

Analysis of Clause Structures in English and Khana Languages

MUELE- GABRIEL EWONU¹, FLORENCE NNE AGWU (PHD)²

^{1,2}*Department of English and Literary Studies, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria*

Abstract- *This work presented a contrastive syntactic analysis of English and Khana clause structures in order to identify their ground similarities and differences that define the syntactic organization of the two languages. English is the most spoken world language with much attention given to it by linguists. Khana as one of the indigenous languages of Nigeria has not been particularly described at the syntactic level. As its major theoretical framework, Robert Lado's Contrastive Analysis Theory was used while behavioral theory informed the use made of Chomsky's Minimalist Program. A qualitative descriptive approach was employed using forty clause structures which consists of simple, copound, complex and complexcampaound sentences selected purposively from both languages and then rendered in the corresponding Khana translation. The study revealed that both English and Khana language have common features as to basic syntactic pattern such as Subject Verb-Object (SVO) sentence and clause structures. There are however, several congruational differences between them in the areas of subject verb agreement, tense/aspect markers, clause linkers, the strategies of relativization and realization of subordinate constructions leading to some of the English syntactic challenges encountered by Nigerian Anglophones and indeed all speakers of Khana as a second language. It was observed therefore that English share common structural universalities with other languages and marked differences under certain structures that make the two languages unique. Based on the findings, the paper recommends, the use of contrastive linguistics in the teaching of English language, curriculum design, translation and further describe and classifying of other indigenous Nigerian languages.*

Keywords: *syntax, clause structure, grammar, english language, khana language, contrastive analysis.*

I. INTRODUCTION

“Language is the transportation of human beings for communication, to hold the culture, to transfer the knowledge, and to keep the relationship among them.

Each language can work under system of rules which within the language required and rule for combination of words and convey meaning, where syntax is one of the essential features of it for describing how words are combined to make available phrases, clauses, and sentences. Clause structure becomes one of the comprehensible characteristics of syntax analysis.

Languages share certain universal grammatical principles, while also exhibiting structural features that are specific to individual languages. Some syntactic rules are common to the majority of languages, but there are others that are markedly different from one another, owing to different historical origins, their typological grouping, and sociolinguistic backgrounds. This variation among languages becomes even more crucial for languages such as Nigeria where English is the sole official language is spoken, together with hundreds of native Nigerian languages and dialects. As a result, comparative studies of languages are becoming more popular.

English is a member of the Indo-European language family and has been studied in every respect structurally, functionally and in terms of the generative approach. The description of its clause types exemplifies this fact English clause structures form the basis of the most grammatical sentences.

Contrastingly, many African languages especially the languages in the Niger-Congo phylum have received less attention as regards to corpus-based analysis such as in-depth clause-level syntactic discussion.

The Khana language, spoken and written as /kana/ by the indigenous speakers is one of the languages spoken by the Ogoni people with in the South- South geopolitical zone of Nigeria with a population of

approximately above two hundred thousand (200,000) people (Ethnologue 2018). Ogoniland is made up of six districts, (Nyo-Khana, Ken-Khana, Gokana, Babbe, Tai and Eleme). Ngulube (2013) identified five of the languages spoken in this region. Despite the sociolinguistic importance of Khana within Ogoni communities, however, actual evidence from the systematic study of Khana clause structures vis-à-vis English is thin on the ground. Prior investigations of linguistics structures of Khana language have tended to focus on certain aspects of its structure (phonology and syntax); for example, Kari (2019:4) among other things, provides an overview of the language of Rivers State, where he notes that Kana, one of the Rivers State indigenous languages, has a basic SVO syntactic structure. It is worth noting though that further research is on course to unbundle Kana clause structures/clauses-combinatorial features.

The long term motivation for systematic comparison between English and Khana derives from its status as a lingua franca for Nigeria, as the language of most national (administrative, educational, commercial, social etc.) communication (Egbokhare, 2003). The syntactic structure of English will undoubtedly affect the learning of Khana as a second language in any population, whether indirectly through transfer from the English syntactic in developing the L2 category or directly through interference in structures common to both languages such as word order and agreement, tense-aspect marking, and clause structure. Contrastive Analysis works based on the theoretical notion that if the structures of the L1 and the L2 are compared and shown to the learner to be similar or different, this information can help a language learner to focus on structures that will likely be problematical. (Lado, 1957).

In this context, this writing explores a contrastive syntactic analysis of the clause in English and Khana. The focus of the study is on the comparison of clause structures in the two languages where their similarities and contrasts are identified and implications highlighted.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Contrastive Analysis Theory (1957)

The theoretical framework for my investigation is based mainly on the Contrastive Analysis Theory (1957) developed by Robert Lado. This theory argues that a systematic comparison of two languages will identify similar features and distinguishing elements, situations in which a person learning a second language (L2) will find difficulties. Lado claims that the learner will transfer his L1 language structures into the L2. Where the two languages share common features the learner will have no difficulty but where there is a difference the learner will make errors.

The practice of applying Contrastive Analysis Theory to this research is fitting since this research investigates the clause structures of the two languages English and Khana with the aim of exploring their convergences and divergences of clause structures. This theoretical approach is useful in providing an explanation of the potential effects of differences in clause formation upon the learning of the native speakers of Khana.

Minimalist Program (Chomsky, 1995)

The study also utilized the framework and tools of the Minimalist Program (MP) a dominant framework in the field of generative linguistics, which was devised by Noam Chomsky (2001). MP is a streamlined approach to generative grammar, which attempts to account for properties of language through a minimal number of principles and parameters, based on the interface conditions of language with other cognitive systems (e.g., conceptual-intentional system, sensorimotor system). This promotes a theory with the minimum theoretical machinery, which casts economy principles and checking mechanisms as the motivating force behind syntactic motion. In line with this trend, phenomena such as merge (Chomsky, 2000; 2001), move, and agree can be viewed as deriving from economy parameters in the new system, and phase theory provides a modern framework in which to analyze syntactic displacement.

This theory proposes that linguistic representations are computed on the basis of the smallest number of operations needed to satisfy interfaces. A clause structure account using the Minimalist Program provided a further explanation as to why some elements in English were overt, yet non-obvious and optionally absent in the Khana language. For example, the auxiliary verbs in English are used to display tense and aspect, but these were not represented in Khana and replaced with particles or context. Similarly, effects of the movement of the verb, feature checking, and phrasal projection (TP and CP) were all accounted for. By helping to impose some economy in the syntactic representations of these two languages, the Minimalist Program provided additional linguistic support to the argument.

The above generally afford a sufficient theoretical framework to investigate the clause structures of English and Khana; they benefit from being able to account for the universal syntactic features and differences in structural configuration between the two languages.

2.2 Empirical Review

Agwu & Ndamzi (2024) performed a contrastive analysis of the English and Ikwerre Languages demonstratives. This research paper studied the syntactic and morphological intricacies of English and Ikwerre Languages demonstratives and how their usage may cause problems to the Ikwerre English second language learner. This research paper utilized the contrastive analysis approach along with the descriptive grammar approach to analyze their data. The eclectic approach it adopted allowed a comprehensive analytical perspective on the varied features, subtle distinctions and multi-faceted usages of English and Ikwerre Languages demonstratives. The paper studied both the proximal and distal states of Demonstratives, examined their functions as determiners, adjectives and genitive markers in the structure of the two languages. Results of the research show that English demonstratives, just like Ikwerre demonstratives, also function as determiners, adjectives and genitive markers. Although, the post head position of Ikwerre demonstratives stand contrast to English, its headfirst language structure

carry peculiargrammatical idiom which shape its grammatical features. In the adjectival function, the two languages also employ the use of demonstratives in predicative contexts that have given particular features or states to the noun. However, there are processes of structural differences, such as headfirst language and possessive and pronominal structure, which account in their syntactic characteristics. Morphologically, Ikwerre has a fascinating structure of plural nouns where two types of demonstratives i.e. pre-head and post-head demonstratives that comply greater particularizing expression are used unlike English where demonstrative expression for plural noun is single. The findings have made significant impact in the field of cross – linguistic typology and comparative syntax discussed in the paper. The study therefore, recommends that Ikwerre learners of English while learning the use of English demonstratives should avoid transfer of rules from their first language to the English language.

Obulor and Agwu (2026) in their work A Contrastive Analysis of Word Order in English and Ogba Languages, compared and contrasted the word-order patterns of the English language to the Ogba language, highlighting the similarities and differences. A descriptive linguistic research design was used for the study, Contrastive Analysis was used as the analytical approach, the data collection was through observation of linguistic literature, use of grammatical description, language materials, text analysis, study of corpus and native speaker. The study was based on the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis.

The authors found that there are similarities in the single language (English and Ogba in this case) such as the SVO order across the two languages, similarities in some of the pro-drop parameters and verbal modal forms. They then found that there were differences between the languages on significant levels of the languages' syntax. English was found to be complement-initial and head-final; Ogba was found to be head-initial and complement-final. The authors also found differences between the Languages on articles, numerals and Demonstratives in the NP. They conclude that there are other phenomena to describe within Ogba

syntax and therefore recommends that other levels of the language be researched. The comparison is also relevant to the present study in that it demonstrates ways in which Contrastive Analysis is used to delimit similarities and differences between and among languages. However, while the present study compares English with one indigenous Nigerian Language, Khana (Kanna), Obulor and Agwu compared English with an indigenous Nigerian language (Ogba). The addition of the other indigenous Nigerian Language is, therefore, the relevancy of the reading to the present study.

Nwizug& Nwala evaluated a paper on Micro-Parametric Variations of English and Khana adjectives. This paper examining the syntactic variations of these adjectives rested its strength between two theories of Kmarksis&goumlome; 17 and Chomsky Minimalist.

Program and Lado's Contrastive Analysis. The analysis is purely descriptive. Secondary data was mainly extracted from grammar books and analyzed by Khana native speakers. The analysis has shown that there is an abrupt deviation in the adjectival structures of the two languages, for example, the adjectives in English exhibited a visible morphological pattern of grading while Khana adjectives kept the same forms at the comparative and superlative levels. Lastly it was suggested that English/Khana bilingual teachers should employ teaching approaches that will help learners overcome the difficulties arising from the structural differences of adjectives across the two languages.

Adaji (2018) conducted a contrastive syntactic study of the structure of sentences of English and Igala. The work involved comparing various constructions in the Igala language with corresponding ones in English. The theory of structure as used by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartik (1985) was used as the theoretical framework in the research. The data was gathered through recordings, the intuition of native speakers, conversations and books written in the Igala language. The research showed many features of the sentence structures of the language that were unique to Igala such as the noun occurring after articles and adjectives in the presence of the subject being a syntactic structure made up of both;

for verbs, there is no morphological inflections as used in the English language. The simple or habitual past tense form is made by taking away the auxiliary verb a instead of simply adding d or ed as is done in English. The English 'be' which functions in all its various forms is replaced by verbs that have larger functions than that such de, che and fu as auxiliary verb which is used to express having experienced the activity contained in the verb]. In addition, while English has a predicative svo structure, Igala has both predicative svo and predicative sovstructures. Besides, in the svostructures, the direct object always precedes the indirect object but is always attached by a preposition to or for (ng). For compound sentences it was revealed that

However, Igala applies an alternative froms of words on particles for the conjunctions and" (ngo, lango) and but" (Muda, amaa) and for the complex sentence structures the subordinators in Igala are less than those of English as one can be used to express more than one different subordinate clauses. In conclusion, the findings of the study reveal various points of the arrangement of the utterances in the language thus establishing that, Igala was able to employ a good extent of complexities in the sentence structures to convey full ideas exactly as in English and other languages.

Kari (2019:5) in a study on the languages of Rivers State provides a descriptive survey of the indigenous languages spoken in the state, among which is Kana. The study investigates some selected linguistic features of the languages and provides useful commentaries on their grammatical features. In relation to Kana, the study observes SVO (subject-verb-object) as the basic word-order pattern. This observation is significant to the present study because word order is considered an important aspect of clause structure and is useful for comparison of clause structure of Khana and that of English. The study will provide useful source of descriptive evidence for the basic syntax of Khana.

Kari (2019), on the other hand, is more general because it encompasses many languages found in Rivers State rather than just focusing exclusively on Khana. If anything, Kari's language sample merely

offers some descriptive information on the syntactic structures of Kana but it leaves room for more systematic comparisons with English in terms of simple, compound, complex and compound-complex clause structures. This study expands on the descriptive work by Kari through the conduct of an intensive contrastive analysis of clause structures in English and Khana. In particular, it investigates how clauses are constructed, combined and structured in the two languages and the similarities and differences, which might be relevant to the learning of English in Khana.

Moreso, Odingoweik (2012) conducted a morphosyntactic investigation of functional categories in English and Izon language. The research followed Chomsky's Minimalist Program, which makes emphasis on checking of morphological features. Data from Standard English and the Izon Kolokuma dialect used in the media and in schools were used for the research. This Kolokuma dialect is mutually intelligible with other Izon dialects. Data from books on English grammar and on Izon language were supplemented with the Nasher's own introspective data from native speakers of the respective languages that were used for the research. As the study is competence-based, data from completely grammatical structures of each language were compared. English and Izon's clausal and phrasal syntactic structures were compare and contrasted based on the feature-checking processes central to the Minimalist Program to identify shared and idiosyncratic features. In all shared features between the two languages like phrases, clauses, syntactic heads and wh-fronting, the two languages apparently choose different head parameters. While heads in English precede their complements, heads in Izon follow their complements. Though Nominative Case licensing takes place in Spec-head configurations of the two languages, Accusative Case licensing takes place in the head-comp relation of English and in the complement-head relation of Izon. The two languages allow wh-fronting at Spec-CP positions. Unlike in English, where there is no overt interpreter of wh-elements to check its features in certain dialects, Izon wh-expressions carry obligatorily the functional particles *kì* or *kò*, which also license the wh-elements. Relative clauses in both

languages are built with overt interpretable complementizers in English like *who* that precede their complement clauses. However, Izon relative clauses are built with the non-interpretable *amẹ* (that) which follows their complement clauses. The permittance of the projection of multiple XPs within a DP where two determiners are involved in DP-internal Agreement relations with the noun is a common feature among the two languages. Phrasal and clausal structures, heads, Case and wh-movement are common features among the two languages while interpretability of morphosyntactic features, head directionality and wh-movement licensing constitute peripheral features to the two languages. This research gives a remarkable systemic description of the interface of functional morphological features and syntactic derivations in English and Izon language.

2.3 Conceptual Review

Syntax

Syntax is concerned with the way words are ordered and combined to form meaningful phrases, clauses and sentences. It investigates the grammatical relationships between words and groups of words and the rules that govern sentence structure. In this thesis, syntax deals with the arrangements of words and clauses in English and Khana to form various types of sentences.

Clause Structure

Clause structure concerns how the constituents of the clause are ordered and connected with each other. Clause generally consists of a subject and a predicate. The constituents such as objects, complements, and adjuncts occur in a clause based on the grammatical rules of a language. For the purpose of the present study, clause structure refers to how English and Khana form simple, compound, complex and compoundcomplex clauses as well as how they are conjoin with each other.

Grammar

Grammar is the set of rules and principles concerning the formation, organisation, and usage of the words needed to produce a meaningful utterance in a language. It includes morphology, syntax, agreement, tense, aspect, and word order. In this project, grammar refers to the general context within which

the structural similarities and differences of English and Khana are investigated.

Contrastive Analysis

Contrastive Analysis is a linguistic method that examines two languages to find the type of their similarities and differences. Contrastive Analysis is of use in second-language learning as it is thought that the difference of the first language of the learner and the target language system can account for certain problems or interferences when learning a second language. In this analysis, Contrastive Analysis is employed to highlight the parallels and differences between the clause structures of English and Khana.

III. METHODOLOGY

The study used qualitative descriptive research design, which was appropriate to describe systematically, compare and interpret set of syntactic features of English and Khana without resorting to statistical techniques. The population of the study consisted of grammatical clause constructions in English language and Khana language. For the purpose of the study forty (40) clause structures from English language were purposively selected and translated into Khana language for analyses. The selected clause structures include ten (10) simple

clause structures, ten (10) compound clause structures, ten (10) complex clause structures and ten (10) compound-complex clause structures. These clause structures were therefore selected because they are the major constructions occurring in both languages. The data for the research were acquired through secondary means. The secondary data were printed material collected from text books on Standard English grammar, linguistics materials, existing material on khana grammar, proven native speakers of khana in order to check the translation by some of the khana native speakers. The English clauses were translated into khana language without altering the sense of the clauses. They were directed towards maintaining the data structure for analysis. The data were analyzed primarily using Contrastive Analysis Theory of Robert Lado. Each English clause was compared to its Khana counterpart regarding relation of word and clause, co-constituency, clause type as well as the arrangement of words and constituents, parallel construction of simple and complex clauses, coordination and subordination construction, tense and aspect marking, number agreement as well as other grammatical features of clause formation. The results of analysis were described in a way appropriate to the aim of this study.

IV. DATA PRESENTATION

Table I: English Sentence Structures and Types

S/N	English Sentences	Sentence Structures	Sentence Type
1	The boy is eating food.	Simple	SVO
2	She sleeps peacefully.	Simple	SVO
3	The dog chased the cat.	Simple	SVO
4	How are you?	Simple	SVO
5	He runs every morning.	Simple	SVO
6	He wants to go.	Simple	SVO
7	The teacher reads books.	Simple	SVO
8	She is cooking.	Simple	SV
9	The dog barked	Simple	SV
10	She finished the food.	Simple	SVO

11	I washed the dishes, and she cleaned the house.	Compound	SVO+SVO
12	He went to the market, but it was closed.	Compound	SVO+SVO
13	The rain stopped and the children continued playing.	Compound	SV+SV
14	I called him, yet he did not answer.	Compound	SVO+SVO
15	They studied hard, so they passed the exam.	Compound	SVO+SVO
16	The boy opened the door, and the girl entered	Compound	SVO+SV
17	The teacher entered the class, and the students stood up	Compound	SVO+SV
18	We arrived early, so we found good seats	Compound	SV+SVO
19	He called me, but I did not answer	Compound	SVO+SVO
20	She washed the clothes, and he swept the house.	Compound	SVO + SVO
21	The child cried because he was tired.	Complex	SVO
22	I stayed at home because it was raining.	Complex	SVA
23	She said that she was tired.	Complex	SVO
24	The man who came yesterday is my uncle.	Complex	SVO+ Embedded Relative clause (who came yesterday).
25	If it rains, we will cancel the trip.	Complex	SV+SVO
26	I will help you when I finish my work.	Complex	SVO+ Embedded adverbial clause
27	She bought a dress that she liked.	Complex	SVO+SVO
28	I know that the teacher is in the classroom.	Complex	SVO + Embedded Noun Clause (SVA)
29	I know that she is honest.	Complex	SVO + Embedded Noun Clause (SVC)
30	The dog barked when it saw the stranger.	Complex	SV + Embedded Adverbial Clause (SVO)
31	I wanted to go, but he insisted that we stay.	Compound-Complex	SVO + Coordinating Conjunction + SVO + Embedded Noun Clause (SV)
32	Although the child was hungry, he waited for his mother, and she cooked the food.	Compound-Complex	Adverbial Clause (SVC) + SVO + Coordinating Conjunction + SVO
33	When the boy arrived home, he greeted his father, and his mother smiled.	Compound-Complex	Adverbial Clause (SVA) + SVO + Coordinating Conjunction + SV
34	I will call you when I reach home, or I will send a message.	Compound-Complex	SVO + Embedded Adverbial Clause (SVA) + Coordinating Conjunction + SVO
35	Because the woman was tired, she rested but her husband continued working.	Compound-Complex	Adverbial Clause (SV) + SVA + Coordinating Conjunction + SVO

36	Because she finished the work, she went home, and her friend stayed behind.	Compound-Complex	Adverbial Clause (SVO) + SVA + Coordinating Conjunction + SVA
37	After the child ate the food, he slept, and his mother cleaned the room.	Compound-Complex	Adverbial Clause (SVO) + SV + Coordinating Conjunction + SVO
38	If the child studies hard, he will succeed, and his parents will be happy.	Compound-Complex	Adverbial Clause (SVA) + SV + Coordinating Conjunction + SVC
39	If the rain stops, we will go out, and the children will play.	Compound-Complex	Adverbial Clause (SV) + SVA + Coordinating Conjunction + SV
40	While my mother prepared the meal, my father washed the car, and my brother cleaned the house.	Compound-complex	Adverbial Clause (SVO) + SVO + Coordinating Conjunction + SVO

Table II: Khana Sentence Structures and Types

1	Lè nwí dé zìà.	Simple	SVO
2	Á dàà bu efeeloo.	Simple	SVO

Data Analysis

A consideration of the data in Tables 1 and 2 illustrates that both English and Khana have the four main types of sentence types: simple, compound, complex and compound-complex sentence types. In addition to these there are same allowed use of independent and dependent clause, the addition of clauses, coordination, and relative clause use. Therefore, both languages have the syntactic system(s) which are able to express propositions of a variety of structural configurations.

In simple, declarative sentences, the SVO word order is the default word order used in both English and Khana. In English, for example, simple SVO sentences include The boy is eating food (Table 1, No. 1) and in Khana, Lè nwí dé zìà (Table 2, No. 1). The standard word order in the above examples in English and Khana can be seen to be SVO. The same basic constituent order can be seen to hold in the English and the Khana for The teacher reads books (Table 1, No. 7) and Lo néé torgenu bung kpà (Table 2, No. 7).

Additional data reveals that both languages 18,19 form compound sentences by coordinating two independent clauses. For example, the compound sentence of English, I washed the dishes, and she cleaned the house (Table 1, No. 11) can be viewed as two coordinated SVO independent clauses, and the Khana equivalent, Mm log lo féré, sà à kwa tor (Table 2, No. 11) has the same type structure 18,19. Both languages are also involved with complex sentences by combining a dependent clause with an independent clause. For instance, the complex sentence of English, If it rains, we will cancel the trip (Table 1, No. 25) is expressed with an adverbial subordinate clause followed by an independent clause; the same features can be observed in the Khana sentence, Le bɔɔ dor, I gáá léh kia ke (Table 2, No. 25).

Complexcompound sentences are also observed in both languages: the English (Table 1, No. 32) ‘Although the child was hungry, he waited for his mother, and she cooked the food’ has one dependent and two coordinated independent clauses. The equivalent sentence in Khana (Table 2, No. 32) ‘Kere wò, lóó lo nwí léh, a bééh yè ka, sà à bui lo zia’ also has one dependent and two coordinated independent clauses.

However, the analysis of the corpus also demonstrates significant contrasts between English and Khana in how clauses are formed, combined, and expressed grammatically. Both languages use the basic SVO order within clauses, but English and Khana differ in the expression of tense, aspect,

plurality, the expression of agreement and other grammatical categories, expression of adverbial modifiers, the number of grammatical markers and combinations used. For example, English tends to utilize overt grammatical markers involving Inflecting word, auxiliaries, complementizers, conjunctions and relative pronouns whereas Khana might make use of particles more frequently.

Another notable difference emerges in relative constructions. Comparing the English sentence 'The man who came yesterday is my uncle' (Table 1, No. 24) with the Khana sentence, 'Lo gbara á lu ah nyóó éé ah ééh wuga na té' (Table 2, No. 24), the use of the relative pronoun 'who' in the English makes the link to the embedded relative clause, whereas the equivalent Khana sentence expresses the similar relation without an English correlating relativizer, using instead the grammatical resources of Khana. This may be a source of difficulty for the Khana learners with regard to the acquisition of English relative-clause constructions.

There are also comparative differences between construct complements. In Khana, the equivalent of English complementizer such as that may be the adjective *ta* or the noun *m song*, as in the sentence 'I know that the teacher is in the classroom' (see Table 1 No. 28), the complementizer clause 'that the teacher is in the classroom' is expressed by a separate construction as in the Khana translation '*m sua kor lo nee torgenu le tor nor nu*' (see Table 2 No. 28).

According to the provided data, serial verb constructions exist in Khana. An example (Table 2, No. 6 *Á gáá gbi á kii.*) demonstrates a serial verb construction, while the equivalent construction in English (Table 1, No. 6 *He wants to go.*) demonstrates a different syntactic construction. This has implications in that it represents an important distinction of difference in structures; it may be the case that learners need to learn English-specific strategies to express this meaning.

The similarities and differences revealed between English and Khana have significant consequences for English language learning in Khana speakers. Similarities in the SVO pattern and the simple,

compound, complex, and compound-complex form will probably ease learning, as learners will be able to refer to similar forms in their L1. However, there may be more difficulty in learning in areas where the two languages use different grammatical mechanisms. Difficulties may be found in: tense and aspect marking, subject-verb agreement, the auxiliary, relative-clause formation, complementizers, adverb placements and plural marking.

This results supports Lado's Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, which argues that the closer the structure of the target language is to the native language the easier the learners find the target language to be; the structural differences could, in the least cases, be a potential source of difficulty for learners. This finding can also partially support the assumption of the Minimalist Program that the languages share the universal principles of syntax, but they diverge in their grammatical implementation.

In sum, the results show commonalities between English and Khana in the overall syntactic configuration of the two languages, and divergence with respect to the grammatical means of expressing specific types of syntactic relations. The agreement in the canonical SVO ordering of the two languages, as well as in the availability of similar sentence types, demonstrate the common ground, and the divergence in use of tense and agreement marking, construction of relative clauses and other types, complementization, and serial verb constructions, demonstrates the differential points of departure, highlighting the ways in which contrastive analysis provides a helpful starting point for predicting sources of learning difficulty.

This constitutive distinction between the two languages accounts for the transfer of mother tongue patterns that a native Khana makes when speaking English as a second language."

V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The result of this study illustrated that both English and Khana have shown many syntactical features in common even though they are from separate language families. By analyzing the data of this two

languages, it has shown that both languages utilize the four types of clauses: simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex clauses and most frequently use the SVO constituent order. Thus this study has confirmed the claim of Universal Grammar that all or most human languages have the common sets of constraint regardless of their history or typology.

Nevertheless, the present study showed that distinctive preferences in the realization of the similar clause structures occur. While English has the advantage of grammatical items to encode various grammatical relations for head-final clauses, Khana makes use of indigenous head-final clause-linking devices, pragmatic inference and special morphosyntactic features to cross-linguistically realize these grammatical relations.

The results of this study provide validation for Robert Lado's (1957) Contrastive Analysis Theory, which claims that 'areas in which the two languages differ structurally are the chief sources of difficulty for the second-language learner'. For instance, the differences in tense and aspect marking, agreement, and subordinate clause formation account for many of the types of errors produced by native speakers of Khana seeking to speak English.

In addition, the results support Chomsky's expressed opinion that although all languages are governed by universal principles of structure, each particular language is characterized by a specific set of parameters that regulate the grammaticization of the structure. Based on the results, then, we can conclude that English and Khana is different in the realization of this sentence structure.

Additionally, this research makes a contribution to the documenting of Khana syntax, which itself has been relatively under-represented in the literature. Providing systematic descriptions of Khana clause types side-by-side with the well-documented English, the work is providing some useful data for future linguistic investigation, bilingual education, translation, and other applications to language documentation.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this research project, we have compared the clause structures of English and Khana; using a contrastive syntactic analysis. The research concludes that English and Khana have comparable clause types which tightly follow the Subject-Verb-Object word order. However, there are many differences in the grammatical processes leading to the formation and interpretation of clause structure.

The paper concludes that whereas English heavily relies on overt grammatical indication (conjunctions, complementizers, tense markers, agreement systems), Khana adopts alternative syntactic methods that mirror its grammatical features. It is largely the structural discrepancies that pose difficulty for Khana speakers in acquiring English as a second language.

In general, it was observed that though both English and Khana possess some universal syntagmatic features, each language, nonetheless, exhibits some ascriptive grammatical features that have become natural symbols of the linguistic idiosyncrasies of the individual languages. Based on the preponderance of the findings of the study, it is suggested that contrastive linguistic approach be adopted in the teaching of English language, in the setting of English language curriculum, in the practice of translation and in the documentation of the indigens of Nigeria.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agwu, F. N., & Ndamzi, A. G. (2024). A contrastive analysis of demonstratives in English and Ikwerre languages. *Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 12(3), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.36347/sjahss.2024.v12i03.001>
- [2] Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K., & Harnish, R. M. (2018). *Linguistics: An introduction to language and communication* (7th ed.). MIT Press.
- [3] Carnie, A. (2023). *Syntax: A generative introduction* (5th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

- [4] Chomsky, N. (1957). Syntactic structures. Mouton.
- [5] Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. MIT Press.
- [6] Chomsky, N. (1995). The minimalist program. MIT Press.
- [7] Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). The Cambridge grammar of the English language. Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Joshua, S. F. (2017). Aspects of phonological variations in Kana. ASUU Journal of Humanities: A Journal of Research and Development, 4(2), 179–192.
- [9] Kari, E. E. (2019). The languages of Rivers State of Nigeria: An overview. Marang: Journal of Language and Literature, 31, 1–22.

- [10] Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers. University of Michigan Press.
- [11] Nwizug, S. S., & Nwala, M. A. (2021). A micro-parametric variation of English and Khana adjectives. Covenant Journal of Language Studies, 9(2). 
- [12] Obulor, Q., & Agwu, F. N. (2026). A contrastive analysis of word order in English and Ogba languages. ISA Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18287889> 
- [13] Radford, A. (2021). Analysing English sentences (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics Across Cultures. University of Michigan Press.
- [15] Radford, A. (2021). Analysing English Sentences (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.