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ABSTRACT

Many studies done in second language learning and acquisition focus on the learner. The studies done in Kenya show that students leave school with little competence (see Maina, 1991; Nyamasyo, 1992; Njoroge, 1996). However, the English of teachers of these learners who have acquired and learnt the language in a non-native speaking environment (Kenya) has not been studied.

The aim of this study was to examine, describe and categorize the lexical and phonological errors in the spoken English of pre-school level teachers in Kasarani Division of Nairobi Province. Eight teachers were sampled, and tape-recorded while teaching to provide the data for analysis.

The identified errors were described using the Error Analysis Approach method (Corder, 1974). The errors in the teachers' English were identified as deviations of the teachers' language from the norm of the target language (English) as described in Quirk et al (1985) for the lexical errors, and Roach (1987) for the phonological errors.

The analysis of lexical errors showed that errors were most common in the category of inappropriate use of lexical items. In the phonological errors, errors were most common in the pronunciation of /l/. Finally, the study discussed some possible causes of the errors observed in the teachers' language based on the available literature on Error Analysis and made some recommendations.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the Study

Kabiru et al (1990) observe that Early Childhood Education (ECE) is considered an important sector of the Kenyan education system. This is because they argue it lays the foundation for a child’s socialization and lifelong education. In this regard therefore, the Government of Kenya has encouraged the development of an early childhood program in partnership with parents, local authorities, private individuals and organizations. The ECE program has a teacher-training component in which the teachers are trained through the medium of English, and in teaching English among other areas.

The Ministry of Education in Kenya set up a National Centre for Early Childhood Education (NACECE), based in Kenya Institute of Education (K.I.E) in 1984. The Ministry of Education also launched a two-year in-service program in 1985 for pre-school teacher training. To qualify for the training, an applicant must have attained the following minimum qualifications: be serving teachers with the following passes in the National exams: 15 points in Certificate of Primary Education (CPE) or 35 points in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) or 5 passes in Kenya Junior Secondary Examination (KJSE) or a division 4 in Kenya Certificate of Education (KCE) or a D in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE). However, no pass is required in English yet it is
the language used as medium of instruction in the teaching of the pre-school activities.

English language as noted earlier is one of the subject areas in ECE teacher training curriculum. The teaching of English language to the trainees aims at helping them to communicate confidently and clearly in both oral and written English.

The specific objectives for training English language as listed in ECE teachers training manual (1997) are to enable the trainee to:

- Comprehend and respond appropriately in oral communication in English
- Use correct pronunciation, stress, intonation and expression of English language
- Read for pleasure and understand the instruction for the information
- Write legibly, meaningfully and express ideas, principles and concepts logically
- Acquire confidence, clarity, conciseness, and preciseness in their communication.

From these objectives, the teachers are expected to leave training with appropriate skills to introduce the English language at this early stage of pre-school level. Chomsky (1969) in her study of 5 to 10 year old notes that this is a crucial stage
of language learning in which children are at the border of adult competence. She adds that there is a close relationship between the linguistic system they will command one day as adults and what they are exposed to at age 5 to 10 years. Long (1990) has presented evidence to suggest that the acquisition of a native-like accent is not possible by learners who begin learning after 6 years of age. However, no study has been done on the spoken language ability of the English of pre-school level teachers who interact with the children for long periods of time during this critical stage of language development and learning of specific language skills.

1.1.0 Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to examine, describe and categorise the lexical and phonological errors in the spoken English of pre-school level teachers in Kasarani division in Nairobi. Nyamasyo (1992) points out that most students leave school with very little competence in English despite the high priority given to the learning of English. The students join colleges to become teachers: language users and no longer language learners. A question arises as to whether their language as second language users has lexical and phonological errors.
1.2.0 Research Objectives

The study had the following objectives:

1. To identify and classify the lexical errors in the spoken English of pre-school teachers in Kasarani Division.
2. To identify and classify the phonological errors in the spoken English of pre-school teachers in Kasarani Division.
3. To explain the possible causes of the identified lexical and phonological errors.

1.3.0 Research Assumptions

The study had the following assumptions:

1. That the spoken English of pre-school level teachers in Kasarani division does contain identifiable lexical errors.
2. That the spoken English of pre-school level teachers in Kasarani division does contain identifiable phonological errors.
3. That there are various possible sources of the lexical and phonological errors identified.

1.4.0 Rationale of the Study

Corder (1986) gives a pedagogical justification for the study of errors, namely that a good understanding of the nature of errors is necessary before a systematic
means of remedying them could be found. This study focused on the spoken English language of pre-school level teachers as a means of providing insight to the trainers of the pre-school teachers on the nature of English language course they teach and the nature of English used by the pre-school teachers.

This study hopes to make a contribution to information regarding language ability and language use in a second language-learning environment. This study determines whether the language used has erroneous forms, and if so, to give recommendations as to what curriculum developers of ECD and NACECE should do to intervene at the initial stages of training so that the pre-school teachers have the necessary language skills to lay a firm and correct foundation for further language learning and development.

1.5.0 Scope and Limitation of the Study

The study focused on the lexical and phonological errors in the spoken English language of pre-school level teachers in Kasarani division. According to Richards (1985) lexical competence is a vital component of language competence. Johannson (1979) and Sheorey (1986) note that lexical errors are often rated as more disruptive than grammatical errors. The study focused on all the lexical errors identified, but limited the scope in phonological errors to errors in pronunciation of consonants. The term **phonological errors** is used this study.
as used by Richards (1985). He uses it as a broad classification that encompasses pronunciation errors. Errors in consonants are more disruptive than those in vowels. Norrish (1983) says that in speech, vowel sounds are not as important as consonants. Okombo (1986) says phonemically, there is not much difference between the consonants of East African English and of British English.

The study was limited to eight teachers in Kasarani Division because of time and money constraints. Lastly, the study focused on teachers sampled from pre-schools managed by Nairobi City Council, which follow the stipulated guidelines by K.I.E, and also on the training of teachers. Schools managed by other bodies follow different guidelines.

1.6 Research Design

1.6.1 Area of Study and Study Population

Nairobi province has eight administrative divisions. Kasarani Division is one of them. The latest report on schools (March 2002) from Nairobi City Council Education Department Statistics sub-section indicate that Kasarani Division has nine pre-schools and over forty teachers all of whom are under CICECE. The data for the study was drawn from eight teachers who were sampled from only four schools in Kasarani Division.
1.6.2 Sampling Procedures

To identify the appropriate samples for this study, the following type of sampling procedure was used: random sampling was adopted to identify the schools visited in the division. Random sampling approach was again used to identify the sample of teachers visited in the identified schools. The same procedure was used to identify the specific teachers tape-recorded.

1.6.3 Data Collection

The data for the study was collected by tape recording the spoken language of the pre-school teachers in a classroom set up. The pre-school class entails a series of activities, which include language activities, mathematics activities, environmental activities, Art and craft activities, outdoor activities and music activities. The researcher made two classroom visits of thirty minutes each, for each of the eight sampled teachers in any of the activities listed above except the outdoor activity, which requires the lesson to be carried outside the classroom set up.

1.6.4 Methods of Data Analysis

Following the approach in error recognition and analysis as developed by Corder (1974), the following steps were adopted:
(a) Selection of a corpora of language
(b) Identification of errors in the corpus
(c) Classification of the errors identified
(d) Explanation of possible causes
(e) Evaluation and implication

The analytic approaches of ‘Let the Errors Determine the Categories’ (Norrish 1983) was used to categorize and present the lexical a phonological errors. The tape-recorded data was transcribed and the errors identified. The error categories were indicated on cards. Frequency ratings were illustrated by means of tables showing frequency or percentage.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

The Literature reviewed in this chapter has been presented in sections. First, is a review of literature on studies on errors on the interlanguage, phonological studies, a review of approaches to second language learning studies; specifically looking at contrastive analysis and error analysis then describing teachers language and non varieties of English.

2.1 Studies on Lexical Errors on the Interlanguage

Most studies on interlanguage focus on the learners. We find them relevant to this study because of the identification and classification of errors. Ringbom (1978) analyzed the errors made by 577 Swedish and an equal number of Finish learners of English. The analysis showed that the two groups of learners had very different types of errors. This he explained was due to the fact that there is a close relationship between English and Swedish and the lack of such a relationship between English and Finnish. Ringbom developed taxonomy of lexical errors, which he used not as an end in itself, but as a tool in the analysis of the errors. They include among others over specification, assumed formal similarity, co-hyponyms, language switch, under specification, assumed identity of semantic structure, extension of meaning on the basis of L1 word and Loan translations.
Kellerman (1978) researched on learner use of a set of idiomatic expressions. He tried to establish an explanatory principle for certain types of lexical errors when learners use idioms. His experiments indicate that learners can easily identify the core meaning of a word and it is also easy for learners to identify metaphorical uses of the same verb in other expressions. The experiments indicated that learners assume that idioms in the L1 will transfer to the L2 if these idioms involve core meanings. If they involve more peripheral, metaphorical meaning, they tend to avoid using them in the L2.

Kellerman provides explanations for the way learners treat certain types of idioms and raises some questions about how learners learn to handle new idioms. He also goes further and provides some substantial work on polysemy. His work is often considered a good study on the area of lexical interlanguage even though its scope is constrained as idioms make up only a small part of the daily use of language. Though his study is on the learners, we find it relevant to our study as it focuses on the teachers’ whose interlanguage has lexical errors.

Levenston (1979), Levenston and Blum (1983) have the most substantial work on lexis in interlanguage. Levenston (1979) concern is with the idea of lexical simplification by which he means how learners cope with situations where they want to avoid certain types of words when they are operating in their L2. His main argument is that when a learner chooses to avoid a word in the L2 that
would have been an obvious choice for an L1 speaker, the covert principles behind such a choice are basically the same as the overt principles that publishers use in simplified texts, in translation, in pidgins and in the speech of adult native speakers when addressing children or foreigners. As a result of this, he then concludes that simplification operates according to universal principle. The learners tend to use frequent words in preference to infrequent ones, words, which have no translation equivalent in the L2 are avoided; morphologically simple words are used in preference to complex ones. The learners' need to simplify can be explained by the complexity of the task of acquiring command of all aspects of the native speaker's competence.

Levenston (ibid) bases his work on a discourse completion task, which requires the learners to fill in gaps in a text, which has been specially constructed so that only one item can satisfactorily appear in the blank. Rather than rely on errors produced in a 'natural setting' the method is meant to induce errors. The bases of the analysis are the learner errors. He cites over generalization in the second language learners use of words especially where relationships of antonymy are concerned as the most basic error.

Sonaiya (1991) studied the lexical errors made by students learning French and proposed what has been referred to as a 'Lexical approach' to error analysis. This approach views words in terms of the semantic relations that exist among
them. Thus a word that has been erroneously used by a learner is analyzed in terms of the relationship it bears to the items that should have been used and the specific dimension along which the two or more are identified. Sonaiya’s approach is applicable to this study as the erroneous forms are analysed and identified to their equivalent in the target language.

Lastly, Nyamasyo (1992) focused on the lexical and grammatical errors in the written work of Kenyan pre-University students. Her study consisted of a comparison of the written English of ‘O’ level and an ‘A’ level corpora. She noted that there were similar types of lexical errors in the two corpora. Her study highlighted the following lexical errors: assumed identity of meaning, homonym errors, synonym errors and inappropriate choice based on form. Her study offers a good background to this study and her method of analysis and classification of errors will be useful in this study.

2.2 Phonological Studies

There are not many studies, which have focused on the phonology of second language users. Many studies focus on the other areas such as morpho-syntax and lexical. However, some scholars have studied the phonology of East African English and Kenyan English. Okombo (1986) has given some features that characterize the speech habits of very well educated East Africans. The justification he gives for this is that the English of very well educated is to a large
extent free of locally stigmatized mother tongue features. He noted that phonemically, there is not much difference between the consonants of EA English (EAE) and those of British English (BE) Okombo (ibid) adds that the only BE consonant which may be excluded from EAE is the voiced counterpart of the English sound associated with the diagraph sh (the sound of the final segment in the word English itself). In BE this sound is found in words such as measure, pleasure, and beige where it is orthographically represented by either s or g. He further illustrates how this sound is lost in EAE making it one consonantal phoneme less than BE: in EAE, the words in which the voiced sh is represented by s are pronounced as voiceless, while those in which it is represented by g are pronounced with the quality of J as in the first sound of jaw.

Okombo (ibid) gives characteristics of EAE with regard to the pronunciation of consonants:

- Orthographic s normally has its voiceless quality in such words as is, his, busy, houses.
- The /l/ sound tends to have a clear quality in all positions. The dark variety found in BE is rarely found in EAE.
- In many environments, du has the quality of J rather than that of dy, for example, Educate, dual among others.
He further notes that EAE differs a lot from BE in the pronunciation of vowels. He gives the following examples to illustrate:

(i) All the five a like sounds of BE have the same quality in EAE. Thus the words *hat*, *hut*, *hart* and *hurt* are homophones in EAE— the same sound is used for the first vowel in *about*.

(ii) The vowels of *cot* and *caught* are merged into one vowel, that of *cot*, and the diphthong *ou* as in *goat*, is given the quality of a pure vowel *o* which is non-existent in BE.

(iii) The diphthong *ei* is only realized as such where the spelling has corresponding letters (as in *eight*). Otherwise it has the quality of *ey* where the spelling has *ay* (as in *day, pay*) and that of the pure vowel *e* before consonants. For instance, *age, language, mate, aid*.

(iv) The diphthong *au* usually has the quality of *ao* in such words as *about, now, town*.

(v) EAE is characterized by the use of full vowel quality (usually of the orthographic vowel) in all environments. This tends to make EAE syllable timed, thus distinguishing it from the stress times BE

(vi) *ai* is usually pronounced as *ae* in words as *mobile, hostile*.

Many of his findings are reinforced and further illustrated by Kanyoro (1991) and Schmied (1991).
Schmied (1991) observed that the pronunciation of English in Africa is of particular importance because non-standard pronunciation features seem to be the most persistent in African varieties, that is, they are retained even in the speech of the most educated speakers. This may be because in many languages, pronunciation seems to express subtle sociolinguistic messages of speaker identity and of the distance from; or solidarity with the listener. Schmied gives the features characterizing African pronunciation of English. For many Bantu speakers /r/ and /l/ are rendered as one and the same, often intermediate sound between /lori/ and /lori/ instead of /lori/, for instance. The sets voiced and voiceless fricatives around the alveolar ridge /ʃ, ʃ/ and /s/, and /ʒ, ʒ/ and /z/ are not distinguished clearly either. Lastly, the consonants /θ/ and /θ/ often deviate in the direction of /d/ and /t/ or, sometimes /z/ and /s/ or even /v/ and /f/.

Schmied (ibid) adds that a comparison of the English phoneme system with that of most African languages would show that whereas there are at least as many consonants in African language as in English (but in fewer consonants in combination), there are fewer vowel contrasts compared to those in the extensive English vowel system. The consequences of this contrast being: consonants may deviate at the sub-phonemic level, but the major distinctions at the phonemic level can usually be kept. Vowels deviate at the phonemic level; they merge because
the extreme range of the English vowel continuum is not covered by the underlying African systems of, for instance, the Bantu languages in East Africa.

Kanyoro (1991) observes that perhaps the most conspicuous element that identifies a Kenyan variety of English is the LI interference that makes Kenyan oral English unintelligible to non-Kenyans. He gives illustrations to show some aspects of Kenyan phonology:

1. Stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English stress</th>
<th>Kenyan stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'execute</td>
<td>exe’cute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pho’tography</td>
<td>photo’graphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'demonstrate</td>
<td>demon’strate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Vowels not found in Kenyan languages. For example:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>as in RP <em>bacon</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɜ:/</td>
<td>as in RP <em>bird, herd, turn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>as in RP <em>bad</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Vowels not distinguished for length in Kenya:

Front vowels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>as in RP <em>list, this, live</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and long</td>
<td>/iː/</td>
<td>as in RP <em>heat, least, these, leave</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Back vowels:
Short \(/\text{o}/\) as in RP *pot, stop*
and long \(/\text{i}/:\) as in RP *port*

4. Vowels not distinguished for quality:

\(/\text{æ}/\) \(/\text{ɑ}/:\) \(/\text{ʌ}/\)
back bark buck
cap carp cup
cat cart cut

Diphthongs:

\(/\text{ə} /\) /ou/ \(/\text{ɛ}/\) \(/\text{ɛ}/\)
not – note let – late
cot – coat bet – bait
got – goat get – gate

5. Consonants which present problems to particular mother tongue speakers:

a. Kalenjin speakers use the following interchangeably:

\(/\text{ʃ}/\) /ch \(\leftrightarrow\) \(/\text{k}/\) /ʃ/ /j/
\(/\text{b}/\) /b \(\leftrightarrow\) \(/\text{p}/\) /p/
\(/\text{k}/\) /k \(\leftrightarrow\) \(/\text{g}/\) /g/
cheer ↔ jeer
bakery ↔ pakery
cocacola ↔ gogakola
cake ↔ gake

b. Luo speakers do not have /ʃ/ (voiceless palato-alveolar fricative):
 /ʃ/ sh /s/ s
sugar sugar
shirt sat

c. Central Kenyan Bantus use the following sounds interchangeably: -
 /l/ I /r/ r
ʃ/ sh /ʃ/ ch
lorryrorry
rice lice
land rand

These languages also pre-nasalise the voiced stops /b/, /d/, /g/: -

Bad mband
Red rend
Goat ngoat

Hypercorrection within this group of languages usually results in nasal sounds being deleted before voiced stops:

Language laguage
2.3 Approaches to Second Language Learning Studies

2.3.1 Contrastive Analysis
Most second language acquisition researchers from the 1940s to the 1960s conducted contrastive analyses, systematically comparing two languages. The researchers were motivated by the prospect of being able to identify points of similarity and difference between particular native languages and target languages believing that a more effective pedagogy would result when these were taken into consideration. Fries (1945) stated that the most efficient materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner.

Contrastive analysis was founded on the belief that it was possible that by establishing the linguistic differences between the learner’s first language and the
second language, to predict what problems the learner of a particular second language would face. However, when predictions arising from contrastive analysis were finally subjected to empirical tests, serious flaws were revealed. Studies by Duskova (1969), Chamot (1978), Arabski (1979) indicate that contrastive analysis did not anticipate all the errors, that is, it under-predicted the errors. Furthermore, it over predicted, in the sense that some errors it did predict failed to materialize (Dulay and Burt 1974, 1975). Another flaw of the contrastive analysis approach as pointed out by Long and Sato (1984), was the assumption that one could depend solely upon an analysis of a 'linguistic product' to yield meaning for insight into second language learning.

Contrastive analysis is appropriate to our study to some extent as the study involves the comparison of the teachers inter language and the standard norm. It is used within the interlanguage theory in this study.

2.3.2 Error Analysis

To help analyse the errors in this study, Corder's Error analysis was employed. Error analysis refers to the method developed by Corder (1967), for a systematic description of second language learners' language performance data. The term error as used by Corder refers to imperfection or grammatically ill-formed units occurring systematically in the learners' language performance data. Corder (1971) distinguishes between systematic and unsystematic errors by referring to
the former as errors and to the latter as lapses or mistakes. The lapses or mistakes are as a result of faulty performance and presumably can be corrected if the speakers' attention is drawn to them. Error on the other hand, does result from the state of knowledge that is different in some respect from that of a native speaker.

Error analysis does not suffer from the inherent limitations of contrastive analysis; restriction to errors caused by interlingual transfer. Error analysis brings to light many other types of errors. According to Corder (1974), the methodology of error analysis consists of the steps mentioned in data analysis (Section 1.6.4).

However, error analysis has been criticized. Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1977), later Davies et al (1984), point out that error analysis just concentrates on the erroneous forms and has nothing to say on the correct forms. Furthermore, it is often difficult to identify the unitary source of an error. Nevertheless, Corder (1981) justifies the use of error analysis as a useful tool in identifying and describing the nature of errors before a systematic way of eradicating them can be found.

2.4 Describing and Categorizing Teachers' Errors

Norrish (1983) as quoted in Njoroge (1996) has observed that there are two main approaches of describing and categorizing errors. The first one is for the
researcher to set up his own categories of errors on the basis of pre-conceptions about the most common problems. The second is to classify identified errors into particular areas of grammatical, syntactical or lexical problem, that is, the errors determine the categories. The first method is referred to as **pre-selected category** and the second is referred to as **Let the Errors Determine the Categories**.

The present study adopted the second approach. This study has used the **Let the Errors Determine the Categories** within the steps of Error Analysis approach, which is the studies analytical tool. The approach as used in this study involved the process of sorting and resorting the identified lexical and phonological errors written on cards. The errors indicated on cards determined the categories. It is an approach used by other researchers (see Norrish, 1983; Maina, 1991 and Njoroge, 1996).

**2.5 Non – Native Varieties in English**

The native variety of English refers to some clearly established and codified forms of English, for example, British and American English. Those varieties spoken in former British and American colonies such as Ghana, Philippines and Kenya are referred to as non-native varieties. According to Nelson (1982) non-native variety include the institutionalized varieties established as second languages, as in Africa and India, where English has developed marked African
and Indian varieties in terms of its formal and functional characteristics. Platt et al (1984) calls this non-native variety New English. He has identified two types.

The first type of New English, such as is spoken in Kenya, India, Nigeria and the Philippines can be identified through five criteria as quoted in Nyamasyo (1992):

- It has developed through education by being taught as a subject as well as being used as the language of instruction
- It has developed in an entirely new ecological niche
- It is used for a range of functions in the community in which it is spoken
- It has become localized or ‘nativized’ by adopting certain linguistic features of the indigenous languages of the community
- The speakers are predominantly non-native.

The second type of new Englishes include the varieties spoken in United States of America, Australia, New Zealand, Canada which developed because of the mixing of people from various parts of Britain in new settlement and colonies leading to a mixture of accents and dialects. This has been supplemented by fresh immigration to those areas, which has in turn fostered the development of the new English variety differentiating it further from its original native form.
Bamgbose (1982) observes that in language contact situation, particularly a close one where an exoglossic language becomes a second language with an official role in a country, the second language is bound to be influenced by its linguistic and cultural environment.

Brosnahan, as quoted in Bamgbose et al (1995) observes that the teaching of English in African schools is almost entirely in the hands of African teachers and contact between the teachers and pupils on the other hand and native speakers on the other is very little. The great majority of teachers have learnt English from other African teachers. The present study is on pre-school teachers who have learnt the English language in a non-native environment and have been taught by non-native speakers.

2.6 Description of English Consonants

Gimson (1962) notes that all English sounds are made with egressive air, that is, the air is pushed out of the lungs. There are twenty-four consonantal sounds in the English language. The description of the consonant sounds is made based on three parameters, namely the place of articulation, the manner of articulation and whether a sound is voiced or voiceless. The place of articulation refers to the point at which the air being pushed out of the lungs is obstructed by the speech organs; for instance, obstruction can occur at the lips or at the alveolar ridge. The
chief points of articulation with special reference to the sounds of English are the bilabials, labio-dental, dental, alveolar ridge, soft and hard palate.

The manner of articulation refers to the nature of obstruction made by the articulating organs, whether it is total, intermittent, partial or merely constitute a narrowing sufficient to cause friction. Grimson lists the chief types of articulation as plosive, affricates and approximates. Lastly, voicing refers to whether the vocal cords vibrate or not. If they vibrate, then the sound articulated is voiced whereas if they do not then the sound articulated is voiceless.

2.7 Theoretical Framework

The analysis and description of teachers’ error in this study was based on the theoretical construct of ‘interlanguage’. Error analysis, the concern of this study has been rightly placed within the ‘interlanguage’ theory by second language researchers such as McLaughlin (1987) and Ellis (2000).

2.7.1 Interlanguage Theory

The term ‘Interlanguage’ was coined by Selinker (1972) to refer to the intermediate stages between the native language and target language observable in learners’ language. Other terms that have been used to refer to the same are ‘approximative system’ (Nemser 1971) ‘transitional competence’ and ‘idiosyncratic dialects’ (Corder 1967).
Interlanguage refers to the separate linguistic system which results from a learners attempted production of target language. Although the term was initially used to refer to a learner phenomenon, later developments have extended its use to language use. Richards (1979) has used the concept of interlanguage to explain the generation of different dialects of English or English based languages; a phenomenon associated with countries where English is not spoken natively but is widely used as a medium of instruction and medium of official and informal communication. Richard adds that in such settings, the concept of interlanguage can be used to describe the process by which local varieties of English have emerged in many varieties of the world. Gass and Selinker (1994) also broadened the term to the language produced by non-native speakers of a language. We find the model appropriate to this study because of one of its principles, that is, fossilization.

Fossilization refers to the mechanisms assumed to exist in the latent psychological structure of a second language user. Selinker says that this psychological mechanism, fossilization, underlies the production of fossilized items. Fossilized items refer to rules and subsystems, which speakers of a particular native language tend to keep in the interlanguage relative to a particular target language no matter what the age of the learner or amount of explanation and instruction he receives. The fossilizable structures tend to remain as potential
performance, re-emerging in the productive performance of an interlanguage even when seemingly eradicated. Ellis (2000) says the term has been used commonly to refer to the process which non-target forms become fixed in the interlanguage of second language learners and users. In practice also, fossilization has been used to refer to persistent errors’ (Mukkatesh 1986; Major 1988).

A number of studies give support to the prevalence of fossilization. Mukkatesh (1986) for instance identified a number of persistent errors in the written production of 80 students at a Jordanian University who had an average of eleven years instruction in English.

In addition, Selinker (1972) asserts that only 5% of second language speakers achieve a native-like control of the target language and that some of the structures in the English of second language users will be fossilized. This study focuses on the pre-school teachers’ spoken language on the assumption that such teachers having acquired or learnt English as a second language thus as second language users, have some forms that have become fossilized and will be realized as lexical and phonological errors when they interact with 5 to 6 year olds in learning situations.
CHAPTER THREE: DATA ANALYSIS

3.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with data analysis: the identification, classification and description of lexical and phonological errors. As noted earlier, errors were determined on the basis of the teachers’ deviation from the target language, English as described for example, in Quirk et al (1985) for all lexical errors; Roach (1987) and Gimson (1962) for the phonological errors and a comprehensive dictionary of English grammar for both lexical and phonological and lexical errors. For Classification, we used the ‘Let the Error Determine the Categories Approach’ (Norrish 1983). The identified lexical errors related to the following categories: inappropriate use of lexical items, inappropriate use of multi-word items and lexical errors due to omission. The identified phonological errors related to the categories on the specific consonant on which errors occurred.

3.1 Tabulations and Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate use of lexical items</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate use of multi-word items</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical errors due to omission</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 shows the frequency of lexical errors in specific categories. There were 129 lexical errors. The errors were most frequent in the use of inappropriate lexical items with a 70.5%, which is consistent with Nyamasyo (1992) findings that inappropriate use of lexical items has the highest frequency among the lexical categories.

From the above findings this can be explained from the point of view of the simplicity of teachers’ language. The teachers’ language data had many simple lexical forms, which were used repeatedly in giving examples and in songs in different contexts, which were rendering them inappropriate.

Table 2: Frequency of errors in the inappropriate use of lexical items category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy errors</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malapropism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of wrong preposition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of wrong wh – item</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of wrong auxiliary verb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the frequency of errors in the category of inappropriate use of lexical items. The most frequent were synonym errors with 68.1% and the least frequent were use of wrong auxiliary item with 2.2%. This can be attributed to
the teacher’s inability to distinguish between words with same meanings that is, synonyms and malapropism.

**TABLE 3: FREQUENCY OF ERRORS IN THE INAPPROPRIATE USE OF MULTI-WORD ITEMS CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substitution of one word for a multi-word item</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of an ill-formed multi-word item</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution of a multi-word item from a single-word</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the frequency of errors in the category of inappropriate use of multi-word items. The errors were most frequent in the substitution of one word for a multi-word item with 45.8% and least in the substitution of a multi-word item for a single word with 16.7%. It can be concluded that errors of substitution of one word for a multi-word item were most frequent. This could be due to the fact that the teachers have not yet mastered the multi-word items fully. As such they do not use them frequently thus finding it easier to use single lexical items.
Table 4 shows the frequency of phonological errors. There were 176 errors. The errors were most frequent in the pronunciation of /r/ instead of /l/ with 35.8% and least in pronunciation of /s/ instead of /ʃ/ with 0.6%.
Table 5 shows the frequency of occurrence of each phonological error in a particular word position. It shows how the 176 phonological errors are distributed in the positions: initials medial and final. For instance, out of the errors identified in the category /l/ for /r/ which form 14.8% of the total errors identified, 50% were in the word initial position and the other 50% in the word medial position and none in the word final position.
3.2 Lexical Errors

3.2.1 Introduction

This section discusses lexical errors giving examples from the data. The section starts by giving a definition of lexical item and lexical error. To start with is a definition of lexical item and lexical error.

According to Katamba (1993:332) a lexical item is a content word listed in the dictionary which has an identifiable meaning and is capable of occurring independently, for instance, sky, scream, under. In this study lexical errors will be looked at as the teacher’s inability to use an appropriate lexical item from the vocabulary of English in a given context. The lexical errors noted in this study have been listed in three categories namely inappropriate use of lexical items, inappropriate use of multi-word items and lexical errors due to omission of a necessary lexical item.

3.2.2 Inappropriate Use of Lexical Items

The majority of the lexical errors recorded in the data fell under the category of inappropriate use of lexical items (see Table 1). These were further subcategorized into synonym errors, use of wrong preposition, use of wrong wh-item, use of wrong auxiliary item and malapropism (Table 2).
3.2.2.1 Synonym Errors

The main area of difficulty was in synonym errors. Quirk et al (1985) defines a synonym as a word with same meaning with another. He adds that the sameness of meaning or the equivalence relations between words holds between word senses and not between words, for instance, the word hard is a synonym of difficult in one sense. They are synonymous in the sense of requiring effort in doing something, but they are not synonymous in another sense; the sense in which the word hard contrasts with word soft the word hard and difficult are not synonyms. Synonym errors are errors arising as a result of the lexical form considered erroneous being similar in meaning to the target form in one sense but it is erroneous in the context in which it is used. For instance, the words hard and difficult can be used synonymously in the following ‘he finds it hard/difficult to stop smoking’. Soft which is a synonym of hard cannot be used in the above example synonymously with hard; it would be erroneous because the sense in which hard is synonymously used with difficult is not the same sense in which hard and soft are synonymous. The following are examples observed in the data:

1 (a) You don’t have a book and you are seated there

You don’t know how to use your book

Why are you jumping this space?

Arrange your work nicely. Okay!
(Jumping instead of skipping)

**Jump** is erroneous. **Jump** and **skip** are synonyms in the sense of moving off the ground but specifically **jumping** does not refer to destination, that is, where one will land after jumping; it just refers to the act of moving up. **Skipping** has the idea of moving, then going over something so as to land on the other side. The teacher was asking the pupil why he/she was **omitting** some pages while writing, that is, not writing on one page but moving over to the other.

b) You are writing down the consonants. I am going to give you your books. At the back, here, you are going to write the six consonants we have learnt so far. Write as you read. Okay! Steve divide the **materials**. Pencils, books. When you get your book and pencil write!

*(materials instead of stationery).*

In example (1b) above the synonym error is in the use of **materials** instead of **stationery**. **Materials** is erroneous as it is used as a hyponym of pencils and books, which is **stationery**.

c) **fries are frying** ‘f’ ‘f’ ‘f’ (song)

**fries** are frying ‘f’ ‘f’ ‘f’ (song)

skip to my **loom** my darling (song)

now I am going to give you plasticine you **make** for me letter ‘f’.

I say letter ‘f’ only

We are making ....(song)
(make instead of model)

Make is erroneously used, model is the correct form; both can be synonyms in the sense of creating something, but in this context, they are not synonyms because the word plasticine collocates with model. The word model means creating something using soft substances like plasticine and clay; make does not specify the nature of the materials used.

3.2.2.2 Malapropisms

The second sub-category of errors in the inappropriate use of lexical errors is that of malapropisms. These had the second highest frequency (Table 2). Malapropisms refer to errors occurring because the lexical form used resembles the target form to some degree in one or more sense, but they differ in terms of meaning. For instance, the boys will exhort the girls. (Exhort instead of escort).

The following are examples of errors observed in the study data:

2 (a) Listen! Hold your arms and listen
don’t remove any book first
Who is talking? Okay. Hold your arms don’t talk
last time what did we do in science?

(hold instead of fold)
b) Put your hands together we pray

Those without runch they are going home

Muhammad are you listening?

You go home for lunch and you come in the afternoon *Uambie mama yako* you have to come for remedial work at *eight*. Go!

 *(Eight instead of two)*

c) When you hear your name, come for your meal card then line up here.

Keep quiet. I am saying you line up here behind Joyce with your meal cards so that we can go for lunch at the *canteen*. You will walk quietly.

 *(Canteen instead of cafeteria)*

### 3.2.2.3 Use of Wrong Prepositions

Errors were also observed in the category of use of wrong preposition. Quirk and Greenbaum (1973:143) say that a preposition expresses a relation between two entities, usually a noun or a pronoun and the other words following. The construction following the preposition is called a prepositional complement. A preposition may express such meanings as:

a) Possession - The roof of a house

b) Direction - Went to the river

c) Time - He will come before 2 o’clock
d) Place it is at the back

A change in preposition can mean a change in the meaning of the whole construction. In the above examples the change of the preposition of for to will change the meaning from possession to direction. The following are the examples of errors drawn from the study data.

3. (a) Let's sing for number nine.

Number nine, number nine where are you x2 (song)

Here I am, here I am and how do you do.

(For instead of on)

(b) Okay! Turn to the front

Who was walking under the water?

Nani alitembea juu ya maji?

(Under instead of on)

(c) We are going to learn news.

You tell us what you did on Sunday

You helped your mother, visited your friends

How many went to Sunday school service?

Let's start!

(To instead of for)
3.2.2.4 **Use Of Wrong Wh Item**

There were also errors in the use of a wrong wh-item item as seen in the following examples:

4. (a) Everybody, now we are nodding

   Nod five times. Do you know **what** to nod?

   Then nod.

   *(What instead of how)*

   The correct form is **how**. The teacher is asking the pupils about the act of nodding – the manner or the way of doing it, thus, **how** is the correct item to use as **what** is used when asking about places or people.

4. (b) **What** colour is this?

   *(What instead of which)*

   The correct form is **which**. **Which** is used to ask questions to specify one or more people or things, just like in the example above where the teacher is asking about a specific colour.

3.2.2.5 **Use of Wrong Auxiliary Verb**

In English language, verbs are broadly categorized in to: lexical verbs, modal auxiliary and primary verbs (Quirk et al 1985). Lexical verbs are also called main verbs; they are verbs such as **eat, leave, go** which can occur as the only verb
element in a sentence. Modal auxiliary verbs are also called helping verbs as they help the main verbs realize certain functions. The modal auxiliaries mark modality, showing meanings such as probability, obligation or volition. Examples of modal auxiliaries are **can, may, might** and **could**. Primary verbs are so called because they can function as both lexical verbs and auxiliaries. There are three primary verbs, namely **be, have** and **do**.

The following example shows error in the use of wrong auxiliary verb.

5. (a) How **can** you draw number four?

Let's draw it in the air. Okay!

A stick. A stick and a stick.

**(can instead of do)**

**Do** is the correct item.

In the above example, **can** is erroneously used because in this context. **Can** as a modal marks possibility, ability and permission as in the following examples:

(b) Possibility: Expert drivers **can** make mistakes.

(c) Ability: **Can** you remember where they live?

(d) Permission: **Can** we borrow these books?

The teacher is not asking about ability, possibility or permission. In this context the teacher is asking about manner. **Do** is the correct verb because as Quirk (ibid) puts it: **do** as an auxiliary is empty, it has no meaning and where there is no other semantic reason for any other auxiliary to be used.
3.2.3 Inappropriate Use of Multi-Word Items

Moon (1997) defines multi-word items as vocabulary items which consists of a sequence of two or more words which semantically and, or syntactically form a meaningful and inseparable units. For instance, kick the bucket meaning to die. In this expression, though there are three lexical items (kick, the and bucket) the meaning is one and can only be got by looking at the three lexical items together as a whole unit.

Moon, adds that a multi-word item is a super ordinate term encompassing such types as phrasal verbs which are combinations of verbs and adverbial or prepositional particles, and idioms. In this study, the term is used to refer to both phrasal verbs and idioms interchangeably.

The errors observed are as follows:

6. (a) Listen for your names and come for a pencil and rubber.

(Listen instead of listen out)

(b) Who can read the names written on the blackboard?

(Read instead of read out)

(c) Stand, everybody. Lets sing. This is father ....

(Stand instead of stand up)
The errors show cases where teachers were using one word instead of a multi-word expression. In some examples of deviant forms in this category, teachers have coined new forms perhaps due to their lack of mastery of multi-word items.

7 (a) Why are you **opening your mouth**, you are not writing with your mouth.

The ill-formed expression **opening your mouth** has been used idiomatically to refer to making noise.

(b) I said you **shut your mouth**. I don’t want any of you talking.

The ill formed item **shut your mouth** has been used figuratively.

Lastly, there were errors relating to the use of a multi-word item instead of single word, which would have been more appropriate in the context. This could have been as a result of the teachers not being conversant with the appropriate lexical item to use as in

8 (a) The boat **turned over**

(turned over instead of **capsized** or **overturned**)

(b) **Fold up** your arms and sit up

(Fold up instead of **fold**)


3.2.4 Omission of Lexical Items

This section discusses lexical errors due to omission. This study considers all omitted lexical items without giving grammatical labels like the studies of Maina (1991) and Njoroge (1996), which were not considering lexical errors. The following examples from the data illustrate the omission of crucial lexical items.

(a) Its time for lunch go for lunch and come — in the afternoon.
Everybody must come back. Mnasikia. You have to come for remedial work.

The lexical item back has been omitted.

(b) I can jump four times. I can nod four times
I can clap — number four and I can sing on number four, Lets jump.

The lexical item for has been omitted.

(c) Keep away all the science books. I said it is time for? Okay!

Today we

will learn about — nine. We start by singing for number nine.

The lexical item number has been omitted.

3.3 Phonological Errors

The teachers' data was also analysed to determine phonological errors. As noted earlier in the study, the phonological errors are limited to the teachers' errors in
the pronunciation of English consonants. The major area of difficulty was in the
wrong pronunciation of: the post-alveolar approximant sound, /r/; the alveolar
lateral sound, /l/ and the omission of the same alveolar sound /l/. Though the
teachers were picked randomly, there is evidence in the study that the teachers
had difficulties in making a distinction between the two sounds, the post-alveolar
approximant and the alveolar lateral sound, (see Table 4). A brief discussion of
these two sounds will be presented first followed by the errors observed from the
teachers data in the pronunciation of the two sounds /r/ and /l/, then lastly, a
presentation of errors in the pronunciation of other consonants.

3.3.1 The Alveolar Lateral Sound /l/

/l/ is a voiced alveolar lateral consonant. Roach (1983) says that a lateral
consonant is one in which the passage of air in the mouth does not go in the usual
way along the centre of the tongue. Instead, there is complete closure between the
centre of the tongue and the point of the roof of the mouth where contact is to be
made which is the alveolar ridge. Gimson (1962) notes that the English lateral
sound is usually voiced and frictionless falling in the same category as /r/. Both
sounds are vowel like. /l/ is found initially, medially and finally in English words.
This sound has two allophones, which are in complementary distribution. These
are the clear [l] and the dark [ɻ]. The clear [l] has a relatively front vowel
resonance before vowels and the palatal unrounded semi-vowel /ɻ/ as in the
English y in you and year. [l] occurs before vowels and /ɻ/ but not before
consonants or before a pause. The dark [\textipa{\rl}] has a relatively back vowel resonance. It occurs before a consonant, after a vowel and as a syllabic sound following a consonant. Examples:

10 Clear /l/
   (a) Word initial-leave /\textipa{li:v}/; let /\textipa{let}/; lock /\textipa{\l\l\k}/
   (b) Word initial clusters – blow /\textipa{bl\l\u}/; glow /\textipa{gl\l\u}/; splice /\textipa{sp\l\l\i\l}/
   (c) Word medial – silly /\textipa{s\l\l}/; yellow /\textipa{j\l\l\l}/; alloy /\textipa{\l\l\l\l}/

Dark [\textipa{l}] 
   (d) Word final vowel – feel /\textipa{fi:\l}/; fill /\textipa{fi:\l\l}/; doll /\textipa{d\l\l\l}/
   (e) After vowel before consonant – help /\textipa{\l\l\l\l\l}/; cold /\textipa{k\l\l\l\d}/; milk /\textipa{m\l\k}/
   (f) Syllabic – quarrel /\textipa{k\w\l\l\l\l\l\l}/; final /\textipa{f\l\l\l\l\l}/

3.3.2 The Post-Alveolar Approximant Sound /r/ 

/r/ is a voiced post-alveolar approximant. An approximant is an articulation in which the articulators approach each other but do not get sufficiently close to each other to produce a ‘complete’ consonant. Roach (1983) says that during the articulation of /r/, the tip of the tongue approaches the alveolar area in approximately the same way the tongue would approach for the articulation of alveolar stops /t/ and /d/; but it never actually makes contact with any part of the roof of the mouth. In RP, /r/ occurs only before vowels as in words such as rest /\textipa{rest}/ and reap /\textipa{ri:p}/. /r/ does not occur after vowels as in words such as dear /\textipa{\d}/ and more /\textipa{m}/.
3.3.3 Errors In The Pronunciation of /l/

This section gives examples of all the errors associated with /l/ observed in the data. These errors include /r/ being used for /l/, /o/ for /l/, /l/ for /r/, omission of /l/ and insertion of /o/. This formed a large portion of the errors in the teacher data, that is, 81.8%, (See Table 4). The specific examples are as follows. First, the examples showing /l/ pronounced as /r/ in word initial position in the following words learning, letter and look.

11. (a) We are rearning about number nine today /raənɪŋ/ instead of /lrənɪŋ/
(b) Retter 'b' retter 'b' where are you? / rɛtə / instead of / lɛtə / 
(c) Rook at my mouth, what do you see? / rʊk / instead of / lʊk / 

There were also errors in the pronunciation of /l/ as /r/ in word medial position in the words colour, quickly and smallest in the examples.

12. (a) Have coroured your work? / kərə / instead of /kwə/ 
(b) Finish that work quickry / kwiːkri / instead of /kwɪkli/ 
(c) This is the baby, the smarrest of all / smɔːrɛst / instead of /sməlest/
The words rubbing, write and redo are some of the words that were pronounced erroneously in the data as seen in the examples below showing /l/ used instead of /r/ in word initial position:

13. (a) The teacher is rubbing the blackboard. What am I doing

/ləbəŋ/ instead of /rəbəŋ/

(b) Can you do as I do write, write. I am writing ...

/lət/ and /lətɪŋ/ instead of /rət/ and /rətɪŋ/ respectively.

(c) Ledo that work. I want to see a nice picture

/liːdə:/ instead of /riːdə:/

The following examples show the words with the erroneous pronunciation of /r/ as /l/ in the words zero, very and hurry.

14. (a) Zelo like an egg. One like a tree ...

/zələ/ instead of /zərələ/

(b) Keep it up. Keep it up. A vely good girl

/veh/ instead of /ven/

(c) Hully hully has no blessings

/hələ/ instead of /hərɪlə/
There were other instances where the teachers substituted /l/ for /o/. These errors were mostly in the word final position, none in the medial position and none in the initial position. The examples are:

In word medial, the word milk was pronounced erroneously.

15. Jane has told us that their cow gives them miok. Who else will tell us what we get from cows.

/miok/ instead of /milk/

In word final, the words pencil, middle and table in the following examples have been pronounced erroneously.

16. (a) When I call you, come for your book and a penso.

/penso/ instead of /pensl/

(b) Dance in the mido and then I run away, dancing dancing ...

/midɔ/ instead of /midl/

(c) Leave the plasticine on the tebo.

/tebo/ instead of /tetbl/

There were other instances where the teachers inserted /o/, that is, they had /o/ + /l/ instead of /l/. All the errors in this category occurred in word final position as illustrated by the following examples from the teachers' data. The words model, all and tell.

17. (a) Look at me, can you do as I do. Modlo modlo.

/modlo/instead of /mɔdɔ/

(b) How many pictures are coloured? Alto of them?
Who has told you to draw the tree. Did I tell you to draw?

Lastly, there are errors involving the omission of /l/ as seen in the words called, balls, small and call in the following examples:

18. (a) She is called /kəd/ teacher Cecilia.

Instead of /klld/

(b) Balls /bozl/ are bouncing.

Instead of /belz/

(c) Cut a small /sməl/ piece then fold instead of /sm 1/

3.3.4 Errors Involving the Omission and Insertion of the Alveolar Nasal Consonant Sound /n/

The sound /n/ is a nasal consonant. According to Roach (1983), a nasal consonant is one that during articulation the air escapes through the nose. In the articulation of the other consonants, the soft palate is raised thus the air cannot pass through the nose, but in articulation of nasals the soft palate is lowered. In nasal consonants, however, the air does not pass through the mouth it is prevented by complete closure in the mouth at some point.

In the articulation of /n/, the closure is at the alveolar ridge. The tongue blade moves up against the alveolar ridge causing the closure. /n/ occurs initially, medially and finally in RP.
Examples of /n/ in words:

19. (a) Word initial - neat/nI:t:/; net/net/; none/non/
    (b) Word medial - dinner/d n /; many/men /; monitor/mo:nu:
    (c) Word final - mean/mi:n/; pen/pen/; soon/su:n/

The following are the examples observed in the data showing errors in the omission and insertion of /n/.

The examples showing the insertion of /n/ are:

20. (a) **N**draw a tree and colour it.
    
    /ndro/ instead of /drɔ:/
    
    (b) You are a **b**and boy, why are you making noise.
    
    /bænd/ instead of /bæd/

The errors showing the omission of /n/ are illustrated in the examples below:

21. (a) I am coming **r**oud to see your work.
    
    /raʊd/ instead of /raʊd/ 
    
    (b) Put your **h**ad up.
    
    /had/ instead of /hæd/ 
    
    (c) All the boys, **s**tad up 
    
    /stad/ instead of /ståd/

From the examples above the omission of /n/ occurred before the voiced stop /d/.

This can be said to be as a result of hypercorrection, having had some cases of /n/ inserted before the voiced stop /d/.
3.3.5 Errors Involving the Insertion of Bilabial Nasal Consonant Sound /m/

The bilabial nasal sound /m/ is a nasal consonant just like /n/. In the articulation of /m/, the closure is at the lips thus called a bilabial nasal. Gimson (1962) gives the following examples showing /m/ in words.

22. (a) Word initial – meal/miːl/; mat/meɪt/; move/muːv/

   Word medial – lemon/lem ən/; demon/diːmɔn/; among/əm ʌŋ/;

   Word final – seem/siːm/; lamb/læm/; harm/hɑːm/;

The errors from the data show /m/ inserted just before the bilabial stop /b/, it is called pre nasalising.

23. (a) Wait for the mbell to ring.

   /mbel/ instead of /bel/

(b) White for milk, mblue for the sky.

   /mblu/ instead of /blu:/

3.3.6 Errors Involving Use of Alveolar Stop /t/ Instead of /d/

/t/ and /d/ are called alveolar stops. During their articulation, one articulator, the tongue moves against another articulator, the alveolar ridge so as to form a stricture that allows no air to escape from the vocal tract. Then the air is released and allowed to escape. /t/ is voiceless while /d/ is voiced. The errors observed
were as a result of voice:/t/ was used instead /d/. The errors observed in the data are illustrated below:

24  (a) Green for leaves and red for **bloot**.  
/blaːt/ instead of blood /braːd/

(b) Sit up and look at the **boart**.  
/bɔːt/ instead of board /bɔːd/

(c) Draw and colour the **roat**.  
/roʊt/ instead of road /roʊd/

3.3.7 Errors Involving Use of Labiodental Fricative /f/ Instead of /v/

/f/ and /v/ are labiodental fricatives. In the articulation of a fricative consonant, the two articulators approximate to such an extent that the air stream passes between them with a friction. The articulators in /f/ and /v/ are the lower lip and the upper teeth. /f/ is voiceless while /v/ is voiced.

The use of /f/ erroneously was in one word, vowels which was used repeatedly in:

25. ‘a’ ‘e’ ‘o’ are called **fowels**. Write down the three **fowels**.
/feɪlz/ instead of /vauaɪlz/.

3.3.8 Errors in the Use of /ʃ/ Instead of /tʃ/

/ʃ/ is a voiceless palato-alveolar fricative. It is a fricative just like the fricatives /f/ and /v/ discussed above. Roach (ibid) describes the articulation of palato-alveolar
as partly palatal and partly alveolar. \( \text{ʃ} \) is a voiceless palato-alveolar affricate. An affricate is a sound in which in its articulation there is complete closure at some point in the oral cavity, behind which the air pressure builds up just like in the articulation of stops /t/ and /d/, but the separation of the organs is slow compared to that of a stop so that there is friction just like in fricatives /f/ and /v/. The erroneous forms from the data are:

26. (a) Give the new pupil a **shair**.

/ʃeə/ instead of /ʃeə/

(b) Some of us have **rish** parents.

/rɪʃ/ instead of /rɪʃ/
CHAPTER FOUR: CAUSES OF ERRORS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with two main issues. Firstly, we discuss causes of the errors observed in our study data. Secondly, we suggest recommendations that might help view the teachers' errors from a different perspective because as language users who are well past the critical age, it is hard to reduce the errors in their language. The study also gives recommendations that might help avoid some of the identified errors in the language of the pre-school teacher trainees who are still learning the language.

4.1 Causes of Errors

Second language researchers have come up with several possible explanations as to why errors occur. However, such causes are based on language learners who have not attained full command of the language. Our study was based on preschool teachers who are trained; thus they are now language users and no longer language learners. It is difficult to determine with any certainty that a certain error is related to a particular cause. This study argues that the major cause of the errors in the teachers' language is fossilization.
Selinker (1972) defines fossilization as a term that refers to a psychological mechanism, which underlies the production of fossilized items. Ellis (2000) adds that fossilization is a term used to refer to the process by which non-target forms become fixed in interlanguage. Selinker and Lamendella (1978) as quoted in Ellis (2000) conclude that although a number of possible causes of fossilization have been identified, there is probably no single cause; both internal and external factors play a role.

The fossilized items in the teachers' interlanguage have manifested themselves as the lexical and phonological errors observed in our study. Two possible causes can be inferred from the errors observed for the fossilized items. These are first language influence and the effect of the sociolinguistic situation in Kenya.

4.1.1 First Language Influence

Although the study did not consider ethnic background or first language spoken by pre-school teachers, it aimed at getting teachers from a heterogeneous linguistic background, the effect of First language influence cannot be ignored. Corder's (1974) observation suggests that many errors bear a strong resemblance to the characteristics of the L1 and he notes that indeed many erroneous sentences read like word-for-word transliteration from L1 to L2. This observation has led to the widely accepted theory of transfer, which states that a learner of a second
language transfers into his performance in the L2 the habits of the L1. Corder (Ibid) puts it that a learner’s starting hypothesis is “L2 is like L1 until I have reason to think otherwise.” This approach involves making errors and having others correct them. Thus interference is regarded as a mechanical transference of habits from the source language to the TL and that second language learning is a process, which involves the replacement of the old habits by the new habit. The forms of the first language are, therefore, of crucial importance because they form the basis for the learner’s initial L2 grammar.

It would be hard to ascertain reasons for L1 influence on language users like the teachers studied. A possible reason could be that the teachers as they were learning the English language they had past the critical age. Scovel (1988) as quoted in Ellis (2000) says after this age the brain has loses plasticity, with the result that certain linguistic features cannot be mastered. This is possible as English is a second language for many speakers. Angogo and Hancock (1982) observe that English in East Africa functions for the great majority of its speakers as a second language and the influence of their native language must be considered in a description of their distinctive varieties of English. Schmied (1991) says that the influence of L1 has been seen as a basic cause of African variation in English, because it obviously influences the pronunciation distinctly. The errors observed in our data especially phonological errors could be explained from this perspective.
26. (a) /l/ instead of /r/: Elik /elik/ instead of Eric /erik/
(b) /r/-instead of /l/: Rike /raik/ instead of like /laik/
(c) Omission of /n/: Hadbag /hadbag/ instead of handbag/hædbæg/

The cause of the above errors can be attributed to L1 influence. The use of /l/ and /r/ interchangeably being as a result of a L1 that does not differentiate between them or has only one sound for either e.g. Bantu language like Kikuyu or Kiembu.

4.1.2 Effect of The Sociolinguistic Situation in Kenya

Schmied (1991) observes that the position of English as a language in a country is determined by its official status, as laid down in the constitution or in other regulations. This affects the knowledge and use of English language within the state. He adds that English in Africa exists along with the African languages. English tends to be used more in formal domains and African languages in informal domains. In oral communication the role of English is sometimes very limited. In the family, for instance, non-native speakers rarely use English, except perhaps when educated, urban parents want to help their children to acquire English at home or when ethnically mixed couples have no African lingua franca, a common ground. Schmied (ibid) adds that family life in Africa is the domain of the mother tongue; the reasons are: one, language choice in the family is usually more persistent but also because it is difficult to express the traditional African deferential relationship towards the old member in English.
Kioko and Muthwii (2001) observe that in Kenya, the language norms are closely related to the social meanings that English, Kiswahili and the ethnic languages have acquired over time. They add that each of these languages has certain speech domains associated with them. Kiswahili is the national language, the ethnic languages have no official role in public domains and English is designated the official language that is supposed to be used in education, administration, the media and in many other formal and informal settings. English is mainly learned in formal educational settings. Kioko and Muthwii (ibid) observe that English being an important language for participation in public domain, almost all Kenyans with some education have acquired English, albeit with certain variations. Some of the variations they give are: varieties of English spoken that are ethnically marked, non-ethnically marked, native English and a mixture of English that is both ethnically and non-ethnically marked.

The pre-school teachers studied could be said to speak a variety that is ethnically marked. This is a variety of English spoken that shows traces of a speaker’s first language, and from the speech of such speakers, listeners can guess the ethnic group of the speaker. Mutahi (1988) illustrates how the sociolinguistic situation in Kenya leads to some speakers of English having fossilized items.

Mutahi (ibid) observes that during language learning when there is frequent and intensive contact between the learner and the native speakers, learning becomes
fast and the variety acquired is of good quality communicatively, but when learning takes place through an unguided process or alienated situations (like the learning of English in Kenya), the quality of the varieties acquired is inferior and L1 influence is more evident. He adds that in most cases primary school teachers of English come from the same linguistic group as their pupils. The teachers are speakers of varieties of English that are influenced by their L1. These teachers are the models to these learners; therefore, the learners inherit the same varieties that their teachers speak. There is no contact at all with native speaker models.

The pre-school teachers can be said to have gone through such a sociolinguistic situation in their learning of the English language. They acquired their language from their teachers. Since English is a taught language in Kenya (Kioko and Muthwii ibid) the teachers’ use and learning of the language was limited to the formal setting outside of which they would switch to Kiswahili or their ethnic languages. Sometimes even during lessons, some teachers resorted to code switching, (see Appendix).

4.2 Proposed Strategies to Reduce Errors

As noted earlier in this study, most of the research done in Second Language Learning and Acquisition focus on the learners of second languages, and not second language users like the pre-school teachers studied in this research. Corder (1967:25) states that a learner’s errors provide evidence of the system of the
language that he has learned at a particular point. In our study, the errors indicate the system of the language that the teachers, now second language users have acquired and are providing for acquisition. To proponents of contrastive analysis, error is viewed as a symptom of ineffective teaching or as evidence of failure, therefore, ‘error’ had to be remedied by the use of intensive drilling or over-teaching. There isn’t much literature on dealing with teachers’ errors, or errors observed in the language of Second Language Users. However, based on some literature from studies done on the language situation in Kenya, we may suggest the following strategies that can be used to reduce the errors observed in this study, based on what could be said to be causes of the errors discussed in the previous section.

4.2.1 Frequent Examination of The Pre-School Teacher Trainee’s Interlanguage

The trainee’s interlanguage should be examined frequently by their trainers in order to identify any errors. This will help in employing the pedagogical strategies of reducing errors, as they will be still learning the language. This examination can be extended to the written language of the trainees, which will also show how far they are on the interlanguage continuum. This examination which will also inform teachers that even as language users, language learning is a continuous process as they are on the interlanguage continuum between the L1 and TL.
Mutahi (1988) suggests that there be changes in the training of teachers so that they can learn a variety of English nearest to the native speaker norm as a way of eliminating the effects of L1 influence. The pre-school teacher trainers can focus on the errors identified in this study so that in the training of pre-school teachers the areas of difficulty can be addressed. This will help in breaking the cycle of negative transfer from the teachers to the pupils. Early intervention is required as the pre-school teachers are the ones making contact with children at the critical age of 6 to 10 years of language learning.

4.2.2 Increase the Years of Training

The two years of in-service training are not enough. In the two years the teachers are trained in all aspects of Early Childhood Education with particular emphasis on teaching and care taking. The minimal academic qualification for training as a pre-school teacher as noted earlier range from 15 points in CPE to D in KCSE. Nyamasyo (1992), in her study on the O-level showed they have errors, the particular areas of difficult she noted are not addressed in this two years of training. In addition, Schmied (1991) underscores the importance of education; that there is a clear correlation between English competence and length of schooling in most Anglophone African countries. He adds that the longer a person stays in the educational system, the higher his standard of English will be.
4.2.3 In-Service Courses for the Teachers

Regular in-service courses are needed for the teachers so that they can fully master the target language rules. The in-service course will also help the teachers in their efforts to overcome certain negative transfers from their respective mother tongues. Agalo (1986) as quoted by Njoroge (1996) suggests that more courses should be provided for English teachers already in the field to give training in modern methods.

4.2.4 Change of the Target Language

Zuengler (1982) reports that the British Standard Variety is the model used in the educational system in Kenya. He further adds that English in Kenya has been a ‘taught’ language conveyed through formal education. The teachers are the ones charged with the responsibility of imparting the knowledge of the language to learners. However, other non-native speakers of English in a second language environment have locally trained the teachers. The materials used for teaching are locally made and locally based; therefore, there is minimal input from native speaker models. In this study, we can argue that the variety used by teachers is different from British Standard Variety; thus changing the target language from British Standard Variety to a regional standard will set achievable objectives. Okombo (1986) says that having a regional standard will give the teachers a source of authority that they can easily identify with and would set for the teacher proficiency goals that he can actually master. Kioko and Muthwii (2001) observe
that majority of people prefer teachers who use Non-ethnically marked variety. This can be called the Kenyan Variety, one that does not have traces of an L1 and it is not Native English Variety either.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study sought to examine the lexical and phonological errors in the spoken English of pre-school teachers in Kasarani Division. The data was collected by tape recording the teachers while teaching, then Error Analysis approach was used to analyse the data.

5.0 Summary of Findings

The study set to fulfill the following objectives:

- To identify and classify the lexical errors in the spoken English of pre-school teachers in Kasarani Division.
- To identify and classify the phonological errors in the spoken English of pre-school teachers in Kasarani Division.
- To identify the possible causes of the identified lexical and phonological errors.

The Error Analysis approach was used within the theoretical construct of interlanguage to identify and classify the lexical and phonological errors observed in the spoken language of the pre-school teachers. Norrish’s ‘Let the Errors Determine the Categories’ was used within the Error Analysis approach to help categorize the different errors observed.
The findings of the study show that the phonological errors had a frequency of occurrence than the lexical errors. In the phonological errors, the errors most frequent in the category of wrong pronunciation of the voiced alveolar lateral sound, /l/; while in the lexical errors, errors were most frequent in the category of inappropriate use of lexical items. Lastly, from the findings two possible causes of the observed errors were inferred. These are the influence of L1 and the effect of the sociolinguistic situation in Kenya.

5.1 Implications

The findings of this study have implications for the pre-school teachers, trainers of pre-school teachers and language policy makers of education in Kenya. The pre-school teachers in the study sample were taken to be representative of the pre-school teacher population in Kasarani Division.

The pre-school teachers are language users trained to use and teach the language. The frequency of errors observed in this study (see Chapter 3) shows that they have not fully mastered some basics in lexical and phonology of the English language. In addition, the presence of errors indicates that these teachers are using a variety that is different from the British Standard Variety, the norm in the Kenyan education system. This is significant to the language policy makers in education, as it will highlight that it might not be possible to achieve the goal of teaching the norm, the British Standard Variety. The pre-school teachers who
make initial contact with learners of the language, who are at the crucial stage of language learning and acquisition (5 and 6 year olds), do not speak that variety.

The findings of the study have implications too for the curriculum developers of ECE. The results of this study will highlight some of the areas that require change and emphasis in the curriculum for pre-school teacher training. The changes can be effected so that the new syllabus for the pre-school teacher training can include the areas of difficulty highlighted by the study so that they can be addressed in the training of these teachers or even in the organization of in-service causes for the pre-school teachers. Lastly, the findings of the study will also inform the teachers themselves of the areas of difficulty in their language use. Although the teachers may not do much about their language use, this knowledge may help them in teaching to avoid negative transfer of some errors to their learners.

5.2 Areas for Further Research

The study focused on lexical and phonological errors only in the spoken language of pre-school teachers. However, from the language data collected it was evident that the pre-school teachers had errors in other levels of English. In order to come up with conclusive observations of the English of the pre-school teachers, there is need to study other areas like grammatical and all phonological areas. Further research can also be done on the teacher and learner’s language to see the possible
effect of teacher’s errors on learners. As this study was carried out in an urban setting, a comparative study of the urban situation and the rural situation can also be carried out. Lastly, studies on teachers of other levels of language teaching can be carried out too, to determine the language used by the teachers.

5.3 Conclusion

The results of this study show that some pre-school teachers have not attained near-native proficiency in English in the area of lexical and phonology and more so in the area of phonology. Our suggestion is that intervention be made at all stages of language learning and teaching right from the pre-school to the university so that all those trained as teachers and more so teachers of English can be taken to be true authorities of the language they teach, and know what is and what is not correct English. It is evident that being a language user does not necessarily mean proficiency and full mastery of the language used; language learning and mastering is a lifelong process.
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Extracts from the spoken data of the pre-school teachers in Kasarani Division.
Has he told you his name? He is going to tell you his name and here we have another teacher. This one is going to be your teacher. She is going tell you she is teacher who. Good morning children. Can we start the sounds that we have already read.

The next sound?
Letter 'f' what does letter ‘f’ sound, sound?
What colour is one. One colour Black
What colour is this. Purpo? Yeah purpo.
Blue colour? What picture is that and what colour is this? Somebody is talking five
fork frag
Letter f sounds /f/ This is sound
Allo of you p you are sound
Allo of us we are sound ‘f’
We are going to do that work in our books.
You write the letter and the sounds. Do not write the picture before you write this.
You start from here then another one at the centre and another one at the end
All the letters which are there.
Copy all the sounds, which are there collecty
If it is brack colour brack don’t put blue because our flag does not have blue colour .Use the correct corours and I am going to give you another book ad you are going to write like this.
And you are going to write the way I have written my work.
Skip one line the way we do. Make sure you underline and colour, somebody is talking, I want good work.
Those who have finished let me have your books. You can correct for those who have finished. Have you coroured your work. Why did you open your book and you have not finished. Can you write the word flag. Can you write that word properly! Open now. How ara you opening. No going for break if you have not finished the work.

Crap, crap, crap

I am quiet look at me can you do as I do quiet quiet quiet

Some of you are not looking at the teacher, today is Monday yesterday was Sunday. Today we are gong learn something we call news you have been at home from Saturday and yesterday Sunday. What were you doing on Saturday? Can you stand up! We are going to draw all what you did on Saturday and Sunday like me on Saturday I was washing my cloth I will draw myself, myself washing the clothes. I went to upcountry. There I saw some vehicles on the road so I will draw cars and buses. I saw some people. Children praying so I am going to draw a church and some windows like that. These are my news. Okay? You, you are going to draw your news and good work. Those who know how to name the picture draw and name them like me I know but if you don’t know the name of the pictures just draw pictures alone and in your book where you write today is Monday you write news.
TEACHER 2

Okay.

Karanja remember to write the date. You are a noise maker.

Na we kazi yako ni kuongea unataka tukosane na wewe enda uandike haraka na sitaki kusikia reports. Sitaki kusikia teacher sasa yule anaongea ndiye ananikosea.

Put your hands together like this.

Oh God Bless this tea as we take it in Jesus name

Nani huyo anaongea.

Sema nyuma yangu.

This is the mother, no this is the father. Ota Mubarrak vile anafanya, bad manners.

This is the father who brings home bread

This is the mother who cooks for me, who cooks for me.

This is the sister, the sister, niangalie who prays with doo.

This is the brother who plays with a ball, who plays with?

This is the baby, baby ni nani, the smarrest of all. Yule mdogo kushida wote

Family members, family members ni nani nani. Natak ushukue mkono nataka tusome juu ya vile tunakaa nawao kwetu.

Can you count, how many legs can we count

how many arms. Mikono ako na ngapi

I am not talking about fingers Abukar I am talking about hands

mikono ako na two hands

ako na mapua mangapi

good morning children?

Kwa nini watu wameketi, wana ni salamia wameketi

Tukiwa tumesimama hivyo natakta tuimbe wimbo mmoja

Smoo letter ‘g’

retter g sounds ‘g’
retter ‘a’ sounds /a/
smoo retter ‘b’ sounds
retter ‘b’ sound /b/
smoo retter ‘c’
retter ‘c’ sound /k/.
smoo letter ‘d’
retter ‘d’ sounds /da/
smoo retter ‘e’
retter ‘e’ sounds /ee/
smoo retter ‘f’
small retter ‘f’
retta ‘f’ sounds?
Karanja wewe
Small retter ‘g’
retter ‘g’ sounds ‘g’
kwa nini unanisumbua
an appo a a a
Ann has an appo a a a x2
skip to my loom my darling
skip to my loom my darling
balls are bouncing bu bu bu
balls are bouncing bu bu bu
skip to my loom my darling x2
Charles is cunning
dad is driving dr dr dri
skip to my loom my darlin
eggs and elephants e e e
fries are frying fu fu fu
grace is a girl
Let us repeat for the last time, ears for hearing, eyes for seeing. I am telling you to keep quiet and listen and look here. We said God created everything and we talked about?

When we are doing CRE we say God gave us a family. A family is made of father, mother and children. What is the work of the mother in the home?

Just put your hand up. Keep the house smart, washing the clothes, the baby and washing you (pupils). Okay. What is the work of the father in the home?

Who takes you to bed, any one of them can take you to bed? Pay for you school fees, driving a car. I cannot hear. Waiting for food, put your hand up. What is the work of the children now?

It is good when you go home to help. Wash the dishes, wash your uniform wash your handkerchief, you can brush your shoes. Can sing after me.

Who made the twinkling star?

Who made you and me?

God created so many things you and me everything. How many of you went to Sunday school service on Sunday. What were you taught in Sunday school! How many went to church?

You have to be humbo put your hands together and you pray. Humbo yourself before the Lord. He will lift you up. He will lift you up. Close your eyes and put your hands together and pray.

Okay, take out your science book, your CRE book no science. Draw for me something.

Write God's creation and draw for me what God created. Let me draw for you mountain.
Who are those talking: Look for your book quietly
Where is your pens and you draw big pictures
What is the date today
Hands together we are playing. Close your books first and look at the board
We are going to do English
Today we are going to learn a new word
How many of you have seen that word when you are reading stories?
It is used when you want to say for example you will not do something now you
will do it later
And when you are using the word will, we use it for example in a sentence, if I
write a sentence
I will tell you when to write
they will come
I give you sentences and you fill the gaps with will and you shall write will when
you see the words.
Feathers, again.

Who has feathers, which animal has feathers?

Have you ever seen a goat with feathers?

This elephant has feathers?

Those animals which have feathers are birds, hens, ducks, turkey, ostrich

Listen when you go home, listen and I said when you go home, you go pull a feather and bring me tomorrow, one feather.

You know what is a frog?

Where is your face? Who is father it is your daddy no I want somebody to read for us.

Those people who are modeling can you make a ball those who are writing can you finish, look at me and see what I am doing.

Show me four fingers all of you

Let's count again one, two, three, four

Nod four times.

Nod your heads four times

Crap your hands four times

Crap your hands arms again four times

Do like this four times

Enough, enough is enough

Fold your arms some of you don't how to write number four

How many know how to write number four

Put your finger up there again

I can draw four appos, when you get your book you write number four here.

You write number four here.

Today is Tuesday and the date is twenty-eighth.

Everybody spell the word Tuesday.
Then you wio draw four appos four nice appos
who is talking, rets count them
now wen you get your book you draw appos then you corour your appos
when corouring you don't have to use all colours.
That is not corouring. That is very wrong, corour nicely
What am I doing? You are corouring
You are crapping your hads.
Draw and corour big pictures draw big appos
When you are hear you say I am, so that I can see
You can't hear when you are talking.
Bring my pensos
bring my crayon
now put the booz
If you coo me you will see what I will do to you I can see you
Put the crayons here
I am coming loud
now when you hear your name you go for lunch you will leave your books on the
table
When you here your name you will come and pick your card and rine up
I am not calling your name ten times so you better shut your mouth and listen!