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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of one's first language on Kiswahili composition writing. The setting of the study was Kanduyi Division, Bungoma District.

The respondents consisted of 120 Form Three Babukusu students and thirteen Form Three Kiswahili teachers. Data was collected through questionnaires, tests and interviews.

The study sought to find out to what extent grammatical, spelling and vocabulary errors in Kiswahili composition writing were influenced by the learners' first language (L1) and the teachers' intervention strategies.

The results of the study revealed that, in grammar, spelling and vocabulary, there was a tendency to over generalize, that is to directly transfer rules from one's first language to written Kiswahili and thus errors occurred.

The intervention strategies suggested by the interviewed teachers included, among others, the need for correct language usage across the curriculum, that is, a need for all teachers to be concerned about the learners' language use, cross cultural intake in schools and the need for frequent Kiswahili seminars and inservice courses.
On the basis of the research findings, the researcher recommended, among other things, a compulsory linguistic course for all teachers in teacher training colleges, exposure of learners to a variety of Kiswahili literature, the use of teaching aids in Kiswahili composition writing lessons, regular Kiswahili seminars and inservice courses and emphasis on remedial work to curb first language influence at primary level before the errors become persistent through uncorrected repetition.

The Thesis was organized in five main chapters. Chapter One, which was an introductory chapter, dwelt on, among others, the background to the study, the purpose of the study and the theoretical framework used in the study.

Chapter Two reviewed literature related to the study. The review related to the theoretical framework stated in Chapter One.

Chapter Three dwelt on the methodology used in the study. This included details such as the sampling procedure, research instruments, data collection and data analysis procedures.

Chapter Four analyzed and presented data, while in Chapter Five the findings of the study were summarized. Conclusions and recommendations were then made by the researcher, based on the findings in Chapter Four. The chapter closed with suggestions for further research.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Language plays an important role as a medium of communication. It is also a binding force in Society and acts as a means through which members of the community interact, thereby creating certain common understandings and social ties.

However, in spite of this role, there are many ways in which language communication may break down. This may be through unclear, distorted or misunderstood messages, which may be influenced by, among others, one's first language (L1).

In Kenya, the language situation is very complex. Kenya is a multilingual society. This multilingualism may be understood in two ways. First, there exist a large number of languages, both indigenous and foreign, which are spoken in different communities. Second, Kenya is a multilingual society in the sense that most people are usually able to speak a first language plus Kiswahili and English or a second ethnic language.
Apart from the multilingual situation, the language situation is intricate. There are over forty first languages within the country. Table 1.1 shows that first languages spoken by different people in Kenya fall at least into four distinct language groups. Most of them are spoken by thousands of people each.

### TABLE 1.1 FIRST LANGUAGES SPOKEN BY DIFFERENT PEOPLE IN KENYA AND THE NUMBER OF SPEAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Bantu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>2,201,632</td>
<td>3,202,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhya</td>
<td>1,453,302</td>
<td>2,119,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamba</td>
<td>1,197,712</td>
<td>1,725,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gusii</td>
<td>701,679</td>
<td>944,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meru</td>
<td>554,256</td>
<td>840,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijikenda</td>
<td>520,520</td>
<td>732,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuria</td>
<td>59,875</td>
<td>89,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embu</td>
<td>117,969</td>
<td>180,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharaka</td>
<td>51,883</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taita</td>
<td>108,498</td>
<td>153,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mbere</td>
<td>49,247</td>
<td>61,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pokomo</td>
<td>35,181</td>
<td>39,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajun</td>
<td>24,389</td>
<td>36,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>9,971</td>
<td>7,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taveta</td>
<td>6,324</td>
<td>7,679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Nilotic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>1,521,595</td>
<td>1,955,845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Para Nilotic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kipsigis</td>
<td>471,459</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkana</td>
<td>203,177</td>
<td>207,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandi</td>
<td>261,969</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maasai</td>
<td>154,906</td>
<td>241,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tugen</td>
<td>130,249</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgeyo</td>
<td>110,908</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pokot</td>
<td>93,434</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>85,800</td>
<td>132,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samburu</td>
<td>54,796</td>
<td>73,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marakwet</td>
<td>79,713</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaot</td>
<td>42,468</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndorobo</td>
<td>21,034</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Njemps</td>
<td>6,529</td>
<td>7,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Cushitic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>249,731</td>
<td>151,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendile</td>
<td>18,729</td>
<td>21,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galla</td>
<td>70,896</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boni/Sanye</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>4,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>59,041</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics, based on the 1969, 1979 census

Note: - (dash) indicates that there was no statistical information on this group that year.

The language situation within the Kenyan society is made more complex, not only by the existence of a variety of first languages (L1), but by the language policies as well.

In Kenyan primary schools, Standards One to Three, the policy as regards the medium of instruction is the use of one's first language in linguistically homogeneous areas and English or Kiswahili in heterogeneous areas. In the first language medium schools, English and Kiswahili are taught only as subjects from Standard One. In Standard Four, the policy is that English takes over as a medium
of instruction in all schools. Kiswahili continues to be taught as a subject, while the first language disappears from the syllabus completely.

From this, it is noticeable that, in Kenya, in linguistically homogeneous areas, one's first language foundation in education is one's mother tongue. This requirement has important implications for education. This is due to the fact that a learner's first language foundation may have some influence on languages that may be learnt later.

Apart from the complex language policies, Kiswahili as a language faces various complexities. Whiteley (1969:3) divides Kiswahili speakers into four groups. First, there are those for whom Kiswahili is a first language. Second, there are those who learn Kiswahili as a second language either in school or through daily interaction with Kiswahili speakers or other speakers. The third group uses Kiswahili to a limited extent, while the fourth group uses Kiswahili only sporadically. Thus, among these KiSwahili speakers, the L1 speaking learners will already have achieved a high level of competence in Kiswahili as compared to other learners.

It is also noticeable that the learner of Kiswahili as a second language is taught Kiswahili and at times "picks it up" out of school from his family, friends, the radio, newspapers and public speeches. Much of the Kiswahili he/she is exposed to out of school may not be the correct Kiswahili, since it will be spoken by people whose first language is not Kiswahili. The learner may also face language problems in learning Kiswahili as a result of the influence from the learner's first language.
These complexities that affect Kiswahili usage in general are also likely to influence Kiswahili composition writing, for this is an area where one's creativity, logical thinking, critical judgment and self expression is displayed.

Kiswahili composition writing is an area that has received frequent criticism. According to the Kenya National Examination Council 1990 K.C.S.E. Examination Report (1992), the Kiswahili performance was not impressive. The candidates' work, especially in Kiswahili composition, showed little difference from that of 1989 K.C.S.E. candidates. The same mistakes were repeated and few candidates scored thirty marks and above. Table 1.2 and 1.3 explain this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karatasi (Paper)</th>
<th>Idadi ya watahiniwa (Candidates)</th>
<th>Alama ya juu (Score)</th>
<th>Wastani (Mean)</th>
<th>Alama ya Tanganishi (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102/1A</td>
<td>130,256</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102/1B</td>
<td>130,375</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39.65</td>
<td>11.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102/2</td>
<td>130,301</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>12.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtihani wote</td>
<td>130,608</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>93.68</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kenya National Examination Council.

Note: Kiswahili Composition is Paper 102/1A.
TABLE 1.3  MTIHANI WA 1990 (1990 EXAMINATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karatasi (Paper)</th>
<th>Idadi ya watahiniwa (Candidates)</th>
<th>Alama ya juu (Score)</th>
<th>Wastani (Mean)</th>
<th>Alama ya Tanganishi (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102/1A</td>
<td>132,673</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102/1B</td>
<td>132,674</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>13.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102/2</td>
<td>132,652</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>12.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtihanl wote (the whole examination)</td>
<td>132,692</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>27.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kenya National Examination Council.

Note: Kiswahili Composition is Paper 102/1A.

The main reasons given by the Examination Council (1992) for the poor performance, especially in composition writing, were:

- the use of ungrammatical language;
- narrow vocabulary range;
- inconsistence in tense use.

In relation to the same issue of poor performance in Kiswahili composition writing, Khalfan (1991) carried out research. From this research it was noted that the poor performance in Kiswahili composition writing was attributed to (among others):

- Examiners who did not teach Kiswahili and yet took part in the exercise of marking;
• Candidates given limited topics and therefore did not have a wide choice.
• Guided topics that forced candidates to write basing on somebody's ideas.

However, Khalfan's reasons and the Examination council's reasons varied. There was thus need for further study in this area. Such further study needed to put into consideration the learners' individual differences in the acquisition of Kiswahili. The study needed to analyze the extent to which the learners' language background influenced Kiswahili composition writing.

1.2 Statement of the problem

There is a possibility of one's first language influencing one's second language acquisition, yet, despite this possibility, none of the studies carried out in Kenya (as far as researcher knows) with the aim of improving students' competence in Kiswahili composition writing have systematically addressed themselves to this issue.

It is thus reasonable to suppose that current studies have not adequately identified the real cause of poor performance and thus lack of competence in Kiswahili composition writing. This is because the trend of poor performance has persisted over the years, in spite of these studies.

Since the objective of these studies has been to improve students' competence in Kiswahili composition writing, then, according to the
constructivist paradigm (that is, the point of view that holds that what the learner already knows is the best starting point for the acquisition of new knowledge) the learners ought to have been the obvious starting point. The studies need to have put into consideration the learners' individual differences in the acquisition of language, as well as the possible conflicts in the first language (L1) and second language (L2) models.

On this basis therefore, the current study set out to analyze the extent to which the learner's first language (L1) influenced Kiswahili composition writing in Kenyan schools.

1.3 Rationale for the Study

This study is useful for pedagogical reasons. According to Mbaabu (1978), there are over forty languages in Kenya. In spite of this variety of languages, Kiswahili, the language of inter ethnic communication, is a compulsory and examinable subject in all Kenyan schools. It is therefore taught to learners from different language backgrounds. There was thus need to investigate linguistic characteristics of learners who were learning Kiswahili as a common target. From the results of a study like this, teachers, teacher trainees and curriculum developers could familiarize themselves with the nature and causes of language problems of learners. Such familiarity would in turn contribute to a better understanding of the learners' needs and hence to better preparation in terms of teaching materials and methods.
No studies had systematically investigated the learners' language background and its influence on Kiswahili composition writing. The few studies that had been carried out, on Kiswahili composition writing (Kembo, 1983; Khalfan, 1991; Rukia, 1992) were concerned with lack of facilities, teaching methodology and students' attitudes towards Kiswahili composition writing. There was thus need to analyze the learners' language background and its influence on Kiswahili composition writing.

It was hoped that the findings of this study would shed some light on the strategies that learners employed in the learning of a common second language. The findings would also shed light on the influence of L1 on L2 writing. This would help explain why learners made certain errors in Kiswahili composition writing.

The study was important to the researcher, being a curriculum developer, for the findings of the study would provide a forum for understanding some of the factors that influenced students' errors in Kiswahili composition writing. From the findings, the researcher would be able to recommend ways and means of avoiding and correcting these errors.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to analyze the influence of one's first language on Kiswahili composition writing. The specific objectives of the study were:
1.5 Research Questions

The study aimed at providing tentative answers to the following questions:

- What grammatical errors did Babukusu learners make in Kiswahili composition writing that related to the learners' language background?

- What spelling errors did these learners make in Kiswahili composition writing that related to their language background?
• What lexical errors did the learners make in Kiswahili composition writing that related to their language background?

• How could these language errors be solved for effective Kiswahili composition writing?

1.6 Basic Assumptions of the Study

The study made the following assumptions:

• That the Form Three students selected in this study had been taught Kiswahili right from primary level;

• That the students had been taught by competent and trained Kiswahili teachers;

• That the students had a keen interest in Kiswahili as a subject;

• That some of the findings in the study may still be generalizable.

1.7 Scope and Limitations

The researcher, though aware that Kiswahili composition writing was a problem throughout the country, limited the study only to selected schools in Bungoma District. This was mainly because of time limitations and scarcity of funds.
Kiswahili composition writing is a problem right from Form One all the way to Form Four (K.N.E.C., 1992), but this study dwelt only on Form Threes. This was because it was expected, as stated by Muhindi (1981), that at this level students would have mastered the basic rules of spelling, punctuation, good knowledge of vocabulary and a fair knowledge of complex structures to enable them write a fairly good composition.

The sample was limited to six schools. This was consistent with the nature of the problem being investigated. Six schools would give a fair representation of first language (L1) speakers. The sample would also enable the researcher to give and analyze written Kiswahili compositions.

1.8 Theoretical Framework

This study was based on the Contrastive Analysis theory. Contrastive Analysis (C.A.) is a theory of second language learning that compares and contrasts two languages in order to establish the areas of similarity and difference between them (Lado, 1957; Lee, 1968). According to the C.A. theory, the differences are seen as the ones that constitute learning difficulties (negative transfer), while the similarities are hypothesized to constitute ease in language learning (positive transfer).

C.A. as stated by James (1980) is not concerned with classification of language, but as the term contrastive implies, the theorists are more interested in differences between languages than in their likeness. Thus, C.A. is founded on the
assumption that languages can be compared, and thus it mainly dwells on language interference.

Some of the earlier proponents of C.A. are Fries (1945), Lado (1957), Wardhaugh (1970), Lee (1968), James (1971) and Sridher (1981). According to Lee (1968:186), C.A. is based on the following assumptions, among others:

(a) That the prime cause or the sole cause of difficulties and errors in second language learning is interference or negative transfer from the learners' first language (L1);

(b) That the results of comparison between the two languages are needed to predict the difficulties and errors which occur in learning the target language (TL).

Lado (1957:9) supports C.A. by stating that:

... we can predict and describe the patterns that will cause difficulty, by comparing systematically the language to be learned with the native language ... of the student.

The C.A. theory was used in this study to show how the learners' first language influenced Kiswahili acquisition and how the acquired Kiswahili was likely to be transferred to Kiswahili composition writing.
1.9 Definition of Basic Terms and Abbreviations

Acquisition: Natural and unconscious way of assimilating and mastering language. The action of obtaining or getting a language by one's own exertion, but the term is used interchangeably at times to refer to the conscious learning of other languages.

Lubukusu: The language of Babukusu of Western Kenya. Babukusu are considered a subtribe of the Bantu group occupying the area now referred to as Western Province.

Composition: The action of putting together or combining a piece of writing. It also refers to combinations of writings as parts or elements of a whole.

Error: As used in the study, "error" and mistake are used synonymously to refer to deviations from the set norms or rules.

First Language (L1): The language which one first acquired, through one's own exertion. In the study L1 referred to Lubukusu.

Second Language (L2): An additional language other than the first language learnt through tutored (classroom) or untutored (outside the classroom) ways. In this study L2 referred to Kiswahili.
Bantu Languages: These are languages that formerly originated from the western side of the African continent. The common feature in these languages is l-tul which is a nominal root to which prefixes may be attached. In Kenya, this group includes, among others, the Kikuyu, Kamba, Luhya and the Swahili group.

Nilotic: There is only one Nilotic language in Kenya - Luo (Whitely, 1974).

Para Nilotic: There are three main Para Nilotic groups:
- the Teso group: Teso and Turkana;
- the Masai group: Maasai, Samburu (Sampur) and Njemps (Ntlamus);
- the Kalenjin group: Nandi, Keiyo, Kipsigis, Turgen, Terit, Sabaot, Ndorobo, Pokot and Marakwet.

Cushitic: There are two main Cushitic groups:
- the Somali group: Common Somali, Central Somali, Rendille and Boni;
- the Galla group: Sakoye, Orma, Gabra and Waat'.

Kiswahili: The word "Swahili" is an Arabic word "sahil" - coast. The prefix "ki" is the Kiswahili prefix marking the noun class which includes the names of languages.
Pronunciation: The use of sound system in speaking. It is the actualization of the phonological system through speech.

Multilingual: The use of more than two languages.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews some selected studies on L1 influence on L2 and relates them to the theoretical approach described in Chapter One. The chapter is divided into five sections. The first section analyzes general views on second language acquisition. The second section deals with the acquisition of Kiswahili by Nilotic speakers, the third section with the acquisition of Kiswahili by Para Nilotic speakers and the fourth section by Cushitic speakers and lastly by Bantu speakers.

2.2 General Views on Language Acquisition

Several studies have been carried out on second language acquisition and the problems that ensue. Examples of such studies are: Whorf (1956), Halliday (1964), Rudd (1971), Corder (1978) and Kress (1983).

According to Whorf (1956), our view of the world, the way we categorize our experiences and conceptualize our environment is effectively determined by our first language. We see, experience, write, speak, very largely as we do
because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation. Thus first language habits influence second language learning. This view is supported by Halliday (1964) and Corder (1973).

As stated by Halliday (1964), language learning normally takes place after first language acquisition is complete. At this level, the language learner has already developed considerable communicative competence in his first language. Due to this, the learners' first language may exert some influence on languages that will be learnt later.

According to Corder (1978:132), when people learn a second language, they already have the first language. Some of the rules they already know in the first language are used in the production and understanding of the second language. Due to this, there is a tendency of applying the rules of the first language onto the second language and thus errors occur.

Whorf, Halliday and Corder’s views were acknowledged by the researcher, for they were a great contribution to the study, since they showed that there is a possibility of one's first language influencing one's second language learning, but they were not very specific. This study took a more specific approach. The study focused on Babukusu learners in particular and analyzed to what extent Lubukusu influenced Kiswahili composition writing.

Lado (1957) and Lee (1968), some of the proponents of the Contrastive Analysis (C.A.) Theory, have made various observations on second language acquisition. According to Lado (1957:2):
... the student who comes in contact with a foreign language will find some features of it quite easy and others extremely difficult. Those elements that are similar to his native language will be simple for him and those elements that are different will be difficult.

Lado explains further that, when a phoneme in a foreign language (L2) does not exist in the first language (L1), the student will tend to substitute the native phoneme that seems nearest within the whole structure of his first language. Lee (1968) supports Lado. Lee points out that the prime cause or even the sole cause of difficulty and error in second language learning is interference coming from the learner's first language.

Kress (1983) supports these ideas further by stating that, for students, learning to write in a language which is not their first language and which has to be fully acquired involves the added complexities of learning the grammar of the new language, learning the process involved in composing in general and at the same time learning to compose in the new language. This learning may be hindered or facilitated by one's first language, depending on the similarities and differences between the two languages.

Lado, Lee and Kress contribute to this study, for they support the Contrastive Analysis (C.A.) theory that one's first language influences one's second language acquisition, but the point of departure between their studies and the present study is that the present study analyzed two Bantu languages: Lubukusu and Kiswahili. From the study the researcher specifically analyzed to what extent Lubukusu influenced Kiswahili composition writing.
Research has been carried out on second language acquisition. Rudd (1971) analyzed the problems of L1 speakers of Hindi, Urdu, Gujarati, Punjabi and Turkish learning English language. He found out that the speakers' first language interfered with the learning of the English language.

Saville (1976), from his research work concluded that, as a child develops control over his first language, many aspects of perception and production become more and more fixed. He soon tends to hear all speech sounds in terms of the phonological system of his own language. He doesn't hear foreign sounds as they are actually produced, but unconsciously pigeonholes them in the categories he has already learnt to distinguish for his first language. This interference on a phonological level finds its way into writing.

Basing on the same trend of thought, Broselow (1983) investigated the pronunciation of words beginning with the consonant clusters of two Arabic dialects: Iraq Arabic and lower Egypt Arabic. He concluded that, mispronunciations of the clusters presented an attempt by the language learners to bring second language forms into conformity with their first language.

Rudd's, Saville's and Broselow's studies supported the Contrastive Analysis theory that one's L1 influences ones L2 acquisition but while these studies mainly dwelt on the influence of L1 on spoken language, the present study analyzed the influence of L1 on written Kiswahili compositions.

Within the Kenyan context, general views have been made on second language acquisition. Khalid (1979) states that, language acquisition in Kenya
mainly begins with a first language. Later, one learns Kiswahili, English and possibly another language. In schools the language policy is that English or Kiswahili should be used. It is thus possible for one's language of education and one's first language to have a linguistic conflict. This occurs when one assumes that rules from one's first language L1, are applicable to the second language L2. This thus contributes to lack of competence and excellence in the second language.

According to Whiteley (1964), first language habits brush off onto second language habits. This, he feels has resulted for Kiswahili in what he has termed as areas of "high tolerance" within the language. That is, speaker A will accept from speaker B forms and usage of Kiswahili, which he would not himself use. This has resulted in terms like Luo Kiswahili, Kikuyu Kiswahili, Luhya Kiswahili or Kalenjin Kiswahili.

Nyamasyo (1992) supported these views. She points out that there is a possibility of L1 influencing L2 learning. She states that, when a learner learns a second language, there is the tendency of the learner incorrectly assuming that there is some equivalence between the two language systems, that is, the first language and the target one. On this basis therefore, he may transfer features of his first language to the target language and thus errors occur.

Khalid's, Whiteley's and Nyamasyo's views support the C.A theory that one's L1 may influence one's L2 acquisition, but in the studies, the authors have pointed out that there is a possibility of L1 influencing L2. In the present study,
the researcher intended to specifically point out to what extent Lubukusu influenced Kiswahili composition writing.

2.2.1 Acquisition of Kiswahili by Nilotic speakers.

Mbaabu (1978) and Odhiambo (1981) investigated the acquisition of Kiswahili by Dholuo speakers.

On Dholuo and Kiswahili, Mbaabu shows that Dholuo uses similar noun class markers unlike Kiswahili. For example, the adjective 'ber' can be used in the same form regardless of the nature of the object, a case which is different in Kiswahili.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dholuo</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kiswahili</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nyako maber</td>
<td>a good girl</td>
<td>msichana mzuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ot maber</td>
<td>a good house</td>
<td>nyumba nzuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okombe maber</td>
<td>a good cup</td>
<td>kikombe kizuri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, while speaking Kiswahili, Dholuo speakers, as pointed out by Mbaabu (ibid.), are likely to say:

- musichana musuri instead of msichana mzuri (a good girl)
- nyumba musuri instead of nyumba nzuri (a good house)
- kikombe musuri instead of kikombe kizuri (a good cup)
This is also overgeneralization of the prefix "m" so that it is used with wrong nouns. The study shows that, for the word "mzuri" (good), Dholuo speakers would alternatively say "musuri" or "msuri".

Concerning sound systems, the study shows that Dholuo speakers perceive the sound \( \gamma \) as in ghali (expensive) and \( k \) as in kali (bitter) both as \( k \). The consonant \( b \) is used instead of \( v \); hence words like vilevile (also) are pronounced as "bilebile". Other difficulties in sounds concern \( j \) and \( z \) which are both perceived as \( s \), so that Kiswahili words such as shamba, shika, shingo, zamani and zawadi are pronounced as "samba, sika, singo, samani and sawadi".

According to Odhiambo (op.cit.), Luo learners are likely to replace Kiswahili vowels with Dholuo ones (leading to errors), since Dholuo has ten vowels divided into two sets, while Kiswahili has five vowels. It is also possible for Luo learners to lengthen stressed syllables of Kiswahili words, given that length is a function of stress in Dholuo.

These studies contribute to the present study, for they support the C.A. Theory that one's L1 influences one's L2 acquisition. The point of departure with the present study is that, while these studies dwelt on L1 influence on L2 in spoken form, the present study analyzed L1 influence on L2 in written form. Also, these studies dealt with the informal situations, while the present study dealt with a formal (classroom) situation.
2.2.2 Acquisition of Kiswahili by Para Nilotics

According to Tucker and Mpaayel (1955, xv), Maasai language has twenty-four consonant phonemes and ten vowels divided into two sets consisting of five vowels each.

In line with what the C.A. Theory would predict, Maasai learners should have problems in the perception and production of the consonants \( v, f, h \) and \( v, f, h \) which are not in their L1 but are found in Kiswahili. There is also a possibility of learners replacing some of the Kiswahili vowels with Maasai ones (leading to errors) since Maasai has two vowel categories while Kiswahili has only one.

Although this study is not on Lubukusu language, it contributes to the present study, for it supports the C.A. Theory that one's L1 has an influence on L2 acquisition. But unlike Tucker and Mpaayel's study, in the present study the researcher intended to find out whether L1 also influences Kiswahili composition writing.

2.2.3 Acquisition of Kiswahili by Cushites

The Somali language has twenty-two consonants and ten vowels divided into two categories of five vowels each (Tucker and Bryan, 1968: 457). In accordance with the C.A. Theory's prediction, Somali learners have problems in the perception and production of the Kiswahili consonants \( v, z, d, c, g \) which are not in their L1. Segment sequences \( Nd, Mb \), which do not initially occur...
in Somali language are also problematic to the learners. Learners are also likely to replace Kiswahili vowels with Somali ones.

This study supports the C.A. prediction that one's L1 has some influence on L2 acquisition, but while in this study the researcher analyzed the influence of a Cushitic language on a Bantu language, in the present study the researcher analyzed the influence of a Bantu language (Lubukusu) on another Bantu language (Kiswahili).

2.2.4 Acquisition of Kiswahili by Bantu Speakers

2.2.4.1 Kamba Language

As stated by Whiteley and Muli (1962:11), Kamba language has nineteen consonant phonemes and seven vowel phonemes. From a C.A. point of view, Kamba learners have perception and production problems with the following consonants which are not found in their L1: /p, b, d, g, ə, z, f, v, r, h/. Since Kamba language has seven vowels, while Kiswahili has five, there is a possibility of learners replacing some of the Kiswahili vowels with Kamba ones, leading to errors.

Although Whiteley and Muli's study is on the Akamba language and the present study is on Lubukusu language, the contribution from the above study is considerable. The study supports the C.A. theory that one's L1 has an influence on one's L2 acquisition. On this basis, the author intended to find out how applicable this theory was when applied to Kiswahili composition writing.
2.2.4.2 KIKUYU LANGUAGE

According to Mutahi (1983:111), Kikuyu has eighteen consonant phonemes and seven vowel phonemes. There are some Kikuyu consonants which mainly occur with certain consonants. For example, |b| occurs mainly with M, such as in mbūmbū (spider); |d| mainly with |n|, such as in nduka (shop); |gl| mainly with |ŋ|, such as in ŋgiŋgo (neck).

There are, according to the C.A. Theory, some consonants which occur in Kiswahili but do not occur in Kikuyu and thus are problematic to the Kikuyu learners, such as |p, z, l, v, s|. Kikuyu does not have consonant clusters found in Kiswahili (Mutahi, ibid.). Thus Kikuyu learners are likely to modify Kiswahili consonant clusters to agree with permissible segment sequences in their first language.

Mutahi's study supports the C.A. Theory that L1 has an influence on L2 acquisition, but while this study dwelt on Kikuyu language, the present study dwelt on the influence of Lubukusu language on Kiswahili composition writing.

2.2.4.3 LUGANDA AND LUHYA LANGUAGES

Scottman (1971) carried out a study on problems depicted by Baganda and Baluhya speakers in their acquisition of Kiswahili, with a view to finding out, among the two groups, which one experienced more difficulties in Kiswahili learning.
From the study it was noted that Baganda speakers had problems of differentiating between /c/ and /k/, so that they pronounced Kiswahili words such as Kiganda as "chiganda" and lakini as "lachini". The Baluhya speakers' most prevalent problem was the use of the voiceless counterpart of the voiced, for example, /t/ for /d/ such as in "kitoko" for kidogo (little) and /pl/ for /bl/, e.g. "atapu" for adabu (manners). The study also revealed that lexical and morphological interferences were more common among the Baganda than the Luhyas. The Baganda Kiswahili also manifested many faults in the concordial agreement. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kiganda dialect</th>
<th>Standard form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mchezo huyu</td>
<td>mchezo huu</td>
<td>this game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mtoto yangu</td>
<td>mtoto wangu</td>
<td>my child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wajirani wetu</td>
<td>majirani zetu</td>
<td>our neighbours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scottman also observed that the Kiswahili of Baganda was characterized by the frequent dropping of the subject morpheme or the use of an inappropriate morpheme, for example, "Mimi nasema takuwa dereva" instead of "Mimi nilisema nitakuwa dereva" (I said I would be a driver).

Scottman's study supports the C.A. theory that L1 has an influence on L2 acquisition, but while Scottman mainly dwelt on a comparative study of Baganda and Baluhya speakers in their acquisition of Kiswahili, the present study dwelt on one language, Lubukusu, and its influence on Kiswahili composition writing.
2.2.4.3.1 Maragoli Language

Muhindi (1981) carried out a phonological contrastive survey of English and Kimaragoli dialect in the learning of English. From the research it was found that a Maragoli speaker will tend to say: I Turi: I for ltri: land I kila:s I for lkla:s I. The reason given for this is that a Maragoli speaker does not have such consonant clusters in his mother tongue.

In reference to vowels, the study pointed out that a Maragoli speaker was likely to say: I a:siki I for la:sk land I miliki I for l milk I. A vowel is included at the end of a word because a Kimaragoli syllable must end with a vowel. There is also vowel insertion to form a consonant vowel structure.

This study, though dealing with Maragoli and English language, has a contribution to make to the present study. It clearly points out that L1 has some influence on L2 acquisition, but while Muhindi's study mainly dwelt on Maragoli speakers, the present study concentrated on the Lubukusu influence on Kiswahili composition writing.

2.2.4.3.2 Lubukusu Language

According to Mutonyi (1986:36), Lubukusu has the following consonant phonemes:
TABLE 2.1 LUBUKUSU CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labio-</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plosive</strong></td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricative</strong></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nasal</strong></td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquid</strong></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glide</strong></td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lubukusu also has five vowels:

\[
\begin{align*}
&i & u \\
&\varepsilon & o \\
&a
\end{align*}
\]

These Lubukusu vowels can be pronounced as short or long, since length in Lubukusu is phonemic. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i e l</td>
<td>xumela</td>
<td>xume:la</td>
<td>(to sprout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l u l</td>
<td>xukula</td>
<td>xuku:la</td>
<td>(to buy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l o l</td>
<td>xurora</td>
<td>xuro:ra</td>
<td>(to nip)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike Kiswahili, Lubukusu is also a tonal language. It has high (H), low (L) and Falling high (Fh) tones. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
&li:ru & HL & (ear) \\
&li:ru & HH & (banana leaf) \\
a:ca & LL & (he goes) \\
aca & HH & (he went)
\end{align*}
\]
From a C.A. point of view, as pointed out by Musau (1992), the following Kiswahili consonants, l, b, d, g, 0, f, v, z, 1, which are not in Lubukusu, are likely to be problematic to the Babukusu learners in both perception and production. It was also noted that, since Lubukusu has vowels similar to Kiswahili, Babukusu learners should not have problems with Kiswahili vowels, except that there is a tendency to lengthen vowels, since in Lubukusu vowels are either short or long. Babukusu learners are also likely to produce some Kiswahili words with their native language tones, given that Lubukusu is a tonal language, while Kiswahili is not.

Mutonyi's study points out that the Lubukusu language has an influence on spoken Kiswahili, but while the researcher in this study accepts this trend of thought, the researcher intended to find out to what extent Lubukusu influenced written Kiswahili compositions.

2.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, studies have been reviewed from various language groups (Nilotes, Para Nilotes, Cushites and Bantu) and they support the C.A. theory that there is a likelihood of one's first language influencing one's second language acquisition. The point of departure between these studies and the present study is that, while the previous studies mainly concentrated on the influence of L1 on pronunciation in L2, this study analyzed the influence of L1 on written language in L2, with particular emphasis on Kiswahili composition writing. Unlike the previous studies that were mainly geared towards primary schools, the present study examined factors related to secondary school level. The present study,
unlike previous language studies, brought the teacher, the school, the student and the home environment into the specific context of Kiswahili composition writing.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

As stated in Chapter One, the main purpose of this study was to analyze the influence of L1 on Kiswahili composition writing. This was determined in terms of:

(i) the grammatical errors the learners made;
(ii) the spelling errors the learners made;
(iii) the vocabulary errors the learners made;
(iv) the views the Kiswahili teachers had.

This chapter deals with procedures used to collect data. It describes respondents used in the study, the research tools and how they were developed and administered. The research tools were specifically designed to meet the objectives of the study as outlined in Chapter One.

3.2 Area Covered by the Study

The study was conducted in Bungoma District, which is one of the four districts of the Western Province of Kenya, the other three being Busia, Vihiga and Kakamega Districts.
Within Bungoma district, Kanduyi division was selected. This was mainly due to its accessibility to the researcher and also, since the secondary Kiswahili syllabus is the same for all secondary schools in the republic, the findings of the study would apply to all secondary schools within Bungoma district.

3.3 Sampling

Kanduyi division comprises 13 secondary schools. Six schools were selected for the study. This comprised 46.1% of the schools in the division. The six schools were selected through stratified and purposive sampling.

First, the schools were divided into three main strata: Boys schools, girls schools and mixed schools. Stratification was used to ensure that schools comprising of different genders were included in the sample. Since there were only two boys' schools and two girls' schools in the division, they were all purposefully included in the sample. Random sampling was used to select two schools out of the nine mixed schools in the division. To do this, the names of the nine schools were placed in a chalk box and shuffled thoroughly before two pieces of paper were selected for the two schools to be included in the sample.

3.3.1 Respondents.

One hundred and twenty (120) Form Three Babukusu students and thirteen (13) Form Three Kiswahili teachers were used as respondents. Form three students were selected in this study mainly because:
• Apart from Form Four which is an examination class, Form Three is the next highest class in the secondary school system in Kenya. From the educational point of view, it was thought appropriate to carry out this study in Form Three, because, to yield useful results, examination is normally carried out at the highest level, since students at this level have been longer in the system than others.

• It is expected that at Form Three level students are familiar with Kiswahili composition writing. It is also expected at this level, that the language habits of the learners have already been formed, so, this is the appropriate level at which to assess whether the formed language habits have an influence on Kiswahili composition writing.

Although all Form Three students wrote a Kiswahili composition, only twenty students were selected in each of the six schools for data analysis. It was felt that since this was a homogenous group, twenty students from each school would give the appropriate data required.

The twenty students from each school were selected based on the progress reports to cater for very good, average and weak students. They were also selected based on their language group: Lubukusu.

The focus on Babukusu learners helped:
• Control for dialect;
• In interpretation, since the researcher was familiar with both the L1 and L2 in question.
3.4 Research Instruments:

Three types of instruments were developed and used to collect data. These were: Questionnaires, tests and interview guides.

3.4.1 Questionnaires.

The researcher used one set of questionnaire; the student questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire was to elicit information from students regarding their background. The questionnaire consisted of ten items (Appendix A). Since the study dwelt on one language group Lubukusu, through the questionnaire, the researcher was able to identify learners who were Bukusu students, who spoke Lubukusu with their parents and who spoke Lubukusu with neighbours and friends. The questionnaire was appropriate in this study for as stated by Dalen (1966):

"In some studies, presenting respondents with carefully selected questions is the only way to elicit the data required."

3.4.2 Written Composition test.

The purpose of this instrument was to assess the influence of one's first language on grammar, spelling and vocabulary. The test consisted of one topic (see Appendix B) selected from the 1987 'O' level composition paper administered by the Kenya National Examination Council.
The main reason why Kiswahili composition writing was selected as an instrument was because:

- The focus of the study was on L1 influence on Kiswahili composition writing.
- Main complaints on lack of students' language competence in Kiswahili have been focused on composition writing.
- Composition writing is the best language area to judge a student's fluency, creativity and competence in language.

The topic was written on the blackboard and read aloud to students. The topic was also typed on papers that were issued to students.

3.4.3 Interview Guide.

The purpose of the interview was to find out what Form Three Kiswahili teachers thought of L1 influence on Kiswahili composition writing and what remedies they had to offer. An interview was thought appropriate in this study for, as noted by Kerlinger (1973), many people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing and will therefore provide data more readily in an interview. In an interview, it is also possible for a researcher to encourage the respondents and thus help them probe more deeply into the problem. Through the interview (Appendix C) the researcher hoped to get the teachers' personal views on L1 influence on Kiswahili composition writing.

Table 3.1 shows the respondents that were used in the study.
Though only 6 schools were used in data collection, 13 teachers from 13 secondary schools in Kanduyi division (Bungoma High, Kibabii, Cardinal Otunga, Nangeni, Town high, Kabula, Napar, St Paul's-Muluki, Kitale sec, Kimaet, Luanda, Sangalo and Netima) were respondents. One Form Three Kiswahili teacher was selected from each school. The teacher selection was from random sampling. The main reason why all the thirteen Kiswahili teachers were interviewed was because the researcher felt that they might have various views on the influence of one's first language on Kiswahili composition writing and various intervention strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>No. of Pupils</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bungoma High School</td>
<td>Boys School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibabii High School</td>
<td>Boys School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Otunga High School</td>
<td>Girls School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangeni Girls School</td>
<td>Girls School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town High School</td>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabula Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napar Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul's Muluki Sec. School</td>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitale Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimaet Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luanda Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangalo Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netima Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Administration of the Research Tools

After authority to carry out research was obtained from the Office of the President, the researcher sent out letters to the six Secondary Heads in Kanduyi Division, to inform them of the intended study.

The researcher then carried out a pilot study of the research tools at Ruaraka Secondary School and Maina Wanjigi Secondary School in Nairobi. The intention was to find out whether the research tools would be clear to the intended respondents and whether they would be valid in the collection of data. These schools were excluded from the actual study.

The researcher then visited the individual secondary schools in Kanduyi Division and explained the purpose of the study to the Heads and the Form Three Kiswahili teachers.

During the actual data collection, students were informed a day in advance through their Kiswahili language teachers that they would be expected to fill a questionnaire and write a Kiswahili composition whose results would be used for a very important purpose.

In each school, all Form Three students wrote a Kiswahili composition, although only twenty students were required. The test was supervised for 45 minutes by the Kiswahili teacher. Answer scripts were collected immediately
after the test. It took two weeks to administer the test in all the schools included in the study.

After the completion of the test in each school, the researcher interviewed the Kiswahili teachers.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedures

After the scripts were collected, they were analyzed based on Corder's (1981) error analysis technique. This method was selected because this study was based on the C.A. theory and, like the error analysis technique, the C.A. theory tries to point out errors that are likely to occur in L2 due to influence from L1. Corder justifies the study of the learners' errors. He states that, from a pedagogical point of view, a good understanding of the nature of error is necessary before a systematic means of eradicating them can be found. From the theoretical point of view, a study of learners' errors is part of the systematic study of the learners' language, which is itself necessary to an understanding of the process of second language acquisition.

The procedure for analysis was as follows:

- After the completion of the testing, the scripts were collected from the pupils.
The scripts for data analysis were selected based on the students' questionnaire which indicated their L1 backgrounds and the class reports which indicated the students' performance.

The 20 selected scripts were analyzed by the researcher and two Kiswahili teachers who were both Lubukusu speakers and were also trained examiners of Kiswahili composition.

The errors were identified in each script. To offset the effects of bias, the script of each student was independently marked by each of the teachers. The marking of scripts was done in pencil. In each case the identified errors were recorded by the researcher and then erased before being passed to the next examiner. If a student repeated a similar error, it was recorded only once.

The individual examples of errors were classified under general categories of errors, that is:

- Grammatical errors
- Spelling errors
- Vocabulary errors.

With the assistance of the two teachers, the researcher identified among each category errors that were due to Lubukusu influence.

The percentage of L1 influence was calculated on the basis of the total number of errors due to L1 influence over the total number of errors in the general category (e.g., grammar, spelling, vocabulary).
Results from the interviews were used as informative evidence in explaining some of the findings.

A detailed analysis of data collected is presented in Chapter Four of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of L1 on Kiswahili composition writing, among Form Three students in Kanduyi Division of Bungoma District. To fulfill this objective, data was collected from students by the use of questionnaires and tests and from teachers through an interview guide. This is outlined in Chapter Three.

The obtained data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as percentages and then interpreted with regard to the stated objectives.

This chapter therefore presents the analysis of data and report of findings in four sections. The sections are divided in relation to the research questions outlined in Chapter One.

The questions that this study sought to answer were:

(i) What grammatical errors did learners make in Kiswahili composition writing that related to the learners' language background?
(ii) What spelling errors did learners make in Kiswahili composition writing that related to the learners' language background?

(iii) What lexical errors did learners make in Kiswahili composition writing that related to the learners' language background?

(iv) How could these language errors be solved for effective Kiswahili composition writing?

4.2 Presentation of Results

4.2.1 Grammatical Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total number of Errors</th>
<th>Total number of Errors due to M.T. Influence</th>
<th>Percentage of Percentage of M.T. Influence other Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>21.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 presents information of the total number of grammatical errors made by 120 students in six schools, the number of errors attributed to one's first language influence and the percentage of the L1 influence.

### 4.2.1.1 ERRORS DUE TO THE SINGULAR/PLURAL FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Bukusu version</th>
<th>Correct version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mazawadi</td>
<td>bianwa</td>
<td>zawadi</td>
<td>gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandizi</td>
<td>kamatore</td>
<td>ndizi</td>
<td>bananas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mang'ombe</td>
<td>chikhafu</td>
<td>ng'ombe</td>
<td>cows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occurrence of errors was mainly due to the fact that the Babukusu learners made the pluralization of nouns explicit, while in Kiswahili it is not general that pluralization be marked.

In Lubukusu, the pluralization of nouns is explicit, that is, singulairs always have plurals. For example:

- Gift, "sianwa" has the plural "bianwa" (gifts);
- Banana, "litore" has the plural "kamatore" (bananas);
- Cow, "ekhafu" has the plural "chikhafu" (cows).

Thus, the learners transferred the number-markedness from Lubukusu to Kiswahili, without the realization that in Kiswahili not all nouns mark plurals. For example, animals - "kondoo" (sheep) in the singular remains "kondoo" (sheep) in the plural.
These errors tend to support Corder’s (1973) view, stated in Chapter Two, that when people learn a second language, they transfer some of the rules they already know in the first language to the production and understanding of the second language.

4.2.1.2 CONCORDIAL AGREEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Bukusu version</th>
<th>Correct version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kikapu muzuri</td>
<td>sikapu silai</td>
<td>kikapu kizuri</td>
<td>a nice basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shule muzuri</td>
<td>sikuli silai</td>
<td>shule nzuri</td>
<td>a good school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nguo muzuri</td>
<td>engubo endai</td>
<td>nguo nzuri</td>
<td>a nice dress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occurrence of errors in the concordial agreement was mainly due to the fact that learners used wrong concords for different noun classes, since in both Lubukusu and Kiswahili there is concordial agreement (Appendix D). These errors can be attributed mainly to the fact that learners seem not sure of the concords used in different noun classes.

4.2.1.3 NEGATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>Correct version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hatukunywangi chai</td>
<td>sikhunywechanga</td>
<td>hatunywi chai</td>
<td>we do not drink tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>echai ta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatukulangi</td>
<td>sikulichanga</td>
<td>hatuli</td>
<td>we do not eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hawakuandikanga</td>
<td>sibaandikanga</td>
<td>hawakuandika</td>
<td>they did not write a letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barua</td>
<td>ebaru ta</td>
<td>barua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asifanyange kazi</td>
<td>akhakhola</td>
<td>asifanye kazi</td>
<td>he should not be working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimilimo ta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is likely that the learners added -nga, -ngi, -nge to verbs because in Luhukusu -nga, -ngi and -nge mean regularity of action, but they are not morphemes in Kiswahili.

In the interview, 69.2% of the teachers complained that they had frequent problems with the learners' frequent addition of -nga, -nge and -ngi to Kiswahili verbs. This was attributed to the influence of Luhukusu, for in Luhukusu these are frequency morphemes.

According to Mutonyi (1986), the habitual aspect in Luhukusu is used to refer to actions and states which can be categorized in terms of three perspectives, the daily, the past and the future. The daily aspect will refer to a habit that still goes on, the past will refer to a habit that has ceased and the future will refer to a habit that is expected to be going on in the future. In these three aspects, -nga, -nge and -ngi occur as verbal suffixes to denote regularity of habit. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bukusu</th>
<th>Kiswahili</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alichanga</td>
<td>hula</td>
<td>he eats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akholanga</td>
<td>hufanya</td>
<td>he does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khachichenge</td>
<td>nitakuwa nikienda</td>
<td>I will be going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, there is a tendency of Babukusu learners overgeneralizing and thus writing:

hukulanga for hula eats
hufanyanga for hufanya does
nitaendanga for nitaenda I will be going
4.2.1.4 TENSES

Error: Amefika jana saa nane.
Correct version: Alifika jana saa nane.
Bukusu: Kolele likoloba saa nane.
Gloss: He arrived yesterday at two o'clock.

Error: Alikasirika kwa sababu ninashindiwa kumsaidia.
Correct version: Alikasirika kwa sababu nilishindwa kumsaidia.
Bukusu: Kasinyikhe khubela senamuyetele ta.
Gloss: He was annoyed because I was unable to assist him.

The learners mixed the present, past and future tenses. It seemed the learners did not adhere to the rule that in Kiswahili tense use:

-na- is used for present form, e.g., ninacheka (I am laughing);
-li- is used for past form, e.g., nilisoma (I read);
-ta- is used for future form, e.g., nitasoma (I will read).

Mutonyi (1986) gave an explanation of why this occurred. According to him, tense in Lubukusu can be viewed in three time perspectives: the present, the past and the future. The present tense marks the central point from which reference is made backwards and forwards in time, in relation to incidents and events. The present tense consists of the verb roots + the vowel |a|. For example,

:a:lia - he eats
He further states that, in Lubukusu, the present tense is also used to refer to a past that seems long ago. In its use, the emphasis is laid more on the remoteness of an event than on the time lapse. It might be used to refer to an event that took place a month ago or many years back. For example, "Acha lichuma lilyawa" (for, "He went last week"). Yet "a:cha" also means "He is going". According to Mutonye, the past in Lubukusu is expressed in four different ways:

(i) Near Past [ama]: "Ama khuchu" (He went not long ago.)
(ii) Intermediate Past [fîlè]: "Achile" (He went long ago.)
(iii) Far Past [îlé]: "A:chile" (He went yesterday - backwards.)
(iv) Remote Past [a]: "Âca" (He went.)

The future tense in Lubukusu is shown in four different ways, determined by the distance into the future from the present, ranging from a few minutes to come to an indefinite time in the future. For example,

(i) Near Future [la]: "Alacha" (He will go.)
(ii) Intermediate Future [kena]: "Kenache" (He will go, some day, late.)
(iii) Far Future [kha]: "Akhache" (He will go.)
(iv) Remote Future [li]: "Alichâ" (He'll go.) remote.

From these examples it is noticeable that the Babukusu learners may encounter problems in tense use, for while in Lubukusu the present tense refers to both the immediate and the remote past, in Kiswahili it only refers to the immediate. While in Lubukusu the past and future are stated in four different ways, in Kiswahili there is only one reference for the past (li) and one for the
future (ta). Thus while the present and past can appear in one sentence in Lubukusu, applying this to Kiswahili results in errors.

4.2.1.5 ADJECTIVAL CONCORDS

Error: Mtu huyu ni mutajiri.
Bukusu: Omundu yuno omuyinda.
Correct version: Mtu huyu ni tajiri.
Gloss: He is a rich man.

Error: Yeye ni mumaskini.
Bukusu: Oyuno omutambi.
Correct version: Yeye ni maskini.
Gloss: He is a poor man.

It is likely that the learners wrote the words "tajiri" and "maskini" as "mutajiri" and "mumaskini" mainly because they transferred the mu- prefix from Lubukusu to Kiswahili. For, as stated by Mutonyi (1986), the Lubukusu nouns take prefixes which show the class and the concordial agreement marker.

4.2.1.6 OTHER FACTORS

Other factors contributed to grammatical errors, though they were not directly related to L1 influence.
Punctuation's

• Omission of Commas:

Error: Methali hii asiyesikia la mkuu huvunjika guu hutumiwa...
Correct version: Methali hii, asiyesikia la mkuu huvunjika guu, hutumiwa ...
Gloss: This proverb, 'One who does not heed to an elder's piece of advice breaks his foot', is used ......

• Omission of Fullstops:

Error: Nilienda shuleni leo kesho nitaenda nyumbani.
Gloss: I went to school today. Tomorrow, I will go home.

• No Open or Closed Inverted Commas:

Error: Utaiba tena mwalimu mkuu akamuuliza Juma.
Correct version: "Utaiba tena?", mwalimu mkuu akamuuliza Juma.
Gloss: "Will you steal again?", the head teacher asked Juma.

46.1 % Of the teachers stated that grammatical errors due to poor punctuation were very common in Kiswahili compositions. They attributed this to the teaching techniques. They felt most Kiswahili teachers were keen on the content in compositions, not the punctuation. They also felt that most teachers hardly taught what was expected in a good composition, but usually told students
to write compositions. Thus students just wrote, without giving the other aspects such as punctuation the seriousness they deserved. The teachers noted that poor punctuation was exhibited by the learners in all writings and not only in Kiswahili compositions.

Table 4.1 shows that 29% of the grammatical errors were contributed by L1 influence. Examples of these errors were: the use of the singular and the plural, negations, adjectival concords and tenses. The learners overgeneralized, that is, they transferred Lubukusu grammatical rules to Kiswahili and thus errors occurred. The C.A. theory indicated in Chapter One was applicable in determining these errors.

It is possible that 71% of the errors were due to other factors and not to Lubukusu influence, mainly because both Lubukusu and Kiswahili are Bantu languages and, as stated by Wallwork (1985), each language has its own grammar which will be like the grammar of related languages in some ways but unlike them in others. The closer the language relationship, the lesser the grammatical errors. Therefore, since Lubukusu and Kiswahili are both Bantu languages, we expect lesser grammatical interference from Lubukusu into Kiswahili, since they have the most intermediate structures in common.
4.2.2 Spelling Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total number of Errors</th>
<th>Total number of Errors due to M.T. Influence</th>
<th>Percentage of M.T. Influence</th>
<th>Percentage of other Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 presents information of the total number of spelling errors made by 120 students, the number of errors attributed to first language influence and the percentage of L1 influence.

4.2.2.1 OMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Correct version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uwezi</td>
<td>huwezi</td>
<td>not able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alafu</td>
<td>halafu</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mioko</td>
<td>mihogo</td>
<td>cassava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wakuamini</td>
<td>hawakuamini</td>
<td>they did not believe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abari</td>
<td>habari</td>
<td>how are you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dropping of the initial sound h may be attributed to the fact that in Lubukusu h is a glottal sound and thus the vowel that follows becomes more pronounced than the initial sound h. As stated by Wallwork (1985), the sound h has some vowel-like qualities, since in its pronunciation, the upper parts of the mouth and throat are in position ready for the following vowel, thus the actual sound of \( h \) varies according to the vowel which follows. Thus it is possible that since the sound h is almost silent at the initial stage in Lubukusu while the vowels are more pronounced, the learners transferred this to written Kiswahili compositions.

**4.2.2.2 ADDITION OF LETTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Error</strong></th>
<th><strong>Correct version</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gloss</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kuhepukana</td>
<td>kuepukana</td>
<td>to avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baruwa</td>
<td>barua</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asikari</td>
<td>askari</td>
<td>policeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mule</td>
<td>mle</td>
<td>inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funguwa</td>
<td>fungua</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38.4% of the teachers stated that the addition of letters was a constant occurrence in Kiswahili composition writing. They noted that, where the sound m was followed by a consonant, learners usually inserted the sound \( u \) between the consonants. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Error</strong></th>
<th><strong>Correct version</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gloss</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mvululana</td>
<td>mvulana</td>
<td>boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musichana</td>
<td>msichana</td>
<td>girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muzuri</td>
<td>mzuri</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the errors made, it is noticeable that the learners broke either the Kiswahili vocalic or consonantal clusters to form a consonant-vowel structure (CVCV). The learners also disyllabized the nasal \( l m l \).

The omission or addition of consonant or vowel sounds by the learners may be, as pointed out by Mutonyi (1986), because Lubukusu adheres to the consonant-vowel structure (CV): that is, in Lubukusu, a consonant is followed by a vowel and a vowel is usually followed by a consonant. It is in rare cases that two consonants or vowels follow each other. Thus the Babukusu learners transferred the Lubukusu syllabic structure to Kiswahili. The learners modified Kiswahili consonant and vowel sequences to agree with permissible patterns in Lubukusu. Selinker (1972) points out that it is possible for the learner to incorporate known elements from L1 to L2 and this seems to be what the learners were doing.

4.2.2.3 SUBSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Correct version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( bl ) for ( pl )</td>
<td>bunde</td>
<td>punde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( pl ) for ( bl )</td>
<td>pei</td>
<td>bei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vipoko</td>
<td>viboko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wakupwa</td>
<td>wakubwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cl ) for ( jl )</td>
<td>kichichini</td>
<td>kijijini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chulikana</td>
<td>julikana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>machirani</td>
<td>majirani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mocha</td>
<td>moja</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The substitution errors are likely to have been induced by similarities in cognate forms between Kiswahili and Lubukusu consonants. It is likely that the learners established correspondence between sounds that are phonetically different, although belonging to a similar cognate form. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>and</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>are bilabial plosives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>are alveolar plosives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| gl | are velar plosives.  
| fl | and | v | are labio dental fricatives.  

These consonants occur within similar environments. Thus it is possible that the learners regarded them as variants of the same phoneme and could be used interchangeably.

It was also noticeable that learners used certain segments which were closer to Lubukusu than those not existent. For example,

| Tamini      | for Thamini (value) | t for θ |
| kali        | for ghali (expensive) | k for γ |
| sangilia    | for shangilia (praise) | s for j. |

It is noticeable (appendix E) that the dental fricative | θ |, the velar fricative | γ | and the palatal fricative | f | are non-existent in Lubukusu. And so the learners substituted them with the alveolar plosive | t |, the velar plosive | k | and the alveolar fricative | s | which are among the Lubukusu consonants. This supports the view held by Selinker (1972) that the learner usually incorporates known elements in his L1 into the perception or production of the target language.

Lado (1957), as quoted in Chapter Two, also noted that, when a phoneme in L2 did not exist in L1, the learner tended to substitute the native phoneme that seemed nearest within the whole structure of his L1 language. It is thus noticeable that the learners used certain segments that were closer to Lubukusu and avoided those which were further away.
Though the learners tended to mix up the voiced and voiceless Swahili consonants, there was a greater tendency to replace voiced Swahili consonants generally with voiceless ones which are common among the Babukusu. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swahili (English Translation)</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paraka</td>
<td>baraka (blessings)</td>
<td>that is, p for b;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitoko</td>
<td>kidogo (little)</td>
<td>that is, t for d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may have been mainly because, as stated by Maddieson (1984), voiceless segments are less marked, that is, they are frequently used and therefore easier to learn. He further states that some segments, e.g., \( l s l, l f l, l p l \) and \( l c l \) are not rare in world languages. In fact, \( l s l \) is the most frequent alveolar fricative in world languages. So, since these segments are frequently used, they do not pose problems, but some segments, e.g., \( l 0 l, l v l, l z l \) and \( l y l \) are relatively marked, that is, they are rarely used in most world languages and therefore cause very high error rates. It is thus likely that Babukusu learners replaced Swahili voiced fricative \( l z l \) mainly because \( l s l \) occurs more frequently in Lubukusu, while \( l z l \) is less frequent.

Although the tendency was to replace the voiced Swahili consonants with voiceless ones, there were cases where the voiceless Kiswahili consonants were replaced with the voiced one. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swahili</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( l b l )</td>
<td>for ( l p l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( l d l )</td>
<td>for ( l t l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( l z l )</td>
<td>for ( l s l )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This substitution tendency was also noted by De Blois (1975:145). He stated that in Lubukusu the unvoiced segments \( l \ p \ l \) and \( l \ k \ l \) become voiced if followed by one or two vowels. Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
kata (cut) & \quad \text{becomes} \quad gata, \\
pepo (wind) & \quad \text{becomes} \quad bepo.
\end{align*}
\]

Although these errors (substitution) seem to have been influenced mainly by the learners' L1, Erickson (1986) points out that substitution errors are at times due to cross association. This is where teachers present items alongside one another, for example,

\[
\begin{align*}
p \quad \text{and} \quad b \\
t \quad \text{and} \quad d \\
s \quad \text{and} \quad z.
\end{align*}
\]

Thus students are aware, while writing, that one of the two forms is correct, yet they are uncertain which one. Thus they guess any.

Table 4.2 shows that 61.4 % of the spelling errors were due to L1 influence and were predictable by the C.A. theory. These errors were omissions of sounds, addition of sounds and substitution of sounds. The learners wrote Kiswahili on the basis of the Lubukusu sound system.
4.2.3 Vocabulary Errors

TABLE 4.3 VOCABULARY ERRORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total number of errors</th>
<th>Total number of errors due to M.T. influence</th>
<th>Percentage of M.T. influence</th>
<th>Percentage of other factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 presents information of the total number of vocabulary errors of the 120 learners, the number of errors attributed to L1 influence and the percentage of L1 influence.

4.2.3.1 TRANSLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence constructed</th>
<th>Bukusu version</th>
<th>Correct version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alinibebea mkono.</td>
<td>Kasutire</td>
<td>Alinipungia mkono.</td>
<td>He waved at me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kumukhono.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damu ilinikimbia</td>
<td>Kama/fuk kelukhe</td>
<td>Nilishtuka.</td>
<td>I was shocked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwilini.</td>
<td>mumubili.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliandika matope.</td>
<td>Kaandikire</td>
<td>Hakuandika lolote la maana.</td>
<td>What he wrote was not impressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kamatoyi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the examples given, it is noticeable that the learners directly translated Lubukusu words into Kiswahili. This is a result of translating ideas from mother tongue to Kiswahili, for, as stated by Wallwork (1985), the learner at times finds that his communication needs exceed his linguistic potential, that is, the language demands are much higher than the supply within his disposal. In such cases, the learner adjusts by attempting to use references within his linguistic potential. It is possible that the learners transferred what was within their linguistic potential in Lubukusu to Kiswahili.

4.2.3.2 USE OF BUKUSU WORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence constructed</th>
<th>Bukusu version</th>
<th>Correct version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alipopigwa alikutuka</td>
<td>Kakhupilwe kakukula.</td>
<td>Alipopigwa alipiga mayowe.</td>
<td>He screamed when he was beaten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amekevwa na wazazi.</td>
<td>Kakaywa ne bebusi bewe.</td>
<td>Amekevwa na wazazi.</td>
<td>He was cautioned by the parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliambiwa atoe vichiki</td>
<td>Kabolelwe asiule vichiki.</td>
<td>Aliambiwa atoe visiki.</td>
<td>He was told to uproot the tree stumps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliwapata wanamumonya</td>
<td>Kabanyolele ne bamumonya.</td>
<td>Aliwapata wakimsengenywa.</td>
<td>He found them backbiting him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of Lubukusu words in Kiswahili (4.2.3.2) gives support to Corder's (1981:96) view that at times learners have quite clear beliefs about what they think is similar in their L1 and the target language and they therefore transfer these words causing errors. It is possible that the learners did not note the difference between:
vichikhi and visiki (tree stumps)
khukaywa and kukanywa (to be cautioned against doing something)

Mouton (1962) supports this by pointing out that sometimes the occurrence of a word is simply a matter of habit, something which seems entirely natural, even inevitable. This habit is so firmly fixed that the learner in learning L2 may not be able to notice the difference in some aspects of L1 and L2.

69.2% of the teachers interviewed stated that the use of Lubukusu words in Kiswahili composition writing was a common occurrence among the Babukusu students. For example, in Lubukusu 'Ta' means 'no'. In Kiswahili 'taa' means 'lamp'. Though Kiswahili has a long vowel (aa), while Lubukusu has a short vowel (a), some learners, while writing, seem not to note the difference. For example, "Alipoulizwa kama atarudi shuleni, alisema taa". The learner made the vowel long (aa) for emphasis. A teacher conversant with Lubukusu will understand the sentence to mean, 'he won't go back to school', while another one not conversant with Lubukusu will decode the student's statement as vague and confusing, especially if he attributes 'taa' to the Kiswahili word meaning 'lamp'.

Another problem cited by these teachers was the word 'papa'. In Lubukusu, 'papa' means father, while 'papa' in Kiswahili means shark. For some Babukusu learners, writing 'papa' for father is not confusion or error. For example,

Sentence constructed: Papa yangu alikuja shuleni.
Correct version: Baba yangu alikuja shuleni.
Gloss: My father came to school.
Thus, though in Kiswahili it is wrong to refer to father as 'papa', in Lubukusu it is right. Thus students transfer this from Lubukusu to Kiswahili, causing errors.

The word 'munyu' was also problematic among Babukusu learners. In Kiswahili 'munyu' refers to only salt, while in Lubukusu 'munyu' refers to both salt and soup. Thus it becomes difficult for a learner who writes the following sentence to note any error;

Kwenye sherehe hiyo, munyu wa nyama ulikuwa ntamu sana na nikanywa wote.

The student intended to write that 'At that party, the soup was tasty and I drank it all'. Yet the implication given is that, 'At that party the salt of the meat was too sweet and I drank it all'. This makes the sentence vague to the teacher.

The teachers also cited the learners' use of the word 'nyama'. For example, the learners may write: "Mwalimu alitwambia nyama yake imechoka". Directly translated, this becomes "The teacher told us his meat was tired". What the learner meant was, "The teacher said he was tired". In Lubukusu the word 'meat' can also be used to refer to one's body.

The teachers pointed out that they had learners who directly transferred so much from Lubukusu to Kiswahili, that Kiswahili teachers who were not Babukusu had at times to consult with Babukusu teachers in order to understand what the learners were writing about. This was mainly because, reading such essays, Babukusu teachers were able to make out what the learners meant.
4.2.3.3 THE USE OF SLANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence constructed</th>
<th>Correct version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buda</td>
<td>baba</td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alikosa donge la kungwutua</td>
<td>Alikosa pesa za kutumia</td>
<td>He had no money to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ushago</td>
<td>Mashambani</td>
<td>Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilifanya guni faya.</td>
<td>Nilipuuza niliyoambiwa.</td>
<td>I ignored what I was told.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3.4 THE USE OF VAGUE TERMS

Sentence constructed:

Watoto tandali;
Kicheko cha aiskrimu; not vague
Nguvu kama mboko;
Chokora mapipa;
Nguo mchwara mchwara;
Aliingiwa na shetani;
Alijisikie kisukari.

The use of slang and vague terms in the learners' written compositions is an indication that the environment outside the classroom has an influence on the type of language students use in the classroom. It is possible that the learners in their peer groups know what these terms mean and have thus assumed that these terms are applicable to Kiswahili.
It is thus noticeable (Table 4.3) that 56.3% of the vocabulary errors were due to first language influence, while 43.7% were attributed to other factors such as slang and vague terminology. The L1 errors, that is, direct translations and the use of Lubukusu words were predictable by the C.A. theory.

From the analyzed data, it is noticeable that the lexical errors are likely to have been contributed by the learners' lack of mastery of contextual words in Kiswahili. This may be due mainly to lack of exposure to Kiswahili literature. Ellis (1980) states that a pupil cannot accurately use a lexical item which he does not understand; and in order to understand a lexical item fully, a learner must read or hear it many times in realistic situations.

4.2.4 Intervention Strategies

To come up with a solution to Kiswahili composition errors, 13 Kiswahili teachers were interviewed. The informal interview addressed itself to grammatical, spelling and lexical errors in Kiswahili composition writing. The objective of the interview was to elicit opinions of Kiswahili teachers on the influence of L1 on Kiswahili composition writing, and based on these views, to formulate an intervention strategy to solving these errors so identified.

69.2% of the teachers were of the opinion that one's first language influenced Kiswahili composition writing. They gave examples of the learners' additions of the suffixes -nga, -ngi and -nge to Kiswahili verbs. These, they noted, were due to Lubukusu influence.
To solve these problems, they suggested that:

- There was need for correct language usage across the curriculum. That is, every teacher in every school should be concerned about the type of language the learners used in their subjects. If a teacher notes that the learner is not communicating as expected, due to first language influence, the teacher should assist the learner by creating in the learner an awareness of the error made. Thus language correction should be a task of all teachers; not only language teachers.

- There was need for Kiswahili teachers in schools to work as one force. There was need of assisting each other in finding out how L1 was used in the classroom, the school as a whole and outside the school. It is only by such awareness that they would formulate intervention strategies to curb its influence in written compositions.

- The lessons allocated to Kiswahili per week should be increased. It was noted that since respondents in this study communicated more in their first language than in English or Kiswahili (Table 4.4), the L1 habits were deep-rooted. Thus the number of lessons allocated to Kiswahili were not adequate for frequent practice in writing and drilling.
TABLE 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Use Pattern</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kiswahili</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages used with teachers in class</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages used with classmates in class</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages used with others outside class</td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages used within the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages used with teachers outside class</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There was need for a cross-cultural intake in schools. It was noted that the L1 influence was more persistent in schools with a dominant language group, especially in rural areas. It was noted that in a heterogeneous group it was easier for learners to note the L1 influence amongst each other than in a homogeneous group.

- There was a need for the Examination Council to be more strict with the marking of Kiswahili composition papers at Form Four level. It was noted that, according to the Examination Council, if a student in the writing of a Kiswahili composition used a term which was not a Kiswahili term but used inverted commas, the student was not penalized. The examiners who are Kiswahili teachers take this message to the learners in the classroom. So the learners know that if they use inverted commas, they can use L1 or slang and get away with it.
• There was need to expose learners to a greater variety of Kiswahili literature. It was noted that the errors in grammar, spelling and vocabulary in Kiswahili composition writing that were a result of L1 influence were mainly due to the fact that learners lacked mastery of Kiswahili contextual words.

• There was need for the Kenya Institute of Education and curriculum developers to produce Kiswahili guide books that would guide teachers on how to deal with Kiswahili errors that were due to first language influence in writing.

• Curriculum developers should organize frequent seminars, workshops and inservice courses where teachers will be guided on how to teach Kiswahili composition writing and how to solve various problems such as the first language influence in writing.

• The Teacher Training Colleges should train learners on how to teach Kiswahili composition writing and how to solve various language problems such as the first language influence.

• There was need to reduce the Kiswahili teachers' work load and school responsibilities. This would enable the teachers to have more time to devote to learners in composition writing and drilling.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This study is presented in five chapters. Chapter One deals with the statement and definition of the research problem. Chapter Two presents the summary of literature reviewed. Chapter Three describes the research methodology used in the study. Chapter Four deals with the presentation and analysis of the data, while Chapter Five synthesizes and discusses the findings presented in Chapter Four with reference to the research objectives outlined in Chapter One. These are:

(i) To identify grammatical errors made by learners in Kiswahili composition writing and the extent to which these errors are influenced by the learners' language background.

(ii) To identify spelling errors made by learners in Kiswahili composition writing and the extent to which these errors are influenced by the learners' language background.
(iii) To identify vocabulary errors made by learners in Kiswahili composition writing and the extent to which these errors are influenced by the learners' language background.

(iv) To offer suggestions on how Kiswahili composition errors that are caused by the learners' language background can be avoided.

The research findings were thus analyzed under five main headings:

- Qualities of a good composition;
- Grammatical errors;
- Spelling errors;
- Vocabulary errors
- Intervention strategies for error correction.

It is on the basis of these discussions that recommendations were made.

5.2 Summary

5.2.1 Qualities of a Good Composition

According to the Kenya National Examination Council, in a good composition, candidates are required to write adequately and relevantly on a subject, to arrange their material effectively and to use a reasonable variety of structures and range of vocabulary.
The criteria according to which compositions are awarded marks are:

- The presentation of ideas or arguments logically and coherently;
- Mastery of syntax, the ability to construct sentences that are correct;
- Appropriateness of vocabulary to its purpose;
- Sensitivity to the requirements of vocabulary in respect to the subject matter;
- Correct spelling, punctuation, sequence of tenses, usage and idioms;
- The adequacy and relevance of the subject matter and the suitability of its arrangement.

Amongst these most weight is given to efficient handling of the language. It is on the basis of these qualities that the grammatical, spelling and vocabulary errors were summarized.

5.2.2 Grammatical Errors

The grammatical errors identified included errors in:

(a) Singular - Plural Forms

The learners generalized by making the pluralization of all Kiswahili nouns marked (mazawadi, mandizi). Though in Lubukusu the pluralization
of nouns is marked, in Kiswahili not all nouns mark plural (mbuzi in the singular remains mbuzi in the plural).

(b) **Concordial Agreement**

In Kiswahili, as in Lubukusu, different noun classes use different concords. Yet learners tended to use similar concords for differing noun classes (e.g. kikapu muzuri, shule muzuri). Since concordial agreement is marked in both Lubukusu and Kiswahili, these errors indicate that the learners lacked mastery of concords applicable to various noun classes.

(c) **Negation**

The learners added the following suffixes to Kiswahili verbs: -nga, -nge, -ngi (e.g. hatukulangi, hawakuandikanga). In Lubukusu these are verb morphemes that indicate regularity and frequency of actions, but they are not morphemes in Kiswahili.

(d) **Tenses**

Learners mixed the present, past and future tenses. For instance, in one sentence the learner would start by writing in the present tense and end up referring to the past (e.g. amefika jana saa nane). In Lubukusu, the present tense can also refer to the remote past, but this is not applicable in Kiswahili.
(e) **Adjectival Concords**

The learners inserted mu- prefixes to Kiswahili nouns (e.g. mutajiri for tajiri). In Lubukusu, nouns take prefixes which show the class and the concordial agreement marker, but this is not always the case in Kiswahili.

Thus the grammatical errors identified from the study that were influenced by the learners' language background were errors in singular - plural forms, negation, tenses and adjectives and they constituted 29 % of the grammatical errors.

5.2.3 **Spelling Errors**

(a) **Omission of Sounds**

The learners omitted some sounds, for instance l h l (writing apa for hapa, and umu for humu). In Lubukusu the sound l h l is a glottal sound and the vowel that follows is more pronounced than the initial sound l h l. This resulted in the omission of l h l in written Kiswahili.

(b) **Addition of Sounds**

Students wrote 'baruwa' for 'barua', and 'asikari' for 'askari' (see 4.2.2.2). There was a tendency of learners inserting vowels or consonants to form a consonant vowel structure (CVCV). Lubukusu mainly adheres to the consonant vowel (CV) structure. It is only in rare cases that two
consonants or vowels follow each other. Learners transferred Lubukusu syllabic structure to Kiswahili.

(c) Substitution

The learners substituted Kiswahili sounds, for example:

- /p/ for /b/  e.g. pei for bei
- /t/ for /d/  e.g. kitoko for kidogo
- /k/ for /g/  e.g. kundua for gundua
- /f/ for /v/  e.g. famiwa for vamiwa

There was a greater tendency to replace Kiswahili voiced segments with voiceless ones that are common among the Babukusu. For instance, in Lubukusu /p/ occurs more frequently than /b/. The learners used phonemes closer to Lubukusu than those non-existent. For example, the following Kiswahili sounds which are not in Lubukusu were substituted with Lubukusu sounds:

- /t/ substituted /θ/  e.g. tamini for thamini
- /k/ substituted /γ/  e.g. kali for ghali

The spelling errors influenced by the learners' language background were errors of omission, addition and substitution of sounds and they constituted 61.4% of the spelling errors made.
5.1.4 Vocabulary Errors

(a) Direct Translation

Learners translated directly, word for word, from Lubukusu to Kiswahili. For example, in Lubukusu, 'to wave to someone', translated word by word is 'to carry one's hand for somebody'. That may be the reason why learners wrote, 'Alinibebea mkono' instead of 'kupungia mkono', for 'kubeba' directly translated is 'to carry' (see 4.2.3.1).

(b) The Use of Lubukusu Words

There was a tendency to use exact Lubukusu words. For example, in Lubukusu 'vichikhî' refers to tree stumps; in Kiswahili tree stumps are 'visiki'. In Lubukusu, to backbite someone is 'khumonya', while in Kiswahili it is 'kusengenya'. Yet in written Kiswahili, the learners used Lubukusu terms such as 'vichikhi' and 'kumonya'.

(c) The Use of Slang

For example, 'buda' for 'baba'; and 'ushago' for 'mashambani'.

(d) Vague Terms

For example, 'watoto tandali' and 'nguvu kama mboko'.
The vocabulary errors influenced by the learners' language background were: direct translation and the use of exact words from Lubukusu to Kiswahili. These errors constituted 56.3% of the errors made.

5.2.5 Intervention Strategies

When teachers were interviewed, most of them observed that:

(a) There was need for curriculum developers to emphasize correct language usage across the curriculum.

(b) There was need for the Kiswahili department to work as one force in curbing the L1 influence.

(c) There was need to increase the number of lessons allocated to Kiswahili in schools.

(d) There was need for the Examination Council to be more strict with the marking of Kiswahili papers.

(e) There was need to expose learners to a greater variety of literature.

(f) There was need for a cross-cultural intake in schools.

(g) There was need to reduce the Kiswahili teachers' workload and school responsibilities.
5.3 Conclusions

From the findings of the study in Chapter Four, the following conclusions were made:

(a) That mother tongue has an influence on Kiswahili composition writing: It was noted that 29% of the grammatical errors, 61.4% of the spelling errors and 56.3% of the vocabulary errors were due to overgeneralization; that is, the learners attempted to impose their first language rules to Kiswahili and thus errors occurred.

(b) The environment outside the classroom has an influence on the type of language students write in the classroom. Thus teachers should pay attention to the language that surrounds them and their pupils in schools.

(c) Students lack sufficient exposure to Kiswahili literature. Due to this, they lack mastery of Kiswahili contextual words and thus, when they are unable to express themselves, they borrow terms from their L1.

(d) The L1 issue is a persistent problem in Kenyan schools. Yet the periods allocated to Kiswahili are not enough to eradicate this problem.

(e) There are other contributing factors that enhance the mother tongue influence in Kenyan schools, such as, the teachers' workload and lack of textbooks.
5.4 **Recommendations**

On the basis of the findings of this study and the teachers' views expressed in Chapter Four, the following recommendations have been made:

(a) Linguistics should be a compulsory unit in all teacher training colleges. The basic knowledge of linguistics will help teachers guide learners to accurate articulation of sounds. If learners articulate sounds correctly, they are likely to write correctly.

(b) The teacher training colleges should emphasize correct language usage across the curriculum. That is, every trained teacher should be concerned with the type of language the learners use, whether spoken or written, in their subjects. If the learners have problems due to L1 influence, such problems should be dealt with by all teachers and not only language teachers.

(c) There is need to increase the number of periods allocated to Kiswahili language, in order to create more time for drilling, writing, class debates and discussions. Drilling will condition learners into using the correct form by getting them to imitate or produce many examples of the correct form. Discussions and debates will enrich the learners' vocabulary.

(d) The learners should be exposed to more varied Kiswahili literature, such as story books, magazines, newspaper cuttings. This will enrich their
vocabulary, for it has been noted from the study that some errors are due to overgeneralization. This has occurred mainly because the learners' exposure to Kiswahili is limited.

(e) Teaching aids should be used by Kiswahili teachers in composition writing lessons. Most Kiswahili items have referents. If the referent can be seen, touched, smelt, tasted or heard, then it is likely that the word and referent will be usually associated and therefore remembered by the learners. A teacher can take objects to class for learners to see; alternatively, he/she can use demonstrations, drawings, tape recorders where learners can listen to correct pronunciation; or the learners can be taken to the surrounding environment to interact with the local community so as to see, feel, smell, taste and listen to the referents of selected items. These are contributory factors to the minimizing of errors due to L1 influence in Kiswahili composition writing.

(f) Grammatical, spelling and vocabulary rectification is best carried out in primary schools, before wrong language habits have developed. If first-language influence is not rectified at the primary level, the language errors at the secondary level will have been so reinforced by uncorrected repetition that they have become very strong language habits and they persistently resist remedial teaching.

(g) Curriculum developers should organize regular Kiswahili seminars and inservice courses. Apart from emphasizing on how to teach Kiswahili, the seminars should also emphasize on how to tackle various learners'
problems, such as L1 influence, that occur in the learning of Kiswahili. These seminars and inservice courses should be conducted by subject specialists who have an idea of what actually occurs in the classroom.

(h) The Kiswahili teacher guides should be designed in such a way that they do not only give answers to student exercises but also enlighten teachers on how to tackle language problems such as the L1 influence.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

(a) For a thorough analysis of first language influence on Kiswahili composition writing, it is necessary to consider a variety of data per student. An analysis based on one composition on a particular topic is bound to be limited. There is thus need for a study of L1 influence based on students' compositions written over a whole term, during which a variety of topics have been covered.

(b) The study analyzed the influence of the first language on one language skill - writing. There is need for a study to be carried out to analyze the influence of L1 on the skills of listening and pronunciation.

(c) Replication of the study in a different first language setting would shed more light on the problem of focus.
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APPENDIX A.

1. Tafadhal, jibu maswali kwa ukamilifu. Kwenye sehemu za ( ) weka alama ya ./
   (1) Jina lako ..................................................
   (2) Wewe ni msichana ( )
       mvulana ( )
   (3) Kabila lako .............................................
   (4) Nyumbani unazungumza lugha gani na baba na mama?
       ...................................................................
   (5) Ulipokuwa mtoto mdogo ulizungumza lugha gani hasa?
       Jibu: nilizungumza ....................................
   (6) Ulianza kuzungumza kiswahili
       (a) ulipokuwa mtoto mdogo ( )
       (b) kabla ya kuingia shuleni ( )
       (c) baada ya kuingia shuleni ( )

7. Unazungumza lugha gani hasa na marafiki zako?
   ......................................................................

8. Unazungumza lugha gani hasa na majirani zako?
   ......................................................................

9. Unazungumza kiswahili
   kwa shida ( )
   barabara ( )

10. Unaweza kuzungumza lugha zipi nyingine? ........................................
    ....................................................................
APPENDIX B

Andika insha isiyozi kurasa mbili kuhusu methali ifuatayo:

"Asiyesikia la mkuu huvunjika guu".
APPENDIX C

An Interview Guide for Kiswahili Teachers in the Sample Schools

1. What is the linguistic situation of the community served by your school? i.e. is it multilingual, bilingual or practically monolingual?

2. Do you think the linguistic situation of this community has any influence on the kiswahili written by your students?

3. What do you think the learners usually do when they are unable to write a kiswahili word?

4. There have been frequent complaints about kiswahili compositions being poorly performed in our schools. What would you say are some of the reasons for the poor performance?

5. From your own point of view, do you think the learners language background can influence kiswahili composition writing?

6. Please suggest to kiswahili teachers some ways of overcoming kiswahili composition errors.
## APPENDIX D

Bukusu Noun Class Marker Concordial Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>O/A</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>omukhasi</td>
<td>woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>bakhasi</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>kumwenya</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>kimyenya</td>
<td>songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>lilyanda</td>
<td>piece of charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>kama kinda</td>
<td>pieces of charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>sisindu</td>
<td>thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>bibinodu</td>
<td>things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>enju</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>chi</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>chinju</td>
<td>houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>lulwi:ka</td>
<td>horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
<td>kha</td>
<td>kha</td>
<td>khakha:ndu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>bubwi:fi</td>
<td>theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>khu</td>
<td>khu</td>
<td>khukhwi:mba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>locative (at)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>aase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>locative (on)</td>
<td>khu</td>
<td>khu</td>
<td>khukwase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>locative (in)</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>munju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>augmentative (sing.)</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>kukwana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mutonyi (1983)
APPENDIX E

Lubukusu Consonants and Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plosives</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>$\breve{n}$</td>
<td>$\breve{r}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glide</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowels

i
u
e
o
a

Source: Mutonyi (1983:36)
APPENDIX F

Kiswahili Consonants and Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plosive</td>
<td>pb</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>f v</td>
<td>θ δ</td>
<td>s z</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
<td>ʃ'</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>η</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid</td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glide</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. The different places of articulation are arranged from left to right and the manners of articulation are arranged from top to bottom. When there is a pair of phonemes with the same place and manner of articulation but differing in whether they are voiceless of voiced, the voiceless one is placed on the left of the voiced one.

Vowels

i u

e o

a

Source: Ashton (1944:3)
# APPENDIX G

## Grammatical Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Correct Version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manyumba</td>
<td>nyumba</td>
<td>houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapanga</td>
<td>panga</td>
<td>slashers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hizo vitu</td>
<td>hivyo vitu</td>
<td>those things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabila yake</td>
<td>kabila lake</td>
<td>his tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mach nyekundu</td>
<td>macho mekundu</td>
<td>red eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gari ilisimama</td>
<td>gari lilisimama</td>
<td>the vehicle stopped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zile kondoo</td>
<td>wale kondoo</td>
<td>the sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matunda tamu</td>
<td>matunda matamu</td>
<td>sweet fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hayikuwa</td>
<td>haikuwa</td>
<td>it was not so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wajasiri</td>
<td>jasiri</td>
<td>brave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX H

**Spelling Errors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Correct Version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asungumze</td>
<td>azungumze</td>
<td>talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raiya</td>
<td>raia</td>
<td>citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watu walikucha</td>
<td>watu walikuja</td>
<td>people came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mwesimiwa</td>
<td>mheshimiwa</td>
<td>honourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilimpidi</td>
<td>ilimbidi</td>
<td>he was forced to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mawaita</td>
<td>mawaidha</td>
<td>advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasasi</td>
<td>wazazi</td>
<td>parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machi</td>
<td>maji</td>
<td>water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akaanja</td>
<td>akaanze</td>
<td>he begun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX I

### Vocabulary Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Correct Version</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>walikosa cha tumbo</td>
<td>walikosa chakula</td>
<td>they lacked food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alikuia kiboko</td>
<td>alipigwa</td>
<td>he was beaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amepitia maneno mengi</td>
<td>ameyaona mengi</td>
<td>he has had a lot of experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aliiba huyo msichana</td>
<td>alimuoa bile idhini ya</td>
<td>they eloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wazazi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuangalia kwa barua</td>
<td>kusoma barua</td>
<td>to read a letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alimwagie babake mchanga machoni</td>
<td>alimpa babake aibu</td>
<td>he embarassed his father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alikula karo yote</td>
<td>alitumia pesa za karo vibaya</td>
<td>he wrongly used his school fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walipigwa kupigwa</td>
<td>walipigwa sana</td>
<td>they were thoroughly beaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alifura</td>
<td>alikasirika</td>
<td>he was annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ana damu ya kunguni</td>
<td>ni mwoga</td>
<td>he is a coward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>