

**A Contrastive Analysis Of Morphological Challenges In The Acquisition Of English And
Kanuri By Non-Native Speakers**

By

Muhammad Mallam Modu

Department of English and Literary Studies

University of Maiduguri

mmmodu@unimaid.edu.ng

08034590519

And

Ahmadu Mohammed Dauda Ph.D

Department of English and Literary Studies

University of Maiduguri

ahmadumdauda@unimaid.edu.ng

08067018673/08029656963

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the morphological challenges faced by Kanuri speakers in acquiring English, with a focus on the contrast between the morphological structures of Kanuri and English. The main objectives of the study are to identify the key morphological differences between Kanuri and English, explore how these differences affect Kanuri speakers' acquisition of English morphology, and provide recommendations for improving second language acquisition strategies, especially for displaced populations. The research was conducted with 50 Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) residing in Dalori Camp, Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria. Data was collected using semi-structured interviews with 25 participants and questionnaires with the remaining 25 participants, specifically designed for individuals with minimal educational backgrounds. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed to analyze the challenges Kanuri speakers face in acquiring English morphological structures. The study is grounded in the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH), which suggests that differences between a learner's first language (L1) and their second language (L2) can predict areas of difficulty or ease in language learning. The framework focuses on how structural differences, particularly in morphology, contribute to learning challenges. The study finds that Kanuri speakers face significant challenges in acquiring English due to differences in morphological structures, particularly the reliance on prefixes in Kanuri for abstract noun formation, in contrast to English's use of suffixes. The research also

reveals that Kanuri speakers often transfer L1 morphological rules to English, leading to errors. Additionally, socio-economic and psychological factors, particularly those faced by IDPs, escalate these challenges, hindering effective language learning. The study concludes with recommendations for contrastive instruction, interactive exercises, and culturally sensitive teaching methods to address the unique difficulties faced by IDPs in acquiring English.

Keywords: Morphological challenges, Contrastive analysis, Second language acquisition, Kanuri speakers and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The acquisition of second languages (L2) often presents significant challenges, particularly when the linguistic structures of the first language (L1) differ substantially from those of the target language (L2). This is especially true in the case of morphology, where the internal structure of words, including inflection, derivation, and compounding, plays a crucial role in the fluency and accuracy of language use. Kanuri, a language spoken predominantly in the northeastern region of Nigeria, exhibits a unique morphological structure that differs from that of English in several key aspects, including its use of affixes, word formation processes, and the role of tone in morphology. Given the increasing number of non-native English speakers in regions such as Bama, Konduga and Kaga Local Government, which houses a large population of internally displaced persons (IDPs), it becomes crucial to explore how Kanuri speakers navigate the complexities of English morphology. This research aims to investigate the morphological challenges faced by Kanuri speakers when acquiring English after being displaced in there various local government.

Despite the growing body of literature on second language acquisition, particularly with respect to morphological structures, there remains a significant gap in research concerning the acquisition of English morphology by speakers of African languages, particularly Kanuri. Existing studies predominantly focus on European and other well-documented languages, leaving a gap in understanding how speakers of less-studied languages, such as Kanuri, approach the challenges of acquiring English morphology. Additionally, there is a lack of attention to the influence of limited educational backgrounds on the acquisition process, especially in contexts such as refugee camps, where learners often face additional socio-economic and psychological

barriers. This study addresses these gaps by investigating the morphological difficulties Kanuri-speaking IDPs face when learning and communicating English and how their unique linguistic backgrounds influence their second language acquisition. By applying the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, this research aims to offer valuable insights into how learners' L1 morphology interacts with their L2 acquisition process, thereby contributing to the development of more effective language teaching strategies for displaced populations.

The aim of this study is to conduct a contrastive analysis of the morphological challenges faced by Kanuri speakers in acquiring English morphology. Specifically, the study aims to identify areas of difficulty and ease in the acquisition process, focusing on inflectional morphological structures.

CONCEPT OF MORPHOLOGY AND MORPHOLOGICAL ACQUISITION

According to Martin (1976) morphology is a study of the structure of words, the study is essential for mastering any language, including English, as it involves process like affixation and inflection that shape word meaning and grammatical function. Tomasello M. (2000) Morphological acquisition refers to the process by which children learn and acquire the ability to understand and use the morphological structures of their language, including morphemes (the smallest units of meaning). The process involves learning how words are formed, how they change in different contexts (such as tense, number or case), and how they interact with syntax (sentence structure) Morphological acquisition in second language learners involves understanding how they navigate challenges related to mastering morphological rules, influenced by factors such as error analysis, frequency effects, input, and cognitive factors. Error analysis reveals patterns like overgeneralization and undergeneralization, providing insights into learners' understanding of morphological rules and areas needing targeted instruction. The frequency of exposure to certain forms, with high-frequency words being learned faster than less common or irregular forms, also impacts acquisition. Rich, varied input from diverse contexts enhances learners' ability to internalize complex morphological patterns. Cognitive factors, including age, motivation, and cognitive aptitude, further shape the ease with which learners acquire morphology, with younger, more motivated learners or those with higher cognitive aptitude often finding it easier to master these structures.

Example:

In English children must learn to add suffixes like “-ed” for past tense

Work + -ed = worked Stop + -ped = Stopped

In English children must learn to add suffixes like “-s” for number *plural*

Bag + s = bags plate + -s = plates

METHODOLOGY

The primary data for this study were drawn from Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) residing in Dalori Camp Maiduguri, Borno State Nigeria. The study targeted 50 native Kanuri speakers with limited educational backgrounds, most of them had attained only low primary education levels. These participants were divided into two distinct groups for data collection purposes:

1. **Interviews:** 25 participants were selected for semi-structured interviews to gather qualitative insights into their challenges and experiences with English morphological structures.
2. **Questionnaires:** The remaining 25 participants were provided with questionnaires specifically designed to be accessible to individuals with minimal educational backgrounds. The aim was to ensure clarity and reliability of responses.

METHOD OF DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Data presentation and analysis occurred concurrently, employing both qualitative and quantitative methods. The qualitative data from the interviews and open-ended questions were analyzed thematically to identify common challenges and strategies for acquiring English morphological structures. The quantitative data from the proficiency tests and questionnaires were analyzed to measure the participants' understanding of inflectional morphology.

The study pays particular attention to how second language learners acquire English morphologically, drawing comparisons between the learners' first language (Kanuri) and their second language (English). By adopting a contrastive analysis approach, this research highlights the morphological challenges encountered by non-native speakers in their acquisition of English,

specifically focusing on areas where their native language structure either facilitates or hinders the learning of English morphology.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study is grounded in the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH), a framework developed by Robert Lado in 1957. Lado proposed that comparing the structures of a learner's first language (L1) with those of a target second language (L2) could predict areas of ease and difficulty in language learning. Lado's ideas, influenced by behaviorist and structuralist traditions, suggest that differences between L1 and L2 would lead to learning difficulties, while similarities would facilitate positive transfer.

The **(CAH)**, which emerged prominently in the mid-20th century, posits that the structural differences between a learner's first language (L1) and their target second language (L2) significantly influence the acquisition process. Developed within the framework of behaviorist psychology and structural linguistics, CAH suggests that areas of linguistic similarity between L1 and L2 facilitate learning, while areas of difference predict difficulties and errors. This theory has been particularly influential in understanding how learners acquire L2 inflectional rules, word formation, and the integration of morphological elements into grammatical structures.

LITERATURE REVIEW (EMPIRICAL AND CONCEPTUAL)

Ellis, R. (1994). This empirical study examines morphological transfer in second language acquisition, particularly focusing on learners' ability to acquire inflectional morphology in English. The study suggests that learners' L1 influences their ability to correctly use inflections such as tense, number, and case. Learners from languages with rich morphological systems tend to transfer their L1 structures to their L2, resulting in errors in English morphology. This study does not explore how specific languages with distinct morphological systems, such as Kanuri, influence English morphological acquisition. The gap lies in understanding how particular features of Kanuri morphology such as inflectional elements affect learners' acquisition of English morphology.

Laufer, B., & Paribakht, T. S. (2008) This empirical study explores how compound words (e.g., "toothpaste", "sunflower") are acquired by second language learners of English. The findings suggest that learners struggle with compound word formation due to differences in how compounds are structured in their L1 and English. The study does not address the specific challenges faced by speakers of languages like Kanuri, which may have unique ways of forming compounds. The gap in this research is the lack of focus on how Kanuri speakers navigate English compound word formation, particularly when their language might not have equivalent structures.

Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). This conceptual review discusses how cross-linguistic influences shape the acquisition of morphological features in second language learners. The review highlights how learners' L1 morphology influences their comprehension and production of L2 morphology, emphasizing the challenges that arise from significant differences in morphological structure between the learner's L1 and English. The review does not focus on the specific morphological structures of Kanuri, and how these structures might cause specific challenges in acquiring English morphology. There is a need to understand how the particularities of Kanuri's morphology (e.g., its use of affixes and word order) influence the acquisition of English morphology.

The current study explores how Kanuri speakers acquire English morphology, sharing a focus on L1 influence and morphological challenges with previous SLA research. While it examines cross-linguistic influence, inflectional morphology, and compound word formation like earlier studies, it uniquely analyzes English-Kanuri contrasts, including both inflectional and derivational morphology through an empirical approach, filling a gap in SLA research

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

i. Inflectional Morphology

Inflectional morphology in Kanuri involves the modification of words to express grammatical features like tense, number, gender, case. Similar to **English**, Kanuri forms these inflectional morphemes primarily through **affixation** (adding prefixes or suffixes to a root word).

Both **prefixation** (adding a prefix at the beginning of a word) and **suffixation** (adding a suffix at the end of a word) are used in **noun formation** in Kanuri.

ii. Affixation in Kanuri

1. ‘kər-’

This prefix is attached to **nouns** to create **abstract nouns**. In English, it might be similar to how adding “-ship” to a noun forms an abstract noun, like “friend” → “friendship”.

2. ‘nəm-’

This prefix can be attached to both **nouns and adjectives**. It might function like “-ness” in English, which turns adjectives into abstract nouns, like “happy” → “happiness”.

Kanuri inflectional morphemes are also formed through affixation like English language. Both processes of prefixation and suffixation are used in the formation of nouns in the language.

iii. Prefixation

Various prefixes are employed in the formation of nouns in the Kanuri language. Among these, the prefixes ‘kər-’ and ‘nəm-’ are particularly notable. The prefix ‘kər-’ is used to derive abstract nouns from certain base nouns, while ‘nəm-’ can be affixed to both nouns and adjectives to modify their meanings. The following examples illustrate their usage:

S/N	Kanuri	English
1.	nəm-	Ness
2.	kər-	Ship

Kər-

S/N	Kər-			
1.	Prefix	Noun	Abstract Noun	Gloss
2.	Kər-	Mələm (scholar)	Kərmələm	Scholarship
3.	Kər-	malem (teacher)	kərmáləm	Teachingship
4.	Kər-	Kərmu (death)	Kərmu	Deathliness
5.	Kər-	mai (king)	kərmái	Kingship
6.	Kər-	Ta (to hold)	Kərta	Seriousness
7.	Kər-	músələm (muslim)	kərmúsələm	Muslimhood

This table illustrates how prefixes in the Kanuri language are used to form new words. The prefix ‘kər-’ is specifically employed to derive abstract nouns from certain base nouns. For example, kər- added to mai (meaning ‘king’) forms kərmái, which translates to kingship in English. However, while Kanuri uses a prefix (kər-) for this transformation, English uses a suffix

(-ship), highlighting a fundamental difference in morphological processes between the two languages.

These differences present challenges for Kanuri speakers learning English as a second language. Since Kanuri relies on prefixes to modify word meanings, learners may struggle to adapt to English morphological rules, where similar modifications are often achieved through suffixes. For instance, if learners are instructed to add a morpheme at the beginning of the word ‘king’ to express an abstract noun, they might incorrectly interpret it as ‘*shipking*’, which is both meaningless and morphologically incorrect in English.

Such challenges are particularly evident among Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) from Kanuri-speaking backgrounds who are learning English as a second language. The contrast between the use of prefixes in Kanuri and suffixes in English creates a learning barrier that must be addressed in language instruction.

nəm-

S/N	Kər-			
	Prefix	Adjectives	Noun	Gloss
1.	nəm-	Sələm (Black)	Nəmsələm	Blackness
2.	nəm-	Sawa (Friend)	Nəmsawa	Friendship/ Friendship
3.	nəm-	Səlwai (Lazy)	Nəmsəlwai	Laziness
4.	nəm-	Ashi (stubborn)	Nəmashi	Stubbornness
5.	nəm-	Kuru’u (Tall)	Nəmashi	Stubbornness
6.	nəm-	Wakawa (Trouble)	Nəmwakawa	Troubledness
7.	nəm-	Shawa (Beautiful/Handsome)	Nəmshawa	Beautifulness/ Handsomeness
8.	nəm-	Kori (Short)	Nəmkori	Shortness
9.	nəm-	Tawar (Dirty)	Nəmtawar	Dirtiness
10.	nəm-	Kəlado (Wicked)	Nəmkəlado	Wickedness

In Kanuri, adding a prefix to an adjective can sometimes transform it into a noun. For example, when the prefix *nəm-* is added to the adjective *Sələm* (Black), it becomes *Nəmsələm*,

which functions as a noun. This morphological process is similar to how the prefix *kər-* is used in Kanuri to form abstract nouns, such as *kər-* + *mai* (meaning ‘king’), resulting in *kərmái* (*kingship* in English).

However, while Kanuri relies on prefixes (*nəm-*, *kər-*) to achieve these transformations, English typically uses suffixes (*-ness*, *-ship*) for the same purpose. This contrast highlights a key difference in the morphological structures of the two languages.

iv. Suffixation

Suffixation also plays a significant role in the formation of nouns in the Kanuri language. Various suffixes are used to modify the meaning of base nouns, particularly to indicate plurality and possession. The key suffixes are described below (**-ti**, **-ri**, **-wa**, **-mi**, **-be**).

These suffixes are used with **personal names** or **titles of chiefs** to create nouns that refer to **places** or **towns** associated with those individuals.

S/N	Kanuri	English
1.	-ti	Used in possessive forms related to naming nouns.
2.	-ri	Functions similarly to the English apostrophe-s (’s) to indicate possession.
3.	-wa	Marks the plural form of nouns, comparable to the English -s plural suffix.
4.	-be	Used to indicate possession, equivalent to the apostrophe-s (’s) in both singular and plural forms.
5.	-mi	Denotes possessive forms in naming nouns related to a person’s son or daughter .

Examples:

i. -ri Possessive form of apostrophe s

S/N	--ri			
	Singular	Suffix	Noun	Gloss
1.	Bulama(Ward Head)	-ri	Bulamari	Bulama’s palace
2.	Shehu – (Emir)	-ri	Shehuri	Shehu’s palace or Emir’s palace
3.	Shetima (Traditional Title)	-ri	Shettimari	Shetima’s Resident or a Town named after Shetima or a town/resident which comprises of many Shettimas.
4.	Kaska (Firewood)	-ri	Kaskari	A place where Qur’anic students (Fuwura) gather and recite the Holy

				Quran. The word (Kaska-Firewood) is used because it is burnt during the night and dawn time to lighten the vicinity for visibility.
5.	Mai (King)	-ri	Mairi	King's Palace
6.	Maajir (Immigrant Islamic scholars)	-ri	Maajiri	(immigrant's camp)A camp or place where the <i>Maajirs</i> reside and study the Holy Quran.
7.	Ganga (Drum)	-ri	Gangamari	an area or ward in Shuhuri North in Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria where many drum beaters reside.

In Kanuri, the suffix '**-ri**' functions as a **possessive marker**, similar to the English **apostrophe-s ('s)** used to indicate possession.

Example in Kanuri

- **Bulama (Ward Head) + -ri → Bulamari**

Gloss: *Bulama's palace*

In this example, the base noun **Bulama** (which refers to a ward head or community leader) takes the suffix **-ri**, resulting in **Bulamari**. This newly formed word means *Bulama's palace*, indicating something that belongs to Bulama.

In English, possession is typically shown by adding an **apostrophe-s ('s)** to the noun:

- **Bulama's palace** Here, 's serves the same function as **-ri** in Kanuri. Both indicate that the palace belongs to Bulama. **Bulama + -ri → Bulamari** Suffix **-ri** marks possession
Bulama + 's → Bulama's palace Apostrophe-s ('s) marks possession

This comparison highlights how Kanuri uses a **suffix** attached directly to the noun for possession, while English uses a **punctuation-based marker ('s)**. Despite the difference in form, both serve the same grammatical purpose.

ii. -wa Plural Suffix

S/N	-wa			
	Singular noun	Suffix	Plural Noun	Gloss
1.	fèrò (girl)	-wa	Fèròwá	Girls
2.	Kamu (woman)	-wa	Kamuwa	Women
3.	Nglaro(ram)	-wa	Nglarowa	Rams
4.	Moto (car)	-wa	Motowa	Cars
5.	Fato (house)	-wa	Fatowa	Houses
6.	Koro (donkey)	-wa	Korowa	Donkies

Function: Marks the **plural form** of nouns in Kanuri, similar to the English plural **-s**.

Example:

fèrò (*girl*) + **-wa** → **fèròwá** (*girls*)

Just as English adds **-s** to form plurals (e.g., *girl* → *girls*), Kanuri adds **-wa** to the singular noun.

iii. -ti Possessive Form of Naming Noun

S/N	--ti			
	Singular noun	Suffix	Plural Noun	Gloss
1.	Liman	--ti	Limanti	town named after Liman
2.	Lawan (Ward Head)	--ti	Lawanti	Lawan's resident or a village/town named after a lawan.
3.	Mowaram (traditional title)	--ti	Mowaramti	a house or town named after Mowaram (it is a title given to Shehu's elder sister).
4.	Wakil (traditional title)	--ti	Wakilti	is a house where deputy to traditional title holders reside.

Function: Used to create **place names** derived from personal names, often indicating that a town or location is named after a person.

Example:

Liman + **-ti** → **Limanti** (*town named after Liman*)

While English doesn't have a direct equivalent, this is similar to naming places after people, like *Washington* (named after George Washington), though without a morphological suffix.

iv. -mi Possessive Form Indicating Son's of'

In Kanuri, the possessive case is marked by the suffix ‘be’ attached to nouns. It is used for both singular and plural nouns. The suffix ‘-mi’ on the other hand is attached to names of women in order address people after their mothers. It (-mi) simply means ‘son of’. Examples are:

S/N	-mi			
	Singular noun	Suffix	Noun	Gloss
1.	Fànnà	-mi	Fànnàmì	Son of Fanna
2.	Fusam is a Kanuri female name.	-mi	Fusami	The son of Fusam
3.	Fanta (a Kanuri male name)	-mi	Fantami	named after a female Kanuri name, called Fanta . Fanta is a Kanuri female name derived from the Arabic female name Fatima .
4.	Aisa (a Kanuri male name)	-mi	Aisami	Aisa is a Kanuri female name derives from the Arabic female name Aisha.
5.	Gambo (a Kanuri male name)	-mi	Gambomi	Gambo is a name (either boy or girl) given to a child after twins.

Function: This suffix is attached to **women’s names** to indicate ‘**son of**’ in Kanuri, denoting lineage or family connection.

Example:

Fànnà + -mi → Fànnàmì (*son of Fanna*)

English might use phrases like “*son of Fanna*”, but in some cultures or older naming conventions (like **Johnson** meaning *son of John*), this morphological feature is comparable.

v. -be Possessive Suffix of Noun

S/N	-be			
	Plural noun	Suffix	Noun	Gloss
1.	Fero (girl)	-be	ferobe	the son of a girl/woman (Alhaji Modu Ferobe (the late renowned Bama business magnet)
2.	Modu	-be	Modube	modu the son of modu
3.	Falta or Falmata (Female Kanuri name)	-be	Faltabe/ Falmatabe	the son of Falta/ Falmata
4.	Bintu (Female Kanuri	-be	Bintube	Bintu is a Kanuri female name

	name)			derived from the Arabic noun Bintu (a young girl).
5.	Kusu (Female Kanuri name)	-be	Kusube	the son of Ya Kusu. Ya Kusu is a Kanuri female name derived from the Arabic female name Khulthum. This is similar to Ferohe, because a male name is usually added or attached to it, e.g. Ali Bor Kusube, unlike Falmatabe, Gombobe,

Function: Marks **possession** in both singular and plural forms, functioning similarly to the English **apostrophe-s ('s)**.

Examples:

Fèròwá (girls) + **-be** → **fèròwàbé** (the son of a girl/woman)

In example above, the **-be** functions like **'s (fèròwàbé)** showing ownership by multiple people.

4.3 Summary of Kanuri Prefixes

Kanuri suffix	Function	Example (Kanuri)	Gloss (Meaning)	English Equivalent
-wa	Plural form of noun	<i>fèrò</i> <i>fèròwá</i>	Girls	Girl girls
-ti	Naming places after people	<i>Liman</i> <i>Limanti</i>	Town	Named ward after Liman
-mi	Indicates “son of ” from a woman’s name	<i>Fànnà</i> <i>Fànnàmi</i>	Person	Son of Fanna
-be	Possessive suffix of noun	<i>Fèròwá</i> <i>Fèròwàbé</i>	Girl’s	Girl’s
-ri	Possessive form of apostrophe s’	Shehuri	Emir	Shehu’s palace or Emir’s palace

This breakdown clarifies how suffixes in Kanuri are used for pluralization, possession, and naming, and how these compare to similar structures in English.

The table below summarizes the inflectional morphemes found in the **Interview** and **Questionnaires** of 50 L2 learners of English in the camp. Here are their frequency and percentage of occurrences.

Inflectional morphemes			
S/N	Suffixe Forms	Frequency	Percentage
1	-be plural form	19	13.29%
2	-be singular form	21	14.67%
3	-wa	20	13.99%
4	-m	18	12.59%
5	-ti	16	11.19%
6	-ri	15	10.49%
	Prefix forms		
7.	kər-	14	9.79%
8.	nəm-	20	13.99%
Total		143	100%

The findings show that there are one hundred and forty-three (143) instances of inflectional morphemes identified in the data. These morphemes are categorized into suffix and prefix forms. Among the suffix forms. The **-be plural form** was identified nineteen (19) times, representing thirteen point twenty-nine percent (13.29%), while the **-be singular form** occurred twenty-one (21) times, making up fourteen point sixty-seven percent (14.67%). The morpheme **-wa** appeared twenty (20) times, accounting for thirteen point ninety-nine percent (14.99%) of the total occurrences. The **-m** morpheme was recorded eighteen (18) times, equivalent .to twelve point fifty-nine percent (12.59%), followed by **-ti** with sixteen (16) instances, representing eleven point nineteen percent (11.19%). Lastly, the **-ri** morpheme appeared fifteen (15) times, accounting for ten point forty-nine percent (10.49%).

In terms of prefix forms, **kər-** was observed fourteen (14) times, representing nine point seventy-nine percent (9.79%), finally, **nəm-** occurred twent (20) times, equivalent to thirteen point ninety-nine percent (13.99%),. Altogether, these morphemes sum up to a total of one hundred and fouty-three (143) instances, covering one hundred percent (100%) of the data.

DISCUSSION OF RESULT

This research adds to the understanding of language acquisition challenges within the context of African languages and displaced communities. It emphasizes the need for tailored, culturally sensitive pedagogical approaches that consider the specific socio-economic and psychological realities of learners, particularly those in refugee and IDP contexts. The study highlights the importance of addressing linguistic challenges through contrastive analysis and interactive practices to improve second language acquisition and support learners in overcoming the barriers they face.

CONCLUSION

The research provides valuable insights into the morphological challenges faced by Kanuri speakers in acquiring English, highlighting significant structural differences between the two languages. The primary challenge arises from Kanuri's reliance on prefixes for forming abstract nouns and converting adjectives into nouns, while English predominantly uses suffixes. This structural disparity leads to difficulties for Kanuri speakers, who often transfer morphological rules from their native language (L1) into their second language (L2), resulting in errors such as the incorrect use of prefixes in place of suffixes. Moreover, the study underscores the additional socio-economic and psychological challenges faced by internally displaced persons (IDPs) in refugee camps, which exacerbate these difficulties in acquiring English morphology.

The study contributes significantly to second language acquisition (SLA) literature by focusing on the interaction between Kanuri and English morphology, providing insights into the impact of socio-economic and psychological factors on language acquisition, particularly for displaced populations. By identifying common difficulties, the research offers practical recommendations for improving language teaching strategies tailored to refugee and IDP communities. These recommendations include explicit contrastive instruction to address the morphological differences between Kanuri and English, interactive practices for engaging with both inflectional and derivational morphology, and culturally sensitive teaching methods that take into account the unique challenges of displaced populations. Contextualized learning, using

locally relevant examples, is also recommended to enhance the learning experience and improve retention.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures*. University of Michigan Press.
- Laufer, B., & Paribakht, T. S. (2008). *The Impact of Vocabulary on Second Language Writing*.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schmitt, N., & McCarthy, M. (2007). *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition, and Pedagogy*.
- Snow, C. E. (2010). *Academic Language and the Challenge of Reading for Learning about Science*.
- Tavakoli, P. (2016). *The role of morphology in the acquisition of English as a second language*. Language Teaching Research, 20(1), 41-63.
- Tomasello M. (2000) *the item-based nature of children's early syntactic development*