche Afrique University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Block B. & Trager, G. (1942). *Outline of linguistic analysis*. Baltimore: Waverly Press

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt.

Britain, D. (2015). *Dialectology*, Southampton: Centre for Language, Linguistics and Area Study, University of Southampton.

Brooks, C. & Warren, R. P. (1972).*Modern Rhetoric*, New York: Harcourt Brace Inc.

Carden, K. (2016). *Vowel-consonant interaction in two dialects of Mandarin*. The University of Iowa.

Census (2006) Population and Housing Census of the Federal Republic of Nigeria Bauchi State: Priority Tables Volume 1 of the NPC.

Chambers, J. K. & Trudgill P. (1998) *Dialectology* (second edition), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Chambers, J. K., Trudgill P. & N. Schilling-Estes (eds.) (2002) *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change;* Oxford, Blackwell

Chambers, J. K. (1993). '*Sociolinguistic Dialectology'*. In Preston 1993b

--------- (1994). '*An introduction to dialect Topography*. 'English World-Wide

-------- (2003). *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and Its Social Significance*, Oxford: Blackwell. First edition 1995.

-------- (2007). *Sociolinguistic: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Hammondsworth: Pengiun.

Comrie, B. (2007). "*Language".* Microsoft Student 2007 (DVD). Redmond, W. A: Microsoft Corporation.

Cruttenden, A. (1979). *Language Infancy and Childhood*, Manchester. Manchester University press.

Dadi Nuhu (2013). *Zaar at a Glance:* Oluwale Printing Co. 61, Niger Road, Ilorin.

Darwin, C., & Prodger, P. (1998). The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals. Oxford University Press, USA.

Daura, R. J. (2012). *An Introduction to Phonetics and Phonology, and Morphology*. Zaria: Yahaya Ventures.

Davenport, M. & S. J. Hannahs (1998). *Introducing Phonetics and Phonology*, London, Arnold.

Ekundare, F. (1996). *Phonetics: An Introductory. Handbook*. AI Publishers.

Elis, R. & Tomlinson, B. (1980).Teaching Secondary English, London: Longman Group Ltd.

Farinde, R. O. & Ojo, J. O. (2005). *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*: Lektay publishers. Lafiya Street, Mokola Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959) "Diaglossia". In Giglioli, P.P. (ed) Language and Social Context. Harmonswoth: Pengiun.

Fishman, J. A (Ed) (1978). *Advances in the study of Societal Multilingualism*; The Hague: Mouton.

-------- (1972). *Advances in Language Planning*; The Hague: Mouton.

-------- (1970). *Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction*. Rowley, Mass. Newbury House

-------- (1967) *Bilingualism with and without Diaglossia: Diaglossia with and Without Bilingualism. Journal of Social issues.*

Fromkin, V. & Rodman, R. (2011).*Introduction to Language*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Giles, Howard (1977). *Language Ethnicity and Integre up Relations*; London and NewYork: Academic Press.

Gimson A. C, (1980). *A practical course of English Pronunciation*. London Edward Amold

Greenberg, J. (1971). *The Language of Africa.* Bloomington: Indiana University.

Gregory, M. J. & Caroll, S. (1978). *Language and Situation: Language Varieties and their Social Contexts*; London: Routledge and Kengan Paul.

Gumperz, John J., and Jenny Cook Gumperz (1982).*Introduction: Language and the Communication of Social Identity,* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1977). The Sociolinguistic Significance of Conversational Code-switching. *RELC journal*, *8*(2), 1-34.

Gumperz, J. J. (1962). *Types Lingual Communities.* London Macmillan.

Halliday, M. K. A. (1994). Introduction to Functional Grammar. London Edward Amold.

Hall, R. A, (1969). Introductory Linguistics. Delhi Motiahal Banarsidas.

Halliday, M. A. K. Mclutosh & Strevens, P. (1964). *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*; London: Longman.

Hammarstrom, H. & Nordhoff, S. (2011). "Langdoc: Bibliographic Infrastructure for Linguistic Typology". In Johannessen, J. B. (ed). *Language Variation Infrastructure.* Oslo Studies in Language VOL. 3 (2), 2011, 31-43.

Harris, Roy (1990). *The Dialect Myth, in Jerold A. Edmondson, et al. (eds.) Development and Diversity:* Language Variation across Time and Space: The Summer Institute of Linguistics, Publication 93.

Haugen, F. (1966). Dialect, Language, Nation, American Anthropologist, 68 (4); 922-935.

Hockett, Charles F. (1958). *A course in modern linguistics*; New York: Macmillan.

Holmes, J. (2008). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*: London: Pearson Education Limited.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialect

Hudson, R. A. (1980). "*Sociolinguistic.*" Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

-------- (1996). *Sociolinguistics, Cambridge*, Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, S. (2002). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, Dell (1972). *On Communicative competence*; In John Pride and Janet Holmes (eds) Sociolinguistics, Harmondsworth: Pengiun.

Katzner, K. (1977) *The Languages of the World*, London.

Labov, W. (1994), *Principles of Linguistic Change*, Vol. 1: internal factors, Blackwell, Oxford.

-------- (1972a). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*; University of Pennsylvania Press.

-------- (1972b). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington DC. Centre for Applied Linguistics

-------- (1972c). Some Principles of Linguistic Methodology. *Language in Society, 1*(1), 97-120.

-------- (1963). 'The social motivation of sound changes', Word 19

Ladefoged, P. (1975). *A Course in Phonetics*.USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Lado R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures*; applied linguistics for language teachers. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lass, R. (1984).*PhonologyAn Introduction to Basic Concepts.* Cambridge. Cambridge, University Press.

Lee, H. (2013). *Evidence of diachronic sound change: A comparative acoustic study of Seoul and Kyungsang Korean* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas).

Long, D. (2001). Towards a Framework for Comparing Sociolinguistic Aspects of Isolated Language Variety Communities. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics, 7*(3), 13.

Lyons, J. (1981). Language and linguistics. Cambridge University Press.

-------- (ed) (1970). *New Horizons in Linguistics*; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

-------- (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matthews P. H. (2007). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics:* SPI Publishers, Great Britain

McArthur, T., Lam-McArthur, J., & Fontaine, L. (Eds.). (2018). *Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford University Press.

Mesthrie, R. et. al (2003). *Introducing Socio Linguistics*, Edinburgh: University Press Edinburgh.

Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and Social Networks;* London: Basil Blackwell

-------- (1970). *Language and Social Networks*; Oxford: Blackwell.

Mishra, D., & Bali, K. (2011, August). A comparative phonological study of the dialects of Hindi. In *17th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences (ICPhS XVII), Hong-Kong, China* (pp. 17-21).

O' Grady, W, Archibald, J., Aronoff, M., and Rees-Miller, J. (eds) (2001). *Contemporary Linguistic*, Boston: Bedford.

Omachonu, G. S. (2013). Comparative Analysis of the Numeral Systems of Igala, Yoruba, German and English. *Linguistik online*, *55*(5).

Omoniyi Moses Ayeomoni (2012). A Lexico-syntactic Comparative Analysis of Ondo and Ikale Dialects of the Yoruba Language. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 2, No. 9, pp. 1802-1810, September 2012. ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland. ISSN 1799-2591

Osisanwo, A. (2012). *Fundamentals of English Phonetics and Phonology*. Lagos: Femolus-Fetop Publishers

----------(2003). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics*; Lagos: Femolous-Fentop Ebute-Meta, Lagos.

Petyt, K. M. (1980). *The Study of Dialect: An Introduction to Dialectology*. London: Andre Deutsch Limited

Reinecke J. E. et-al (1973).*Bibliography of Pidgin and Creole Language*, Honolulu; University Press of Hawaii.

Roach, P. (1997).*English Phonetics and Phonology*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Romaine, Suzanne (1994).*The Language of Children and Adolescents*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sapir, Edward (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. London: Canada Publishing Limited.

Schiffman, H. F (2008). *Diaglossia as a Sociolinguistic Situation*. Pennsylvania: South Asian Regional Studies.

Schneider, E. (2007), *Postcolonial Englishes: Varieties Around the World*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sowa, J. F. (2000). *Language and the Lexicon*: Introduction. Retrieved from http/www.jfsowa.com/ontology/lexicon.htm

Syal, P. & Jindal D. V. (2013). *An Introduction to Linguistics: Language, grammar and Semantic*s. PHI Leaning Private Ltd, Rimjhim House, 111, patparganj Industrial Estate, Delhi.

-------- (2008). An Introduction to Linguistic: Language Grammar and Semantics. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

-------- (2007). *An Introduction to Linguistics: Language, grammar and Semantics.*PHI Learning Private. Ltd.

Stanford, J. N. (2007). *Dialect contact and identity: A case study of exogamous Sui clans* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University. Department of Linguistics and Germanic, Slavic, Asian, and African Languages).

Thomas, L., Wareing, S., Singh, I., Peccei, J. S., Thornborrow, J. and Jones, J. (2004*). Language, Society and Power*; *An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Torgersen, E. and Kerswill, P. (2004), 'Internal and external motivations in phonetic change: Dialect leveling outcomes for an English vowel shift.' *Journal of sociolinguistics* **8** (1), 23–53.

Trudgill, P. (2004), *New-Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

----------(2000). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. Penguin UK.

----------(2002). *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change*; Oxford University Press.

----------(1983). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to language and society*. Hammonsworth: Penguin Books LTD.

----------(1974). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction*. Middlesex, New York: Penguin Books.

----------(1994). *Dialects;* New York: Routledge.

Udondata Joseph (2017). A Comparative Analysis Of English And Annang Phonological Systems. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research* Vol.5, No 6, pp. 43-63, December 2017. UK (www.eajournals.org)

Vajda, E. J. (2013). *Dialectology*. Retrieved from http://www.pandora.cii.wwu.edu/vajda/ling 201/test3materials/dialectology.htm

Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.

---------- (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (5th edition) Blackwell

---------- (1993). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics;* Oxford: Blackwell.

---------- (1987). *Language in Competition*; Oxford: Blachwell.

Wolfram, W. and Schilling- Estes, N. (2006). "How Language Varieties Come about" in McC.askill, C., Bayley,B. and Hill, J. *The Hidden Treasure of Black ASL: Its History and Structure* Gallaudet: University Press.

Wolfram,W. (1991) *Dialects and American English*, Englewood Cliffs N. J., Prentice Hall.

Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---------- (1996). *Pragmatics;* Oxford University Press

---------- (1985). *The Study of Language*; Cambridge University press

Yul-Ifode, S. (2001).*An Introduction to Language in History and Society*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.

Yusha'u, Z. (2015). "A Comparative Study of the Lexico-Phonological Variation in Kano and Sokoto Dialects of Hausa". Master's Thesis, Department of English and Literary Studies. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

APPENDICES

Appendix I

Interviews/Interviewees

Mr. Mark Y. Samako	-	Sangh-ghshi dialect
Mr. Gambo Bissu	-	Sangh-ghshi dialect
Mr. Nehemiah Simon Sang	-	Sangh-gami dialect
Pst. Kongho Talata	-	Sangh-ghshi dialect
Rev, Yohana Sale (rtd)	-	Sangh-gami dialect
Baba Adamu Bitkon	-	Sangh-ghshi dialect
Mrs. Yuwaina Timothy	-	Sangh-gami dialect
Pst. Yohana Barau	-	Sangh-gami dialect
Mrs. Margret Abednigo	-	Sangh-ghshi dialect

Appendix II

List of lexical items with same spelling and pronunciation

Sangh-gami Dialect	Sangh-ghshi Dialect	English
1.Mwan (n)		
2.Kihr (n)		
3.dzaŋ (n)		
4.Zhaghali(n)		
5.miir (n)		
6.Maanda(v)		
7.dzangi		
8. lhm (n)	lhm (n)	moon
9. mokshi(v)	mokshi(v)	courtship
10. naar (v)	naar (n)	hunting
11. zha (n)	zha (n)	water
12. laar (n)	laar (n)	river
13. nduuri (n)	fworgh(n)	kitchen
14. nyatsa (n)	nyatsa (n)	sand
15. longa (n)	longa (n)	hare
16. gwami (v)	gwami (v)	raw
17. gyass (n)	gyass (n)	fish
18. shalaŋ (n)	shalaŋ (n)	bucket
19. mardu (n)	mardu (n)	trouser
20. biaŋ (n)	biaŋ (n)	goad
21. kutn (n)	kutn (n)	mortar

22. Lwu (n)	Lwu (n)	shirt
23. kolat (n)	kolat (n)	calabash
24. Gemtli	gemtli	rival
25. Khŋnga(n)	khŋnga(n)	spoon
26. Piis (n)	piis (n)	arrow
27. Kipm (n)	kipm (n)	bow
28. Mbatlaŋ(n)	mbatlaŋ(n)	corn stock
29. Ngelaŋ (v)	ngelaŋ (v)	stroll
30. Mwot (n)	mwot (n)	bone
31. volaŋ (n)	volaŋ (n)	ground nut
32. Rom	rom (n)	axe
33. Waar	waar (v)	idol
34. ɓwa	ɓwa (v)	to give birth
35. Lyaa	lyaa (v)	to play
36. yadli	yadli	bird
37. risəɲ	risəɲ	tongue
38. khadì	khadì	dog
39. djung	mmagn	dirty
40. tuu	vwa	stomach
41. suta	sutu	evening
42. dugn	kavit	night
43. tlrhgn yatl	yɔchi	snake
44. kusəgn	mbab	rat
45. datəp	datip	road
46. zuri	balgam	local sitting room
47. kwati	kwachɔ	shoes
48. maat	maat	goat
49. wure	wuri	howfar
50. vorang	vorang	blood

51. tsign	tsigni	sit
52. mbwagta	na-mbwabtag	frog
53. kaar	kaari	back
54. yakngari	kaari	behind
55. mberni	mberni	lie
56. ndirr	ndirr	bush
57. namtsa	namtsə	farm
58. gaam	gaam	head
59. gung	gung	king
60. wuum	wuum	pain
61. mbuta	mbuti	navel cord
62. tlrhgn	luut	rope
63. zam	zam	beans
64. khaman	khaman	friend
65. khaam	wummi	here
66. dwam	wurɓa	money
67. bachi	buti	okro
68. mwandah	mwandah	plenty
69. əsubsu	tantan	eight
70. tsoŋ	choŋ	heaven
71. rub	rub	river
72. guchok	mbubti	buttock
73. nyungəs	nyangas	reject
74. zhedî	zhedî	mosquito
75. mɓok	mɓok	hatch
76. goghli	goghli	goitre
77. zlem	ngelaŋ	go round
78. zhurr	phrshi	horse
79. fwaghŋ	fwaghŋ	baboon

80. kerki	nərəm	monkey (sp)
81. zheti	zheti	grass hopper
82. mbutsa	shrəŋ	stick
83. yaar	yaar	grass
84. digsa	gəbzə	ladder
85. zhiɓər	zhiɓər	maggot
86. zhatali	zhatal	maggot (sp)
87. zholnga	zholnga	marrow
88. mbem	mbem	free
89. karo	daagubzhi	ram
90. nyintsəŋ	nyitsəŋ	nose
91. tsughər	jiga	bag
92. laghr	laghri	jesting
93. dzub	dzub	ten
94. ngil	ngil	song
95. ɓamlak	zaghat	yam
96. ləndəŋ	ləndəŋ	elephant
97. munvar	mənvar	elder
98. ŋaitaas	ŋatass	finger
99. gəpda	gəpdə	crocodile
100.Tari	tari	flat rock

Appendix III

Table four: Lexical Items Differences Autography, Pronunciation but same Meaning.

Sangh-gami Dialect	Sangh-ghshi Dialect	English
1.əsubsu	tantan	eight
2.dzaŋ	choŋ	God
3.gyamda	mbishlr	ashes
4.chat	cim	call
5.ndugbogn	twaknanndam	nine
6.ɗyeɓad	mburuk	all
7.dwaam	wurɓa	money
8. gambur	wuur	mountain
9.fwaraŋ	falaŋ	thunder
10. kyasəŋ	shaŋndi	pot
11. lambh	puus	stone
12. suɓər		
13. nduri	fworghad	short
14. nduwan	dan	stool
15. ndwaba	dabwa	toad
16. ndi	naghad	food
17. mbogta	na-mbobtak	frog
18. mbutsa	shirhŋ	stick
19. madi/maji	mani	come
20. mmam	kuur	throw
21. tuu	vwa	stomach
22 .votsa	sorgah	broom
23. vuri	gari	monkey
24. tamji/tamdi	tamdì	give me
25. zhuur	phrshi	horse
26. taakunt	rubzuŋ	pestle

• 27. kanci/kandi	kaghdî	small hoe
• 28. robjhi	gaa	sickle
• 29. vun	vin	room
• 30. thlaa	ngər	to cut
• 31. nduŋh	kavid	night
• 32. wuldah	ndi	to answer
• 33. kusuŋ	mbab	rat
• 34. nghndà	dedah	reason
• 35. digsa	gəbzə	ladder

Appendix IV

QUESTIONNAIRE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES
FACULTY OF ARTS
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA
M A ENGLISH DISSERTATION (WORD LIST)

This research is being carried out on "A Comparative study of Lexical Terms in Sangh-gami and Sangh-ghshi dialects of (Zaar) Sayawa Communities of Bauchi State." Kindly assist the researcher by supplying the following information:

BIO-DATA

Gender: male ( ) female ( )

Age adult 45 and above ( ) youth 25-44 ( )

Marital status married ( ) single ( ) divorcee ( )

SECTION A: Lexical Items

Kindly supply the Sayawa (Zaar) words for the following words by filling the blank space appropriately

S/NO	ENGLISH	SANGH-GAMI	SANGH-GHSHI
1	Hand		

2	Guard		
3	Donkey		
4	Moon		
5	Flood		
6	Dirty		
7	Food		
8	Pig		
9	Hoe		
10	Tongue		
11	Power		
12	Pain		
13	God		
14	God		
15	Beans		
16	Child		
17	Today		
18	Pot		
19	Friend		
20	Eight		
21	Wet		
22	Write		
23	Sister		
24	Wife		

25	Birth		
26	Quite		
27	Hair		
28	Bag		
29	Fish		
30	Navel		
31	Rope		
32	Sand		
33	Ashes		
34	Cassava		
35	Water		
36	Maize		
37	Cloth		
38	Ram		
39	Devil		
40	Respect		
41	Journey		
42	King		
43	Eat		
44	Cry		
45	Broom		
46	Mortar		
47	Groundnut		

48	Dog		
49	Rabbit		
50	Morning		
51	Onion		
52	Blood		
53	Cow		
54	Pestle		
55	Money		
56	Mat		
57	Sickness		
58	Mirror		
59	Snake		
60	Nine		
61	Night		
62	Evening		
63	Goat		
64	Road		
65	Cook		
66	Wine		
67	Duck		
68	Row		
69	Joyful shout		
70	Calabash		

71	Shame		
72	Fetch		
73	Collect		
74	Cotton		
75	Short		
76	Handsome		
77	Back		
78	Plate		
79	Man		
80	Servant		
81	Husband		
82	Skin		
83	Gather		
84	Fallow land		
85	Baboon		
86	Poverty		
87	Idol		
88	Axe		
89	Sickle		
90	Blind		
91	Sit		
92	Grumbling		
93	Stirring		

94	Read		
95	Brother		
96	Horse		
97	Ladder		
98	Bird		
99	Stick		
100	Frog		

SECTION B: RESPONDENTS' USE OF THE DIALECTS

Kindly provide answers to the following questions

1. What dialect do you speak? (a) Sangh-gami ( ) (b) Sangh-ghshi ( )

2. a. If Sangh-gami is your dialect, do you understand Sangh-ghshi speakers? YES/ NO

2. b. If Sangh-ghshi is your dialect, do you understand Sangh-gami speakers? YES/ NO

3. Which of the dialect is more widely spoken in (Zaar) Sayawa land? (a) Sangh-gami ( ) (b) Sangh-ghshi ( )

4. Do the neighbouring languages have any influence on the Sangh-gami and Sangh ghshi dialects of (Zaar) Sayawa language? (a) Yes ( ) (b) ( )

(If yes, give examples of words that are borrowed from the neighbouring languages into the dialect under study).

Sangh-gami…….....

Sangh-ghshi…….