



GOMBE SAVANNAH

JOURNAL OF
LANGUAGE, LITERATURE
& COMMUNICATION STUDIES
(GOSAJOLLCOS)



DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES
AND LINGUISTICS
GOMBE STATE UNIVERSITY



Volume 7 | Number 1 | JUNE, 2026



Savannah Journal of Language, Literature and Communication Studies (SAJOLLCOS)

Vol. 7 No. 1: June, 2026 — ISSN: 2787-0286 & 2811-2261 (Online & Print)

**SAVANNAH JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND COMMUNICATION
STUDIES (SAJOLLCOS)**

**DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS,
GOMBE STATE UNIVERSITY**



VOLUME 7 NO. 1, JUNE 2026

ISSN: ONLINE: 2811-2261, PRINT: 2787-0286

**A Publication of Department of Languages and Linguistics
Gombe State University, Gombe State.**

**Copyright © 2026 SAVANNAH JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND
COMMUNICATION STUDIES
(SAJOLLCOS) Gombe State University, Gombe State. Volume 7, No. 1 June, 2026.**



© Department of Languages and Linguistics, 2026
Gombe State University,
Tudun-wada Jauro Abare, Gombe -
Nigeria.

All rights reserved.

No part or whole of this Journal is allowed to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, without prior permission of the Copyright owner.

ISSN: 2787-0286 Print & 2811-2261 Online

Printed in Nigeria @Six-Sweet Printers and Publishers

GSU, Gombe, Gombe State.

Phone No: +2348039511789

E-mail: alameenalaira@gmail.com

The Journal

Gombe Savannah Journal of Language, Literature and Communication Studies (GOSAJOLLCOS) is a peer-reviewed journal of the Department of English, Gombe State University. The journal is committed to the development of communication arts through researches in Language, Linguistics, Literature, Theatre Arts, Cultural Studies, Creative Arts, Media and Communication Studies. It has both print and online versions. The Editorial board hereby calls for thoroughly researched papers and articles on the subject areas already mentioned. Submissions of papers are accepted all year round but publication is expected to be done in May/June annually. All manuscripts should be accompanied with the sum of ten thousand (~~N~~**10,000**) naira only. On acceptance of any manuscript, contributors will pay the sum of twenty five thousand (25,000) naira only as publication fee.



Editorial Committee

Dr. Abubakar Mohammed Gombe
Dr. Leah I. Jalo
Dr. Fatima Shuaibu Gara
Fatima M. Gurama
Mohammad Abubakar Musa

Editor-in-chief
Editor
Member
Member
Editorial Secretary

Advisory Board

Professor Saleh Abdu

Department of English,
Federal University Kashere

Professor Emmanuel S. Dandaura

University

Department of Theatre and
Cultural Studies, Nasarawa State

Professor Muhammad Dahiru
State University

Department of Languages, Yobe

Professor A. S. Abdulsalam
Languages,

Department of Linguistics and Nigerian
University of Ilorin

Professor E. U. Ahidjo

Department of English, University of Jos

Professor Nahum Upah Butari

Department of English and Drama,
Kaduna State University

Professor Nesta Alu

Department of English, University of Jos

Editorial Policy

Savannah Journal of Languages, Literature and Communication Studies is Produced by the department of English and Literary Studies, Gombe State University, Gombe Nigeria. It invites scholarly and well researched articles on any topic related to language, literary and communication studies. Authors of article(s) should adhere to the following requirements:

- Manuscript(s) should be double spaced on A4 paper with 12 points, Times New Roman.
- Manuscript(s) length should not exceed 5000 words, including titles, references and/or notes.



- Abstract(s) should not be more than 250 words, followed by four to five keywords.
- Manuscript(s) sent to SAJOLLCOS must be original and previously unpublished.
- Manuscript(s) should adopt either the APA 7th edition or MLA 8th edition format
- Title(s) and subtitles should conform to the adopted referencing style.
- Manuscript(s) would be subjected to editing and peer reviews prior to acceptance and publication.
- Author(s) should provide a bio-data of not more than three sentences at the end of their paper stating their rank, affiliation, research interest and email address.
- All Manuscript(s) for consideration should be accompanied with non-refundable sum of ₦10,000.00 assessment fee.
- On acceptance of any manuscript, author(s) will pay the publication fee of ₦25,000.00
- Creative work publication fee of ₦5,000.00
- All editorial correspondences should be directed to:

The editor,

Savannah Journal of Language, Literary and Communication Studies, Department of Languages and Linguistics,
Gombe State University, Gombe.

Email: sajollicos@gmail.com

Website: <https://www.gombesavannahjournal.com>

For further enquiries, please contact: Editor-in-Chief

SAJOLLCOS, HOD's Office,

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Gombe State University, Gombe sajollicos@gsu.edu.ng,

C/o: amgombe2@gsu.edu.ng



LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Mustapha Ibrahim Garba, PhD

Department of English and Linguistics
Federal University Dutse, Jigawa
igmustaphasays@gmail.com
08065951233

Sakina Wada

Department of English and Linguistics
Federal University Dutse, Jigawa

Suku Hyellamada Kenan, PhD

Department of Languages and Linguistics,
Gombe State University,
hyellawilbe@gmail.com
08139668910

Aishatu Bello Umar

School of Secondary Education Languages,
Department of English Language, Federal
College of Education (Technical) Gombe
aishatubu@gmail.com
08036585813.

Hannatu Joseph Bega

Department of Modern Languages,
College of Education Billiri.
hannatujosephbega@gmail.com

Ibrahim Garba Nayaya (Baba)

National Teachers' Institute, Kaduna.
ibrahimba182@gmail.com
+2347066366586/ +2348125351694

Danlami Bala Gwammaja, PhD

Aminu Kano College of Islamic and Legal
Studies, Kano
danlamigwammaja@gmail.com
08020605148

Musa Ahmad Sani

Department of Arts Education, Faculty of
Education, Kaduna State University
musa.ahmad@kasu.edu.ng
08035562885

Abdullahi Dahiru Umar, PhD

Department of English and Literature,
Federal University Gusau
dumar@fugusau.edu.ng
08065726292

AbdulAzeez Lawal, PhD

Department of English and French, Umaru
Musa Yar'adua University, P. M. B. 2218,
Katsina
abdulazeez.lawal@umyu.edu.ng

Abdulrahman Idris Abdulwaheed, PhD

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Faculty of Arts, Yobe State
University, Damaturu
Email: iabdulrahman2255@gmail.com
08037041081

Hamidou Bappa, PhD

Department of English Language and
Literatures of English Expression, Higher
Teachers' Training College Maroua,
University of Maroua, P.O. BOX 55 Maroua,
Cameroon
Email: hamidoubappa@gmail.com
Tel: 696551858

Theodore Bebey, PhD

Department of English Language and
Literatures of English Expression, Higher
Teachers' Training College Maroua,
University of Maroua, P.O. BOX 55 Maroua,
Cameroon
Bebeylawane@yahoo.fr
/bebeytheodore20@gmail.com

Abdurrazak Abubakar

Department of English Language, Federal
College of Education (Technical) Bichi,
P.M.B. 3473 Kano State, Nigeria
abubakarabdulrazak296@gmail.com
07036051705



Sani Isma'il Abubakar

Department of English Language, Federal
College of Education (Technical) Bichi,
P.M.B. 3473 Kano State, Nigeria
ismailsania@gmail.com
07064891033

Malata Andrew Zakayo, PhD

Department of Languages and Linguistics,
Gombe State University,
zakayomalataandrew@gmail.com
08027326216

Ismail Bala

.....

Abubakar Mohammed Gombe, PhD

Department of Languages and
Linguistics, Gombe State University
08060839578
amgombe2@gsu.edu.ng

John O, Udeigwe Ph.D

Department Of English
Language/Literature
Abia State University – Uturu
jo.udeigwe@abiastateuniversity.edu.ng
08146142122

Shamsuddeen Ismaila

Department of Hausa, Shehu Shagari
College of Education, Sakkwato
Shamsuddeenismail83@gmail.com

Mshelbwala Comfort Usman

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Federal University of Kashere,
Gombe State, Nigeria
08067131647
comfortbwala01@gmail.com,

Shehu Yahuza Abbas

Department of General Studies, Isa
Mustapha Agwai 1 Polytechnic,
Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria
abbassshehuyahuza@gmail.com /
Phone: 07030573795 / 08125163443,

Shema'u Abubakar Umar

shemauari@gmail.com / Phone:
08035965496
Department of General Studies, Isa
Mustapha Agwai 1 Polytechnic,
Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria

Ibrahim Muhammed Ogah

ogahibrahim075@gmail.com / Phone:
07067169460
Department of General Studies, Isa
Mustapha Agwai 1 Polytechnic, Lafia,
Nasarawa State, Nigeria

Sani Saidu

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Yobe State University
sani002saidu@gmail.com
08061353634

Umar Amos Hadiya

Department of Languages and
Communication, Federal Polytechnic
Mubi
umardamos@gmail.com
08034846180

Abdullahi Usman Garko

Department of Languages and
Linguistics, Gombe State University
augarko@gsu.edu.ng



Angela Butack

Department of Languages and
Linguistics, Gombe State University

Fatima Ibrahim Usman

Dept of Languages and Linguistics
Gombe State University
+234 7041726084
phartimaribrahim@gmail.com

Tarr, Mathias

Department of Languages, Nigerian
Defiance Academy, Kaduna
08034641925
tarrmathias@yahoo.com

Fatima, Inuwa S. Gara, PhD

Department of Languages and
Linguistics, Gombe State University
08039199933
fatigara2@gmail.com

Apasi Marizukot Ahuoyiza

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Bayero University, Kano

Adamu Idris, PhD

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Bayero University, Kano
aidris@buk.eng.edu.ng

Ibrahim Sofiyat Temitope

Department of English and Literary
Studies, Bayero University, Kano



TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A: Language & Literature

A Conceptual Metaphor Analysis of Selected Proverbs in Aliyu Kamal's Silence and a Smile

Mustapha Ibrahim Garba, PhD & Sakina Wada **1-15**

Repositioning Reading through Multimodality in English Language Teaching

Suku Hyellamada Kenan, PhD, Aishatu Bello Umar & Hannatu Joseph Bega **16-30**

Dislocation and Renegotiation: Postcolonial Belonging in Cry, the Beloved Country, Paradise, Bird Summons, and Wahala

Musa Ahmad Sani & Abdullahi Dahiru Umar, PhD **31-41**

Reconfiguring Belief: Religion, Culture, and Displacement in Postcolonial and Diasporic Fiction

Abdullahi Dahiru Umar, PhD & AbdulAzeez Lawal, PhD **42-54**

An Exploration Of Stylistic and Literary Devices In Tess Onwueme's The Broken Calabash

Abdulrahman Idris Abdulwaheed, PhD & Sani Saidu **55-74**

Borrowing and Code-Switching among Hausa-English Speakers in the North Eastern Nigeria: A phonological analysis

Hamidou Bappa, PhD & Theodore Bebey, PhD **75-89**

Disillusionment and Commitment: a Reader – Reception Study of Elma Shaw's Redemption Road

Abdurrazak Abubakar & Sani Isma'il Abubakar **90-103**

Contextual Use of English in Nigerian Motivational Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Speeches

Aishatu Bello Umar & Malata Andrew Zakayo, PhD **104-113**

English Language In Nigeria, Past, Present And The Future: a Concerned Issue

John O, Udeigwe Ph.D **114-124**

The Interface between Morphosyntax, Language Development and Its Sustainability: A Case Study of Bura Verbal Group

Mshelbwala Comfort Usman **125-143**



Digital Folklore And Nation-Building: Repurposing Indigenous Verbal Arts For
Cultivating Civic Realignment And Social Stability Among Nigerian Youths

Shehu Yahuza Abbas & Shema'u Abubakar Umar

144-159

Algorithmic Reclamation: Digital Resources As Structural Instruments For
Countering Linguistic Imperialism Among Indigenous Language Teachers

Shehu Yahuza Abbas & Ibrahim Muhammed Ogah

160-173

Bi-Implication and Negative Markers in Atiku Abubakar's 2023 Presidential
Declaration Speech

Sani Saidu & Umar Amos Hadiya

174-196

Comparative Analysis of English and Tangle Fricative Phonemes for Pedagogical
Implications to the Tangle English Speakers

Malata Andrew Zakayo, PhD & Angela Butack

197-224

Writing the Posthuman: Artificial Intelligence, Literature, and the Metaphysics of
Relation in the Digital Age

Tarr, Mathias & Fatima, Inuwa S. Gara, PhD

225-233

A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in Selected
Episodes of *Jenifa's Diary*

Apasi Marizukot Ahuoyiza & Adamu Idris, PhD

234-248

A Linguistic Analysis of Language Evolution in Digital Communication

Ibrahim Sofiyat Temitope & Adamu Idris, PhD

249-269

SECTION B:

Gudunmawar Turawa Da Manazarta 'Yan Kasa Ga Ayyukan Al'Adun Hausawa Daga
1965 Zuwa Yau

Ibrahim Garba Nayaya (Baba) & Danlami Bala Gwammaja, PhD

270-287

Ashe Kunya Ba a Ido Kadai Take Ba: Sake Bitar Fulaku Ga Fulanin Zamani Da Suka
Yi Kaka Gida a Kasar Hausa

**Abdullahi Usman Garko, Abubakar Mohammed Gombe, PhD &
Shamsuddeen Ismaila**

288-295



SECTION C: Creative Writing

Poems for *Gombe Savannah: Journal of Language, Literature and Communication Studies*

Ismail Bala

296-300

Under the Mango Tree

Fatima Ibrahim Usman

301-303



Comparative Analysis of English and Tangle Fricative Phonemes for Pedagogical Implications to the Tangle English Speakers

Malata Andrew Zakayo, PhD

Department of Languages and Linguistics, Gombe State University
08027326216

zakayomalataandrew@gmail.com

Angela Butack

Department of Languages and Linguistics, Gombe State University

Abstract

This study presents a comparative analysis of the fricative phonemes of English and Tangle with a view to identifying areas of convergence and divergence and examining their pedagogical implications for Tangle speakers of English. Guided by the Contrastive Analysis framework, the study adopts a qualitative, secondary research design using published phonological descriptions of English and Tangle as its primary data sources. The analysis compares the fricative inventories of both languages and examines their distribution across word positions. The findings reveal that English has nine fricative phonemes (/f, v, θ, ð, s, z, ʃ, ʒ, h/), whereas Tangle has only four (/θ, s, z, ʃ/). The two languages share only the voiceless alveolar fricative /s/ with similar distributional patterns, while significant differences exist in the inventory and positional distribution of the remaining fricatives. The absence of the English fricatives /f, v, ð, ʒ, h/ in Tangle is likely to result in predictable pronunciation difficulties and mother-tongue interference among Tangle learners of English, leading to sound substitutions and mispronunciations. The study concludes that understanding these phonological differences is essential for developing effective pronunciation instruction and recommends explicit teaching of problematic English fricatives through contrastive and articulatory approaches to improve the oral proficiency of Tangle English speakers.

Keywords: Contrastive Analysis, English Phonology, Tangle Language, Fricative Phonemes, Pronunciation, Mother-Tongue Interference, Second Language Acquisition, English Language Teaching.

Introduction

Human language is a unique communication system that

utilizes meaningful speech sounds (Lyons, 1981; Yule, 1996). speech sounds are what humans use for



verbal communication. To therefore communicate with each other in various languages, speech sounds or more preferably phonemes are used. All languages of the world have their set of phonemes. For instance, English has either 44 or 49 phonemes depending on the school of thought's categorization is employed. Tangle has 39 phonemes according to Tadi and Zakayo (2008; 2012). These phonemes of languages are classified into two main categories as consonants or vowels. These are further classified based on the characteristics and features of each. For instance, the consonant category is classified into manner of articulation, place of articulation and state of the glottis and the vowel category into the shape of the lips and position of the tongue among others.. For second-language learners, pronunciation challenges, such as with fricative sounds, often arise from mother tongue influence, as observed among Tangle and other languages' English speakers.

In Nigeria, English serves as a vital lingua franca and official language, linking diverse ethnic groups. This study provides a comparative analysis of English and Tangle fricatives, specifically addressing implications for Tangle English speakers. While

Tangle phonetics has been studied, the impact of fricative differences on English pronunciation remains under explored. This research aims to bridge that gap.

Tangle is a West Chadic (Afro-Asiatic) language spoken in the southern part of Gombe State, Nigeria. There are two main dialectal varieties and more varieties are also found under these two main varieties. The two varieties are referred to as Billiri and Kaltungo/Shongom dialects. There is a great difference between the two dialects that at times the speakers are not mutually intelligible to one another especially in the modern generation that the language is not spoken much. These differences coupled with the political divide make the speakers resign to saying that the two dialects are separate languages. But when looked at them from a linguistic point of view based on what we understand in the literature about language and dialect, we can see and agree that these are dialects of the same language. Based on this division and how each community wants to consider her language and the nomenclature to be called, the researcher goes with the separate terms to refer to the two groups as Tangle West that comprise Billiri and Kumo and their attached villages; and Tangle East



that comprise Kaltungo, Shongom and Ture and their villages. Therefore, the dialect adopted for this study is the Tangle West dialect. This is with no prejudice to anyone. The name Tangle is mostly known as Tangale which is the modification by Hausa speakers. But the owners of the language refer to themselves as Tangle speakers when speaking the language as to pronounce Tangale will violate the phonostatic of the language. Therefore, the terms Po Tangle, Tangle and Tangale refer to the same group of people/language but this study employed the term Tangle.

Tangle speakers are second language learners/speakers of English. For Tangle English speakers (hereafter TES), pronunciation challenges are bound to occur because of the differences in the sound systems especially with the fricative sounds of English. The English fricative phonemes are nine while Tangle has four fricative phonemes. With this disparity TES are bound to face difficulties in the pronunciation of English.

The objectives of the study are to examine the similarities and differences between the fricative sound systems of English and Tangle; assess how the differences in the fricative sound

systems affect the English pronunciation of native Tangle speakers; and consider the pedagogical strategies that can effectively address these identified pronunciation challenges by Tangle English speakers. Consequently, the research questions that the study seeks to answer are: What are the key similarities and differences between the fricative sound systems of English and Tangle? How do these differences affect the English pronunciation of native Tangle speakers? What pedagogical strategies can effectively address these identified pronunciation challenges by Tangle English speakers.

The findings will benefit researchers in Tangle linguistics and aid learners in understanding key pronunciation contrasts between their native language, in particular Tangle and other Nigerian indigenous languages and English.

2. Literature Review

A contrastive analysis requires identifying the formal similarities and differences between two language systems (Corder, 1973). This study, therefore, examines the fricative phonemes of English and Tangle to determine their points of convergence and divergence, specifically as regard



to implications for Tangle speakers of English.

Phonology studies how sound differences convey meaning and how sounds are systematically combined within a language. Hyman (1975) argues, understanding a sound system requires analyzing both the physical production of sounds and their grammatical function within a wider linguistic context. This is because phonology is language-specific; no two languages organize their phonological features identically (Fakuade, 1989). Consequently, a major challenge in second language (L2) acquisition is interference from the learner's first language (L1), which is often most pronounced at the phonological level.

For instance, a Tangle speaker may struggle with an English sound like /f/ if it is absent in their L1 inventory, potentially substituting it with the nearest native sound, such as /p/. This illustrates the direct interference Fakuade (1986) describes. However, the capacity to learn new phonetic categories exists, and performance can improve with targeted effort (Suter, 1976), highlighting the practical need for this comparative analysis.

2.1 Fricatives Phonemes

Phonemes are speech sounds that are distinctive in a language. That means that if that phoneme is replaced by another the meaning of the word will change for example the phonemes /l/ and /r/ in English in words like lice and rice. The consonant sounds are further classified where a particular class is called the fricative based on the manner of articulation. Fricative is one of the about seven manners of articulation of sounds that are consonants in English. Others are Plosive, affricate, nasal, lateral, liquid and semivowel/approximant. They are produced by forcing air through a narrow constriction or partial contact of the organs that are used in their articulation, creating turbulence and a hissing sound. They are continuant consonants, meaning they can be sustained. This means that the fricative phonemes are produced with little/partial obstruction in their articulation.

2.1.2 Fricative Phonemes of English and Tangle

English has nine fricatives, categorized by their place of articulation and voicing as presented below:

I. Labiodental fricatives: Produced with the upper teeth against the



lower lip. These are the voiceless /f/ (as in laughter) and the voiced /v/ (as in very).

II. Dental fricatives: Produced with the tongue tip against the upper teeth. These are the voiceless /θ/ (as in think) and the voiced /ð/ (as in this).

III. Alveolar fricatives: Produced with the tongue against the alveolar ridge. These are the voiceless /s/ (as in say) and the voiced /z/ (as in zoo).

IV. Palato-alveolar fricatives: Produced with the tongue near the hard palate. These are the voiceless /ʃ/ (as in shoe) and the voiced /ʒ/ (as in pleasure).

V. Glottal fricative: Produced by constricting airflow at the glottis. English has one voiceless glottal fricative, /h/ (as in happy).

The Tangle fricative phonemes are four which are:

I. Dental fricative /θ/ which is voiceless

II. Alveolar fricatives /s/ which is voiceless and /z/ which is voiced

III. Palato-alveolar fricative /ʃ/ which is voiceless

English possesses a relatively rich set of nine fricative phonemes—/f, v, θ, ð, s, z, ʃ, ʒ, h/—produced at five distinct places of articulation

(labiodental, dental, alveolar, palato-alveolar, and glottal). These sounds are generally characterized by pairs of voiceless (fortis) and voiced (lenis) consonants. Comparative analysis shows that while sounds like /f, s, h/ are common globally, English dental fricatives /θ, ð/ and voiced palato-alveolar /ʒ/ are frequently absent in other languages, leading to systematic substitutions by second-language (L2) learners.

1. Key English Fricatives and Global Comparisons

) Labiodentals (/f, v/): Shared with many languages (e.g., French, German). However, some languages e.g., Hausa) may lack the voiced /v/, substituting it with /f/ or /b/.

) Dentals (/θ, ð/): Often described as the most challenging English sounds for non-native speakers, these are absent in many languages, including French, German, Yoruba, and Indonesian. *Substitution:* frequently replaced by stops (/t, d/) or alveolar fricatives (/s, z/).

) Alveolars (/s, z/): Present in most languages.

) Palato-alveolars (/ʃ, ʒ/): While /ʃ/ (as in "ship") is common, /ʒ/ (as in "measure") is rarer and often substituted with /s/ or /ʃ/ by learners.



E) Glottal (/h/): Generally common, though some dialects drop this sound.

2. Comparative Analysis by Language Background

A) Yoruba & Igbo Learners: Yoruba lacks dental fricatives (/θ, ð/), leading to substitutions like /t/ for /θ/ (e.g., "thought" becomes "tot").

B) Mandarin/Cantonese Speakers: These speakers often struggle with dental fricatives, often assimilating /θ/ to /s/ (Mandarin) or /f/ (Cantonese).

C) Indonesian (EFL): Over 70% of Indonesian learners in studies replaced dental fricatives with /t/ and /d/. They also struggle with /v/, /ʃ/, and /ʒ/.

D) French/Igala Comparison: French has seven fricatives; Igala has only one. Both lack the dental fricatives found in English, leading to similar substitution errors (e.g., /t/ for /θ/, /d/ for /ð/).

E) Arabic Speakers: Arabic shares some fricatives (/f, s, ʃ, h/) and possesses pharyngeal fricatives not used in English. However, they may struggle with the specific articulation of /θ/ and /ð/.

3. Common Patterns of Interference (L2)

A) Stop Substitution: Replacing dental fricatives (/θ/, /ð/) with stops (/t/, /d/).

) Voicing Assimilation: Learners may replace voiceless fricatives with voiced ones or vice-versa based on their native language constraints (e.g., substituting /z/ for /s/).

) Consonant Cluster Simplification: In complex clusters, fricatives might be dropped.

) Influence of Orthography: Learners sometimes pronounce fricatives based on how they are spelled in their native language (e.g., 'th' as /p/ instead of /f/).

4. Phonetic Proximity

) Frisian: Phonetically considered the closest language to Modern English, sharing similar consonant structures.

) Hausa: Shares /f, s, z, ʃ/ but lacks dental fricatives and distinguishes fewer voiced-voiceless pairs

of the four Tangle fricative phonemes, three are voiceless and only one is voiced.

2.2 Related Literature on the Tangle Language

The documentation of Tangle phonology has evolved through scholarly works. The earliest significant effort was by Reverend John S. Hall and his supporters (1944). Other works were by Reverend Samaila Kure (1988), Jungraithmayr (1991), Tadi, and Zakayo (2008, 2012) establishes



that both /s/ and /ʃ/ consonants exist in Tangale, though /ʃ/ occurs in fewer words. Kidida (1993) also provided a systematic phonological study, identifying four principal dialects Billiri-Tangale (BT), Kaltungo-Tangale (KT), Shongom-Tangale (ST), and Ture-Tangale (TT) noting lexical, tonal, and phonological variations between the four main dialects. Her work largely dwelt on the Kaltungo, Shongom and Ture dialect that are referred to as the Tangale East. Building on all the above studies, Tadi and Zakayo (2008) presented an inventory of nine vowels and twenty-eight consonants, including clusters like /sw/ and /gb/ which are called labialized sounds. For this study, fricative consonants referred to as labialized from their list were excluded. This is because the labialized phonemes are only significant in Tangale and do not influence the realizations of the English phonemes by the TES. Zakayo (2012) also investigated the similarities and differences between English, Tangale and Sinhala that highlighted the implication for the Tangale and Sinhala speakers of English. Zakayo (2019) also studied stress and intonation variations in the speech of Tangale West speakers that explored the peculiarities of Tangale English speakers and its effect on their English. These works highlight the different

aspect of Tangale language and some were more specific on the phonological influence of Tangale on oral English communication.

Phonologically, each language operates through a system of distinctive sound units, or phonemes, that signal meaning. The significant differences between English and Nigerian languages, including Tangale, often create learning challenges, primarily due to mother-tongue interference and other influencing factors that have been put forward in other studies such as the one by Zheng (2021). This is notably evident with English phonemes absent in the learner's first language (L1), such as /θ/ and /ð/ where Nigerian English speakers may replace them with /t/ and /d/ (e.g., thin /θm/ pronounced as [tɪn]). Such interference underscores the need for a detailed contrastive analysis of the phonological systems of English and Tangale.

2.4 Comparison of English and Tangale Fricative Sounds

The English language contains nine fricative sounds: /f, v, θ, ð, s, z, ʃ, ʒ, h/. In contrast, Tangale has four fricatives: /θ, s, z, ʃ/. Consequently, the English fricatives /f, v, ð, ʒ, h/ are absent in Tangale. This absence influences substitution patterns; for example, a Tangale speaker may replace the



missing labiodental /f/ or /v/ with the nearest available sound in their inventory like /p/ and /b/. While both languages share the voiceless dental fricative /θ/, the voiced /ð/ is present only in English. In terms of distribution, English fricatives generally occur in initial, medial, and final word positions except the /h/ phoneme that occurs at just the initial and medial word positions. Tangle fricatives show more restricted patterns: /θ/ occurs medially and finally; /s/ appears in all positions, but /z/ is limited to medial and final positions; and /ʃ/ is found in initial and medial positions but not finally. The English glottal fricative /h/, found initially and medially, has no counterpart in Tangle.

2.5 Empirical Studies on English Fricative Phonemes with Other languages Fricatives

Wahidah, Sajidin, and Aminuddin (2025) explored how learning Arabic might aid in improving English pronunciation, specifically focusing on fricative sounds by Indonesian students. This is because many students are familiar with Arabic, particularly in pesantren-based schools. Arabic and English share certain phonetic features, especially in the fricative consonant sounds, which could help Indonesian students learn English

pronunciation more easily. Using a mixed-methods approach that combines both quantitative and qualitative data, this research applies a pre-experimental one-group pre-test and post-test design. The study involved fifteen junior high school students in grade VIII from an Islamic character school. The primary goal of the research was to assess how the students' English pronunciation, particularly on fricative sounds, improved after learning Arabic. The results show a significant improvement in the pronunciation of /f/, /ʃ/, /s/, /z/, and /ʒ/ sounds. However, the students showed less improvement in the pronunciation of /ð/ and /θ/ sounds. This suggests that while Arabic may offer some advantages in mastering specific English sounds, there may be challenges that still hinder the improvement of other English consonants. These findings could provide insights into language learning strategies and the potential role of Arabic in enhancing English pronunciation.

Another study was conducted by Lamido and Abdullahi (2019) who examined the articulation of English fricatives among Hausa/Fulani in some Selected Secondary Schools in Gombe made a comparative investigation of the English fricatives among



Hausa/Fulani by teachers and students of Senior Secondary School in Gombe metropolis. Some of the English fricatives do not exist in the first language of the teachers and students, and a researcher being a teacher noticed a great variance in the articulations of the English phonemes by teachers and students in their spoken English. The various English fricatives (labio dental, dental, and alveolar, palatal alveolar and glottal) were looked into, to investigate the difference in the teacher's articulation of the nine fricative phonemes. A test was designed, of individual words, ten (10) sentences and a reading passage with fricatives in the initial, medial and final position to assess their articulations in the various environments. Fifty (50) students and twenty (20) teachers were sampled and each was presented with the task of articulating ninety (90) fricatives in different positions of the words. Descriptive analysis and comparison of two population proportions were used. The findings show that the wrong articulations of the fricatives by teachers and students are often the replacement of the voiceless with the voiced phonemes of the same fricative due to influence of MT of the study population. The voiced dental fricative / ð / is often replaced by the voiceless

alveolar plosive /t/, the voiceless palato-alveolar fricative /ʃ/ is replaced by voiceless palato-alveolar affricative /tʃ/ and voiced alveolar fricative /d/. The wrong articulations of the fricatives by the teachers and students were the same except that the students have a greater percentage of wrong articulations. Finally, learning of oral English should be made compulsory in all the teachers training programmes and pronunciation should be given emphasis in the teaching and learning of English at all levels of education.

Similarly, Oyinloye, et al. (2023) examined the gender differentiation in the use of voiced labiodental fricative sound /v/ of English Language in a Non-Native Context. The emphasis is on Yoruba learners of English as second language, with particular reference to the production of the dental fricative /v/ which is non-existent in Yoruba language phonology. Sixty secondary school students (30 males and 30 females) were randomly selected as the sample from three selected senior secondary schools out of 11 public secondary schools in Ondo East Local Government Area, Ondo State, Nigeria using descriptive survey design. A pronunciation test were used as the instruments for collecting data. The test consisted of a word list



and a set of sentences all containing problematic phonemes for Yoruba speakers of English. The participants were asked to read aloud English words and sentences containing problematic English sound /v/ while being audio recorded. A computer and a microphone were used for the purposes of recording. The recorded data were then transcribed and analyzed after listening to each participant's pronunciation a few times. A sample of the pronunciation transcriptions was also presented to and confirmed by a Yoruba-speaking professor in an English Department in Nigeria. The participants' mispronunciations were categorized and frequencies of errors pronunciations were computed. Chi-square statistics was used to test the significant difference in the total number of errors made by male and female students in pronouncing the English Labiodental sound /v/ at 0.05 significant level. The study revealed that that the participants replaced the labiodental sound /v/ with /f/ sound during pronunciations; and there is no significant difference in the total number of errors made by male and female students in pronouncing the English labiodental sound /v/. It is recommended amongst others that teachers should pay proper attention to the learner's cultural

background and spot out those areas that are likely to bridge second language acquisition.

Another study by Zheng (2021) examined Cross-language Differences in Fricative Processing and Their Influence on Non-native Fricative Categorisation. Studies have shown that native speakers of Mandarin Chinese and Hong Kong Cantonese tend to have difficulty perceiving the English fricative /θ/. However, although both languages have /f/ and /s/ categories, Mandarin speakers tend to assimilate it to their /s/ category whilst Cantonese speakers would assimilate it to their /f/ category. Over three studies, this thesis investigated various factors that may lead to this difference, while enhancing our understanding of the acoustics and the perception of the fricatives of these languages. Study 1 explored acoustic properties of target fricatives of the three languages (Mandarin, Cantonese, English) using audio recordings from native speakers, and conducted comparisons of the fricatives within and across languages. The results showed that the phonemes /f, s/, even though shared by the three languages, were produced differently in the different languages, likely due to the effects of the different fricative



inventories. Moreover, different acoustic cues were more or less effective in distinguishing between the different fricatives in each language, indicating that native speakers of these languages likely rely on these cues differently. Study 2 examined how transition cues may affect the identification of /f/ and /s/ by native speakers of the respective languages by combining a phoneme monitoring task and EEG measures. Target fricatives were spliced with vowels to create stimuli with congruent or incongruent transitions. In contrast to previous studies (e.g., Wagner, Ernestus & Cutler, 2006), the results revealed that all groups attended to formant transitions when processing fricatives, despite their differing native fricative inventory sizes. Study 3 investigated cross-language differences in categorisation boundaries of target fricative pairs using a behavioural identification task. The study interpolated pairs of stimuli to create a frication continuum and a vowel continuum, forming a 2-dimensional stimuli grid. The results indicated that frication was the primary cue for fricative identification for the native English, Cantonese, and Mandarin speakers, but also revealed cross language differences in fricative boundaries. Overall, the results of

these studies demonstrate that the processing of fricatives was largely driven by the frication section, and the differential assimilation of /θ/ was likely due to the different acoustics of the same fricative category across languages. The results also motivate a reconsideration of the role of coarticulatory cues in fricative perception.

Abdullah (2013) investigated the production of the voiced labiodental fricative /v/ of Saudi Arabian speakers of English. Data is elicited through participants' reading of a word list with the target sound in initial and final position. The data coding was performed through spectrographic analysis and rater judgments. The analysis employs descriptive statistics, a dependent t-test used to compare production errors between initial and final position. The findings showed that word-final position is more difficult in pronouncing the phoneme /v/ than word-initial position. In addition, when the voiced labiodental fricative /v/ is mispronounced, it is substituted with the voiceless labiodental fricative /f/. Lintunen (2014) investigated the English sound production skills of Finnish university students. The students (N=69), whose L1 was Finnish, were asked to do a self-assessment on sounds that they



found most challenging in English, after which they participated in a pronunciation test that consisted of the reading out loud of a short text and a word list. The study found that most difficulties in pronunciation among the Finnish students had to do with consonants and opposition between /v/ and /w/ was found to be the most difficult one.

An investigation of the pronunciation problems of Hausa speakers of English in Nigeria was carried out by Keshavarz and Khamis (2017). The study used 60 native speakers of Hausa who were studying at three universities in Northern Cyprus. The participants' pronunciation problems of English were elicited by mean of a pronunciation test that consisted of a word list, a short paragraph, and 15 individual sentences. Fifteen pictures were shown to the participants to name while being audio-recorded. All the test items contained English consonants and vowels with potential pronunciation difficulties for Hausa speakers of English. The collected data were then transcribed and analyzed, and percentages and frequencies of pronunciation errors were computed. The results revealed that native speakers of Hausa face problems in pronouncing certain English consonants (/v/).

Theoretically, the findings lend support to the notion of negative transfer as all of the errors were the result of mother tongue interference. Azizi, Jamil and Omar (2013) also conducted a study entitled 'Debunking the Nation of Nativization in the Pronunciation Variation at Segmental Level among Non-Native ESL Teachers in Sabah, Malaysia'. The subjects of the study were English language teachers of Kadazan ethnic background working in the area of Tuaran and Tamparuli in Sabah, Malaysia. The study investigated pronunciation variations. CA was used in the study in order to analyze the data gathered from the actual utterances of the subjects. The findings of the study showed that L1 does have influence on the pronunciation of the English language. The subjects in the study tended to substitute other sounds existing in their L1 for the target sounds of English consonants. Herman (2016) investigated the most difficult position in pronouncing the English labiodental sounds at the second grade of Senior High School of Taman Siswa Pematangsiantar. Descriptive qualitative method was implemented in this research. The data were taken from each English labiodental words pronounced by the students. The study found that the most difficult



position in pronouncing the English labiodental sounds is final position in sound /v/.

Similarly, Dumanig (2004) examined the phonological differences of (f) and (v) among young Filipino male and female students in relation to their social class differences. There were 30 participants in the study consisting of 15 males and females categorised as middle class from Far Eastern University and 15 males and females categorised as lower working class from Manila High School. Both males and females from the two social classes read texts with (f) and (v) sounds, which were tape-recorded for analysis. Findings of the study showed that most female respondents in the middle class and linguistic features for lower working class display a significant difference in the use of standard and non-standard pronunciation of (f) and (v) compared to the male participants in both social classes. It was also found that there are variations in the pronunciation of (f) and (v) among males as well as among females in relation to their social status. Jahandar, Khodabandehlou, Seyedi and Abadi (2012) investigated the impact of gender on pronunciation accuracy of advanced Iranian EFL learners and whether male or female

learners will outperform in their performance of the pronunciation accuracy of phonological characteristics in their speech production. The pronunciation accuracy of the learners was assessed through reading aloud, a recorded oral test and learners' speech production. Fifty-three advanced EFL learners-including 21 male and 32 female were chosen randomly from among the junior undergraduate university students studying English in Rodaki Institute of Higher Education in Tonekabon, Iran and participated the study. The results revealed that female outperform male subjects in producing accurate consonants, but not vowels, that it is not significantly noticeable to result in complete superiority of female over male subjects.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study employs the contrastive analysis (CA) framework developed by Lado (1957). The framework systematically analyzes two or more languages to identify their similarities and differences across various levels, including phonology. CA involves describing the languages, comparing them, and predicting learning difficulties. James (1980) says CA involves description, selection and comparison. Description



involves the L1 (native language) and L2 (target language); selection involves choosing specific linguistic features which for this study is the phonological aspect of the two languages, English and Tangle; comparison involves matching the structures to spot the common traits and gaps; prediction of areas of divergence and error types can be carried out; verification with real life data can also be done - these make up the five steps in contrastive analysis. But this study utilizes description, selection comparison, and prediction with the exception of verification

The analysis is guided by the theory of language universalism, which posits that all human languages share fundamental commonalities. Such universals include basic linguistic units like phonemes. This research applies this principle to the phonological level, treating fricative sounds as one such universal category. The framework therefore facilitates a structured comparison of English and Tangle fricatives to establish their points of convergence and divergence.

CA takes primary interest in those things that make contrasted languages different and that can turn out to be factors determining interlingual interference. CA is

concerned with a comparison of corresponding systems in only two languages. Contrastive analysis can be conducted on 4 levels: phonetic, grammatical, semantic and pragmatic.

4. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, secondary research methodology. Data are drawn from existing published materials on the phonology of English and Tangle fricatives, with analysis focused on the positions of the English and Tangle fricative phonemes in words in both languages. The primary texts consulted include: Hyman's *Phonology: Theory and Analysis* (1975), Aremo's *Advanced English Composition* (2001), Cruttenden's *Pronunciation of English* (2008), Kure's *Teach Yourself the Tangle Language* (1988), and Tadi and Zakayo's *Po Tangle Orthography* (2008) and *Wunthu Sab Tangle: Po Tangle-English Dictionary and Vocabulary* (2012). These works were selected for their detailed treatment of the sound systems and phonetic descriptions relevant to this comparative analysis.

The words that were used for comparison were each presented in tables based on the positions of initial, medial or final that they are found in the two languages. Subsequently each fricative



phoneme was discussed by pointing out the similarities and differences in their usage in English and Tangle as well as the implication for the Tangle speakers of English.

5. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

The fricative phonemes of the two languages (English and Tangle) are presented in terms of their

distribution; and the data was analysed and interpreted based on the distribution of similarities and differences with regard to the implications for the Tangle English speakers.

The data is presented in the tables below where Tangle and English fricative sounds are given with their distribution in the syllable/word initial, medial and final positions.

Table 1: English Fricative Phonemes

State of the Glottis	Place of Articulation				
	Labio-dental	Dental	Palato-Alveolar	Alveolar	Glottal
Fortis (voiceless)	f	θ	ʃ	s	h
Lenis (voiced)	v	ð	ʒ	z	-

English has nine (9) fricatives phonemes as can be seen in the table above that indicates their states of the glottis and places of articulations.

Table 2: Tangle Fricative Phonemes

State of the Glottis	Place of Articulation		
	Dental	Palato-Alveolar	Alveolar
Voiceless	θ	ʃ	s
Voiced	-	-	z



Tangle has four (4) fricative phonemes as shown in table 2 above that indicates their states of the glottis and places of articulations.

5.1 Data Presentation of English Dental Fricative Phonemes

The English fricative phonemes are presented in tables 1 - 9 showing the positions of their occurrence in syllables/words in the language.

Table 3: English Voiceless Labiodental Fricative Phoneme /f/

Initial	Medial	Final
<u>f</u> ine	o <u>ff</u> er	ser <u>f</u>
<u>f</u> ast	def <u>end</u>	relie <u>f</u>
<u>f</u> an	ref <u>er</u> ee	saf <u>e</u>

The voiceless labiodental fricative /f/ is realised at word initial, medial and final positions in English language as shown below.

Table 4: English Voiced Labiodental Fricative Phoneme /v/

Initial	Medial	final
<u>v</u> ine	rev <u>o</u> lt	ser <u>v</u> e
<u>v</u> ast	vi <u>v</u> id	sav <u>e</u>
<u>v</u> ery	ri <u>v</u> er	star <u>v</u> e

The voiced labiodental fricative/v/ is also realised at word initial, medial and final positions.



Table 5: English Voiced Dental Fricative Phoneme /ð/

Initial	Medial	Final
<u>th</u> is	fa <u>th</u> er	breath <u>e</u>
<u>th</u> at	gath <u>e</u> r	bat <u>h</u> e
<u>th</u> em	moth <u>e</u> r	writ <u>h</u> e

The voiced dental fricative /ð/ also occurs at word initial, medial, and final in English language as shown below.

Table 6: English Voiceless Dental Fricative Phoneme /θ/

Initial	Medial	Final
<u>th</u> ink	no <u>th</u> ing	bo <u>th</u>
<u>th</u> ank	re <u>th</u> ink	mou <u>th</u>
<u>th</u> ought	auth <u>o</u> r	oath <u>h</u>

The voiceless dental fricative /θ/ also occurs at word initial, medial and final position in English language as shown below.

Table 7: English Voiceless Alveolar Fricative Phoneme /s/

Initial	Medial	Final
<u>s</u> ip	rac <u>s</u> ing	plac <u>s</u> e
<u>s</u> at	con <u>s</u> ert	pass <u>s</u>
<u>s</u> leep	less <u>s</u> er	niec <u>s</u> e

The voiceless alveolar fricative /s/ is realised at word initial, medial and final position in English language like in the following words.



Table 8: English Voiced Alveolar Fricative Phoneme /z/

Initial	Medial	Final
zip	razor	has
zink	bozom	fees
zoo	lizard	blaze

The voiced alveolar fricative /z/ occurred at word initial, medial and final in English language as seen below.

Table 9: English Voiceless Palato-alveolar Fricative Phoneme /ʃ/

Initial	Medial	Final
ship	bishop	fish
sheep	mission	cash
sheet	machine	rush

The voiceless post-alveolar fricative /ʃ/ is released at word initial, medial and final position in English language as below words:

Table 10: English Voiced Palato-alveolar Fricative Phoneme /ʒ/

Initial	Medial	Final
genre	usual	garage
gigolo	leisure	prestige
jabot	measure	rouge

The voiced post-alveolar fricative /ʒ/ is realized at word initial, medial and final positions in English language.



Table 11: English Voiceless Glottal Fricative Phoneme /h/

Initial	Medial
<u>h</u> it	a <u>h</u> ead
<u>h</u> ead	per <u>h</u> aps
<u>h</u> at	be <u>h</u> ave

According to Peter Roach (2000), the glottal fricative /h/ is phonetically a voiceless vowel which carries the quality of the vowel (voiced) that follows it. The phoneme is not realized in word final positions in English as exemplified in the table above.

5.2 Distribution of Tangle Phonemes

Table 12: Tangle Voiceless Dental Fricative Phoneme /θ/

Medial	Gloss
bath <u>a</u>	‘cornstalk’
but <u>h</u> e	‘decay’ (will)
sut <u>h</u> e	‘fear’
kut <u>h</u> o	‘Harmattan’
kut <u>h</u> lo	‘stock’
kwat <u>h</u> i	‘always’

The voiceless dental fricative /θ/, unlike that of the English language that occurs in initial, medial and final positions, only occurs in the initial position of the syllable and only in subsequent syllable not the first syllable of a word as can be seen in the words below.

**Table 13: Tangle Voiced Alveolar Fricative Phoneme /z/**

Initial	Gloss	Final	
	Gloss		
nezi	'saying'	liz	'to'
put or keep'			
pizi	'collection'	Yaz	
	'doing'		
yazi	'doing'	waiz	
	'happy'		
wezi	'having, getting'	diz	
	'sit'		
tagza	'a type of guinea corn'	piz	'receive'

The voiced alveolar fricative /z/ is realized at word initial positions of a syllable in Tangle language. But when the last phoneme in the words above are elided, it tends to be realised as the final position in the syllable as can be seen in the examples below. This is so because Tangle as observed by Tadi and Zakayo (2008); Tangle is a language that is highly govern by elision for ease of pronunciation which is a phonotactics of the language.

Table 14: Tangle Voiceless Palato-Alveolar Fricative Phoneme /ʃ/

Initial	Gloss	Medial	Gloss
shithu	'will come back'	Maisheru	'name of a person'
shi	'you (feminine)'		
shitha	'pepper'		
shino	'rest'		

The voiceless palato – alveolar fricative /ʃ/ is found in Tangle language, although very few words contain the phoneme. It is realized in the initial and medial positions which can be seen above.

**Table 15: Tangle Voiceless Alveolar Fricative Phoneme /s/**

Initial	Gloss	Medial
<u>s</u> ana	'food'	less <u>i</u>
	'agreed'	
<u>s</u> angge	'pond'	kess <u>u</u> /lessu
	'sieve, strain'	
<u>s</u> anang	'holy, sacred, divine'	kugzash <u>i</u>
	'have been washed'	
<u>s</u> angur	'louse/lice'	kulash <u>i</u>
	'shaved'	
<u>s</u> anjara	'to shout'	kashikar
	'a type of sword'	
Final	Gloss	
pos <u>s</u>	'full'	
pothos <u>s</u>	'mosquito'	
kwas <u>s</u>	'hoe'	
tolos <u>s</u>	'tendom'	
wos <u>s</u>	'bone'	

The voiceless alveolar fricative /s/ is found at word initial, and final positions in Tangle language. Examples are as shown in the table above.

4.4.1 Similarities between English and Tangle Fricatives

The only similarities realized that the two languages share as far as distribution of the studied phonemes in this research (fricatives) are concerned is in the voiceless alveolar fricative /s/ which in both languages is found at word initial medial and final positions as presented below.

**Table 15: English Language**

Initial	Medial	Final
<u>S</u> ave	rac <u>ing</u>	gl <u>ass</u>
<u>S</u> leep	nas <u>al</u>	bo <u>ss</u>
<u>S</u> oap	con <u>son</u> ants	clo <u>s</u> e
<u>S</u> alt	res <u>ou</u> nds	lo <u>ss</u>

Table 16: Tangle Language

Initial	Medial	Final
<u>S</u> ala	P <u>iss</u> i	low <u>as</u>
<u>S</u> ana	P <u>uss</u> i	po <u>s</u>
<u>S</u> amkong	l <u>igg</u> ish <u>i</u>	t <u>us</u>

4.4.2 Difference between English and Tangle Fricatives

In comparing the fricatives of both languages, the research indicates that English language has nine (9) fricative phonemes /f, v, θ, ð, s, z, ʃ, ʒ, h/ while Tangle language has four (4) fricative phonemes that are present in Tangle /s, z, ʃ, θ/. Tangle does not have the following fricative phonemes found in English: labiodental fricatives /f, v/, dental fricative /θ/, palato-alveolar fricative /ʒ/ and the glottal fricative /h/.

In terms of distribution, only the voiceless alveolar fricative /s/ stands as the point of similarity between the two languages. The remaining fricatives are

distributed differently in the two languages. These fricative phonemes are considered one after the other in terms of their distribution in the two languages.

- i. / θ / - voiceless dental fricative.

The voiceless dental fricatives / θ / is obtained at word initial, medial, and final positions in English language whereby in Tangle it is obtained at word medial position.

- ii. /z/ - voiced alveolar fricative.

This phoneme /z/ is realized at word initial, medial and final positions



in English language whereby it is only realized at word medial and final positions in Tangle language.

- iii. /ʃ/ - voiceless palate - alveolar fricatives.

The phonemes /ʃ/ is found at word initial, medial and final position in English language whereby in Tangle language it is realized only at syllable initial position.

4.4 Discussion

This section presents the discussion of findings for simple reference: the findings were discussed according to the order of the research objectives. In terms of examining the fricative sounds of both languages, it was discovered that English has nine (9) fricative phonemes, while Tangle language has four fricative phonemes as shown on tables 1 for English and table 2 for Tangle. Tangle does not have five of the English fricative phonemes /f, v, ð, ʒ, h/. the absence of the five fricative phonemes of English in Tangle has its implication on the TES speech as discussed under

implications. This finding is consonance with that of other studies by Wahidah et al. (2019) who also found differences in fricative phonemes of English versus Arabic, English versus Hausa/Fulani among others.

In analyzing and examining the fricative phonemes of both languages in terms of their distribution. The research shows that English fricatives /f, v, θ, ð, s, z, ʃ, ʒ/ appeared in all the three positions, that is, word initial, medial and final positions as shown on tables 3-10. It is only the glottal fricative /h/ that is found in two words positions: initial and medial as on table 11 while Tangle fricatives /θ, s, z, ʃ/ are found in initial and medial positions only as in tables 12-15. Such as /θ/ in word initial and medial positions, /ʃ/ in word initial and medial positions, /z/ in word initial and medial positions and only /s/ is found in all three positions in Tangle words. For example the words 'sala,asse, and tuş' on table 16.

The similarities between the two languages occurred only with the /s/ phoneme where Tangle has all the word positions like that of English as shown on table 3-10 for



English and table 15 for Tangle. In the case where the fricative sounds are absent, the Tangle English speaker tends to generalize by making the implication to be both positive and negative. The difference realized were in the sounds /f, v, ʒ, ð/ which are present in English and absent in Tangle.

4.4.3 Implications for Tangle English Speakers

The comparative analysis yields the following specific implications for Tangle speakers learning English:

1. Facilitating Factors: Similarities between the sound systems aid acquisition. The fricatives /s, z, ʃ, θ/ present in both languages provide a foundation for accurate pronunciation, as in words like see /si:/ or think /θɪŋk/.

2. Challenges and Interference: The absence of English fricatives /f, v, ð, ʒ, h/ in Tangle leads to predictable pronunciation difficulties. This results in systematic substitutions:

- The voiced dental /ð/ is often replaced by /d/ (e.g., that /ðæt/ → [dæt]).

- The labiodental pair /f, v/ may be merged, with /v/ replaced by /f/ (e.g., veil /veil/ → [feil]).

- Words containing /ʒ/ or /h/ pose particular challenges due to a lack of direct phonetic equivalents.

3. Systemic Constraints: The broader phonological disparity, where Tangle possesses four fricatives versus English nine, exacerbates these challenges. Furthermore, English's non-phonemic orthography, where spelling does not directly mirror sound, complicates learning, as speakers may overgeneralize rules from Tangle's more consistent sound-letter correspondence. This situation reflects a common issue for ESL, especially from Nigerian language backgrounds, where smaller fricative inventories intensify the difficulty in mastering English's wider and qualitatively distinct set of fricative phonemes.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study affirms that while English and Tangle possess complex sound systems, their fricative inventories differ markedly. The primary similarity identified is in the distribution of the /s/ phoneme, which occurs in word-initial, medial, and final positions in both languages. For the Tangle English speaker, this results in a mixed implication: the presence of sounds like /θ, s, z, ʃ/ in Tangle offers a positive foundation for acquiring their



English counterparts. Conversely, English fricatives such as /f, v, ð, ʒ, h/, which are absent in the Tangle sound system, present a specific learning challenge and constitute a negative implication, highlighting an area of potential phonological difficulty. This comparative analysis ultimately clarifies the specific phonetic hurdles and advantages faced by Tangle speakers in mastering English fricatives.

References

- Abdullah, N. A. (2013). *Pronunciation Problems in the Production of the Voiced Labiodental Fricative /v/ by Saudi Speakers of English*. Master of Arts degree in Applied Linguistics, Southern Illinois University Carbondale.
- Arema, B. (2001). *Advanced English Composition*. Lagos: Scribo Educational Books.
- Azizi, A. A.; Jamil, S. S. & Omar, H. M. (2013). Debunking the notion of nativization in the pronunciation variation at segmental level among non-native ESL teachers in Sabah, Malaysia. *International Journal of Pedagogical Innovations*, 1(10): 1-10.
- Babayo, A. (2007). *Tunsaba Ta Po Tangale. Tangale Elementary Dictionary*. Jos: Optimum Productions.
- Corder, S. P. (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Penguin Books.
- Crozier, O. and Blench, R. (1992). *An Index of Nigerian Languages*. 2nd edition, Dallas Texas: Whycliffe Bible Translators.
- Cruttenden, A. (2008). *Gimson's Pronunciation of English*, Seventh edition, Hodder.
- Crystal, D. (2003a). *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language* (2nd ed). Cambridge UP.
- Crystal, D. (2003b). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge UP.
- Dumanig, F. P. (2004). Phonological Differences of (f) and (v) among young Filipino male and female students. *INTI Journal*, 1 (4): 318-330.
- Fakuade, G. (1989). The phonological problem of Edo



- (Benin) Benin
speakers of English.
*British Journal of
Language Teaching*,
Vol. 27 No. 1 .
- Grimes, B. (Ed.) (1984).
*Languages of the
World: Ethnologue*
(10th ed). Whycliffe
Bible Translators .
- Hyman, L. (1975). *Phonology:
Theory and Analysis*.
Richard and
Winston.
- Jahandar, S.; Khodabandehlou, M.;
Seyedi, G. & Abadi, S. M. D.
(2012). A Gender-based
approach to pronunciation
accuracy of advanced EFL
learners. *International
Journal of Scientific &
Engineering Research*, 3 (6):
1-9.
- James, C. (1980). *Contrastive
Analysis*. Longman.
- Jowitt, D. (1991). *Nigerian English
Usage*. Longman.
- Jungaithmyr. H. (1991). *A
Dictionary of the
Tangale Language*.
Dietrich Verlag
Berlin .
- Keshavarz, M. H. & Khamis, A. M.
(2017). An investigation
into pronunciation
problems of Hausa-
speaking learners of English.
*International Online Journal
of Education and Teaching
(IOJET)*, 4(1): 61-72.
- Kidda, M. E. (1993). *Tangale
Phonology: A
Descriptive Analysis*.
Berlin. Dietrich
Reimer Verlag.
- Kure, S. (1988). *Teach Yourself the
Tangale Language*.
Challenge Press.
- Lamido, I. & Abdullahi, S. A.
(2019). A
comparative survey
of the articulation of
English fricatives
among
Hausa/Fulani in
some selected
secondary schools
in Gombe. *Journal of
Linguistics
Association of
Nigeria (JOLAN)*, vol
22(1), pp. 173-188.
- Lintunen, P. (2014). Kuinka
kielenoppija eroaa
foneetikosta?
Ääntämistaidon
opettamisesta ja
itsearvioinnista. In K. Jähi
and L. Taimi (eds.), XXVIII
Fonetiikan päivät Turku
25.-26. lokakuuta, 1-9.
- Newman, P. (1977). Chadic
classification and



- reconstruction.
Afro-asitic Linguistics, Vol. 5(1).
- Oyinloye, C. A, Frimpong, D., James, N. C. & Kparou, H. C. (2023). gender differentiation in the use of voiced labiodental fricative sound /v/ of English language in a non-native context. *The Seybold Report*. 18(8), 1835-1845.
- Roach, P. (2002). *English Phonetics And Phonology*, 3rd Ed. Cambridge UP.
- Suter, R. W. (1976). Predictors of pronunciation accuracy in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 26(2), 233-253.
- Tadi, N. Y. and Zakayo, M. A. (2008). *Orthography of Nigerian Languages: Po Tangale Orthography*. Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council.
- Tadi, N. Y. and Zakayo, M. A. (Eds.) (2012). *Wunthu Sab Tangle: Po Tangle English Dictionary and Vocabulary*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello UP.
- Wagner, A., Ernestus, M., & Cutler, A. (2006). Formant transitions in fricative identification: The role of native fricative inventory. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 120(4), 2267-2277.
<https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2335422>
- Wahidah, N., Sajidin & Amimudin, M. (2025). Language learning strategies in English fricative consonants through Arabic. *International Journal of Education Development (IJED)*.
<https://doi.org/10.61132/ijed.v2i.286>.
- Zakayo, M. A. (2012). Similarities and differences in English, Sinhala and Tangale sounds: Implication for Sinhala and Tangale English speakers. In Somsundara, D. *Sri Lanka Versus Nigeria Comparative Studies*



*on Economy, Polity
and Society.*
Shithara.

Thesis, University of
Maiduguri, Nigeria.

Zakayo, M. A. (2019). *Stress and
Intonation
Variations in the
English Speech of
Tangle West
Speakers.*
Unpublished PhD

Zheng, Y., & Iverson, P. (2016).
Assimilation of English /θ/ by L1
Mandarin and Cantonese
speakers. *New Sounds 2016:
8th International Symposium on
the Acquisition of Second
Language Speech*, 213.