

BARRIERS TO SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

A CASE STUDY OF HAUSA AND KURAMA

BY

MRS. MAIMUNA SALIHU

MA/ARTS/24440/2000-2001

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN HAUSA – LANGUAGE**

**DEPARTMENT OF NIGERIAN AND AFRICAN LANGUAGES
FACULTY OF ARTS, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY
ZARIA NIGERIA**

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis has been written by me and that it is a record of my own research work. It has not been presented before in any previous application for a higher degree.

MRS. MAIMUNA SALIHU

(CANDIDATE)

Date: _____

The above declaration is confirmed

DR. MUNIR MUHAMMADU

(MAJOR SUPERVISOR)

Date: _____

CERTIFICATION

This thesis entitled “Barriers to Second Language Acquisition a case study (Hausa and Kurama) by MRS. MAIMUNA SALIHU meets the regulations governing the degree of Master of Arts Hausa – Language of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, and is approved for its contribution to Hausa and Kurama language.

Date: _____

Dr. Munir Muhammadu

Major Supervisor

Date: _____

Internal Examiner

Date: _____

External Examiner

Dean Postgraduate School

Date: _____

DEDICATION

To my parents, my husband Dr. S. A. Dadari and my children.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise be to Almighty Allah who alone is the most beneficent and the merciful for giving me the ability and guidance through out my educational carrier and towards successful completion of the research work.

There was no doubt that this research afforded me with an opportunity to know alot about the Kurama and Hausa language's. I was made to know alot of their problems especially of Kurama adults learning Hausa as second language phonological, barriers syntax and morphoneme.

I was assited by numerous individuals and organizations in the course of this study. I wish to personally thank few of them that readily come to mind.

I wish to acknowledge indebtedness and gratitude to my husband Dr. S. A. Dadari who provided me with all supports and encouragement to be able to complete this work. I am highly indebted to my major supervisor Dr. Munir Mamman of the Department of Nigerian and African Languages, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, who despite his numerous responsibility provided the supervision, inspection, encouragement and other assistance that brought this work to fruitions.

I am also grateful to Mal. R. M. Zarruk of the Institute of Education for his unmeasurable contribution. I am highly indebted to Mal Abubakar, Mal Shuaibu Abdulmumini of the Department of Nigerian and African Languages who also spear their time to offer their professional advices which really helped me to get through with my work. I am grateful to Mal Sani Nuhu, Mal. Samaila and Mal

Nuhu Sada Secretary, all of the Department of Nigeria and African Languages for their individual support.

This knowledge will not be complete if I did not extend my thanks to Mrs. Rekiyatu Ibrahim, Usman Abdul of the Division of Agricultural Colleges (DAC) Samaru – Zaria and Mal. Ibrahim Babati of the Department of Nigerian and African Languages, A.B.U., Zaria who took the responsibility of typing this work. I am grateful to the Librarian, Mal. Usman of the Department of Nigerian and African Languages, Librarian Faculty of Education Hajiya who supported me materially when ever the need arise.

It is not possible to mention all those who contributed directly or indirectly to the success of this work. I therefore acknowledged with gratitude to those who were not mention specifically but have helped in one way or the other.

ABSTRACT

Language is the key point to any effective reasoning for every individual, without language, one cannot express its idea properly and effectively.

This thesis is an attempt to find out the barriers faced by Kurama adults in acquiring Hausa as second language. It is divided into five chapters, the first chapter introduces the study, purpose of the study, statement of the problem of the study, significance of the study, scope and limitation on the study and then basic assumption.

The second chapter is about literature review on second language – acquisition. Sociopsychological problem in language learning and learning strategies in an adult. The third chapter introduces the research method used in conducting this study. The fourth chapter is data presentation and discussion where the researcher identified barriers relating to phonetic and phonology interference of Kurama phonological system into Hausa language and barriers relating to syntax. The last chapter summarizes, discussion and recommendation concerning the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	i
Declaration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
Certification	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
Dedication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
Acknowledgement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	v
Abstract	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vi

CHAPTER ONE

1.1	Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
1.2	The Purpose of the study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
1.3	Statement of the Problem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
1.4	Significance of the study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
1.5	Scope of limitation of the study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
1.6	Basic Assumption	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

CHAPTER TWO

2.1	Literature Review	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
2.2	Sociopsychological problem in language learning	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17
2.3	Language learning strategies for the adult	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0	Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26
	Background of the study									
3.1	Theories of Language Acquisition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26

3.2	Behaviourists theory	-	-	-	-	-	-	26
3.3	Mediation theory	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
3.4	Nativist theory	-	-	-	-	-	-	33
3.5	Kurama Origin	-	-	-	-	-	-	36
3.6	Hausa Origin -	-	-	-	-	-	-	37
3.7	Population of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	41
3.8	Method of measuring attitude	-	-	-	-	-	-	41
3.9	Data Collection	-	-	-	-	-	-	43

CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation and Discussion of Data

4.1	Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	44
4.2	Barriers Relating to Phonetics and Phonology	-	-	-	-	-	-	45
4.3	The Interference to Kurama Phonological system into Hausa	-	-	-	-	-	-	55
4.4	Barriers Relating to syntax	-	-	-	-	-	-	58
4.5	Types of Sentences Produced by the Kurama Adults	-	-	-	-	-	-	58

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1	Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	61
5.2	Conclusion	-	-	-	-	-	-	61
5.3	Recommendation	-	-	-	-	-	-	63
	References	-	-	-	-	-	-	63

CHAPTER ONE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In Nigeria today, we have different types of languages which according to some researchers are about 179 (C. L. Temple). A source among these are Kurama and Hausa. Kurama people are mostly found in Lere Local Government of Kaduna State. These people have been together with Hausa in that area from time immemorial, they shared some cultural values together (Notes on the tribes of Northern Nigeria).

Kurama people are known to be using Hausa as their second language irrespective of whether they can speak it fluently or not and the Hausa people in the area are aware of this.

Seeing how researchers on language learning put less emphasis on barriers or problems facing language learners, the present research is intended to look into these barriers. A study research would be conducted on barriers facing Kurama adults acquiring Hausa as second language to know why, how and where these barriers do occur.

1.2 THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study is to find out what are the barriers facing Kurama adults in acquiring Hausa as a second language. Problem of letters, pronunciation and formation of Hausa sentences is very much common among Kurama both adults and teenagers (Ndhahi, 1982). Stated that second language learners acquire certain grammatical aspects in an order similar to that followed by first language acquirers. It is also

claimed that second language learners regardless of their age or first language background, acquire grammatical morphemes and structures in a similar sequence (Duley and Burt 1973).

Moreover, researchers in second language acquisition have observed that the processes involved in the acquisition of first language and second language may be fundamentally the same i.e. that first language and second language learners of a given language adopt similar strategies in acquiring the language (Corder 1975, Macnmere, 1975 and Ndhahi, 1982).

Since there are processes or strategies in acquiring second language, then there will be barriers or problems moving together with those strategies. So the study intended looking into these problems with the hope of getting solutions to them. The study also intended to compare of problems or barriers found by other researchers with those in the present study. Therefore, the researcher's aim is to know the barriers facing Kurama adults in acquiring Hausa as second language.

1.3 **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

In acquiring second language is known to be faced with many barriers especially in an adult, whose tongue is stiff and whose acquiring abilities have already developed, even though, (Dulay and Burt, 1973) claimed that second language learners regardless of their age or first language background, acquire grammatical morphemes and structures in a similar sequence. From the above statement both adults and teenagers

encountered the same problem in acquiring second language. So it is hoped that, this research will look into these barriers encountered by second language acquirer and also to answer the following question.

1. Why do Kurama adults encountered difficulties in learning Hausa as second language.
2. What were the barriers the Kurama face when learning Hausa language?
3. Do Hausa and Kurama share Linguistics similarities?
4. Are they making any attempt to get rid of such barriers?
5. Why do Kurama allowed these barriers continue from generation to generation?
6. Would they adopt similar ways like other languages acquirers in solving their own problems?

1.4 **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

Very little research work has been carried out on second language learning and more emphasis in children not in adults, and also barriers in second language learning is not a major concern to linguistics researchers. Ndhahi (1982) carried a research on second language acquisition in childhood but not on barriers and Yusuf, (1984) on phonological development of a Hausa child, also not on barriers but rather how the language is acquired. So the present study is purely on barriers facing adults second language acquirer.

The study will also serve as a guide to Kurama on how to properly construct Hausa sentence in accordance to its correct grammar. It will also serve as a guide to teachers teaching Hausa to Kurama children so that they would be able to avoid such barriers in adulthood.

It will also be a contribution towards stimulating linguists, and other researchers' interest to carry out studies in this area of barriers in second language acquisition in an adults and in Hausa and Kurama in particular.

According to Tomori, (1981) that in spite of all the research as done so far in the field of language learning, we do not know enough about the best strategies for language teaching.

So to follow the mechanisms and strategies in teaching language will bring less barriers in acquiring language. Mc Donough (1981) gives support to the point made that studies of second language learning have the potential of giving course writers and teachers direct evidence of how people learn languages which coupled with the analysis of how various teaching techniques work can eventually lead to a systematic and rich account of the teaching learning process to be embodied in new types of language course and thus result in more successful learners.

So since language teachers do not follow the best strategies and mechanism, there will be problems here and there in acquiring second language. The study will carry a research work to find out the barriers affecting Kurama adult in acquiring Hausa as second language.

1.5 **SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY**

This study is concerned with barriers to second language acquisition of a Kurama adult, it is impossible to deal adequately with the whole language. Some selection have been both obvious and necessary. The study is therefore specifically concerned with barriers on construction of Hausa sentence, letters pronunciation and formation of vocabulary. It will also give an indication to the process involved in language acquisition by Kurama adults acquiring Hausa as second language.

The study would hopefully deal with other aspects of linguistic development acquisition of the sound system, strategies adopt in solving language acquisition problems. This will be necessary to a Kurama adult where nothing have been done of language development.

1.6 **BASIC ASSUMPTION**

The following are the basic assumption of the study:-

Since many second language acquirers have been observed to progress through the same process to those observed in first language learning, so the problem faced in childhood will also be the same in adulthood. Chomsky, (1965) and Mcnell, (1965) stated that, every child is born with universal linguistic device for the acquisition of language, so it is the same devices used in adulthood and probably the same barriers have been encountered.

Assumption has also been made that adult language is not through acquisition process, that is, through gradual development of ability by

using it naturally in communicative situation, but it is through learning process. That is, through a conscious process of accumulating knowledge of the vocabulary and grammar of a language.

Also those whose second language experience is primarily a learning one, tend not to develop the proficiency of those who have had an acquiring experience. Some features like vocabulary, grammar etc. of a second language are easier to acquire than others like phonology.

It is an assumption that on attending puberty period, it became very difficult to acquire another language fully. It is also believed that young children are quicker and more effective in second language acquisition than adults as Munir, (1992) stated that children learn, through informal Islamiya School. It will be very difficult for an adult learning or acquiring second language in such organization because the optimum age may be during the years of 11 – 16 Yule (1987) when the flexibility of the language acquisition faculty has not been completely lost and the maturation of cognitive skills allows a more effective working out of the regular features of the second language encountered.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

From the 60^s and 70^s, Child language research has been systematically been the prior work for linguists. Theories on second language acquisition especially in adults have not been the concern for linguistic research. Richards (1971a), States that the utility or generative linguistic theories in second language research is not especially obvious at the present time. This research on barriers on second language acquisition in an adult will, however used theories on child language development both first and second language learning, to be able to develop or sort out barriers affecting adult second language acquisition on Kurama adult acquiring Hausa as second/language, and also to develop a solving theory for them. Yule, (1985) states that errors are considered to be negative, so they should be eliminated. Though strevens, (1969) Hypothesizes that barriers in language acquisition should not be viewed as problems to be over come but rather as, normal and inevitable features indicating the strategies that learners us.

Ndhahi, (1982) defines second language as “It implies a formal learning situation with feedback error correction rule learning and an artificial environment that introduces aspects of the grammar one at a time. Although usually used with respect to adolescent and adult. Adolescents and adults are the major group involved in second language

acquisition, but learning in the formal ways is not a necessity because in some adults learning of a second language occur as a result of constant interaction with the community of the target language, while some individual learn their first and second language right from childhood. Yule, (1985) states that it is true that many young children whose parents speak different languages can acquire a second language in circumstances similar to those of first language acquisition, while a majority of people are not exposed to a second language until much later.

First and second language acquisition are generally believed to be similar as Tryop (1974) suggests that there is no qualitative different between language one acquisition and language two learning. But it is not possible of this statement because the capability of learning a first language for children cannot be the same with that of an adult who has a lot to do, whose tongue has stiff and whose acquiring abilities has declined. Adults are not capable of learning language in the natural spontaneous way that children are. The adult learning a second language usually involved great effort and seldom results in perfect mastery of the new language. Also language learning in childhood is seen as natural and inevitable, but these natural abilities in adults might have been lost.

Langacker, (1968) states that little is known about the specific environment factors that make it possible for language, acquisition to occur, but the primary ingredients would appear to be merely sufficient exposure to I language use in a social context. So it is obvious that to

acquire a language very well, it needs constant interaction and sufficient use of the target language. Though, the Kurama adult, subject of this research, has the chances of all these but yet barriers still exist in acquiring Hausa as his second language because of his first language impact which is Kurama. It is also true with the researcher herself, she is a Kurama, she grew up speaking the two languages that is Hausa and Kurama, but yet she still has problems on letters pronunciation. She makes her correction after learning the language in a formal way.

However, the differences between learning in the child and in the adult may have been exaggerated, but the art of adolescence does seem to constitute some sort of dividing line on the ability to master a linguistic system. For example a person past adolescence is not likely to learn to speak a second language without a noticeable account, however slight.

Ndhahi, (1982) states that both language one and language two learners make use of prior knowledge skills and tactics, that any learning build on what has happen before. So language learning and language acquisition are creative process, just as the child acquiring his first language is seen as actively playing a role in the creation of his own language, while in language two the learner is creating his language theory (that is second language learner). More so other researchers have found differences between language one acquisition and language two learner. Chun (1980). For example argues that language two learner is a very different person who finds himself in a different situation. Again

Cordor (1967) states that the learning of first language is inevitable, but there is not such inevitability in the learning of a second language.

What ever may be the case, learning a language is something which is governed by grammatical rules and no tongue can be acquired without it. So both language one and language two system progress through series of stages by means of rules that the learner essentially formulate himself with. Though, children language has been accepted as a system in its own right and not as a deviation from the adult language, while second language learner speech that is inter- language is regarded as a unique system which is different from the learners first language.

Richards, (1971a) suggests some factors which according to him will in hence and help influencing the learner's language use. The first according to his is language transfer. That sentences on the target language may exhibit interference from the mother tongue. In this language transfer there is the interference analysis tends to be from the deviant sentence back to the mother tongue, while contrastive analysis on the other way is predicting errors by comparing the linguistic system of the mother tongue, and the target language. Dulay and Burt, (1972). In another development Yule, (1987) found that one-third of the deviant sentences from second language learning attributed to language transfer. Any way, the idea of language transfer cannot be over emphasized, but is the case with some children learning second language formally but not possible with adults.

The second factor as he states is interlingual interference. This refers to items produced by the learner which reflect the structure of the mother tongue, but generalizations based on partial exposure to the target language. It's observation was made on an English errors produced by speakers of many unrelated languages. What he discovered was sub categories of error types which seen to be common to speakers of diverse language as they develop hypothesis about the structure of English. Like first language learner, the second language learner also tries to derive the rules behind the data to which he has been exposed, and may develop hypotheses that correspond neither to the mother tongue nor target language. Richards, (1971a) found systematic intralingual error to involve overgeneralization ignorance of rules restriction, incomplete application of rules and semantic errors. Also Brudhiprabha as it was discovered by Richards, when quantified learners of English suggest that many intralingual errors represent the learning difficulty of what are often low levels rules in the target language. Richard and Brudhiprabha were more concerned about learners learning English as second language, but less concerned about other learners learning different languages and not English.

The third factor is the socio-linguistic situation. He states that different settings for language use result in different degrees and types of language learning. He further explains that the effect of socio-cultural setting on the learners of language, the relationship between the learner

and the target language community are the effect of the learners motivation for learning the second language. Richards, (1971a) forget that there are learners, inspite the effective motivation given by the target language community, ten not to master the language. So learning a language sometimes does not depend on motivation or relationship of the learner with the target language community but rather the learners interest to the target language.

The fourth factor is the modality of exposure to the target language and the modality of production. According to Richards (1971a) production and perception may involve the acquisition of two partially overlapping system. Vildomee, (1963) observes that interference between the bilingual's language is generally on the productive rather than receptive side. People often report instances of intrusion of element of their mother tongue in speech production, but rarely in their understanding of another language. On the other hand, Nemser (1971a) suggests that two different systems may be internalized in the target language depending on the modality. He found that in the productive modality, phonological replacement differ depending on whether the learner was imitating utterances he heard or producing speech spontaneously.

Production here does not necessary matter much as the leaner is more concern on how to acquire the language. So production modality will definitely improve when the target language is acquired.

The fifth factor which according to Richares (1971a), may affect the approximates system of the second language learner is his age so aspect of the child's learning capacities change as he grows older and these may affect language learning. He further explains that the child's memory span increases with age. He acquires a greater number of abstract concepts and he uses these to interpret his experience. Lenneberg (1967), notes a period of primary language acquisition, postulated to be biologically determined beginning when the child starts to walk and continues until puberty. Some of the characteristics of child language has been attributed to the particular nature of his memory and processing strategies in childhood. Brown and Belling, (1964), relates aspect of children language to imitation on the length of utterances imposed by the child's in ability to plan ahead more than a few words. Therefore in some ways adults are prepared for language learning than children. Adults have better memories, a larger store of abstract concepts that can be used in learning and a greater ability to form new concepts. Children however are better imitation of speech sound.

This is an idea to agree with, but to make the hypotheses more clear, adults whose acquiring facilities have decline cannot acquire language better than children. Children are still very young with fresh memories are believed to acquire language in a better way quicker than adults. Tryop (1974) suggests that adults mother tongue developments is primarily in terms of vocabulary. The adult strategies of language learning

may be more vocabulary oriented than syntactic. Acquisition of syntax poses a task for adults which is no longer easy.

However, research into second language learning and bilingualism has not gone very far toward explaining how the rules for the generation of sentences in two or more language by the same speaker are related. Swan, (1971), working with children who had been exposed to two languages or more languages from birth, suggest that for the learner of this age 2 – 4 years, the differentiation to two or more linguistic code is not a significantly difference problem from that faced by the monolingual child who acquires control of several different varieties of one language informal or formally. He also found that linguistic rules which were common to both languages were first to be acquired by bilingual children, rules which were language specific were acquired later. These rules are more applicable to children and are specially learning language in the formal way. They can also be applied to adults if the second language acquisition is through formal way.

The sixth factor according to Richards (1971a), is lack of stability of the learners approximates system. Such system, as he stated, are usually unstable in given individual, since there is invariably continuing improvement in learning the target language. He further explains that the circumstances for individual learning are never identical. This varies from one individual to another. All these factors given by Richard (1971) which

may affect the approximative system of second language learning may be acceptable in some individuals, but in some the reverse is the case.

Yule (1987) has also given some education approaches which are aimed at fostering second language acquisition. The first approach as he states, was developed by carton which is the grammar translation method. In this approach is to treat second language learning as a way similar to any other academic subject. Long list of words and a set of grammatical rules have been memorized and the written language rather than spoken language is emphasized. This approach or method could be more effective on those who can read and write. But in a setting where the subject of the study could not read or write, this approach is less important to him.

The second method called direct method is the recreation of the exposure which young children have in language acquisition. Everything said in the classroom, for example, has to be expressed in the second language. Emphasis was placed on the spoken language, while vocabulary lists and explanations of grammatical rules were avoided. By assumption this method is more relevant in classroom setting. The subject of this research is not learning in the classroom, the acquisition of the target language is through communication and interaction with the target language community.

The third method is known as audiolinqual. It is an attempt to improve on the short coming of the direct method by devising more

structured material for the student. This involved a systematic presentation of grammatical constructions of the second language moving from the simple to the more complex often in the form of drills which the student has to repeat. This method was strongly influenced by the belief that the fluent use of language was essentially, a set of habit which would be developed with a lot of practice. This approach was justified by Rivers, (1964), He claims that second language learning is basically a mechanical process of habit formation. The method is practicable in both formal and informal way of language acquisition.

The fourth approach given by Yule, (1987), is the communicative approach. He states that, this approach is widely used in second language teaching. It is a partially a reaction against the artificiality of pattern-practice and also against the belief that consciously learning the grammar of a language will result in an ability to use the language. This approach is more useful to language teaching but in the process where language learning is informally done, less emphasis is placed on grammar but how to communicate with the target language. Language one, unlike an adult learning second language is more a communicative pattern than drilling and pattern practicing.

Dulay and Burt, (1973, 1974) observed that like the language one learner, the language two acquirer, passes through period of incorrect usage or incomplete control of a pattern prior to total mastery of structures. Language two research produces evidence of developmental errors like

those errors found in language one acquisition. If this is something to go by, the research on language two should learn something from language one process.

In summarizing the above discussion, it is believed that both first and second language learners undergoes the same process irrespective of either children or adults. But language two learner is perceived as the product of some one who is in some way. Competent in one language and incompetent in another, so we should consider second language as a type of language in its own right, which may as its varies and develop, provides us with crucial insights into the very nature of that more general phenomenon called human language.

2.2 SOCIOPSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM IN LANGUAGE LEARNING

Most significant research has been applied to problems of learning a first language, and perhaps even more has been expended on the difficulties of second language learning. Most of this investigation has concentrated upon various aspects of the psychology of learning, though, some have also dealt with other, and perhaps to some extent more fundamental problems, namely motivation, language prejudice as one of the aspects of culture language problem.

Relatively little research, however has been related to three other aspects of language learning and use,

1. is failure of some person to learn a foreign language despite continue and excellent exposure.

2. level off in the process of language learning, despite continued exposure and
3. significant declines in ability to use a language which has once been moderately well learned or even mastered.

These problems were presented by Eugene A. Nida (1969) during paper presentation from the second international congress of applied linguistics. She further explain that, though, certain of these problems may seem quite tangible to the principal interests of many persons concerned with language teaching, nevertheless it is quite possible that the insight gained from a careful consideration of these types of difficulties in language learning and use, may suggest important new approaches to some of the nagging problems with which we are constantly so concerned.

The problems discussed according to Nida, (1969) were not based upon psychological tests with a control groups or upon broad surveys, nevertheless, the problems which are presented are much more likely to yield to explanation based upon tests of psychological profile. The learning difficulties of people outside the classroom are much more close to real-life situation and this more likely to reflect fundamental psychological traits and predispositions than do those problem which are encountered in attempt to test such personality features as related to classroom performance.

Failure of some persons to learn second language despite excellent exposure she explain is an immediate economic advantages which may

figure in one's decision not to speak the learned language. A person who level off in a language according to her is a learner on both side of the consumer and producer aspects of the language, tends to stop once the initiation rits' have been completed. She explain initiation rites' as language learning by many persons stops immediately after examination or the degree of acceptance within second language community which means necessary for carrying on one's activities with minimal effort. Decline in language ability according to her occurs when the learner is removed from constant exposure, she emphasize that decline is especially rapid in the case of a second language learner and particularly if the language has been only partially learned. Such a decline may even occur in the case of one's own mother tongue.

2.3 LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES FOR THE ADULT

Corder, (1967) states that the linguistic performance of the adult language learner is evidence of his possession of a strategy or built in language learning syllabus, one which might be different from the syllabus imposed on him by the language course designer. The question then naturally arises whether this syllabus is the same for the adult as for child, that the child has such a syllabus seems now to be beyond question. Smith and Miller, (1966). A language learner theory that ascribes the same language learning potential to the adult as fore, e.g. by Sweet (1899), Jespersen (1904), and by Palmer (1922). But these typical language learning reformers felt it necessary for various reasons to

superimpose on this innate language learning competence various principles of course design that determined in advance the order in which the adult learner would acquire the lexical and structural elements of the targeted language. At the same, Palmer (1921), and Palmer and Redman (1932) recognized that while it might be correct to credit adult learners with the same innate language learning competence as the child, not all adult learner applied their competence on the same way, or even at all, and it was such differences in language learning performance that accounted for the wide, variation in degree and kind of target language ability that is seen in adult as opposed to children. But while the general trend in the last twenty-five or thirty years has been to deny even the possibility that the adult could in any sense learn a second language in the same way in which he learned his first, the question of whether or not he possesses a language learning competence like that of the child still remains to be formulated into a testable hypothesis. I should therefore like during the rest of the discussion to keep in mind not only the difficulties that stand, or can be made to stand, in the way of the adult learner but also the fact that many adults do acquire rather remarkable skill in using second language. In fact, there is a surprising number of quasi-native speakers to be found, naturally one is not so aware of them as there are none of the usual differential that mark them off from the population of native speakers.

One attempt to explain the differences in language learning performance between adults and children takes as its starting point the observation that many of the features of the learner's already known language get incorporated into second language system the learner constructs for himself (Fries, 1945). While the child, as a *tabula rasa*, needs to consider only the primary linguistic data of one language, the adult learner has the idiosyncratic features of his first language as part of his intellectual make-up, and cannot extricate them from the stimulus system to which they function as responses. Hence interference phenomena arise inevitably such an account is bound to leave a taste of dissatisfaction in the mouth of those linguists and psychologists who no longer hold strict structuralist or behaviourist view, but what such modern linguists have done is simply to revise the theory of language learning so as to make it conform to more current views, while not abandoning the initial assumption that that adult is bound to be a different kind of learner from the child, from the point of view of his innate learning capability (McNeil, 1965; Lenneberg 1967; Lakoff, 1969)

As long as interference phenomena are treated as the mechanical result of the learner's language learning strategy, while inexorably incorporates into the grammar of L2 linguistic features of L1, there is no difficulty in collecting data to support that hypothesis. The rest of this paper is devoted to the argument that an important distinction has been missed, however by including under one schema all that the adult learner

does, and that it is essential to distinguish at least two components in the language learning strategy of the adult.

Consider the distinction made by Chomsky (1965) between 'competence' and 'performance'. He is of course referring to linguistic knowledge, on the one hand, and the linguistic behaviour, on the other of the idealized speaker hearer. The first underlies, but does not fully account for the second. While competence is necessary, it is not sufficient to account for all the performance features that are the result of the interaction of very complex and overlapping systems of belief, as logical mechanisms of speech.

Let us extend this distinction into the field of learning as well. Thus is useful to think of underlying learning principles, known in advance by the learner before he ever undertakes a learning task, and the procedures by which he implements these principles in a particular situation, or with a particular kind of primary data or input. Together, these principles and procedures constitute his learning strategy. In Aristotle's terminology, the learning principles are the formal cause, the procedures the efficient cause of learning. This is exactly analogous with Comisky's distinction between competence the formal cause, -and performance the efficient cause – of language behaviour. We will thus view the language learning process as composed of two parts; a language learning "competence" and the actual language learning "performance"

Of course, it is an open question what the nature of the principles of language learning are that constitute this language learning competence. Trying to specify them amounts to trying to say just what formal features or criteria of analysis would have to be build into a language learning device that replicated the language learning competence of the human being. First of all, the device would have to have some notion of phonetic representation. This feature is the analogue of the perceptual characteristic of the human learner that enables him to identify speech-sounds as such, to the exclusion of other auditory inputs. Secondly, we assume a segmentation criterion, which cuts up the linear array of speech into the phonetic, lexical, and phrasal elements that constitute the surface structure of the language act. This criterion is what allows the device to arrive at segments that match those of the grammar of the input language. In the meantime, a global semantic representation is assigned to the whole segmented phonetic representation' portions of the total semantic representation are then assigned to segments or segment-sequences of the phonetic representation. Those phonetic-semantic units are then stored in such a way that access to them is possible given either the semantic or phonetic portion. At this point, we do not assume that the device has any information about the actual syntactic operations that can assemble the lexical entities into the original correct surface structure sequence. This is consonant with the claim of McNeil (1965' 1966) that in his first utterances, the child produces strings that honour the basic

syntactic relations such as subject predicate, but lack the correct surface structure form of adult utterances. In other words, the device, while segmenting the phonetic input into elemental part and storing them, will not reassemble them correctly to match the original inputs until the intermediate (transformational) rules that distort the underlying basic structures have been learned. This is just what we find when we trace gradual introduction into the child's speech of the features of adult speech that are the result of transformation that insert surface morphemic material, such as infinitival to, inflections, etc, which delete superfluous elements, and which rearrange, permute, and restructure the elements of the basic structure of the sentence.

At this point, we must assume that the device is provided with a linguistic theory. By this is meant simply that the device is capable of accepting only those analyses of the data that are formulated in terms of certain constraints on the form of grammars. (Chomsky, 1965). Of course, we do not know what the exact form of this is, but it seems inescapable that one must be present. The behaviourist structuralist hypothesis about the nature of linguistic behaviour can be interpreted to mean that, first of all, whatever the general principles of learning, they must be applicable to language, and secondly, that whatever regularities the linguistic detects in the data the procedures that uses to arrive at this analysis are just those one would want the learning device to possess, so that it too could arrive at productive hypotheses about the linguistic form

that lies behind the linguistic input. What modern linguistics has done is simply to assert that the content of this linguistic theory is much richer and more complex, hence more restrictive, than was imagined by the structuralist.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present the research methodology employed in conducting this study. The population of the study consisted of some Kurama adults both men and women and a few number of adolescents Kurama. This will help the researcher to gather different problems faced by those people in learning Hausa as second language.

The procedures used in collecting the data were in form of an interview which is hoped to produce the problems as Kurama encounter in learning Hausa as second language.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

3.1 THEORIES OF LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Different views of the child acquiring a language have been put forward. Some, particularly the behaviourists, see the child as a passive, empty thing to be acted upon by the adult, who fills it with the material or knowledge he sees fit. Others the cognitivists, for instance, see him as an active individual who acts upon the environment in which he lives. H. D. Brown (1980) and Linfords (1980). These views are exposed in the different theories which are discussed below.

3.2 BEHAVIOURISTS THEORIES

The behaviourists view the child as coming into the world with a tabula rasa:-

A clean slate, bearing no preconceived notions of the world about language, and that this child is then shaped by the environment, slowly conditioned through reinforcement. This approach focuses on the immediately perceptible aspect of linguistic behaviour – the publicly observable responses and the relationships or associations between these responses and events in the world surrounding them (Brow, 1980).

The best known attempt to construct a behaviourists model is B. F. Skinner's verbal behaviour (1957). He adhered strictly to the behaviourists position of drawing psychological conclusions only from the physically observable. Skinner is commonly known for his experiments with animal behaviour in "skinner boxes". He believed that fundamental learning processes are the same in animal and in men, i.e., that one can adequately account for human behaviour by applying principles derived from labotory work on small animals. According to skinner, speech (verbal behaviour) is a motor behaviour which is controlled by its consequences; when consequences are rewarding, behaviour is maintained and uncreased in strength and frequency; when consequences are punished or when there is lack of reinforcement entirely, the behaviour is weaked and eventually extinguished. Skinner has contributed to education through teaching machines and programmed learning, where he has applied his principles of learning through reinforcement (Brown 1980, Rivers 1964).

Skinner's approach to language acquisition has been criticized by Noam Chomsky in his famous review of verbal behaviour. (1959). McDonough (1981) and Hilgard and Bower (1975) discuss Chomsky's criticisms of Skinner. Some of the points are given below:

- According to Skinner, language is stimulus-bound. Chomsky says that language is not set of vocal habits that are conditioned by stimuli. We do not say things to people because of past reward granted, language is not entirely stimulus – free; “a large proportion of what we say depends on features of the situation, and the knowledge each conversation partner contributes to the other. However, no S-R mechanism can represent these complexities” (McDonough, 1981).
- Moreover, Chomsky asks; what is a stimulus? Is any and every sensory event presented in the environment a stimulus or just those to which the subject attends and reacts? What makes two stimulus patterns equivalent or similar? (Hilgard and Bower, 1975). In other words, Chomsky, like the cognitivists, argues against the objectivity or validity of Skinner's concepts of stimulus, response, reinforcement and response strength.
- Skinner's S-R model cannot adequately explain processes and phenomena of human mental life. For example, “terms such as want, intend, like, plan, and persuade, cannot be adequately translated into the three-term contingencies countenanced by Skinner's system”. (Hilgard and Bower, 1975).

- According to Chomsky, the empiricist approach to language analysis only deals with performance, i.e. the surface features of utterances, “where as most regularities in language are revealed only when the grammatical “deep-structure” is extracted by some complex syntax analyzer in our heads. Deep structures help to disambiguate sentence which have the same surface structure. (Hilgard and Bower, 1975).

Some views have however, insisted on behaviourism. McCorguodale (1970), for example has published a point by point rebuttal to each of Chomsky’s criticisms about Skinner’s theory of verbal behaviour. He concludes that Chomsky misunderstood the intent of verbal behaviour evaluating it as an accomplished explanation of verbal behaviour rather than a hypothesis about the causes of verbal behaviour (Asher 1972).

However, many more recent researchers have uphold Chomsky’s view of McCorguodale’s answer to Chomsky’s critique. For according to them

.....The tide in psycholinguistic have long since turned to a transformational approach to studying linguistic competence and performance, and the answers simply did not register as effective or persuasive. It is a truism today that experimental psycholinguistics is a branch of linguistics (or cognitive psychology) rather than an extension of behaviouristic learning theories (1975).

Linford, (1980) says that the behaviourists theories reliance on stimulus-response-reinforcement causes serious problem. Parents

verbally reinforced their children according to the truth – value of what they say, rather than for the form they use. (Brown, Cazden and Bellugi 1971). Thus, this review emphasizes that reinforcement and practice do not play a very important role in language acquisition. It is also stated that the child goes through an active process of testing, discarding and refining grammatical rule system. (MacLaughlin, 1978). Moreover, this happens even if the child cannot speak at all but simply hear others speaking (Lennerberg, 1967).

Skinner's model is mechanistic, and at best contributes to explaining the development of surface structure of the language (Eresmie, 1975). Furthermore, the stimulus response theory is not a reflexive theory (Clark, 1975). Clark gives a vivid description of this theory:-

Stimulus – response theory could be compared to an iron. It flattens distinctions between different species of animals and between animals and human beings. It has no theory of stages of development in infant, toddler, child, and adults, of particular interest to us is the fact that it makes no distinction between linguistic behaviour and any other aspect of behaviour. All behaviour is governed by habits, (1975).

Skinner's model of verbal behaviour cannot adequately account for the capacity to acquire language, nor for the development of language itself; neither can it account for the abstract nature of language and for a theory of meaning (Brown 1980). The stimulus – response theory cannot

account for the uniformity of language acquisition throughout the human species, nor can it explain how the child can learn a system so complex in such a relatively short period of time, since it regards the child as beginning at level zero (A tabularasa). Lennerberg (1967), suggest that the child's capacity to learn language is a continuous sequence of maturation.

The speech input to which the child is exposed does not seem to be rich enough for induction of the rules of grammar. Adult speech is not fault-free and so it is a wonder that the child does not acquire the imperfect language of the adult. However, the facts of grammar are not explicable simply on the basis of surface structure, to which the child is exposed. Therefore, there is need to postulate some sort of deep structure to account for how we understand ambiguous sentences. Transformational grammar seems to offer more powerful approach to language than did traditional psychological theory. (McLaughlin, 1978), of which the behaviourist model is an example.

Brown, (1980), therefore quite rightly concludes that "although behaviouristic psychology lays emphasis on empirical observation and the scientific method, it can only begin to explain the miracles of language acquisition leaving untouched a vast domain which can be explored only by an approach that probes deeper. As a result of these inadequacies, some psychologists sought to broaden the base of the behaviourists theory, and

proposed modified theoretical positions, one of which is called the mediation theory.

3.3 **MEDIATION THEORY**

This theory represented by Osgood, (1953), is an attempt to compensate for some of the deficiencies of the stimulus – response theory. (Clark, 1975), which claims that activity is governed by stimuli in the immediate situation, i.e. “the here and now”, in piaget’s language. But in real life it is obvious that we are influenced by events which are distant from us in both space and time, i.e. “the not here and not now”.

The concept of mediation developed out of pavlov’s contiguity theory, which holds that responses which occur naturally to one stimulus can come to be elicited by another, previously neutral stimulus. Thus a response can be attracted to a new stimulus simply by presenting this stimulus frequently in conjunction with the stimulus which already elicits the response. As an example of this learning, Clark (1975) given Pavlov’s experiment with dogs in which he produced salivating in the dog in response to the sound of a bell. The bell had previously been presented just before feeding the dogs.

This theory accounts for meaning by the claim that the linguistic stimulus (a word or a sentence) elicits a mediating response that is self-stimulating. Osgood, (1953), has called this self – stimulating a representational mediation process which Brown (1980), regards as a really covert and invisible process which acts on the learner.

Ironically, the mediation theory attempts to account for abstraction (i.e. abstract nature of language) without admitting that there is such a thing (Clark, 1975). Thus like the stimulus – response theory, the mediation theory does not answer all the questions.

3.4 **THE NATIVIST THEORY**

Partly in response to the apparent inadequacies in the behaviourist view, another view of language acquisition gained ground, variously called the “innatist” “rationalist” or “nativist” position (Linford, 1980). According to this position the child comes into the world with very specific innate knowledge which includes general predispositions and tendencies as well as knowledge of the nature of languages and of the world. This view asks deeper questions and looks for clearer explanation of the mastery of language than did the behaviourist position – Chomsky (1965) and McNeill (1966), both supporters of the innatist view, maintain that every child is born with universals of linguistic structure “wired in” that is, the child does not have to learn the features which are common to the structure of all human languages (Linfors 1980).

According to this view children are born with knowledge of the basic grammatical relations and categories, for example, subject, verb, and object, nouns, verb determiners, and auxillary elements (E. Ingram, 1975). Furthermore, the nativists hold that language acquisition is innately determined, that the child is born with a built in devices of some sort, which predisposes to language acquisition devices (LAD) (Clark 1975).

Unlike the stimulus – response theory, aspect of meaning and the abstractness and creativity of language acquisition are accounted for by the LAD proposition. However, Brown (1980) observes that these are accounted for inexplicitly, adding that LAD is an observed invention that only specifically account for language acquisition.

The nativist position has received support from biologically based research relating to the development of language Lennerberg, (1967); for example, proposed that language is “species specific” behaviour, and that certain modes of perception, categorizing abilities and other language – related mechanisms are biologically determined. Pointing out that there is some correlation between the stages in human development and those in physical maturation, Lennerberge, (1967), posited a “critical – period” hypothesis for language acquisition which ends at puberty. After this age according to him, “automatic acquisition from mere exposure to a given language seems to disappear, and foreign language have to be taught and learned through a conscious and labored effort”. There is however, some disagreement as to when the critical period ends. Krashen (1973), for example, has supported that brain lateralization occurs much earlier that is proposed by Lennerberg, possibly around the age of five.

The innatist also regards exposure to language in the environment as a necessary and sufficient condition for language acquisition in children. The environment is important in two ways.

1. exposure to language in child's environment "triggers" his innate language acquisition device, setting his language acquisition course in motion and
2. language exposure provides linguistic data for the child's innate mechanisms to work as so as to discover the particular details of his language, which set it apart from other human language Lindfors (1980).

A practical contribution of the nativists theory is in connection with the status of the child's language Chomsky (1965) and McNeil (1966) and their colleagues have legitimized child language as a system in its own right. Following this discovery, researchers have constructed hypothetical grammars of child language, which they called "pivot grammars". Brown (1980) has also rightly pointed out that although the nativists did not come any closer to solution than did the behaviourists, this approach to child language made at least two important contribution to the understanding of the first language learning process.

1. freedom from the restriction of the scientific method to explore the unseen, unobservable, under lying, invisible, abstract linguistic structures being developed in the child and
2. description of the child's language is a legitimate rule governed, consistent system.

The three models of language acquisition presented above, i.e. the behaviourists, the mediation, and the nativists theory, present their

conflicting approach to child language acquisition, these models can also apply to adult acquiring second language since the behaviourists maintain that the fundamental learning processes are the same in animal and in men. It is also possible that barriers affecting first language acquiring could affect second language acquirer.

3.5 **KURAMA ORIGIN**

Little is known about Kurama origin since there is no essential documents on the Kurama history. According to the very little history obtained, that Kurama originated from Madayyana a village in Southern Sudan from 16 –17th Century 1400 A.D. They then left Madayyana and settled in the forestry area of Chad, from Chad they proceeded to Kano in Northern Nigeria. But the specific date for the settlements is not known. The Kurama are said to always settle in forestry areas, and the reason was for them to hunt and also farming.

When they left Kano, they again settled in a village called Bura in Anchau district. This time around it was on top of a hill they settle, this was to prevent themselves from being attacked by enemies. From the hill, they spread all over Nigeria. Most of them can be found in Lere local government area in Kaduna State. Their professional Occupation is farming. Their major religion is Islam and Christianity. More so an Kurama adult who attended formal education can read and write Hausa apart from English. But those who did not, can speak Kurama language and if they are lucky to learn the Hausa language, is included in

communication. A typical village Kurama can speak Kurama language only.

3.6 HAUSA ORIGIN

Hausa is the word that has the meaning of a language, the people that speak that language and their homeland. There are different views as to the origin of Hausa and Hausa land. The most popular and acceptable one's are the one given by Ahmad (1985). According to him there are three basic School of thought on the origin of the Hausa as a people. The first school which is the legendary one is, that the ancestor of the Hausa nationality is Bayaiiddah. He is said to be an Arab and also a son of a ruler of Baghdad Abdullahi. It is said that Bayajidda left home and arrived in Hausa land around 10 A.D. Before reaching Hausa land, he first reached Ngazargamu the Capital of Borno. It was there according to version, he married a princess called Magaram and gave birth to a son who begot Binm. He again left to Daura where he also married the Queen Daurama and begot a son called Bawo and is Bawo who founded the Hausa States, they are Gobir, Katsina, Zazzau, Kano and Rano. This five state together with Biram and Daura are what are popularly known as Hausa Bakwai or the seven Hausa states.

The second school of thoughts did not agree with the above view of Bayajidda who is an Arab is origin of Hausa, ancestor and more so, the name Baya-jidda (that he cannot comprehend) when he first arrived in Daura. This shows that he cannot understand the language of Daura

Community. Secondly it is said that Bayajidda arrived in Daura and found the community with their system of government and the language they spoke was Hausa. Thirdly Daura people who are said to be the oldest of the Hausa States claim that their original homeland was in the region of present day Palestine, and Daurama was their tenth ruler after their migration from their (12). The other rulers all women including Inna-Gari, who founded Tsohon Birni, that is the old capital of the Daura polity, it was Daurama who migrated from Tsohon Birni and founded a new capital which is the present Daura town.

There are other versions on the Hausa origin such as that of (Hoghen 1967) and others. But from all indication, Bayajidda who is said to be the legendary origin of the Hausa States must be a stranger and must have passed through Borno to Hausa land where he finally settled.

On the version how the word Hausa” was founded, that there was nothing like the work ‘Hausa,’ the people of every land such as Kano were called Kanawa, Zaria were called Zazzagawa, Gobir-gobirawa, Daura, Daurawa and so on. And as it has mentioned above that their original homeland was in the region of present day Palestine so there was nothing like the word “Hausa”. The name Hausa was formed when the old woman called Ayana wanted to described what Bayajidda rided on when going to killed the Kusugu well snake. Instead of a horse, she said ya hau sa”. So the ‘Hau’ and the “Sa” formed the word Hausa and that it was

from there the people got the name Hausa that is “he rided a cow” instead of a horse.

Hausa is a member of the chadic branch of the Afro-Asiantic family of the languages (Greenberg, 1963). Hausa is also a language that belongs to the northern dialects of North.

Bargery, (1934) in his notes on the Hausa language believes that Hausa is Hemitic language and belongs to the northern or Berber dialects of North Africa, although his relation is not a close one in point of etymology. The main proof of the Hemitic character of the Hausa language is its distinction of grammatical gender in noun and pronoun. The distinction is fully developed in Hausa and shows in its formation of clear affinities to the Berber dialects. This sama characteristic, viz the distinction of grammatical gender is one of the connecting links between Hemitic and Semitic languages. As is natural from the long and the close contact with Arabs and Islam. The language has borrowed a large number of Arabic words, but these importation while enriching the vocabulary, have in no way altered the grammar or general structure of Hausa.

The Hausa language is not, however, exclusively Hematic in character, just as the population as a substratum a pure neuro element, so the vocabulary as well as the grammatical peculiarities of the language disclose definite connections with surrounding sudanic languages.

Another definition of the Hausa language is the one offered by Adamu (1978), who explains that Hausa is the language of the Hausa people who can be said to have historically issued from Hausa-land or their descendants through the male line, or those who become closely associated with the Hausa culture by adopting us language, its customs and religion. It has also become the lingua-franca for millions of others inhabiting the Northern Region of Nigeria and other parts of Africa.

Hausa is one of the most important medium of communication in the West Central Sudan and many other places in the world. Stressing this again, Bargery (1931) is of the opinion that Hausa is, and will always be, the most important native language of west central Sudan. The need of dominating languages medium of interaction and bearers modern ideas is keenly felt throughout Africa, and there is no reason why Hausa should not be this medium for a very large part of west central Sudan and West Africa. This aim will be reached if the language is used in schools wherever it is understood and, still more important, by giving it a good modern and popular literature.

To date Hausa can be seen to be competing not only with Arabic and Swahili in Africa, but also with some major world languages in terms of speakers, scholarship and linguistic spread. The rate at which the language diff uses far and wide and the extent to which people become Hausa nized, compled with the event increasing modern researchers have placed Hausa into an upper must position in West Africa. Inspite of this,

however, Hausa is still not an official language in Nigeria. Perhaps, after several years of continuous hardwork, the hope to make it a national language will come to fruitions.

3.7 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The term population is used by researchers who adopt Western research method, especially when their research involved the application of statistics. It refers to the entire subject coverage or human beings or things involved in the study so the samplings became reliable in the sense that generalization of findings became valid.

In measuring the attitude of Kurama adults learning Hausa as second language, words or letters pronunciation will be emphasized as it is the main problem usually encountered in acquiring Hausa as second language. The researcher will interview 200 adults Kurama.

3.8 METHOD OF MEASURING ATTITUDE

One of the easiest method of measuring the subject attitude is to ask them direct open ended or multiple-choice questions designed to make them show their reason for learning the target language. Also illitation method will be employed to those who cannot respond very well. The researcher will put the questionnaires in form of question or even asked them to used those letter which are very difficult to pronounce in forming words or sentences with them.

With the above method a respondent attitude will score by summing up the value of the degree of using the letters very well and

efficiently. A higher score in pronouncing and producing words with the letters well indicates that favourable attitude towards learning the target language, while a lower score indicates unfavourable attitude toward the language.

This techniques was used by Gardener and Lambert (1959) spolsky (1969), Lassa (1979) Shuaibu (1981) and Chukwu (1983), and the same was adopted in this study as the instrument for measuring the Kurama adults and adolescents attitude to learning the Hausa language and their difficulties. The adaptation has been done in the following ways, the language items from Gardener and Lambert (1959) Spolsky (1969) and Chukwu (1983(, were selected and used while the wording and item arrangements was taken from Lassa (1979). Burns (1983) and Shuaibu (1981). Thus, the above studies were pulled out of which the present research will construct questionnaire that suits the variables of the present study.

There are two sections in the questionnaire, the first section contained items that solicit personal information about the respondent such as name, date of birth, name of parents and so on; the second section contained items designed to measure the subjects' attitude towards Hausa language, it's learning as well to as certain other variable responsible for the formation of such attitudes.

In addition to the Questionnaire , if there is any adult education teachers of Hausa language, questionnaire will be designed for them to

solicit and measure the teacher opinion on what they observed as the attitude or their adults towards Hausa and Hausa learning.

3.9 DATA COLLECTION

The researcher visited the subjects in their various homes or village in person, selected the sample and administered the questionnaire. She explained to them what the visitation all about, she will present the questionnaire by interviewing and for the subjects to respond, the responses will written down by the researcher so that at the end she will compare all the responses and see between the adult Kurama and the adolescents Kurama who can produce those letters very well in word pronunciation.

In summary, the data collection will include the following: Interview, where by the researcher will physically interview the subject. Second method is by distributing some questionnaires which the subject are expected to fill. The third method is by listening to radio especially Kaduna State Radio where Kurama people are involved in discussion, the fourth method is by recording conversation by Kurama in the market, at church and in the mosque.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Having discussed the barriers involved in second language acquisition in adults, it is now time to bring the two languages together and compare their phonological barriers as well as any significant similarities or differences and the interference of Kurama phonological aspect into Hausa, so that the barriers can be identified. It is intended in this chapter also, to discuss the responses of various Kurama adults and adolescent interviewed, their major problems when acquiring Hausa as a second language.

When acquiring second language or any language in general, acquisition varies in relation to where one spent most of his early life. Worthy (1991), states that in a community where two entirely different languages are spoken, a speaker frequently faces a choice between two languages and the same variables that bear upon choices of lexical, phonological details can also influence the choice of language.

However, your speech may also contain a number of features, which are unrelated to regional variation. Two people, according to Yule (1985), growing up in the same geographical area, at the same time may speak differently because of a number of social features. So it is important not to overlook this social aspect of language, because in many

ways speech is a form of social identity and is used consciously or unconsciously, and indicate membership of different social groups or different speech communities.

The researcher having gone round some Kurama villages, interviewed and discussed with some adults and adolescents, now bring out the responses obtained from them. It has been mentioned in the first chapter of this research, that the Kurama being under Lere Local Government Area, are together with Hausas, and this facilitates speaking Hausa very well. Some of the adults Kurama interviewed on this matter, their responses here that, Hausa is not their mother tongue and that there is no sufficient input for them to learn Hausa. So they made it clear that learning Hausa is done with the knowledge of their first language, which is Kurama. They sometimes used the two languages in communication. Another reason given, was lack of exposure to Hausa language, and the influence of the first language. Carroll (1971), support this by stating that learning of language depends on the amount and kind of exposure the child receives.

The researcher intends to go in to discussing the phonological aspect of both Hausa and Kurama language, their similarities and difference.

4.2 **BARRIERS RELATING TO PHONETICS AND PHONOLOGY**

Joanne Ken worthy (1991) defines phonetic as the description and classification of speech sound. There are different branches of phonetics,

there is the articulatory phonetics, the way sounds are articulated, the acoustic phonetics which deals with the physical properties of speech sound, and the auditory phonetics, which approaches the study of sound from the perspective of the hearer or (also known as the perceptual phonetic).

Phonology, on the other hand, has been defined as the branch of linguistics, which is concerned with the description of the patterns of sound in a particular language and the way the set of sound in a particular language work as a system. These patterns of sound shall be discussed in relation to places and manner of sound articulation. R. M. Zarruk (1996) defined phonology in Hausa as the classification of sound between children or between dialects, and according to him, it is through this classification that the differences between languages can be identified. He gave out five places meant for sounds articulation:-

The bilabial, these are sounds made with both lips. The initial sounds of letters like:-

/b/	báákì	-	mouth
/m/	báraáwóo	-	a thief
/b/	máárà	-	abdomen
/p/	fâifâi	-	a mat tray
/w/	wáawáa	-	a fool

These are the bilabial sounds produced with both lips as give by R. M. Zarruk in his book Hausa version “ilmin furua”. The Kurama bilabial sounds are as follow

/m/	màgàbóh	-	keep quiet
/p/	pàsóh	-	to dash
/b/	bâi	-	here
/w/	wùaráh	-	to remove

We can see that the Kurama lacks the (b') sound and is the first feature that distinguishes the Kurama bilabial sounds from the Hausa bilabial sounds. They therefore have barrier in producing sounds with (b') in Hausa language. The interviewer, who is the researcher on the process of her interview, gave out these words to some of the adults and the adolescent for them to produce the words the way they are. These are the words

Ḃaáraáwò	Ḃéera	thief	rat
Ḃááwò	Ḃámbára	shell	to peel
Ḃángàréé	Ḃáunà	side	animal

The responses were not the same, some produced them well, while some cannot. The initial 'b' was produced as 'b'. This is how the words were produced by most of those interviewed that is the Kurama adults and the adolescents.

báraáwùu	bèerá/buaara	thief	rat
báawùu	bàmbára	shell	to peel

bàngàrèé bângárèé side

The interviewer asked them to repeat the words after her but the barrier was still there especially on the adults. When asked why and what is the problem behind their not producing the 'b' correctly, the response was that Hausa is not their language. Not only Kurama people who have problems in producing the affected letters, a lot of ethnic group living in those areas cannot produce the 'b' exactly the way it is.

The researcher again visited a village called Kuzodo under Yarkasuwa district and was able to discuss with some adults Kurama in the area, many of them produce the letters like /b/ /k/ very well. When asked how do they be able to produce these letters correctly, that the Hausa are the majority, so they also became used to that is why. It is also very surprising to discover that some of the Kurama do not bother which sound is correct and which is wrong. Some realized this during the researcher's discussion with them; they therefore try to make necessary corrections. An adult literacy class was also examined by the researcher, Hausa was the language of instruction, but yet the initial 'b' is also a problem. What the researcher observed was the problem of producing these letters is mostly found in adults and children.

The other places of sound articulation is the alveolar these are sounds produced when the tip of the tongue is placed against the alveolar ridge. The alveolar which create problems are as follows:-

/d/ dááwó comeback

/d/	dânyée	raw
/t/	táúnaà	to chew
/z/	záúnaà	to sit
/ts/	tsàyáa	wait
/s/	saùraára	to wait
/r/	raátàyaá	to hang
/u/	leékò	look through
/n/	náawà	my own

The Kurama alveolar sounds are as follow: -

(d)	dámá	to taste
/t/	ùrìgá	dress
/z/	zááwaá	choose
/s/	sáàkaá	to repeat
/r/	riyáh	be careful
/n/	nìnkeé	get up

When we look at the above alveolar sounds, both Hausa and Kurama examples, we can see that they are the same with the exception of /d/ // and /ts/ which the Kurama do not have. It is another barrier faced by the Kurama learning Hausa as their second language. The problem is the same with that of the /b/ sound. So whenever a word in Hausa is having the affected letters, it is change to another sound. For example-

/ts/ →	/s/	tsiyaá	siyaá	poverty
/d/ →	/d/	dáyá	dáyá	one

/l/ → /n/ lállái nánnai really

The adults and the adolescence interviewed were able to make necessary correction within the time of the interview, but return to their normal way of producing the sounds again. In the literacy adult class, the teacher or the organizer have to overhear these sounds since he cannot force them to produce the affected letters correctly. What the researcher again observe was that, Kurama no matter how fluently he speaks Hausa, the barriers in producing the affected letters still exist as it use to occur suddenly or unexpected, especially Kurama who acquired their first language which is Kurama before the second language acquisition.

Another barrier discovered by the researcher is the producing of /L/ letter. The Kurama living in Garu under Kauru local government are using the /L/ in places of (n) so the researcher concluded that Garu Kurama do not have the /n/ letter. But when the interview continued, the researcher later realized that it is only in Kurama words that the /L/ letter is used in places of /n/ but they produces the Hausa words exactly the way they have been written. Here are example of some words comparing he Garu Kuma and other Kurama.

<u>Other Kurama</u>	<u>Garu Kurama</u>	<u>English</u>
nìmbáa	lìmbá	give me
nái	láí	see
zàfaú	láfaù	to lift
anân kái	alânkái	door

Not only Garu Kurama produce or change the /l/ to /n/, there are other Kurama in Falagoro and Rahama under Kano and Bauchi States respectively.

The third place in the places of articulation is the palatal sounds. These are sounds that are located at the hard palate, and it is the tongue which is principally involved in their articulation. Sounds like:-

/č/	čáacá	gambling
/j/	jákì	donkey
/š/	šá ará	refuse
/y/	yá ará	children
'y/	'yaá'yá	children

These are the palatal sounds in Hausa and it is almost the same with that of Kurama language with the exception of the /y/ which majority of Kurama living villages cannot produce. So this is how they produce it – e.g.

<u>Hausa</u>	<u>Kurama</u>	<u>English</u>
'yárkásuwá	yàrkásúwá	a market
'yár yarinyá	yár yárinjá	a little girl
'yámmátá	yámmátá	girls.

The glottal sound /' / is omitted. But most of the Kurama living in areas where Hausa are majority, they can produce the /' / sound. Here are example of some Kurama words with the palatal sounds:-

/č/	čuánáa	to take
/j/	jáná	buy

/š/	šámbòh	forget
/y/	yành	do it

The fourth place is the velars, these are sounds produced quite far back in the mouth at velum sounds like: -

/k/	káraa	corn stick
/K/	kàhoò	horns
/g/	gàdoò	bed

These are the Hausa velar sounds when compare to Kurama. They have /k/ and /g/, but /k/ is absent in the Kurama. For example: -

/k/	káfá	to catch
	kàrèn	don't give
/g/	gáabòh	don't
	gái	plenty

The /k/ turns to /k/. So in any Hausa word having the /K/, it is reduced as /k/.

The fifth place of articulation is the glottal. The above four places of articulation we have discussed so far involved the action of the tongue and other parts of the mouth. But it is possible to produce sounds at other locations. The space between the vocal cords in the larynges is called the glottis. During normal breathing the air can flow freely through the glottis. This simple sound of breathing can also be used in languages. In Hausa language, the initial /h/ and p/ are produced in this way. As it has been

discussed above, the Kurama do not have the /ʔ/ sound, so they find it very difficult to produce letters like.

All the barriers faced by the Kurama adults in acquiring Hausa, occur only in the production of consonants sounds but not with the vowels. So they do not have problems in vowels sounds. Example of words with glottal sounds:-

/h/	hànya`	road
/ʔ/	'ùkú	three
	'áudúgà	cotton

and then the glottal sounds in Kurama are like these:-

/h/	háa	open your mouth
/ʔ/	'a 'a	no
	'o 'o	no

From the above discussion on phonetic and phonology, it is very clear that the barriers in acquiring Hausa as second language by an Kurama adult comes from some phonological consonants sound which differ between the two languages. This came from the responses gather during the interview, discussion and conversation with some Kurama adults and adolescents.

Adults from literacy class complain that their problem is mostly on letters production and is the major barrier faced in acquiring Hausa then followed by Hausa proverbs, that Hausa proverbs are very difficult to understand talk less of explaining the meaning. Apart from these

according to some adults' interview that they have fewer problems in acquiring the language. In some Kurama villages like Ashema, Kawu, Alwalu all under 'Yarkasuwa district have not Hausa people in their area, so they gave an assurance that their younger ones many of them do not understand Hausa. To confirm this, the researcher interview some young children ages 4 – 8 no response, as they cannot understand what the interviewer was asking them. So the researcher went on to interview some teachers in some particular Primary Schools in those areas how they communicate with their pupils, the response was that they used Kurama language in classes 1 – 2 then gradually from classes 3 and above they used Hausa and English. Teachers who are not Kurama by tribe normally faced little problems in teaching the pupils. Counting of numbers is with Kurama language they will said it in Kurama and then translate to Hausa and English respectively. e.g.

<u>Kurama</u>	<u>Hausa</u>	<u>English</u>
ìndíyèn	dáyá	one
búruyà	bìyù	two
bútaàróh	'ùkù	three
búnaàzéh	hùdù	four
'ùshíl	bíyár	five
'utàsè	shídá	six
'usúndárí	Bákwái	seven
'ùrírè	tákwás	eight

'ùtára	tára	nine
bíníkurí	gómà	ten

This is how counting is done in Kurama language and then translate to Hausa and English this is done just for the sake of children who cannot understand Hausa during their first two years in the Primary School. The alphabets that is a – z are also introduced the same way counting of numbers is done. The researcher again entered some classes of 1 & 2 greeted and asks the class who can speak Hausa; very few rise up their hand. She told those who cannot speak Hausa, very soon they would be able to speak but what they need is hard working.

4.3 **THE INTERFERENCE OF KURAMA PHONOLOGICAL SYSTEM INTO HAUSA**

We have seen how and what are the barriers in relation to places of articulation, now it is the interference of theological system of Kurama into Hausa language. Joanne Ken worthy (1991), states that the interference of phonology or phonological borrowing is less easy to perceive than lexical borrowing, yet it also occur. He further explains that at least two mechanisms can lead the phonology of one language to affect that of another. The first and less radical is through the influence of borrowed words carrying some foreign characteristics with them. The interference of Kurama language into Hausa was as result of borrowing. Lets examine some Hausa words, which are English origin while some Arabic and have been borrowed by the Kurama:-

<u>Hausa</u>	<u>Arabic</u>	<u>English</u>
Sábùlù	Assabun	Soap
Cánjì	-	change
Biro/alkalami	álkálàm	biro
Bókàtì	-	bucket
Góoró	-	-
Sákàtàré	-	Secretary
Furamari	-	Primary

These are some of the Hausa words which are Arabic and English origin.

Now the Kurama words which are borrowed from Hausa and English:-

<u>Kurama</u>	<u>Hausa</u>	<u>English</u>
Úchánjì	Cánjì	Change
Utáagá	táagà	Window
Ùsabùnù	Sábùlù	Soap
Ùtákáddà	Tákárdà	Book
Ùgóoró	Góoró	Kola nut
Ùtáabá	Táabá	Cigarette
Ùkáasùwá	Kásùwá	Market
Ùbókátì	Bókátì	Bucket
Ùbàabúr	Bàabúr	Motorcycle
Ùnàdái	Lùdáyì	Wooden spoon
Ùpáramtì	páramtì	Tray
Ágóogó	Ágóogó	Wristwatch

Ùtébìr	Tébírí	Table
Ùkáatkó	Kátákó	Plank
Umoto	Mato	Bus
Ufaífaì	Faífaì	Mat tray
Umangwaro	Mangwaro	Mango
Ulemu	Lemu	Orange
Uparanti	Faranti	Tray
Nibiro	Biro	Biro
Idawa	Daawa	Corn
Uinji	Inji	Grinding machine
Ukwakwa	Kwakwa	Coconut
Akeke	Keken dinki	Sewing machine
Ukeke	Keke	Bicycle
Uaji	Aji	Class
Ugwaiba	Gwaiba	Guava
Udankwani	Dankwali	Head tie
Uriga	Riga	Shirt
Ukwano	Kwano	Plate
Ùdánkàní	Dánkàlí	Potato
Ùtáagiyée	Táagiyá	Cap
Ùjènè	Gýalè	Veil
Ùròogò	Róogó	Cassava

These are some of the Hausa words used by the Kurama as borrowed words. So in every borrowed word by the Kurama they normally put /u/ vowel at the beginning of the word as seen above, but the meaning is still the same. Moreso there are words like bucket change, to mention but few which are borrowed words from English and 'Sabulu' soap from Arabic. The interference of Kurama into Hausa was as a result of influence of Hausa language in the north. Hausa as we all know is the major language of communication in the northern part of Nigeria unlike in the south and the rest where Pidgin English is used.

4.4 **BARRIERS RELATING TO SYNTAX**

The problem leading to this study has encouraged the researcher to go in and find out the barriers relating to syntax among adults of Kurama speaking Hausa as second language. The researcher visited some adults of Kurama and adolescents who speak Hausa as second language, and discovered some syntactic problem which can be regarded as barriers to correct Hausa. These barriers are found mostly within Kurama adults.

4.5 **TYPES OF SENTENCES PRODUCED BY THE KURAMA ADULTS**

These are example of sentences produced by Kurama as follows:-

--Yana gan shi: Yana gan shi kenan Sai ya gudu – (Having just seen him he ran away).

The main problem of the sentence Yana gan shi is that, two grammatical items that of yana and gan that never occur together in one sentence

were arbitrarily used. “Yana” is a person – aspect – pronoun used in the general continuative tense, and the type of the verb gani that follows it must either be gani or ganin. The following are the Hausa person aspect pronoun correctly used in the continuative tense with verb gani.

- ‘Yana ganin wata’: (He is seeing a moon or he sees a moon)
- ‘Yana gani: (He is seeing or he sees)
- Yana ganin shi: (He is seeing it or he sees him)

The verb gan, on the other hand is used only with the general past tense person – aspect – pronoun. The following are the Hausa person – aspect – pronoun correctly used in the general past – tense with the verb gan.

- Yana gani: (He saw)
- Ya ga wata: (He saw a moon)
- Ya gan shi: (He saw it)

So the sentence was supposed to be constructed as “Yana ganin shi kenan, sai ya ruga,” but because of second language problem, the sentence was constructed as “Yana gan shi kenan”

Another syntactic problem is the following sentence recorded expressed by Kurama people:-

“----- Inda yana aiki The inda as a relative item is usually used within nominal phrase as a modifier and as earlier indicated. When ever such an item occurs in such situation, the aspectual pronoun yana changes its form to yake. The sentence “----inda yana aiki” is supposed to be constructed as “inda yake aiki” as for example “nan ne inde yake aiki”

tun kusan shekara Bakwai". It is here he has been working for almost seven years.

Another syntadic problem is lack of difference in gender pronounciation, many Kurama especially those living in Ashema, used "shi" for both female and male gender also ita for both. For example:-

- "ke ne mijinshi" instead of "kai ne mijinta"
- "kai ne wannan" instead of "ke ce wannan"
- taa gudu instead of yaa gudu
- shi ne kawana instead of ita ce kawata

The gender is some times mixed-up, and many Kurama living in far away villages fall in this category. Moreso, the Kurama uses relative past and general past in places of subjective tense. E.g. kaa general past is used in sentences like this

- me kaa ce? Instead of me ka ce?
- Yaya kaa yi? Instead of yaya ka yi?
- Yaya kin yi? Instead of yaya ki yi?
- Ba kai ne kaa ce ba? ba kai ne ka ce ba?
- Ba ke ce kin ce ba? ba ke ce ke ce ba?

This is how many of kurama especially adults kurama living in the villages visited are using the general past tenses in places of the subjective tense.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Summary

This chapter gives the summary of the study of discussion and the interview conducted with the Kurama adults and adolescents who are second language speakers of Hausa. It was specifically under Lere Local government in some particular villages, namely Yarkasuwa, Ashema, Kuzodo and Garu respectively. The chapter again gives out the conclusion and some recommendations on what have been drawn from the study.

5.2 Conclusion

The study was an attempt to find out the barriers involved in Kurama adults acquiring or speaking Hausa as second language. The subject used in this study were Kurama adults, whose first language is Kurama. They were selected from the above mention villages, the method used in this study was physical discussion and interview with the subject. The researcher used Hausa language, and also Kurama language. Many barriers were found especially on oral expression and most of the subjects interviewed cannot read nor write. The summary of the discussion and interview is therefore presented as follow: -

During the interview and the physical discussion with the Kurama adults, the researcher was able to discover lots of barriers rendering from pronunciation of some letters and in producing syntaxs. The discussion

and the interview was a kind of conversation between the researcher and the subject. Through this discussion, the researcher was able to record some of the barriers listed in chapter four. What the researcher also observed were some Kurama adults interviewed who responded Yes or No, when the questions were asked, the following have been observed: -

- ✓ The Kurama second language speaker, only stick to the basic meaning and shape of Hausa words, be it noun, verb or pronoun. When if grammar of Hausa requires a modification of shape or meaning of the basic word, the Kurama speakers do not take this into consideration.
- ✓ Most of the Kurama adults, interviewed or almost all were second language speakers who apart from their mother tongue, which is Kurama also learnt Hausa through relations, friends and other members of the community.
- ✓ Being that the adults interviewed were second language learners, it has been discovered that they have problems in identifying Hausa phonemes such as / ts/ /d/ /b/ /k/ and // as had been discussed in chapter four.
- ✓ There is also problem of identifying grammatical relationship or differences between the mother tongue and Hausa language
- ✓ It is also found that the teachers who teach Hausa in those areas are not Hausa speaking people. So it is possible that the barriers are being acquired.

5.3 Recommendation

In view of the discoveries in this study, it is therefore recommended that: -

1. The Kurama should not stick to the basic meaning and shape of Hausa sentences, but they should also learn the way to modify them. The pupils and students in those areas should be taught how to construct good sentences.
2. Teachers to handle Hausa language, especially, to School children and adolescents should be those who learned the language and know their grammatical units very well so as to avoid acquiring similar barriers.
3. It is also recommended that the affected phonemes should be a topic of discussion for any teacher in those areas. They should be asked to write and speak them repeatedly so that they became used to them, and this will make them very easy to produce.
4. Since both the adults Kurama interviewed were second language learners, we cannot expect their Hausa syntax to be accurately identical to the corresponding performance, which would have been produced by native speaker of Hausa.

REFERENCES

- Jack C. Richards (1949). Second edition. Error Analysis Perspective and Second Language acquisition Cambrielge University Press.
- George Yule (1987). The Study of Language. Cambridge low price edition. Cambridge University press.
- Abraham R. C. (1959). The language of the Hausa People University of London Press. London.
- Grrenberg J. H. (1966). Language of Africa. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Lyons J. (1968). Introduction to theoretical linguistics. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Robbins Burling (1970). Language in its cultural contents. Cambridge University Press.
- Zarruk R. M. (1996) Shimfidar Umin Harsuna a Hausa. Furuci Institute of Education A.B.U., Zaria – Nigeria.
- Ndhahi K. S. (1982). Second language Acquisition in Childhood Ph.D. Thesis Faculty of Education A.B.U., Zaria – Nigeria.
- Paul Menyuk (1977). Language and Mahuration. Cambridge University Press and London.
- Ronald W. Langacker (1968). Language and its structure. Some fundamental linguistic concepts University of California.
- Commission of the European Countries paper (1967) Over coming the language Barrier
- R. Richterich and J. Chencerele (1977). Identifying the need of Adults learning a foreign language. Pergamon press Oxford New York.
- Henry M. Hoewinold (1960). Language change and linguistic reconstruction. The University of Chicago Press.
- Joseph Greenberg (1974). Language typhology, A Historical and Analytic overview. Stanford University Press.
- Paul Pinsleur and Jerence Quinn (1989). The Psychology of Second language learning. Papers from the second international congress of Applied linguistics Cambridge University Press.

Abraham R. C. (1980). Dictionary of the Hausa language. London press.

Adeyengu T. A. (1983). Language needs of Nigerian Post Primary Students in Test Talk. Vol . 14.

Dr. Munir M. (1992). Language Development in a Hausa child Ph.D. Thesis