"Intraference' in the Nominal Expressions of Educated Nigerian Users of English

By Steve Bode O. Ekundayo
University of Benin, Benin

Abstract- ‘Intraference’ is used in this paper as a more economical for Selinker’s “overgeneralization of linguistic materials and semantic features,” Richards and Sampson’s “intralingual interference” and Labov’s “internal principle of linguistic change.” Library research, questionnaires and the record of live linguistic events by educated Nigerians were used to gather data from 2004 to 2013 with a view to establishing morphemic intraference variations between ENE and SBE. It was found that educated Nigerians overstretch plurality rule, redeploy affixes, clip and blend to fabricate lexical items that may not be found in SBE and standard dictionaries. These morphological features, which are not necessarily vulgar errors of ignorance, but the outcomes of creativity and level of competence engendered by some psycho-sociolinguistic dynamics, distinguish ENE from SBE and American English.

Keywords: nominal intraference, interlanguage, educated nigerian english, english as a second language. affixes.

GJHSS-G Classification: FOR Code: 130199

Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of: 

© 2013. Steve Bode O. Ekundayo. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.
‘Intraference’ in the Nominal Expressions of Educated Nigerian Users of English

Steve Bode O. Ekundayo

Abstract- ‘Intraference’ is used in this paper as a more economical for Selinker’s “overgeneralization of linguistic materials and semantic features,” Richards and Sampson’s “intralingual interference” and Labov’s “internal principle of linguistic change.” Library research, questionnaires and the record of live linguistic events by educated Nigerians were used to gather data from 2004 to 2013 with a view to establishing morphemic intraference variations between ENE and SBE. It was found that educated Nigerians overstretch plurality rule, redeploy affixes, clip and blend to fabricate lexical items that may not be found in SBE and standard dictionaries. These morphological features, which are not necessarily vulgar errors of ignorance, but the outcomes of creativity and level of competence engendered by some psycho-sociolinguistic dynamics, distinguish ENE from SBE and American English.

Keywords: nominal intraference, interlanguage, educated nigerian english, english as a second language, affixes.

I. INTRODUCTION

A language that “migrates” from its ancestral home and becomes established as a second language in a heterogeneous, multilingual society, as English left England for Nigeria, will unavoidably impact on its new environment and vice versa in several ways (Ekundayo, 2006; Dadzie 2009). First, the “imported” second language interacts with the user’s first language (LI) and/or mother tongue (MT). Such an interaction often leads to language transfer habits. Second, the second language interacts with the new environment and then assumes some of the features of the second language user’s (LI) and/or (MT). Third, even features of the second language in the mind of the learner interact and influence one another independently of the MT and LI of the user.

Consequently, the psycho-sociolinguistic interaction of the languages in contact causes a new variety to emerge. The new variety is often a blend of the sociocultural linguistic markers of the second language situation and the linguistic features of the languages in contact. Invariably, the variety that emerges is often a fertile ground for research. Investigators usually study second language and its learning by adopting some methods, theories and terminologies like Contrastive analysis and error analysis, language transfer, languages in contact, contact linguistics, transitional competence, interference, interlanguage, among others (Ellis, 1985; Corder, 1981; Selinker, 1984).

Interlanguage is a very popular concept in ESL. John Reneinecke was credited to have first used the term interlanguage in his M.A. thesis in 1935 to mean “a makeshift dialect...still imperfect as compare with the standard language” (Teilanyo, 2002, p.43). Many years later, Selinker popularised interlanguage in his speech that he delivered in 1969 and two articles he published in 1971 and 1972 respectively (Ellis, 1985, Corder, 1981). Selinker (1984, p.37) identifies five fundamental areas of interlanguage to which researchers should pay attention: (i) language transfer, (ii) transfer of training, (iii) strategies of learning, (iv) strategies of communication and (v) overgeneralization of linguistic materials and semantic features. The corpus of literature available shows many extensive studies on the first four areas. However, the fifth area that Selinker calls the “overgeneralization of linguistic materials and semantic features” needs to be expanded and deepened. It is this fifth facet that has been isolated for study and uniquely lexicalized as “intraference.”

Intraference manifests at all the levels of linguistic organization: phonological, morphological/morphemic, structural or syntactic, semantic and graphological. Each of these levels has its sub-types of intraference. Morphemic intraference features are the most common. In morphemic intraference, the nominal sub-type features are the most common. This paper is restricted to an examination of the nominal sub-type of morphemic intraference. The purpose is to document the features of nominal intraference in ESL/ENE, show how educated Nigerians deploy internal language rules and items to produce features of nominal intraference, explain their psycho-sociolinguistic contexts and how they distinguish Nigerian English from SBE and other international varieties. The paper is divided into two major sections. Section one is conceptual/theoretical and section two presents examples to demonstrate the intuitive and theoretical propositions made in the first section.

a) Method of Research

Questionnaires, the Internet, record of linguistic events and library research were used from 2005 to 2013 to gather data from tertiary institution students and academic staff to substantiate the incidence of nominal intraference. The questionnaire used consisted of many...
syntactic structures cast in multiple choice questions with options A and B or A to D. Option A contained the SBE or native English usage and meaning while option B had the ENE meaning and use of each structure. The questions were validated by two professors of English and Literature and two professors of Measurement and Evaluation of the University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria before they were administered by physical contact, e-mail and cell phone to no fewer than fifty thousand educated Nigerians in ten cities and ten federal government universities in the five major geo-linguistic zones of Nigeria: the Yoruba South-west, the multi-lingual South-south, the Hausa-Fulani North, the Igbo South-east and the multi-lingual Middle-belt. The universities are Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Bayero University, Kano (North); University of Lagos, Federal University of Technology, Akure (West); University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka (East); University of Ilorin, Ilorin, University of Abuja, Federal Capital Territory (Middle-belt); University of Benin, Benin City and University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt (South-South). The selection of these universities was informed by their strategic locations across Nigeria and the fact that they use a Nigerian Federal Government policy called ‘Quota System’ or ‘Federal Character,’ to admit students from ‘catchment areas’ and all the regions of Nigeria.

Subjects aged between 19 and 70 years were selected from professors, lecturers and final year students of English and Literature, Linguistics, Communication and other departments. These groups of Nigerians are considered to be, or should be, models of English use and usage in Nigeria. Forty thousand (40,000) of the questionnaire sheets were collated because the researcher had difficulties collating all of them from the various respondents across Nigeria. Several research questions guided the investigation: Do educated Nigerians observe the rule of plurality in ways that are different from native English speakers? Do educated Nigerians redeploys nominal affixes and other morphological processes to fabricate nouns that may not be found in standard dictionaries and native English? What extenuating psycho-sociolinguistic backgrounds constrain educated Nigerians to redeploy nominal affixes and morphological processes in ways that native English speakers may not?

Focus was on widespread usage and educational status, not on age, sex and individual ranks of the educated people surveyed. Where 30 to 44% of the respondents chose an option, it was classified as an emerging variant. Less than 30% is treated as isolated cases in ENE. Where options A and B shared 45-50% for A and B, they were categorized as free variants in ENE. 51-59% were tagged common, 60 -79% widespread and 80-100% entrenched or institutionalized. The distributions of responses are annotated serially in simple percentile count and a summary chart at the end. There are other examples from live linguistic events and published works cited and annotated alongside SBE and/or SAE forms.

The method of research is, therefore eclectic. It is both qualitative and quantitative. The qualitative method is used to describe the syntactic variations gathered and explain their psycho-sociolinguistic underpinnings. Qualitative research is concerned with individual’s own accounts of attitudes, motivations and behaviour. The qualitative approach is best suitable for exploratory, attitudinal, historical and linguistic studies that examine causal processes at the level of the intentional, self-directing and knowledgeable actor (Omorogiwa, 2006, p. 45). However, the simple percentile count and summary chart, which are quantitative, were used to present the percentages of the cases documented. These two methods are best for the intuitive nature and psycho-sociolinguistic features of this study. They also enable readers to easily and quickly appreciate the data that substantiate, or can be used to justify, the claims and intuitive propositions made in this study.

b) Theoretical Background

This work is anchored on Selinker’s Interlanguage, Richards’ and Sampson’s intralingual interference and Labov’s propositions in variationist sociolinguistics. Labov (1994) says that the forces of language change and variations are “in the grammar and they constrain the grammar, and they cannot be described” without reference to the grammar. Morphological and syntactic variables, he says, are informed by “semantic distinctions and/or structural configurations whose development can be traced in the history of the language” (p.84). Bayley (2007) captures the nature of variationist sociolinguistic research as follows:

Research in variationist approach, in contrast to research that seeks a single overarching explanation, assumes that interlanguage variation, like variation in any language, is likely to be subject to the influence of not one but multiple contextual influences. That is, variationist research, whether on native or non-native languages, adopts what Young and Bayley (1996) have referred to as the principle of multiple causes (p.135).

(Bold emphasis mine).

The ‘multiple contextual influences’ that engender interlanguage variations are located in the linguistic dynamics of ESL and the psycho-sociolinguistics of a nonnative English setting. The nominal features of ENE are good examples; for naturally placed in a heterogeneous ESL environment that is far away from a native English setting, educated Nigerians manipulate the grammatical system of English to create structures whose meanings are already well-expressed in some other established structures in SBE.
In “Interlanguage,” Selinker (1984) proposes that the investigator of second language learning should study “the processes that lead to the knowledge behind interlanguage” and “the factors that lead to the knowledge underlying interlanguage” (pp.31-54). Selinker expands “the processes” and “the factors” into five interrelated features mentioned in the introduction. Indeed, if we analyse a given piece of performance or a text of interlanguage or ESL, we will realize the following linguistic features:

### Figure 1: A Schema of the Linguistic Features of ESL/ENE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Linguistic Examples/Markers of Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>NESL: ‘The man ate the money and lied on my head’ SBE: The man embezzled the money and lied against me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Her husband disvirgin her at 20. (b) She is plumpy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NESL: Spirit husband/wife, second burial, native doctor, etc. SBE: ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural linguistic markers</td>
<td>NESL: Well done masir (greetings to someone at work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You meet me well you have walked well/join me on the table (invitations from someone eating).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual features</td>
<td>SBE: Well done is not used in this way and the other structures are not in SBE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowings</td>
<td>For example: Amala, akara, (foods), wayo, shebi, omugwor, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical creativity and coinages</td>
<td>Aristo babe, Nigerian factor, high table, Federal Character, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulgar Errors</td>
<td>‘He did not acknowledged me, which caused me serious embarrass.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These features may not always be present at once in a given ESL text. The last examples of vulgar errors are not common in ENE, but may be found in lower varieties of NE. Examples in column two (2) look perfect English. However, they have features of the overgeneralization of TL (target language) rules (disvirgin instead of deflower; plumpy instead plump). This aspect has been isolated, lexicalized and conceptualised as intraference. What then is interference?

**i. The Concept of Intraference**

Intraference denotes intralingual variations and deviations. The coinage is intended as a counterpart to interference, that is INTERFERENCE versus INTRAFFERENCE, so that when we treat interference, which has become a well-established term, we can also check on intraference as its Siamese counterpart. Intraference is coined from a consideration of three morphemes: inter-, intra and –ference. “Inter-“ and “intra-“ are productive affixes used to create words in English. The two suffixes are mutually exclusive. The well-established interference itself is an amalgam of inter + ferire (to strike). Thus interference means a strike or contact between two things (Funk & Wagnalls, p.339). Intra (being a bound form) has been combined with ferire to have intraferire. Analogically, intra (within) plus (+) ferire (to strike or contact) means to disturb, strike or make two things contact each other within an entity. So, the combination of intra and ferire will result in a clash or contact within a thing. In the context of this work, it is a contact within an entity, which is language. The -ference is the noun formation, meaning an internal contact or disturbance within, that is linguistic “intraference”.

Intraference, which is the reverse of interference, is the transfer or redeployment of second language rules, items and system from sections where they operate in the language to sections of the language where they have hitherto not been operating. In intraference, (second) language users consciously and/or unconsciously engage in self-correction using the rules of the (second) language, extend semantic features, apply linguistic items to have questionable or acceptable formations and extends segmental and supra-segmental features and rules to areas where they used not to apply.

A careful examination of L2 English or ESL will show that some variations are traceable to the deployment of the dynamics of the English language itself. Examples of these dynamics are in grammatical rules and exemptions, word formation rules and inconsistent phonetic and phonological applications. These features collectively, in addition to limited competence and sociolinguistic factors, form the extenuating circumstances in which L2 learners produce certain variations in ESL, as in the ENE of this paper.

**ii. The Concept of Nigerian English (NE)**

Nigerian English (NE) is the variety used by educated Nigerians in Nigeria and outside Nigeria. The idiolects of NE share certain common phonological, grammatical and semantic features. Ethno-linguistic, formal education and sociolinguistic parameters are often used to cateogirise NE. In terms of regions, there...
exist different varieties of English in Nigeria: Hausa, Yoruba, Ibo, Efik, Urhobo, etc varieties. Each regional variety has its linguistic variations, on the one hand, and similarities to the others, on the other hand. Phono logical differences mainly differentiate regional NE varieties. With formal education and linguistic features, a number of classifications have been made. Prominent among them are Brosnahan’s (1958), Banjo’s varieties I, II, III and IV (1970, 1996) and Odumuh’s (1980) and Adesanyo’s written varieties I, II and III (1973). Banjo for instance used grammatical features and educational levels for his classification. Accordingly, Variety I is the lowest, which reflects vulgar errors of grammar and broken structures often used by primary school pupils and those with half-baked formal education. Variety II is an improvement on variety I. It is associated with secondary school students and school certificate holders. Variety III is higher standard associated with highly educated Nigerians, graduates, teachers, lecturers, etc. He proposed this model for Nigerian English. Lastly, Variety IV is identical to native English standard used by a few people who were born in native English speaking countries or have a parent of English origin and consequently acquire English as their first language. However, Variety IV does not have general social acceptance because it is seen as too foreign (Banjo, 1996, pp. 76-80; Sunday, 2008, p.235).

Three levels or –lects are often depicted on the sociolinguistic plane: basilect, mesolect and acrolect (Igene, 1992; Ogbulogo, 2005). The educated variety III of Banjo, which is also acrolect on the sociolinguistic pyramid, is often recommended or preferred as Nigerian standard.

On the whole, Banjo’s variety III, which is acrolect in sociolinguistic classification, is often treated as Educated Nigerian English (ENE), also called Standard Nigerian English (SNE). ENE/SNE is the variety used by undergraduates and graduates of higher institutions, scholars, the intelligentsia, high ranking army officers, the bar and the bench, educated preachers, broadcasters, children from sophisticated family background, experienced junior civil servants and senior civil servants, etc. This variety is the focus of this paper.

II. Review of Related Scholarship

Prior to the 1960s, concepts/theories of “language transfer”, “contrastive analysis” (CA) and “interference” were applied to study second language and its learning. Contrastive analysis is based on the assumption that second language learners have the tendency of transferring the features of their native or first language to their second language utterances, a habit also known as interference. A major weakness of language transfer is that it heaped the blame for errors and variations mainly on “native language.” Apparently, the theories failed to examine critically HOW non-native speakers deploy the rules and dynamics of the second language to produce variations. Ellis (1985) says that from the early 1960s, “there were conscious efforts to show that L2 errors were not predominantly the result of interference.” In this connection, the works of Corder, Richards, Labov, etc stand out. Corder (1981) argues that language transfer and interference theories cannot account for interlanguage features exhaustively or satisfactorily. Richard and Sampson (1984) made a case for “systemic intralingual interference”, which shows “overgeneralization, ignorance of rules restrictions, incomplete application of rules and semantic errors.” Accordingly, “intralingual interference refers to items produced by the learner which reflect not the structure of the mother tongue, but generalizations based on partial exposure to target language”(p.6). On a wider scale, Labov’s works (1966, 1969, 1972, 1994, 2001, 2010), among others, popularised and expanded variationist sociolinguistics. Labov argues that the African American Vernacular English (AAVE) that he studied should not be stigmatized as substandard, but respected as a variety having its own grammatical system.

The aforementioned works deserve commendation for placing emphasis on “systemic intralingual interference.” However, the terminologies used are long and varied. Several phrases such as “systemic intralingual errors”, “intralingual interference” and “internal language transfer,” overgeneralization of linguistic materials and semantic features,” “internal principle of linguistic change and variabil” were used to denote the same linguistic habit. These lack the precision and economy of such terms as “interlanguage” or “interference.” As precision and economy of terms are preferred in linguistics, “intraference” was coined for these long terms (Ekundayo, 2006, 2013). Cases of the nominal sub-type are examined in this paper.

Intraference is not restricted to ESL. It can occur even in a native language situation. Brian Foster (1968, p. 170-198) shows how native English speakers used some affixes to form words like “unclear, unbalanced, imbalance, non-flammable, deemphasize,” and many others, which are now well established in English. Similarly, Quirk et al (1985, p.1531) observe that “the native speaker operates daily in the implicit knowledge that the meaning of most adjectives can be negated by prefixing un- and that most adjectives will permit the formation of abstract nouns by suffixing –ness.” In the same vein, Matthews (1974) acknowledges that the habit of creating new words by overgeneralizing the use of affixes is so common that we cannot ignore it. “To ignore it is like drawing up a map which makes no distinction between ordinary hills and volcanoes. Nor does it belong to some special variety of English (as with literary usage). It is part of ordinary speaker’s
competence. So, surely we need a theory of grammar that can cope with it (p.222).

The last sentence is underlined because it underscores the significance of this study.

Clearly, intraference can account for the formation and currency of many new words in English worldwide; for instance, the formation of American “gotten” from British “got,” America “attendee” as against British “attendant,” American “majorly” (which means “extremely”) from British “major,” “staffers”, now commonly used in America and Nigeria (Okara, 2005, p.20), from British “staff,” American “presently” (meaning in the meantime or now) as against British English “at present.” The phenomenon of intraference also explains the recent acknowledgement and currency of new words like braniac, globalization, dollarization, cyberland, cyberporn, imagineer, netizens and many others being churned out daily (Aitchison, 2006, pp.B23-B29). The overstretching of word-formation processes, particularly the use of affixes, is a veritable source of intraference in a first language situation and more justifiably so in a second language setting, a perfect example being English in Nigeria, or “Nigerian English.”

In major works on Nigerian English, interference is always underscored, in fact ‘overscored’ as characterising Nigerian English varieties (Jowitt, 1991; Ubahakwe, 1979). Even where some obvious cases of intraference are cited, they are not explained as such but lumped under general errors of interference and other types, as in the cases of furnitures and homeworks by Adekunle (1979). The reason for this is the established tendency to trace cases of deviation to language transfer and interference. Secondly, there is this subtle tendency to conform to laid-down principles, concepts and theories of (second) language learning and acquisition, particularly by native English scholars. Thirdly, it might have been assumed that errors and variations of “intralingual interference” are too insignificant to attract extensive studies. However, this study establishes that variations of intraference are widespread and entrenched in “Nigerian English.”

Kujore (1985 and 2009), Schmied (1991), Jowitt and Nnamonu’s (1985), Igene (1992), Bamgbose (1995), Igboanusi (2006), Ogbulogo (2009), Dadzie and Awonusi 2009, have pointed out some features of NE that are traceable to intraference, although they do not expressly call them cases of intraference. In an article restricted to aspects of words formation processes, Teilanyo (2002, pp.75-99) examined the processes of clipping, blending, abbreviation and lexicalization in “Nigerian English”, citing many examples to demonstrate the word-formation habits that he investigated. His article is limited to abbreviation processes. But he does cite relevant examples of morphemic intraference by abbreviation, although that is not what he tagged them.

As a result of certain psycho-linguistic constraints, Educated Nigerians tend to exhibit nominal intraference through affixation, superfluous plurality, omission of the plural morpheme, compounding, clipping and blending which collectively differentiate ENE from SBE and other international varieties of English.

III. Annotation And Data Analysis

Some examples of the various sub-levels of nominal intraference are presented below.

a) Deployment of Nominal Affixes

The percentage of educated Nigerians who chose the Nigerian sense B of the 40,000 analysed is indicated in the front of each example.

BooHtlicker (boontick++er, 90% entrenched)

“He is a government booHtlicker.”

CelebOrant (from the verb sense of celebrate+ant, 100% entrenched)

One who is celebrating birthday, hosting a party, celebrating achievement, promotion, government appointment, etc. SBE celebrant means a priest conducting Mass or someone officiating a solemn occasion.

CoolEr (Cool+er, 100% entrenched)

A plastic, flask-like container of different sizes that keep foods warm usually for sometimes.

Cunningness (Cunning+n+ess 55% common)

Donator (a derivative from the verb donate+or, 60% widespread)

One who donates (a donor); mainly used to denote a man or woman who keeps several sex partners, also informally called ‘Donatus.’

Duper (dup+er, 54% common)

A dupe, one who dupes people.

Gossiper (gossip+er, 65% widespread)

A tale bearer, a gossip; one who goes about spreading people’s secrets.

Indigenes/non-indigene (back clipping from indigenous as in aborigine- aboriginal, 100% entrenched)

A native, or a non-native of a place. “Non-indigenes cannot take part in the festival.”

Nudeness (nude+n+ess, 70% widespread)

Nakedness, nudity.

Naggingness ( nag+ing+n+ess, 57% common, used to differentiate it from the participial form nagging)

Pensioners (pension+er, 60% widespread)

For SBE Pensioners.

Pocket pickers (Pocket pick+ers, also compounding, 61% widespread)

SBE: pickpockets

Non-effectiveness (non+effect+ive+n+ess) 77% widespread
The non-effectiveness of the ban was not in the interest of the manufacturer” (Wole, 2006, p.28). SBE is ineffectiveness. Multi-religiosity (multi-religious + -ity) 66% widespread

“...multi-religiosity of Nigeria is a no-go-area for conlab” (Omonijo & Aziken, 2006, p.4). Three morphemes are combined, as in multiplicity. SBE will be “Secular status of Nigeria, secularism, freedom of religion, pluralism, pluralistic status of Nigeria...” etc. Short-temperness (short+temper+ness) 57% common

“Such a feeling makes one to be very susceptible to anger and short-temperness.” (David West Jnr. 2006, p. 12). SBE is short-temper.

Upliftment (uplift+ment) 93% entrenched

“Author dedicates book proceeds to his town upliftment” (Akor, 2005, p.12). The standard word is uplift, either as noun or verb.

Sufferness (suffer+ness) 56% common

Sometimes used as the equivalent of native English suffering, misery, hardship, inconvenience: “I started thinking of when my sufferness will end.” (Public Service Examination 2005, p. 2).

Industriousness (industry+ous+ness) 91% entrenched

A widely used hybrid form for the sense of the native form “industry”:

“His industriousness took him to great height”, instead of SBE “his industry took him to greater height.” Industry in Nigeria is restrictively used to denote a manufacturing firm or a sector of the economy, while industriousness is used to mean hard-work.

Reocurrence (re+occur+ence) 92% entrenched

A Nigerian usage having the memory and structure of words like reemphasize, rearrange, reorganize, etc. “What should we do to avert a reocurrence (Muduagbunam, 2005). SBE is recurrence.

Oraculist/Oraclist (Addition of the suffix –ist to oracle, as in cycle, cyclist) 75% widespread.

“The family consulted an oraculist to unravel the mystery” (Ekundayo, 2004, p.40).

Bootlicker (boot+lick+er) 88% entrenched

“He’s a government bootlicker” (Ekundayo, 2004, p.39). SBE/SAE often use a bootlick, a sycophant or a toady for both noun and verb. Bootlicker is becoming current in American English.

Quotarization (quota+rize+ation)

Something akin to zoning, it is the lexicalization of “quota system” which operates in Nigeria, an official policy of sharing jobs, positions and resources not on the basis of merit or standard but on the basis of ethnic groups and federal structures. Hence the term quotarization (Also noted in Igene, 1992, p.70).

Godfatherism (god+father+ism)

Godfatherism denotes the idea of having a godfather, the overbearing influence of the godfather, whether positive or negative, particularly in politics (Also see Igene, 1992, p.60).

Braveness (brave+nness, 70% widespread)

“Talking of braveness, Ora is a land of great minds” (Ojo, 2012)

Colomentality (colo- from colonial + mental + -ity, 97% entrenched)

A coinage popularized by Fela Anikulapokutin his song “colomentality” to denotes a typical African attitude of thinking foreign, behaving foreign, talking foreign and giving superiority and excellence to anything foreign or exotic, justifiably or not.

Co-in-law/Co-wife/Co-tenant 76% widespread

This indicates the idea of sharing or belonging to a thing, place and institution. When two persons take a spouse respectively from the same family, they address and introduce each other as co-in-law.

Sickler (sickle+er) 100% entrenched

“I am a sickler” (Oluranti, 2005, p.31). It is a common Nigerian formation for a sickly person or a sickle cell carrier (SS Genotype). The word is widely used in ENE. SS Genotype and its attendant crises are not common with the white race. Hence, the word sickler is not in SBE and native English.

Corper(s) (corp+er) 89% entrenched

A very common formation used to address a fresh Nigerian graduate who is on a one year compulsory National Youth Service Corps (NYSC).

Aristorism (clippering and blending of aristo- from aristocrat/aristocracy and –ism, 88%)

A sign post in front of Moremi Hall, University of Lagos, Nigeria. Aristorism is the practice of young girls dating rich, much older and often married men who are called ‘aristos,’ that is aristocrats or upper class people. Such girls are described as aristo babes.

JAMBITE/Jambite (JAMB+ite) 100% entrenched

A combination of the acronym JAMB and the suffix –ite. The word means a JAMB (Joint Admission and Matriculation Board) candidate or victim and a fresh student in a university or higher institution (Also in Teilanyo, 2002, p.75).

Nollywood (Nneyelike and Afolabi, 2006, p.15) 100% entrenched.

It is formed from Hollywood, a term for the American film industry and centre of film production. The “N” of Nigeria is clipped to replace the “H” of Hollywood. The coinage is now used for the Nigeria Film
Industry, although very fake and questionable, it betrays what Fela calls colo-mentality.

**b) Superfluous Plurality Markers**

Ekundayo (2006, p.30) has listed about a hundred nouns that are often unnecessarily pluralized in ENE. A few of them are given below. The cases entrenched in ENE are depicted here.

**Slangs** (83% entrenched)

“The words, idioms, proverbs and slangs will be those used in the native-speaker dialect. Slangs used in this variety...” (Adekunle, 1979, pp. 29, 37).

“These slangs are acceptable and appropriate...” (Ogu, 1992:60).

Standard form is slang, not slangs because it is a collective noun. But nonnative speakers treat slang and some other collective nouns as singular words that should be pluralized.

**Double-Standards** (100% entrenched)

“...double-standards...” (Guardian Editorial, 2005, p.5). Standard native usage is double standard. The use of “double” in this phrase creates the impression of plurality in a nonnative user’s mind. Double means two. Hence double (two) standards.

**All manners** (90% entrenched)

“He starved the campaign of fund and only started releasing same when he had extracted all manners of assurances...” In Standard British or American usage, it will be all manner of assurance or all kind(s) of promises, not all manners of assurances. The presence of “all” in the phrase gives a nonnative speaker the impression of plurality.

**Incidences** (57% common)

“Senate... believes that publication of the incidences of... affecting the National Assembly (Ukeme, 2005, p.8). SBE or SAE is incidence of...”

**Luggages** (70% widespread)

“How many of these men are prepared to drop their excess luggages?” (Muyi, 2005, p.8). Standard usage is excess luggage.

**Imageries** (92% entrenched)

“Besides, this year’s census would use satellite imageries which will show every nook and cranny” (Anumihe, 2005, p.7) SBE or American English uses imagery as collective plural to mean images, figures of speech, etc.

**Wastages** (85% entrenched)

“The supporters of ex-Generals only need to be counselled against further wastages...”

**A staff/staffs**

“I am a staff of this university.” “Academic staffs are on strike.”

SBE is “I am a member of staff.” “Academic staff are on strike.”

**c) Removal of Necessary Plural Morphemes**

Examples in this sub-section are all entrenched in ENE

**Call it quit** (96% entrenched)

“For calling it quit with her lover-boy of three years, a young lady, miss Inyene Udoh Jonah, has been turned to a monster” (Ikwunze, p. 21). B. Eng: for calling it quits pliers: “Gang robs with plier...” (Francis 28).

SBE is Gang robs with a pair of pliers or with pliers.

**Delay is dangerous** (88% entrenched)

“Delay is dangerous” (Title of a Nigerian film/home video).

SBE is “Delays are dangerous.”

**Brain** (80% entrenched)

“Beauty, brain and creativity” (Ogedengbe 11).

SBE is Beauty, brains and creativity.

**At all Cost** (89% entrenched)

“She wants my husband at all cost” (Abodurin 26). SBE in this context will be .... at all costs.

**Head or tail** (70% widespread)

“Head or tail, he is culpable” (Azuike136).

SBE: Heads or tails, he is culpable.

**Outskirt of...** (88% entrenched)

I live in the outskirt of Benin. SBE: I live in the outskirts of Benin.

**Handcuff** ( 85% entrenched)

“Balogun, the Inspector General of Police, was shown in handcuff..”

SBE: ...shown in handcuffs.

**Surrounding** (75% widespread)

Our surrounding looks clean.

SBE: Our surroundings look clean.

**Congratulations** (95% widespread)

SBE: Congratulations on your success.

**Good office** (80% entrenched)

SBE: Kindly use your good office to assist.

SBE: Kindly use your good offices to assist.

**Specie...** (81% entrenched)

What specie of plant is this?

SBE: What species of plant is this?

**Amend...** (76% widespread)

They went back to make amend.

SBE: They went back to make amends.

**Pant** (64% widespread)

He hardly wears pant.
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SBE: He hardly wears pants.

Spirit (71% widespread)

The professor is always in high spirit.

SBE: The professor is always in high spirits.

Wit (71% widespread)

She admitted that she was at the end of her wit.

SBE is She admitted that she was at the end of her wits.

Gut (76% widespread)

You mean he had the guts to ask you?

SBE is ‘You mean he had the guts to ask you?’

Crossroad (73% widespread)

The girl seems to be at the crossroads.

SBE is ‘The girl seems to be at the crossroads.’

Fund (62% widespread)

The project was hamstrung for lack of fund.

SBE is ‘The project was hamstrung for lack of funds.’

Ground (84% entrenched)

"On compassionate ground and in the spirit of fair-hearing ---"

SBE: On compassionate grounds and in the spirit of fair-hearing ---

Sympathy (81% widespread)

Accept my sympathy on your father’s death.

SBE: Accep t my sympathies on your father’s death.

Condolences (81% entrenched)

He visited to offer his condolence.

SBE: He visited to offer his condolences

Barrack (76% widespread)

They reside in Dodan Army barrack.

SBE: They reside in Dodan Army barracks

Headquarter (68% widespread)

Yemisi lives in the State Headquarter.

SBE: Yemisi lives in the State Headquarters.

Relation (89% entrenched)

He is a Public Relation Officer (PRO).

SBE: He is a Public Relation Officer (PRO).

d) Psycholinguistic Grounds for Questionable Plurality

Some psycho-sociolinguistic and linguistic factors inform questionable plurality in a second language situation. Nonnative speakers treat these words as singulars, like the veritable singular words in English. Following the rule of plurality, they add the plural morpheme to the words. Another reason is that there are so many confusing exemptions in the language that they cannot remember during performance; hence they mix them up. Thirdly, there are clear instances of known plural collective nouns yet used with the plural morpheme in native usage.

Examples are accessory, vocabulary and infrastructure, etc. The Longman Dictionary says “Accessories include a CD player and alloy wheels.” The BBC Dictionary defines infrastructure as “the structures, the facilities, services and equipment that are provided which help a country or organization function effectively.” Then it gives “infrastructures” as a variant.

Same thing it does to accessory and vocabulary. Some other dictionaries (Longman, Oxford Advanced Learners, Websters, Chambers, etc.) do not give the variant plurals. So, in a second language situation where users see a standard native dictionary as the final arbiter of what is right or wrong, at least, until a native speaker can be reached, there is bound to be an argument between the user of the BBC Dictionary and the user of the other dictionaries as to the plural status of say vocabulary and infrastructure. This kind of inconsistency is an extenuating circumstance for double plurality in a second language situation. So long as double plurality also occurs in a native setting, there is the possibility that some of these mass nouns will have variant–s plural forms in the dictionaries of the future.

As for the removal of the plural morphemes in some fixed expressions, the nonnative speakers view them as purely singular words referring to a singular situation as well. Consequently, in accordance with the rules of the language, they think that the words should not be pluralized. Hence they would say delay is dangerous instead of delays are dangerous, or call it quit instead of call it quits. Next, we examine nominal intraference by abbreviation and expansion.

e) Abbreviation, Expansion and Acronymization: Some Creative Formations

Arrangee (back clipping) 100%

It is an informal word for something doubtful, fake or deceptive. Fela Anikulapokuti popularized it in his song, “arrangee masters or army arrangement”. I don’t believe what I saw. It was an arrangee.

Bros (back clipping) 100%

Bros stands for brother with an added meaning. The younger generation of Nigerians use it to show respect and closeness in addressing a male friend or relative who is still young but older than the speaker: “Bros, I like to see you.” It is similar to American “bro.”

Non-indigene (100% entrenched)

“Non-indigene fees” is a popular phrase in Nigerian state-owned tertiary schools. It explains the discriminatory practice of asking people from other States, who are resident or schooling in another State, to pay extra fees different from and in addition to the general school fees. Indigene is back-formed or back-clipped from indigenous, as in Aborigine from Aboriginal.

Media Practitioners (100% entrenched)

A compound word formed with the memory of medical/legal practitioner. It is used to mean journalists or those in the media (Oguntuase, 2006: 34).

National Cake (100% entrenched)
This means federal resources, common wealth and money to be shared or as shared to the federating states of Nigeria.

**Now-now (81% entrenched)**

For emphasis, to convey urgency or emergency, Nigerians often use now-now. “Do you want me to leave now?” “Yes, leave now-now.”

**Area-boys (90% entrenched)**

A term for young (jobless) men, the destitute, urchins, etc that lurk in an area and sometimes constitute a nuisance: “Some area boys snatched her bag at that corner.”

**Public dog (75% widespread)**

It is a derogatory word for a loose girl, a promiscuous woman. “What has a decent man to do with that public dog?”

**Bush meat**

A coinage for meat got from the forest or farm, compared to domesticated meat like chicken, mutton and beef. It is also used by men to describe local, village and unsophisticated girls who can be easily manipulated as against sophisticated urban girls. “But to dump every city girl he had dated and gone for a ‘bushmeat’(according to them) was simply unthinkable” (Chidi-Maha, 2011, p.37).

**Home trouble/family problem**

Home trouble is used to mean socio-economic retardation and spiritual or mysterious predicament that one faces, believed to be caused by witches and wizards or diabolic relatives. Family problem is also used literally to mean family, domestic and marital challenges and responsibilities: Home trouble has been retarding his progress.

**KIV**

An acronym for ‘kept in view’, commonly used by civil servants, now also used in public circles, to denote a file or matter not being considered at present, an issue kept to be possibly considered later, a euphemism for ‘not approved,’ ‘pending,’ ‘put aside’ because there are more pressing matters: ‘What of my application for loan?’ The secretary asked. ‘Well, we have KIV your application for now’, the Director said.

**JJC (Jonny Just Come)**

It is used to denote a newcomer, stranger, novice, neophyte, first timer, etc in informal ENE.

**ITK (I Too Know)**

It is used in informal ENE for someone who shows off with knowledge, or who proves to know too much when the reverse may be the case.

**IGG (Initial gira-gira)**

IGG is used to denote the excitement, energetic effort, resistance, stubbornness or pretense at the beginning of an event or experience, e.g. the initial refusal or resistance by a lady during wooing, which later gives way to acceptance.

**NFA**

“No Future Ambition” (from the defunct Nigeria Football Association: NFA, notorious for its uncommitted attitude to the development of sports) is used to describe people who lazy around, who do not show or pursue any plan or ambition, not serious with their studies, life or work.

**PUME or Post-UME (Post University Matriculation Examination)**

It is a recent coinage emanating from the establishment of an entrance examination after the regular University Matriculation Examination (UME).

**OYO (on your own)**

It stands for you are on your own. In informal ENE, it is used for someone when you are not supporting them in a course of action, or you do not want to give them attention, particularly when you have advised against the intended action to no avail: if you go ahead with it, OYO.

**TDB** *(Informal for Till Day Break)*

“We danced tdb.”

**PP (Private Practice)**

It is deployed to denote self-employment, entrepreneurship, or a job which is not government employment that one does to survive or augment one’s earnings.

These examples are by no means exhaustive. However, they suffice to prove how widespread nominal intraference is in ESL, Educated Nigerian English being an excellent example.

## IV. Conclusion

This paper has shown so far that nominal intraference features, which are the largest type of morphemic intraference, is widespread or entrenched in ENE. Interestingly, intraference is also common in a first or native language situation, for some of the nonce and hybrid formations hitherto treated as errors have found entrance into some dictionaries and native usage. Some examples are convocate versus convoke, the more established one. Convocate is given as a variant in Chambers Dictionary. ‘Tickish’, often treated as an error by many a Nigerian linguist or grammarian because of the well-established tricky, has been entered as an emerging variant in the BBC Dictionary and Chambers Dictionary respectively. Thus care should be taken in condemning some features of morphemic intraference found in the performances of the Nigerian intelligentsia, particularly the ones that use affixes creatively to form words that satisfy the exigency of the moment of linguistic performance.
While some of them may be seen as deviations or errors, quite a number of them can be considered as the outcomes of creativity based on the rules of the English language itself and the level of competence and awareness of the users. It is the nonnative speakers’ way of enriching the vocabulary of the English language, which they inevitably use for socio-educational interaction. Educated Nigerians tend to regard with disdain and disapproval deviations or variations of intraference by people with low education. For example, while the sentence ‘I hate proudness’, or ‘I don’t like delayance’ will be adjudged egregious and unacceptable by highly educated Nigerians, the sentence ‘I am contributing to the socio-educational upliftment of my town’ may be judged acceptable. The reason is that ‘proudness’ is not used in the English of the intelligentsia, but upliftment is used. However, proudness, delayance and upliftment have been fabricated in the same way – through the overgeneralization of the nominal suffixes –ness, -ance and -ment.

This study has thus established that educated Nigerians redeploy nominal affixes and morphological processes to fabricate nouns that distinguish ENE morphology from SBE or other native English morphology.

The question, therefore, is which variations of nominal intraference may judged as errors or glossed over or ignored, or even accepted, and from whom? Well, currency of usage, wide acceptability among educated Nigerians and the compliance of nominal fabrications with the morpho-syntactic rules of the language may be used to assess, accept or question variations of intraference. Those that are clear displays of creativity and the results of a well-motivated desire to establish new concepts and meanings should be accepted as variations.
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